



**First Session — Thirty-Second Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**STANDING COMMITTEE**  
on  
**STATUTORY REGULATIONS**  
and  
**ORDERS**

31 Elizabeth II

*Chairman*  
*Mr. Don Scott*  
*Constituency of Inkster*



MG-8048

**VOL. XXX No. 7 - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 24 JUNE, 1982.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
<b>ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)</b>	Ste. Rose	NDP
<b>ANSTETT, Andy</b>	Springfield	NDP
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BANMAN, Robert (Bob)</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>BLAKE, David R. (Dave)</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>BROWN, Arnold</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>BUCKLASCHUK, John M.</b>	Gimli	NDP
<b>CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.</b>	Brandon West	NDP
<b>CORRIN, Brian</b>	Ellice	NDP
<b>COWAN, Hon. Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent</b>	St. Boniface	NDP
<b>DODICK, Doreen</b>	Riel	NDP
<b>DOERN, Russell</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>DOLIN, Mary Beth</b>	Kildonan	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James E.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>EYLER, Phil</b>	River East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FOX, Peter</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>GRAHAM, Harry</b>	Virten	PC
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry M.</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>HYDE, Lloyd</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>JOHNSTON, J. Frank</b>	Sturgeon Creek	PC
<b>KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene</b>	Seven Oaks	NDP
<b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>	Niakwa	PC
<b>LECUYER, Gérard</b>	Radisson	NDP
<b>LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al</b>	St. James	NDP
<b>MALINOWSKI, Donald M.</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>MANNES, Clayton</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McKENZIE, J. Wally</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)</b>	St. Norbert	PC
<b>NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)</b>	Assiniboia	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.</b>	Selkirk	NDP
<b>PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson</b>	Transcona	NDP
<b>PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland</b>	Fort Rouge	NDP
<b>PHILLIPS, Myrna A.</b>	Wolseley	NDP
<b>PLOHMAN, John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>RANSOM, A. Brian</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>SANTOS, Conrad</b>	Burrows	NDP
<b>SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic</b>	Rossmere	NDP
<b>SCOTT, Don</b>	Inkster	NDP
<b>SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)</b>	Fort Garry	PC
<b>SMITH, Hon. Muriel</b>	Osborne	NDP
<b>STEEN, Warren</b>	River Heights	PC
<b>STORIE, Jerry T.</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>URUSKI, Hon. Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>USKIW, Hon. Samuel</b>	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
<b>WALDING, Hon. D. James</b>	St. Vital	NDP

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON STATUTORY REGULATIONS AND ORDERS**

Thursday, 24 June, 1982

**Time — 8:00 p.m.**

**CHAIRMAN, Mr. D. Scott.**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We have some delegations from the public here. I'd like to explain why we're a few minutes late starting this evening. The House is sitting parallel with the Committee. It's the first time this Session that has happened so we have to run in and pull people out of the House as well so that we have a quorum to start this Committee.

We're going to start off with Mrs Judy Olson this evening. Before we get going we have, I believe it's up over 40 presentations, in total now, to come before the Committee. This morning we gave a great deal of leeway in letting presentation go on for almost two hours. In the interests of the other people who are also behind you in line, I would ask people to limit their presentations, to make them as concise as possible. Some that are very extensive we may permit 20 minutes to half an hour on; most we would like to have people keep them within 15 minutes if that is at all possible.

Okay, could I call Mrs. Olson, please. Yes, Mr. Nordman.

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate what you were just saying, but are we going to allow them more than, say, 20 minutes?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That'll be determined by the Committee. I'll ask Committee for leave for the person that's giving the presentation. In the interest of the people who are further down the list, the chances of you having your presentation made before some time mid-Saturday is very very slim if each delegation takes half an hour to three-quarters of an hour. You know, just multiply it out yourself. We're only here for between two and a half and four hours at a sitting and you find yourself with 17 or 18 hours of delegations very easily. So that means we're running into the latter stages of next week and we'd like, if possible, to have the process sped up, to some degree at least, and if the Committee is willing to give leave, we will give leave for an extended presentation, Mr. Nordman.

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** Fine, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Kovnats.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Yes, just for my own interest at this point. I see the first two people making presentations belong to the same group, the Central Region Child Care Association. Are you going to allow each person coming to make a presentation or are you going to limit the presentations to particular groups or is everybody from a group allowed to speak?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, perhaps we can limit the groups themselves, or ask the groups to try and make their comments within the time limit and they can share between two or three people or whatever, if they

wish, if they have a couple of different people coming forward. If the briefs are totally different or coming from different directions, then I would think that would be possible as well to recognize them as separate.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** It seems fair.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, may we start?  
Mrs. Olson, please.

**MRS. J. OLSON:** We are pleased to see that this government's definition of Day Care is broad enough to include licenced Family Day Care homes. We feel that in order to facilitate greater accountability on the part of licenced Family Day Care, they must also be included in the same set of standards as other Child Care services. We strongly feel this type of care, although necessary, has been constantly overlooked in several important areas:

1. The qualifications of the provider - Currently licensing of a Family Day Care home is processed by one individual and no particular qualifications are required.

2. The quality of programming - Apart from the two semi-annual reports, there is no consistent monitoring of care given.

3. The Child-Staff ratio i.e. one staff to as many as eight children and at this time three of those children may be under the age of two years. It should be noted there is no back-up or relief person required in the event of illness or emergency.

There is still a certain traditional stigma toward group infant care and it has been the policy of decision makers, to our knowledge, to encourage Family Day Care placement for infants. We cannot support this policy.

Group infant care is required by fire regulations to provide a ratio of one staff person to three children. These staff spend their eight hour shift attending only to the physical, emotional, and intellectual needs of the children. Their time is totally devoted to "quality of care" and to program. How can a Family Day Care provider possibly provide the same "quality of care" and program when working alone with as many as eight children in the home, three of whom may well be under the age of two? The ratio contradicts fire regulations. As well as caring for the children the Family Day Care provider is also expected to be the cook, the caretaker, the telephone receptionist and be available to deal with any callers, professional or otherwise.

In order to support and monitor Family Day Care it would be advantageous for Family Day Care to become satellites of group centres within their geographical area. The monitoring of care and programming could be the responsibility of the Group Day Care Directors with the co-operation of the Family Day Care giver. Directors would be used as resource people in the following way:

The Family Day Care providers could select Community Board Members to formulate a Community Board to determine the policies of the Family Day

Care homes. The Group Day Care Director would be responsible to that Central Board. The Group Day Care Director would be involved in licensing, available for consultations, regular visits to the home, toy and library exchange, staff meetings, regular Board meetings with the Family Day Care provider and the elected Board. The Group Centres would also be a resource for relief staff, either with the Family Day Care home itself, or by caring for the children from the Family Day Care in the Group Centre when necessary.

It is important that parents are able to choose the type of care that they desire for their child, Group Care or Family Day Care. However, it is equally important that once that choice is made the parent is assured that the care their child receives will be "quality care."

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much Mrs. Olson, are there any questions from members of the Committee?

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you very much, Judy, for the brief from your area Association. Again, I'd like to pose the two questions to you that I did to the person that presented the brief this morning. One in terms of the staff ratios or the number of children allowed in Family Day Care. You don't say in your brief how many children you think would be an acceptable limit. Do you agree with the Day Care Coalition on their limit of five?

**MRS. J. OLSON:** It sounded to me this morning like there might have been some misinterpretation there. The current regulations are five children of preschool age, under the age of six, including the providers own home, plus they may also have three additional school-age children when they're not in school. I don't have a lot of difficulty with that given the resources and the backup that I think they need, to provide quality care to that age group. I do have a lot of difficulty with the Family Day Care providers being allowed to have three children under the age of two, as well as two between two and five, and three over the age of six.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** In your suggestions in terms of Family Day Cares as being satellites to a Group Day Care Centre - it sounds to me, first of all, this idea of a community board of Family Day Care providers, I haven't heard that idea before, it intrigues me - in your suggestion, when you say the Day Care providers would select community board members, would that be from amongst themselves?

**MRS. J. OLSON:** No, that would be from amongst their parents or interested citizens within their community. Presumably it would be largely parents.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** I see. And you're suggesting that the Group Day Care Director would work in cooperation with this board over and above the duties that he or she might have running and operating their own Day Care Centre at, you know, an average salary of less than \$1,000 a month, that they should take on all these responsibilities that you've suggested here.

**MRS. J. OLSON:** Not for nothing, not for nothing, no. I see the Group Day Care Directors, at least in the community which I am from have all had several years' experience and I believe would be good resource people to the Family Day Cares, and it would certainly provide more in the way of contact for the Family Day Care parents to be involved in some kind of staff meeting, staff development, and certainly in order to provide that backup.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Chairperson, I'd like to follow up on that. If you're saying not for nothing, would their Day Care Centre pay them extra for taking on these duties? Would the Family Day Care providers in the community all chip in for this extra assistance in resource, or are you suggesting that we, as government, should in our program provide extra funds for this additional time?

**MRS. J. OLSON:** I haven't solved that problem, if that's what you're asking me. One suggestion would be that perhaps a portion of the Family Day Care's per diem, or of their maintenance grant would perhaps go towards that. Certainly no board of a Group Centre is going to say we'll pay your total salary but you can spend half your time looking after Family Day Cares. That obviously would have to be negotiated and worked out.

The other side of that coin is that if my total salary was being paid by my Group Centre then it would probably be getting 100 percent of my energy and expertise because that's where I would feel my loyalty lay. You know, so that kind of thing would certainly have to be worked out.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** I'd just like to pick up on this part because I think that there's a vehicle there that sounds very interesting. I'd be very interested as time goes on if you have more suggestions in that vein if you could bring them to us. For instance, the same thing, if you're looking at staff people in a Day Care Centre, and as you and I know most of them are very harried, and working under pretty severe circumstances to try to keep up with delivering a quality program where they are, if you're asking them to go out into a Family Day Care home, if the Day Care provider is ill, and act as a relief person, I think we have to think on that quite extensively before that concept, the satellite kind of concept, could be put into place.

**MRS. J. OLSON:** There is that type of system happening quite frequently in the States at this time where certainly the number of Family Day Care homes would be limited to a per-group centre.

One of the things that happens is that the family, in the States I'm referring to, the Family Day Care mother and her children have regular weekly visits to the Centre so that the children are familiar with the staff, and the staff are familiar with those children, that there is an interchange. It might be more feasible to have the children brought to the Centre, rather than a staff go out. That would certainly depend on the circumstances and the number of children. As you're aware, I have a very keen interest in infant care because I provide infant care in Portage and one of my chief concerns is the care of infants under two in

Family Day Care when there is no back-up and there is no resource for those Moms.

**MSM. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Chairperson, could you give me information on what states and what research you have on that kind of a program at some point?

**MRS. J. OLSON:** Yes, I would certainly be willing to look that up for you.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you. That's all the questions I have.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any other questions?  
Mr. Kovnats.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Mrs. Olson, is the Central Region Child Care Association from Portage la Prairie?

**MRS. J. OLSON:** I am from Portage la Prairie. The members of the Child Care Association are from throughout Central Region.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Of the Board of Directors of the Central Region Manitoba Child Care Association, are all parents of children attending Day Care Centres? Are you aware of the Board of Directors that's listed on the . . .

**MRS. J. OLSON:** Yes, I'm sorry, I didn't understand the question.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Are all of these parents or could some of them be interested parties, other than parents of children attending Day Care Centres?

**MRS. J. OLSON:** I understand your question now. Some of them are Day Care Directors. There is a Board member from one of the Day Cares from Central Region. I am a parent and one of the other people is a parent within our own region and group centres.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any other questions? That being all, thank you very much, Mrs. Olson. I call Jan Lucas. Would you just hold for a second while your presentation is passed out Mrs. Lucas?

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** I'm Jan Lucas and I'm the Chairperson of Central Region MCCA and I would like to take the opportunity of thanking the Committee for this opportunity.

Since the conception of the Day Care Program in '72 we have seen many changes take place regarding this necessary but still controversial program. As care givers we are impressed with the priority of importance this government has given to the Day Care Program. We realize this government considers Day Care to be a very important service to safeguard the well-being of Manitoba children and to protect and strengthen family life.

During the past few years we have seen many changes, all of them beneficial to meeting the changing social and economic needs of the users of this service, however, we do have some concerns. We do not oppose the principle of standards that are outlined in Bill 21. In fact, what concerns us is not in the bill,

rather in the regulations that will certainly be surrounding this bill.

In addressing our concerns as outlined, may we include the following observation? We believe the general value of our Canadian society is one of pluralism which suggests that our communities are best suited to getting needs met by a variety of independent voluntary associations. May we remind ourselves that this is only possible if organizations, which would include Voluntary Community Day Care Boards, are independent of government authority. Indeed, when the converse of this happens, i.e., government authorities appointed by the province and accountable to the province, a totalitarian structure exists. The importance of understanding the relationship between democracy and bureaucracy cannot be underestimated in the specific issues as related to "enforcement" in the Day Care Standards.

We believe in our B.N.A. Act which defines education as a provincial rather than federal concern and this again reinforces the design of community elected Boards dealing with decisions in both the primary and secondary level of education. We find it an easy parallel to extend our vision to the community volunteer Boards determining and enforcing policies for Day Care Centres rather than the enforcement being carried out by a paid government employee.

We cannot stress enough the great necessity of keeping the taxpayers' dollar in the proper category, directly related to enhancing existing programs - rather than the horrendous drain of monies that would be incurred by the hiring of civil servants needed to do the job that Volunteer Community Boards are now doing.

Day Care guidelines are presently being monitored by 16 civil servants whose salaries total approximately \$360,000 per annum. In order to monitor standards in both Group and Family Day Care homes, these Civil Service positions would need to double - hence a cost of approximately \$720,000 in salaries alone, to say nothing of operating expenses.

We acknowledge the need for standards and welcome them. We acknowledge the tremendous resource of concerned skilled volunteer community citizens and we welcome their direction. We do not accept, however, the concept of only one person being given the power to enforce these standards, nor do we welcome this concept.

The value of retaining Volunteer Community Boards would ensure the Centre's autonomy rather than one person monitoring the individuality established by each Centre's elected Board.

Canada is a multicultural society and in order to best meet the needs of multicultures, the election of community based citizens must be in the best interest of preschool Centres.

The obvious advantage of retaining volunteer Community Boards as "Enforcers" is the continuous interchange of communication between said Board and Director through monthly Board meetings, fund raising activities and parent committees. The Community Board also has daily access in and out of Centres and this would be the proper measuring stick to determine the consistency of care being extended in the community. As we expect parents to constitute at least 30 percent of the Board - is it not expected that

they would also be constantly aware of the quality of care being given? May we stress that in order that volunteer Boards maximize their potential there must be available to them volunteer leadership development programs.

We would also like to propose the formation of a Regional Advisory Board which would consist of representatives elected from Volunteer Community Board in each region. This Board would act as an Arbitration Board and would be in direct communication with and responsible to the Day Care Office and its Director. The dissolution of any complaint would be worked out at this level of unbiased input.

The social reaction of too much government involvement in the legislation of young children is a well-known fact. We believe the ramifications of hired government employees used to enforce the Day Care Standards would be cause for much concern across this province.

Section 29(1) of the Act calls for qualified staff. At present approximately 90 percent of budgets are going out to pay minimal salaries which presently are well below the forthcoming minimum wage of \$4 an hour. Once trained, do you not believe these people should command a professional salary? We must be realistic at this point. Teachers and Nurses once trained immediately command a salary of \$1,700 to \$1,900 per month. Is it not reasonable to expect the same for Day Care workers whose training is now mandatory? Have they not earned the right to the same expectations salary-wise?

The Day Care budget is small in comparison to other expenditures. We must be responsible to see that any expenditure of tax dollars is going to enhance existing staffing and child care programs rather than establishing bureaucratic positions.

In conclusion may I add that it is imperative that we remind ourselves that we the Day Care community are here as a support to families. It is too easy at this point in the brief history of Day Care to forget that as we look to forming the regulations that will have such impact upon today's child as well as the children of tomorrow: let us not usurp the responsibilities of parents and the community.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much, Mrs. Lucas, are there any questions from the members?  
Mr. Sherman.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mrs. Lucas. I take it, since you and Mrs. Olson both participate in the Central Region Child Care Association that your two Briefs are really part and parcel of the same position being advanced by the Central Region Child Care Association, is that correct, or are they being submitted as individual briefs entirely independent and separate of each other?

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** No, the both presentations tonight are condensed from an original Brief that was presented to this Committee April 29th.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you. On the last page of your Brief, in the second paragraph, Mrs. Lucas, I understand what you're saying there, but I would appreciate some clarification on the point you're try-

ing to make. You say that we must be realistic at this point, teachers and nurses, once trained, immediately command a salary of \$1,700 to \$1,900 per month, etc., etc. Are you suggesting that the Central Region Child Care Association has reservations about qualifications and about standards and training parameters because of the fact that once in place they will necessarily imply salaries that are unrealistic or salaries that the Day Care Program and Day Care Centres would have difficulty in meeting?

**MS J. LUCAS:** I don't think I can answer no or yes; there are several answers to that question. First of all we are not, in any way, apprehensive of the proposed training program that is going to be required for staffing Day Care Centres. However we must be realistic in realizing that the money in our present budgets just is not there, that there is going to have to be some kind of infusion of monies from either maintenance grants or whatever. We simply cannot expect girls to take a two-year training course and have them come out and make \$4 an hour. What is the difference between a two-year child-care training program and a two-year RN training program?

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Let me put it this way, Mr. Chairman, if I might, to Mrs. Lucas. Are you suggesting that Section 29(1) of the Act is unrealistic? Are you suggesting that it's impossible to adhere to what the Central Region Child Care Association fears will be the regulations drafted by the government with respect to qualifications and training because they will impose requirements that will cost a great deal more than society can afford to pay?

**MS J. LUCAS:** That's right. In Section 29(1) is only one of the qualifications that is going to be necessary. We won't be able to meet any one of the regulations unless there's a change in budgetary monies coming our way. As I say, 90 percent of all Day Care budgets right now are going out on salaries and the salaries are at minimal wages usually. We're having difficulty trying to meet this year's budget with the increase in the \$4 an hour put forth for July 1st.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** This may be an unfair question, but it isn't intended as an unfair question, Mr. Chairman. Have you had any indication in your discussions with government or with the Minister's office or representatives of his office as to how tough those qualification standards are going to be or are you waiting like the rest of us for the regulations?

**MS J. LUCAS:** As I mentioned in the first of my Brief, my concerns lay with the regulations that are forthcoming, that Bill 21, if it's passed the way it is, enables government to build in the regulations and unless we have some input into those regulations, then we will be concerned. I have had assurance that we will be approached. We, as rural people, represent 50 percent of the total Day Care Community and we feel that we certainly should have some kind of voice in some of the decisions that will be made or at least consulted with.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** What kind of qualifications would

you require at the present time in terms of training and competence in the Day Care Centres with which you're familiar at the present time?

**MS J. LUCAS:** Because of the shortage of trained staff, we look for people that have the characteristics of good care givers which are an understanding of young children, that have a lot of stamina. We have to scrounge. It's a sad scene in rural.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Have you had any difficulties though in terms of what could be described I suppose as quasi-professionalism. Have you had any difficulties with underqualified or incompetent people?

**MS J. LUCAS:** Certainly.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** So you have an idea in your mind of how qualified you think a person should be before they would be employed as a regular staff in a Day Care Centre?

**MS J. LUCAS:** Yes we do. We certainly go through quite a procedure in selecting our staff people, but at the same time we have to be very flexible in our employees simply because we, again, have to be realistic. The trained people are not there and it's going to be a horrendous job getting qualified staff in the Centres. This again is probably a concern that will have to be looked at and worked out. We need to have grandfather clauses worked into regulations to ensure that we have the time that it's going to take. I understand that the Red River Community College turns out about 30 trained people in two years and they don't end up in rural centres.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** So at the present time, what you're saying though essentially to the Committee, is that 29(1) is too nebulous and too wide open and it could do more damage than good unless the government is prepared to examine very closely, with people who have had the kind of experience that the Central Region Association has had, the levels of qualification required and the source from which the funds are going to be available to fund that kind of training.

**MS J. LUCAS:** That's right and we only selected Section 29(1) simply because we wanted to make the point that the Day Care budget would have to be increased to meet any one of the proposed standards. That's the bottom line for it all.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Do you have any objections in principle to Day Care Centres offering enriched programming and charging fees over and above the regular approved provincial fee or subsidy rate, in order to pay for those enriched services, if parents are willing to pay for them?

**MS J. LUCAS:** I hate answering hypothetical questions. 'If' is a very big word and I don't know whether there are too many parents around that would be - they may be willing but I think, economically speaking, they certainly would not be able to pay more than what is being charged to them at this point.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Well, it's not entirely a hypothetical question because there are Day Care Centres that do it. I guess what I'm trying to get at with you is whether you think this objective of the government, under what is at this point, a pretty open-ended clause, 29(1), can be achieved, unless there's some flexibility in terms of the costs that are charged. Do you think it can be done under a standardized program that limits and regulates the amount of fees that can be charged? Do you think it's practical or realistic to suggest that the government and the province can supply the kind of Day Care spectrum that's proposed in the legislation and the kind of qualifications that are suggested, somewhat vaguely, by 29(1) without permitting a range of opportunities for Day Care Centres to charge over and above the standard rate if parents can afford to pay more than the standard rate?

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** I don't understand all the ramifications of a sliding scale, however, I do know that along with Section 29(1) and any other section in this bill, unless there is more money from someplace, we will not be able to implement one of the regulations.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thanks very much, Mrs. Lucas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you Mrs. Lucas. I was very interested in the overlying theme in most of your brief which seems to express a concern that somehow we are going to be taking the authority away from voluntary Boards. Was there something in the Act that led you to believe?

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** There is nothing in the Act and that probably, again I will state, is one of our concerns. It is not outlined in the Act as to who the ultimate power will be given to regulate or to ensure that the standards are being adhered to. The point that we are trying to make from Central Region is, because of the amount of monies involved in the total program, we feel that because the volunteer community boards are doing a good job that it would not be in the best interest of the Care givers to have the kind of monies that would be going out to hire more Civil Service jobs.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to follow that up, first of all, one reference in the Act which, in fact, is incorporated in the name of the Act is the word "community" which I had hoped would give an indication to the Day Care community that we felt that Day Care was, indeed, a community responsibility, both in the determining of programming and the delivery of the service within the broad parameters of the Act; but also that funding for child care in this province is a community responsibility. Now, obviously when you and your Association read the legislation that was not the message you picked up, am I correct in assuming that?

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** No, we certainly were encouraged when we saw the emphasis on the word "community." However, we also are still concerned with the fact that it has not been laid out in black and white as to what is going to be happening.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you. With that then, you are concerned about Day Care personnel taking over the function of boards, somehow. Does that fear stem on anything that you found in the Act, or from past practice, considering that Day Care for the most part has been operated by co-operative or non-profit boards that have had autonomy, even if they are under the government program, and have been getting assistance from Day Care Co-ordinators or the Day Care office? I'm curious as to where your concern comes from?

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** Well, let me say, that we have found the existing program to be working very well, at least as far as rural is concerned. We feel that the community-based boards have done a darn good job and are still doing a darn good job and we also feel that the position of a Co-ordinator as a resource person is an advantage to each Centre, as long as the Co-ordinators have the sufficient training in child development, etc. And, as resource people, we plug into them for those kinds of things. We would see a conflict arising if that job of the Co-ordinator would be expanded to, not only include a resource person, but then too also come into the Centre as an enforcer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess I'm concerned about where you get that fear that that's the way it will happen from the Act. I'm just trying to track down, you're quite firm throughout the first two pages of your brief, that that is a genuine concern of yours and so I'm trying to pick up.

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** Well, are you assuring us that this is what will be then?

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Well, I think under the existing regulations where a Day Care Board must have X-percentage of parents, etc. under the Acts which incorporate co-ops and non-profit organizations, there are provisions for the makeup of those Boards and the duties of those Boards. Under the concept that we have that perhaps we haven't communicated, being that our staff people would be there to assist Day Care Boards to develop a quality program if, say for instance, no one on the board had the expertise to lay out a program or your Day Care Director needed some assistance in program development, especially in rural areas, as you say, with the difficulty of obtaining qualified staff. I see the Day Care office more as a resource function to help Day Care Centres through their Parent Boards and their Community Boards developing quality programs. So, perhaps, as I say, we haven't communicated that as well as we might.

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** That could be possibly so.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** In fact, we generally have kept most of those kind of things in the regulations so that flexibility can be there. Now, all I can do at this point is assure you that on Page 2, where you have one person monitoring the individuality established by each Cen-

tre's elected Board. I guess all I can do is assure you that that is definitely not our intention.

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** No, that's right and I suppose I should clarify that we have responded to certain other briefs with the suggestion in there that the Co-ordinators would be the enforcers and that probably is what we're responding to.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Chairman, in fact, I would like to concur with you that Day Care Centres, up to this point, with voluntary Boards and Boards made up of working parents who usually, when they get home after a hard days work and have to do the housework as well, take time out to sit on Boards and do fund raising, etc. etc., have done a splendid job under horrendous circumstances in the last 10 years of the Day Care Program.

I guess I would also like to explore the issue that the Member for Fort Garry raised about staff qualifications. First of all, in terms of the fact that in our Budget this year we increased the Day Care Budget by 30 percent as one of our key moves in terms of the Budget we presented. I guess I wonder whether that message got out, too, that Day Care does have a rather high priority with us.

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** Well, it certainly has and I would, again, say that we appreciate the emphasis that this government has placed on the Day Care Program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I also would like to concur with you that when you talk percentages you always have to say 30 percent of what? So I think the message that you're bringing that 30 percent of \$9 million is certainly not adequate to do the kind of job that most of us know needs to be done out there.

In terms of salaries then and money, and salaries commensurate with whatever qualifications end up in the regulations, and I am looking forward to having working papers, and going out to the community during the interim of the session to work on those regulations, and discuss what one does think the minimum qualifications should be.

In your response to the Member for Fort Garry, I guess I would like to have you clarify whether or not your Association from your experience trying to get staff that do a quality job with children in terms of early childhood education, whether you would concur that a two-year Red River - Community College course, excuse me, I say Red River because that's all we have at the present and I'd like to add on to that - whether you would concur that would be desirable.

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** Yes, it would be. We hire girls with the understanding - in fact, that's one of the processes that they go through at the initial interview, that they make themselves available for any of the Red River extension courses that are available, and that is one of the areas that we start training our girls right away. I myself have been involved in a training program with staff from my particular Centre and we use every resource available to us.



**MS M. PHILLIPS:** So it's not a question then - excuse me, Mr. Chairperson, we're not supposed to have a conversation, you know, without going through him - and ask a question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes, and ask a question.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Well, I do want to get to the bottom of this. Mr. Chairperson, and Mr. Minister, of the fact that your Association would be then concerned about having (a) the training available and (b) the funds then to pay people who had gone to the trouble to upgrade themselves.

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** That's right.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** It's not a concern that we will be expecting under this Act for people in the Day Care fields to over a period of time phased in achieve the goal of having some formal qualifications.

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** That's right.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Okay, thank you. In terms of, what was I going to say next? Somebody's singing. Oh, in terms of the Community College courses I guess I would like to make you aware that we are planning on extending the numbers and not just at . . .

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** Yes, I understand that.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Not just at Red River but in the other Community Colleges. We have to look at this in terms of implementing the sections in the Act and the regulations of providing those facilities, so that will have to be worked out.

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** That is one of our concerns also regarding some of the regulations that are forthcoming. Can I just give you an example of what is going to be facing two of my staff this summer in order for them to get a three week course that is being offered? They are giving up their holidays and they are also losing \$900 in salary in order to take that three week course.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** There's nothing I can add to that. It's abominable.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Evans.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Yes, just very briefly, Mr. Chairman. I'm a bit confused by your reference to the value of retaining Community Boards as Ms. Phillips suggested, it's our hope that all the nonprofit organizations would, of course, in fact we would require them to have Community Boards. But I don't understand your reference to ensuring autonomy and then objecting to monitoring by staff. You suggest that you want standards but it seems to me that you're suggesting that Voluntary Community Boards would ensure those standards are maintained to the point that we would not need anyone from the government, from the department, to go and make sure that standards were being maintained. We're being asked to raise standards, so how do you propose that we can satisfy ourselves that a nutritious lunch is being served; that staff

ratios are being abided by; that the health care is adequate; that the children are not just sitting watching TV all day? You know, the developmental program, if one is put in place, how do we ensure that? Are you suggesting we simply rely on the Voluntary Community Board that that will be done?

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** Well, first of all, Mr. Evans, if you had a child in a Centre, and you were one of the 30 percent of the parents that sat on the Board, I am sure that you would be more than aware of the kind of consistent care that was going on in the Centre. We feel that parents because they are going to be part of the Board, at least 30 percent of the Board, certainly are going to be up on the kind of things that goes on in the Centres.

For Centres that may be in arrears, that are maybe not living up to the proposed standards, we have proposed that a Regional Advisory Board be selected. That would be where one Board member be selected and they would form a Regional Advisory Board. They would be in direct communication with the Day Care Office and would be under the direction of the Day Care Office Director. Between them they would work out a satisfactory solution to the problem. When you are offering care, a community service, you cannot for very long fool all of the people all of the time and your reputation precedes you.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Are you at all unhappy about the degree of monitoring that goes on at the present time where we do have Regional Co-ordinators who go in and ensure that certain basic health standards, physical standards are being maintained.

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** None at all.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Ms Phillips, do you have another question?

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, if you'd be quick please, we're running on.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Yes, I'll make it quick. In terms of the staff qualifications again; the section that deals with the staff qualifications review committee. We intended to have that be able to deal with equivalency in terms of experience of all those Day Care workers that are out there in the field and have gained a lot of experience. Does that mechanism sound satisfactory to your Association in terms of recognizing the experience they have and maybe requiring that they then add on with additional courses to get their certificate?

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** Yes, it's very intriguing and it sounds very exciting that, you know, the foresight would be displayed in this sort of a way. Our concern would be certainly that rural would have some representation on that review committee Board.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** That committee sounds acceptable, say, to the Day Care workers in the Centres that you

represent?

**MRS. J. LUCAS:** Yes.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Okay, thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, thank you very much Mrs. Lucas. Could I call next either Ann Barr or Rose Parker. Okay we have a Brief, and we'll present that as you're getting ready to speak.

Could you identify yourself, please?

**MRS. A. BARR:** I'm Ann Barr and I'm representing the Manitoba Association of Social Workers.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

**MRS. A. BARR:** The Manitoba Association of Social Workers wishes to commend the Government of Manitoba for bringing Bill 21 before the Legislature. There's an ever-growing need for Day Care facilities for children in this province, and we feel strongly that to place priority on high quality Day Care is an investment in our future. We trust that an Act to set standards for Day Care will result in better care for a larger number of children who are looked after outside of their homes for a significant portion of each working day.

The Manitoba Association of Social Workers supports the general requirements of the Bill, 3(1) and 3(2), calling for an environment conducive to the health, safety and well-being of the children, and for the provision of activities to promote physical, social, emotional and intellectual development of the children cared for within Day Care facilities. We are aware of the importance of meeting these needs in young children. Many social workers come into contact with children, adolescents and adults who have not had their basic personal needs met, and who subsequently become involved in the child welfare and justice systems, or who require treatment because of mental health problems or because of difficulties in their family relationships. The long term consequences of this are very costly to society in human and financial terms. While we would not assert that Day Care can prevent all of these problems, we feel it should be a priority of the community to provide the best possible care to young children, as one way to promote the development of well-adjusted, productive adult citizens.

It follows that the establishment of a Day Care Staff Qualifications Review Committee, to advise the Minister on requirements for and qualifications of staff and training thereof, is most important. It is necessary for the staff to be aware of the various needs of young children and to have the skills to create a social environment and specific programs that will help them to develop to the maximum of their potential for each developmental stage. We also feel it is important that staff relate to the children in ways that will enhance their sense of self-esteem, as this is basic to their positive emotional development.

A certificate in child care from a community college, or its equivalent, should be required of Day Care Centre Directors and at least one worker in each group of children. We are aware that many individuals have

acquired the personal qualities and knowledge required to do the job from their work and life experience. We recommend that Day Care staff have the opportunity to demonstrate their qualifications and skills through Challenge Credit Exams or some other mechanism. We feel that the care of children should not necessarily become restricted to professionals. This is particularly so in the case of family Day Care, which we feel should remain as it presently is designed, a service provided by competent individuals who are screened and assessed regularly by professional Day Care co-ordinators. Adequate supervision by trained professionals would seem to be the key to maintaining standards of care and I mean there, specifically in relation to qualifications and skills. In addition, we recommend adequate access to child care related courses that could lead to a certificate, in-service programs and extension courses. It should be noted that many of the children in Day Care have special needs because of physical, mental or social handicaps, and training should be available, as necessary, in order that staff have the knowledge to deal with the particular needs of these children.

We would like, at this time, to endorse, in general, the proposed "Standards in Day Care" that have been developed by the Coalition on Day Care, of which we are a member. I shall elaborate on and qualify several points made in their paper.

MASW supports the principle of nonprofit Day Care for children. It is traditional in this province, that care outside of the home, for children in need, has been provided on a nonprofit basis; for example, foster care, adoption, many group treatment facilities and, in the past, orphanages. Philosophically we feel that these services should be offered with the best interests of the children as the primary concern. I might just say that we are not against Day Care workers, be they family Day Care or in Day Care Centres, being paid an adequate salary and a living wage. Nonprofit, community-based Day Care, with parental involvement, as outlined in the Coalition's standards paper, offers the opportunity for creation of a network of community activities and support services for families and their young children. The components of this have already been outlined and you've had access to their papers. I won't detail them now.

At a time when nuclear families are increasingly isolated and working parents, particularly single parents are often under stress and without traditional family support systems, this model offers potential for positive support for these families and for the community as a whole.

There's a need for more Lunch-and-After-School programs. There appears to be a growing number of children under the age of twelve who are left without supervision while parents work. It is important that there be adequate funds to support such programs and that the Day Care Office have the mandate to assist in organizing these programs in communities unable to do so on their own. Parents, of course, must accept some responsibility for organizing the resources needed by their children. However, it is often the parents in need of these facilities who are the least able to mobilize the community because of their lack of time, energy and organizational experience. Here again, the community model may provide an oppor-

tunity to parents to become more involved with the care provided for their children and to increase the awareness of some parents of the need for adequate supervision for their children.

In terms of children with special needs, we would recommend the continuation of the Special Needs Family Day Care Program administered by Family Services of Winnipeg and funded by the province. This program allows for the recruitment of Day Care providers who are willing to care for children who have extra needs in a family atmosphere where numbers are limited. This does not lead to segregation from the community for these children. This program, with a higher ratio of staff to Day Care homes, is able to offer more intensive professional support to providers. The higher per diem rate paid to providers of Day Care for physically and mentally handicapped children should be continued. Otherwise, we would endorse the recommendation of the Coalition that special needs children be integrated into regular Day Care Centres, and that there be recognition of the need for additional training of workers to deal with their particular requirements. The provision of a positive Day Care experience for these children can greatly enhance their development toward independence and provide much needed relief and support to their families.

We agree that present salaries are inadequate in relation to the training for and responsibilities and importance of the job. Decent salaries are required to attract and keep skilled employees. We do feel that family Day Care providers should continue to be paid on a per diem basis so that all of them are paid equally for the job that they do. We would be opposed to their being paid salaries that vary according to their education and training. However, we feel that per diem rate should be brought to a level where it is economically viable for them to provide that service and may attract more well-qualified persons to provide that service.

In conclusion, the Manitoba Association of Social Workers again expresses support for the introduction of legislation to set standards for the provision of Day Care. We look forward to the implementation of the proposals of the Coalition for the continuation and expansion of the present community based model of child care as a step toward enhancing and strengthening the family lives of many of our citizens.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much, Mrs. Barr. Are there any questions?

Yes, Mr. Nordman.

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** I think I only have one. It's not really a question; it's just a statement.

I think this is the fifth or maybe the sixth presentation that we've heard and this is the first one which says anything about the parents having any responsibility and it briefly says, "parents of course must accept some responsibility for organizing the resources needed by their children." As far as I'm concerned, it's the parents' responsibility for the whole damn thing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes, on a point of order, the Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Chairman, it's not the function of the Committee to debate the issues with the people.

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** I'm not debating, I made a statement.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Actually the point of order is quite correct, Mr. Nordman, not to reprimand at all, but the role of the Committee is to hear and to ask questions on the specific points brought forward as they relate to the Bill by those appearing before us. I would ask, in asking our questions as well, if we could be somewhat more limited and a bit more concise. We've been moving along pretty good, much better than this morning at least.

Once we get in, Mr. Nordman, if you wish to make statements and points of view, in particular, I would suggest that the place we do that is when we get into the clause-by-clause debate ourselves.

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes, Mr. Kovnats.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Yes. I've got to agree with you, but I think that there's two sides to every coin and I can understand Mr. Nordman being reprimanded, but I think the duties of this Committee is to ask questions of clarification, rather than to point out their own views or to bring out the views of a particular side and I think that has been happening and I would hope that we would follow the rules for both sides.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Oh, yes, it will be. It will be very clearly.

Okay is there any other? Mr. Sherman, with a question.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** I have a question, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Barr, I don't have the Coalition on Day Care paper in front of me, but I do have it. I just haven't got it in front of me. I'd like to ask you, because I don't recall exactly whether this point was addressed or not. You make considerable reference to the question of standards and the fact that the Manitoba Association of Social Workers endorses the standards on Day Care presentation by the Coalition. Do you believe that standards can be developed for Day Care and implemented in a universal way in a province like Manitoba? Are you advocating rigid, universal standards that would apply in rural Manitoba, remote regions of Manitoba, Northern Manitoba, in the same way that they would apply in urban centres? I ask that for clarification because I don't recall whether the Coalition addressed that specifically.

**MRS. A. BARR:** I don't believe the question of different standards for different parts of the province was addressed. I think we support that need for a minimum level of standards no matter where it is but the question of how those would be applied I believe would come out in specific regulations which could vary, depending on the situation and circumstances.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Do you see any difficulty with the process that were embarked upon at the present time,

of looking at a bill that leaves all that to regulation, and with respect to my colleague, Ms Phillips, the Honourable Member for Wolseley, I disagree with her and I would expect that she would expect me to disagree with her. When she says that one of the reasons that we've left these to regulations is so we will have the flexibility. Not to be argumentative, my position is precisely the opposite. Leaving it to regulations means you will have no flexibility; the government will decide what the regulations will be. Do you have any difficulty with the process you're going through here, making representations to a Committee on a bill that simply is Enabling Legislation, or do you feel that there's enough substance to the bill that the exercise is worthwhile?

**MRS. A. BARR:** I would just say that our Board has expressed no concerns about the process.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Are you going to be making representations to the government on the regulations themselves?

**MRS. A. BARR:** I would presume so.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Could you give the Committee any indication of what your feelings are with respect to the cost requirements? Do you think it's practical to talk in terms of the training standards and qualifications that are at least proposed by the bill, without addressing the fiscal side of the question at the same time?

**MRS. A. BARR:** Obviously they're related but I would just have to say that we, I guess thankfully, can leave that to the government. It is a problem in terms of being realistic and at the same time having standards and we're very aware of the costs that would be involved in having qualified staff, having them paid adequately and just even providing the number of licensed and subsidized spaces that are required. It is a tremendous task and I'm glad I'm not the one who has to deal with that problem.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** In your experience as a social worker and your experience with Day Care, what is the desirable requirement in terms of training for a qualified Day Care worker. Is it a two-year course at a Community College?

**MRS. A. BARR:** I, myself, don't work in the Day Care field but we have supported the concept of the two-year Community College course or its equivalent and I think that could be any number of things in terms of training and experience. We'd want to recognize people's experience as well.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** And would you see that requirement being imposed on everybody who is in the Day Care field at the present time?

**MRS. A. BARR:** No. I think we pointed out that, first of all, at the present time there should be opportunities for people to prove their qualifications but that the two-year basic qualification should be part of the Directors of Centres and one staff person per group of

children, but not every employee or every Family Day Care provider.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** So there would be categories or grades of Day Care workers, employees of Day Care Centres would not require, in your view, the intensive two-year Community College training course.

**MRS. A. BARR:** Yes.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Any other questions? Mr. Kovnats.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Just very short questions. I've been listening to the presentations and I have heard nobody make any reference to how community Day Care workers relate with children. I think I heard them saying that they require university or Red River College two-year courses and things of that nature but nothing about relating with children. In your opinion, would that be the prime requisite to be working in a Day Care Centre, the ability to relate with children rather than a course at Red River College?

**MRS. A. BARR:** Well, that's obviously one of the requisites that one would hope those who have the training would have and those without it would have as well. I think we did mention the ability to relate to children in ways that enhance their self-esteem. I think that's what that sentence was really all about although you may not have picked up that meaning from it. I think, when we talk about knowledge of child development and needs at various developmental stages, it is more than just kind of a cold and clinical knowledge. It is a sense of what does that child need in terms of emotional development and that does come down to the way in which the people relate to them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Kovnats. Another question?

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I'm trying to give the credibility to the Brief that it deserves inasmuch as there was one statement, "We feel that the care of children should not necessarily become restricted to professionals." Is this where you're relating to the ability to relate with children?

Thank you.

**MRS. A. BARR:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** I'd like to ask Mrs. Barr if she sees any comparison between central standards in this legislation, the requirement provincially for certain standards to be met throughout the province, taking into account regional preferences or preferences of parents in a particular Centre. Do you see any comparison between that and the requirement provincially under The Public Schools Act for certain programs and qualifications for staff which are lined out, by the way, in detail in the regulations and the variety of children that we have throughout the province in the public school system?

Thursday, 24 June, 1982

**MRS. A. BARR:** I suppose there is but I, personally, and the Board, haven't addressed that particular question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any more questions?  
Mr. Evans.

**HON. L. EVANS:** In the Brief you talked about the necessity for knowing details and setting of standards and so on and these will have to be forthcoming. But would Mrs. Barr agree that, in large measure, the regulations setting out standards will ultimately depend and will have to depend on the amount of money we can get from the Treasury of Manitoba to ensure that we have standards, whether it's ratios of staff to children, the degree of facilities, the qualifications of the personnel we use. Would you agree that what we set out in regulations, what we set out in standards, will ultimately be limited by the amount of money we have available to ensure that we can get those standards at a given level, in place?

**MRS. A. BARR:** Ultimately, I accept that, yes.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much for your Brief and your comments, Mrs. Barr. Next I'd like to call Doris West. While she's coming to the mike, I would ask the Clerk to give out the presentation, or at least some background to the presentation, I should say, Ms West, before you start. Your presentation is rather lengthy and I would hope that you're going to be making a consensus of it or a summary, in your presentations if that's possible. If you're giving us a synopsis, would that throw you off key too much?

**MS D. WEST:** It probably would, I haven't done this very often.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay.

**MS D. WEST:** I went through it before I came and it took me about 25 minutes so I don't think it should take too long.

Good evening, Mr. Chairperson, and members of the Committee. We would like to compliment the Hon. Len Evans and Myrna Phillips for their hard work in developing The Community Child Day Care Act. We also appreciate the Committee members involvement here and we realize that it will take a long time and many hours of your dedicated work.

We are really excited about the significant time for Day Care in Manitoba. I think for the first time we really feel like we're getting somewhere. I have been introduced as Doris and I am Doris and I would just like to add that I'm the Director of Brooklands Day Care Centre and I'm here on behalf of the Manitoba Child Care Association.

The Manitoba Child Care Association is an organization for people concerned with all areas of child care. It was established in 1974 in response to the Provincial Government Day Care Program. The goals of the Association are:

1) to promote the continuing development of any service for the care of children 12 years and younger.

2) to advocate quality standards and guidelines designed to maintain quality child care.

3) to educate the parents and the general public regarding the value of child care services.

The membership, consisting of 355 individuals, is mainly comprised of Child Care workers with a variety of educational backgrounds and experience. It is representative of quite a geographical cross section of Manitoba.

The Advisory Committee of the MCCA through many meetings, discussions, and much listening, have developed the main core of the following proposed Child Care standards. They have been designed by people with working experience in the Child Care field. The committee has been successful in receiving input and approval from the general membership of the MCCA. The ideas have been carefully reviewed and represent our realistic and knowledgeable opinions, thoughts, and views.

We are pleased to have the opportunity to present our concerns and what, in our judgment, are minimally acceptable standards. We would like to start by going through concerns we have with the bill. We feel very pleased with the general thrust of the bill, however, we have some certain reservations.

Section 1, under Definitions, we strongly recommend that facilities offering babysitting while parents are participating in recreational opportunities in the facility such as racquet courts or the spa, be included under definitions, perhaps, under Occasional Day Care Centre to ensure they meet minimal guidelines.

Section 15, Interim License; 16, Provisional License; 17, Orders Respecting Requirements. We strongly urge that the Director and staff, Board of Directors and parents must be notified by the Day Care office when an interim or provisional license and orders respecting requirements is issued to a Centre. We feel that parents and all involved have a right to know this information.

Section 27(1)' Day Care Staff Qualifications Review Committee. Because of the responsibilities of this Committee we strongly urge that the members be chosen with great care. We would like to see the Review Committee expanded to 10 or 11 members, including: two rural representatives; one Family Care representative; two MCCA representatives; one school age Child Care representative; one community rep.; two parent representatives; one college or university faculty member; and one professional rep.

Section 29(3), Ministerial Certificate. We understand the reasoning for this certificate but it is our belief that the qualifications of staff directly affect the quality of program offered. We strongly urge a method be made available for the person receiving the ministerial certificate to obtain Child Care training.

Section 32, Further Assistance. Our concern with this particular section is that certain individuals might attempt to take unfair advantage of the government's generosity, therefore, we would like to see the conditions of assistance defined clearly to prevent abuse.

I'd like to now turn to the list of standards which the MCCA recommends be adopted which expand on regulations to fall under Section 33.

The Child Care Standards. In submitting the following standards there is an assumption that the funding criteria from the government would change to

accommodate the facilitation of these standards. The first section we go through is staff qualifications and we feel that this section deserves careful consideration as we feel it is of utmost importance in ensuring quality care. An individual working prior to the effective date of regulation may retain the position with qualifications different from those stated providing that they have demonstrated competence in that job and will pursue the appropriate courses to ensure adequate qualifications. Also, an individual who feels they have the expertise and/or experience could challenge the certificate or the diploma. The criteria for this could be established by the Department of Education.

The Director must have a degree or diploma from a recognized educational institution in Early Childhood Education and at least two years experience. Business Administration background would be an asset. We would like to advise that the Business Administration be made available and as Aleda referred to this morning it has been happening through Project Manage. A lot of Child Care workers at this time have been finding that the rates, although they are as cheap as they can be, are still too expensive.

Child Care Worker III must have a degree or diploma from a recognized educational institution in Early Childhood Education. A Child Care Worker II must have a certificate in Early Childhood Education or equivalent. The diploma is a two-year program offered at Red River; the certificate is an evening program equivalent to the first year of the diploma. The Child Care Worker I, an individual who demonstrates desirable qualities to work with children and will immediately pursue appropriate courses to ensure adequate qualifications. It should be noted, at this time in Manitoba, there is no specific training available in infant care, birth to 2 years, or school age child care, 6 to 12 years. Training must be made available to ensure proper qualifications of staff.

The Directors must be a Child Care Worker III and will count for only ½ person in the staff-child ratio but in Centres licensed for over 24 children the Director may not be counted in the child staff ratio. Each child group must have a minimum of one Child Care Worker III on the floor at all times. There is a maximum of one Child Care Worker I per group.

The Child-Staff Ratios and Group Size. This is another area we feel deserves careful consideration because these factors also directly affect the quality of care offered. The staff in the child-staff ratios include only those in the actual care of children. Working ratios must be upheld at all times.

To ensure for safety, there must be a minimum of 2 people in the child facility at all times when one or more children are present.

Infants and toddlers are to be completely separated from other groups of children in the facility by a separate room. We'd also like to add that other groups must be separated by at least a physical barrier or divider to prevent general mixing of the groups in one room.

Following, you'll note there's a chart showing age, maximum group size and staff-child ratios. We feel this chart is straightforward and covers all the age groups that can be allowed. Presently, regulations are unclear in this area.

The Physical Facilities. Every Child Centre shall provide designated space for activity rooms, play, toileting, washing, eating, dressing, resting, the preparation of food if meals are prepared on the premises, an office, staff rest periods, isolation for health reasons, storage for food, beds, bedding, toys, indoor and outdoor play material and equipment, cleaning equipment and medical supplies, and where not shared with other facilities, heating and electrical equipment. Physical facilities to be used by children are to be child size.

There must be 4 square metres of usable indoor playroom space for each licensed child space. This space does not include permanent fixtures such as lockers, kitchen cupboards, storage, etc.

There must be reasonable access to 25 square metres of usable outdoor space for each child in existing Centres. All newly created Centres must have direct access to 25 metres of outdoor space per child. This area must be fenced.

There must be one indoor toilet and one sink for every 10 children.

Careful consideration must be taken in regard to natural lighting and windows at the child's level.

New Centres must have all indoor space used by children at ground level.

Nutrition. Each child in attendance for a full day must be provided with one nutritious lunch and two nutritious snacks.

All menus are to be approved by a nutritionist to ensure that the Centre's providing three quarters of a child's daily nutritional requirements.

Each Centre will ensure proper food management procedures are maintained. We recommend that provisions be made for workshops in food handling to take place.

Consideration must be given in regard to breakfast needs to children who arrive early. Centres open as early as 7 o'clock in the morning and it may be difficult for children to have something to eat before they reach the Centre.

Under Program. We want to see Centres remain unique and individual for parents to choose what best accommodates their needs. While we encourage Centres to maintain their individuality, every Centre should have written statements, for parents and staff, outlining the program philosophy and method of management in each of the following areas: Daily Schedule, including daily outdoor play, weather permitting. We'd like to see guidelines concerning weather for outdoor play to be defined in the regulations. Health care for children and staff, program policies and records, parental involvement; we feel this is a necessity and a must for Centres to be involved in. It's strongly urged. We want to see it strongly urged for Centres to involve their parents. Age appropriate and suitable equipment and supplies; a variety of age appropriate activities for children based on objective goals, providing social, physical, intellectual, artistic and emotional development. Also we would like to have outlined positive behaviour and guidance techniques. We feel that co-ordinators can act as a resource person in this area to ensure well rounded programs are being offered.

In the past, punishment has been seen in Day Care Centres. There's no room for punishment in guiding

positive behaviour, or guiding behaviour positively. This section is important to provide protection for children and to encourage positive techniques to be used. To ensure child protection, the following forms of discipline shall not be used: corporal punishment, including but not limited to the following: striking a child directly or with any physical object; shaking; shoving; spanking or other forms of aggressive contact; requiring or forcing the child to repeat physical movements; physical restraint as a form of punishment; also harsh, humiliating, belittling or degrading responses of any form including verbal, emotional and physical.

The next area we've covered is Special Needs. We feel also this needs special consideration for expansion is greatly needed. Special needs is defined as physically handicapped, mentally handicapped, emotionally disturbed and environmentally deprived. Centres with the resources and capabilities should have an option to provide for children with special needs. It should be noted that in Manitoba, up to this date, there has been no combination of expertise and practical knowledge in the area of mainstreaming special-needs children into group care. We feel research is needed in this area.

**Safety.** All staff must have a valid first aid or life saving certificate. All staff must have knowledge of fire safety regulations and be trained and experienced in the use of fire safety equipment. We feel training in the use of fire safety equipment must be made available. Although we all have fire extinguishers in our Centres, if we really had to use them I don't know if there's one person that would know how to put out a fire.

There are two additions that we've made in this area that are not noted on the page. We feel a closer look needs to be taken considering child transportation in day care settings, necessary to have defined guidelines to ensure child safety. Also pool activities, whether recreational or instructional, we feel require clearly defined child instructor ratios and guidelines to ensure safety.

**The Board of Directors.** The present Provincial Day Care Program regulations governing the Board of Directors should be adhered to. Parents must constitute at least 30 percent of the Board of Directors for each Centre by the first annual meeting. We feel it is very important that Centres are to be provided with the resources to educate the Board of Directors in their responsibilities and duties.

**Enforcement.** We are in agreement with the sections in Bill 21 dealing with enforcement. We feel the Board of Directors are responsible for all aspects of Centre operation. The role of the Provincial Child Day Care Office will be to act as a resource and administrative support service to the Board of Directors, the staff and parents of the Centre. Co-ordinators must have relevant educational background and experience in the child care field. Each area will have an appropriate number of co-ordinators to allow for regular visits and quarterly reports. Reports are to be made available to staff, parents and Board of Directors.

The Provincial Child Day Care Office will have forced legislative regulations through the day care co-ordinators. We feel they are in the best position to evaluate our programs. Where a Centre's Board dis-

agrees with the co-ordinator's evaluation, there must be a means of appeal through a community based Arbitration Board before further action can be taken. In the event a Centre is in breach of any standards, the Provincial Child Day Care Office will impose an appropriate penalty, including imposing a suitable probationary period in writing to the staff, parents and the Board of Directors, putting the Centre under administrative receivership similar to the trusteeships set out in The Public Schools Act and closing the Centre.

We feel these proposals outline our major concerns with Bill 21 and present a realistic picture of what is necessary to provide quality care to young children. We urge you to consider our proposals very carefully. Before ending our presentation, we have a few more concerns we would like to address.

Staff qualifications have been demonstrated to have direct influence on the quality of program offered to children. We have attached a copy of a study for your information, that is, attached to your presentation there. We feel strongly that it is time to push for Child Care Worker qualifications and provide opportunities for academic upgrading.

Also, we feel it is time to push for Child Care Worker recognition. No matter how long we spoke and how many stories we told, we feel we could not really inform you as to how important and demanding this field of work is. Guiding children's behaviour and providing many learning experiences for children requires dedication and conscientious planning. We would like to see the government recognize this fact and provide increases in budgeting that will accommodate healthy wage increases to a field of workers who have for years sacrificed their income levels for their child care programs. This may also attract more male workers to the field which we feel is important.

We would like to see a study, perhaps a job evaluation program, which would attempt to establish an equitable wage scale for Child Care Workers in comparison to other professionals. This could be used as a guideline to assist Board of Directors in making their decisions for staff wages.

Finally, we would like to point out that we feel it is really important to maintain public input throughout the remainder of the process which will determine the final shape the regulations are to take. We would recommend that once the proposed regulations are drafted, they be circulated to the public and open to response through public meetings, presentations and written Briefs. The regulations will be the heart of The Community Child Day Care Standards Act.

Thank you for this opportunity to present our ideas.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much, Miss West. Do we have questions?  
Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Miss West, in two areas, both including business administration backgrounds for directors or training in the financial operation of the Centre and also, for courses for the members of the boards, you've suggested that courses be provided.

My question, considering we've talked a lot already today about the inadequate funding and the need for

funding directed to the care of the children and to me that would be the first priority, is there any way an association like yours could offer those kind of courses? You don't say in here who should be offering them. I'm assuming you're telling us we should be offering them.

**MS D. WEST:** Well, I feel right now that Centres do not have the funding to provide that to Board of Directors. Something like Project Manage does put on workshops specifically for a Board of Directors, but that involves some money and we're asking volunteers to pay to better themselves. I don't really feel that's fair.

Also, for the administration for Directors, it's the same circumstances, although I know Project Manage is offering the programs as inexpensively as possible, because they are being subsidized, it is still a lot of money to ask directors to pay to go to these workshops.

So somehow that is going to be worked out. Perhaps Day Care co-ordinators would be in a position to offer more assistance in this area to Board of Directors. I feel that they are knowledgeable or could obtain the knowledge to pass on to the Board of Directors. I'm sure that staff people generally, would feel that if they were getting paid an equitable wage, they probably wouldn't mind paying to further their education. So, it's either we see more money coming to Child Care Workers, we'll probably be willing to take that, but if that doesn't come, we feel that we need assistance in that specific area.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** I was wondering whether a co-operative approach on that would be interesting to your Centre in terms of your organization. I know your newsletter goes to most Day Care workers or Day Care Centres, at least, doing the organizational work with the government perhaps providing the staff person to run the workshop.

**MS D. WEST:** One of our goals is to help educate and I'm sure that the Child Care Association would be quite willing to get involved in that aspect. Unfortunately, they too, are a little tight when it comes to funding. I'm sure that on behalf of the Association, we would be quite willing to get involved and see something like that happening.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** One more question quickly. In Section 4, under 'Enforcement' of your Brief, you're asking for an appeal mechanism in terms of the evaluation of the co-ordinators. My understanding of Section 20 of the Act, there is an appeal procedure that would take into account the fact that if the evaluation from the co-ordinator said that segment of the licensing requirement, be it programming or physical space or whatever, was not being adhered to and there was a danger of the licence being revoked or not being issued in the first place that there is that appeal procedure under Section 20. When you read that, is that not adequate for the . . .

**MS D. WEST:** Yes, we felt quite pleased with the outline that was there. I feel that does cover.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** I just wanted to clarify whether you

were asking for something more than that.

**MS D. WEST:** No, I feel that we did discuss this and we felt that we were fairly pleased with the way it was worded here.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** One more question, Mr. Chairperson. The issue about parental involvement throughout your Brief, especially on boards, to me only takes into account the situation of co-operative or non-profit boards. It doesn't take into account the profit-making Centres or the very small, sort of, I'd call them Aunt Sally's corner Day Care Centre where this one individual or two individuals are running a Centre on their own and there's no parent board. Are you suggesting that in those circumstances, there should be parent boards? Is this for all Day Care Centres in the province or just the ones that we've covered now under the ones that we subsidize?

**MS D. WEST:** I feel that parents should have some input into what's happening in their programs. We feel strongly that the place for them to take their role in putting something into the program is through the Board of Directors. I'm hoping that with the regulations that the situations you're describing would fit under definitions and therefore, they would have to go as far as having a Board of Directors in having that Board of Directors comprised partially of parents.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any other questions? Mr. Evans, do you have a question?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Just one question. I'd like to thank you very much for the Brief. It was very informative and sets out a lot of very good ideas. I'm wondering whether the delegate, Ms West, would agree that some of the detailed standards that are outlined in the Brief, such as reference to Day Care worker I, II, III, the different levels, etc., and the requirements, that it would be reasonable to expect the government to work gradually towards bringing forth required standards. Is it not reasonable to expect that any government considering the limitation of funds that we always seem to be faced with these days would have to take some time to work into gradually and steadily, nevertheless, towards some ideal set of standards?

**MS D. WEST:** I'm hoping that the government would set it so that we could work up toward it. Under 'Staff Qualifications,' I feel we have put a grandfather clause in there, or a grandmother clause, as Aleda would refer to it. I do feel that it's not going to happen overnight and it is going to take some time and we are going to have to allow the time for people to obtain their training. It may not happen in one year; it may take five years to happen, but I would hope that the regulations would be set so that we are working towards what we have proposed.

**MR. L. EVANS:** Just one other question then - maybe put you in a bit of an awkward position, but there is, as Aleda Turnbull indicated this morning in her presentation, a great demand for Child Day Care spaces. I think she referred to an estimate of only about a third of the demand being provided for, that two-thirds still



had to be provided for.

Now, the additional funding that is being requested over and above the \$11 or \$12 million that we have already in this year's Estimate will be needed both for physical expansion of program, namely, more Day Care spaces, more Day Care Centres and facilities as well as further funding to upgrade standards. So I just wondered if we could get some guidance. It may be an unfair question, but where would you put the emphasis? We really have to do both and I'm in a bit of a quandary as to where should we put the emphasis, physical expansion, that is, meeting that additional two-thirds that Mrs. Turnbull talked about or going more money into higher standards than what we've got?

**MS D. WEST:** Well, I don't know if I can speak on behalf of the Association for this; I can tell you how I feel about it.

I would hope that both could be covered; that would be really nice. But I know that we do have financial restrictions and that probably both cannot be covered. I feel that now that we have some programs developed, I would like to ensure that the quality of care that's being offered to the children today is adequate. I know last year I went out and visited a few Centres and I came back really upset. I felt that I went into each Centre and came out with a different feeling - excuse me, I cry very easily - and I would hope to think that the care that we're offering should be the quality care and that we expand later on.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you, very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any other questions for Ms West?

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask Ms West, with respect to the certainly, the imminently laudable objectives that the Manitoba Child Care Association sets out to the Day Care field, has the Association had the opportunity, or does it have the ability to provide any costing estimates on the kinds of programs you're proposing? Do you have any idea for the help of legislators as to what we're talking about here in terms of an annual cost of operating a program of this kind?

**MS D. WEST:** I can see that would take a lot of research and I would anticipate that the Association would help out in any way that they can. I feel that there are some Centres in Winnipeg right now, not very many, but there are some that are offering pretty close to what these standards are suggesting. So I feel that we could probably come up with a fair estimate as to what the actual cost is and what money we would feel comfortable with to provide those types of standards. I think that is something we could research and come up with something.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, I just might say by way of comment, Mr. Chairman, I think that'd be very helpful. I can't speak for the government, obviously, but from the Opposition's point of view, it would certainly be very helpful.

But just to reconfirm in response to the Minister, if

we look at the projected increase in the Day Care budget for 1982-83 over 1981-82, as I calculate it - unless the Minister's uncovered some additional supplementary spending - it's \$2.4 million on a base of 9.3 which is 26 percent. Now, he's announced that he's moving into initiatives to provide 750 new spaces which, with cost price increase and the inflation rate, etc., etc., will certainly eat up that \$2.4 million. What you're saying to him is your priority would be to forget the 750 new spaces and put the \$2.4 million into the first stage of implementation of some standards, is that right?

**MS D. WEST:** I guess that's what I did say, wasn't it?

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, I'm not disagreeing with that, but I just want you to tell the Opposition what to do so that we can keep the government honest and in line.

**MS D. WEST:** Okay. I don't know if I really have an answer for that. I feel that - I spoke on my behalf in that regard and there are a lot of children that are receiving, I feel, inadequate care in Day Care Centres right now, but there are probably a lot of children in private situations that are really receiving perhaps worse care. So the two are really important to look into. I really feel it's difficult to set a priority as to what is more important, but I would definitely like to see the quality of care being offered now in the Centres we have now, upgraded.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thanks very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mrs. Smith.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I would just like to ask Ms West if she considered offering the services of her organization to work with government on costing? In your presentation, you made mention of a lot of the costs to society of not having good child care. I think you mentioned disturbed children, mental health problems later on, a lot of family difficulties. Customarily, when we cost things out, we look at the direct costs and don't look at some of the long-term costs of what happens if we don't do such programs.

I wondered if your Association had thought of perhaps offering to co-operate with government in some kind of a study of that wider type of cost benefit study?

**MS D. WEST:** I'm glad you pointed that out because it is really important. I know of one Director that had stated to me - she was the Director of a Centre and she asked her Child Care Workers how many children that had been through their program were having difficulty in kindergarten or Grade 1 and they could not remember any children that were having difficulty in those primary grades. So I feel that Day Care in a good situation is offering a lot for children and in the end is going to cost less all around for the taxpayers' money. But, I feel that, on behalf of the Association, if there's anything we can do to help these regulations get through and to ensure that they are what we want to see, we will be more than willing to participate in any study or any research that we can help out in.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I believe that's all. Oh, Mr. Kovnats, I'm sorry.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** It's Ms West?

**MS D. WEST:** Doris.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I, too, am quite emotional and I cry quite easily. As a matter of fact, I've been crying since last November, but that's another story.

In your presentation you make some remark concerning corporal punishment wherein you list all the things where you mustn't touch a child. Is this your view or the view of your organization? I can't quite agree with how detailed you go into how you mustn't touch a child. As a parent I think that I'm entitled to punish my child to some extent, not to beat the child, but some physical punishment. Why would you restrain the people who are looking after my children in this manner?

**MS D. WEST:** We have tried to make it as clear as possible and I'm sure if you speak to the co-ordinators in the government program, they can tell you stories of what they have seen. I know that spanking and hitting has carried on in Day Care Centres and I really feel that as a qualified person, I have my diploma from Red River and I have years of experience working in the field, and I feel there are better alternatives. Punishment is not in the best interest of the child and to protect children so that there is someone that can say, listen, this is what's happening in the centre, you're not allowed to do that. There are better, positive techniques of handling children and some positive techniques involve restraint. If the child is going to be hurting another child, harming the environment then that child has to be stopped or even if the child is hurting himself. So a positive guidance technique can involve where a Child Care Worker will be touching the child in the form of maybe a restraint but that's for the protection of the child himself or other children in the environment rather than punishment.

We would like to feel that child care workers are qualified to know that positive techniques can be used. A term we'd rather use is discipline. There are positive discipline techniques that can be used, punishment I really feel there is no need for punishment in a Day Care Centre. If a Child Care Worker has to resort to spanking then they probably shouldn't be in Day Care there are many more positive techniques that will work.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** One point for clarification is that your view or the Manitoba Child Care Association?

**MS D. WEST:** I feel that is the Manitoba Child Care Association view.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I'm not completely against it I just stated mine and you stated yours, I'm ready to accept that.

**MS D. WEST:** What parents do in the home is up to their discretion. Right now it is actually illegal for Child Care Workers to use the form of spanking in Centres.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** In our home we only hit our child in self-defense.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If that is all the questioning I would like to thank you very much, Ms West, for your fine presentation. No need to be nervous, was there? We're probably more nervous than you are.

Next is Pauline Russell.

Mr. Eyler.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Before we start if I could just make a comment on the proceedings. I find myself in a somewhat awkward position. I realize we're talking about a Day Care Standards Act and it's quite natural to come in and suggest standards and guidelines and regulations but I find that a lot of what we are being presented with in our verbal Briefs basically concerns the substance of regulations which would follow along later. Whether or not there are four square metres of space inside per child or five or six - I don't know what it's going to be - I don't think that's the purpose of the legislation to set that sort of thing out. The legislation is basically to set up the vehicle for establishing regulations. I wouldn't want to discourage any written Briefs or receiving any of this information because it's certainly interesting and informative to me, but I wonder if we could restrict ourselves more to the spirit of the Act rather than the actual regulations which are proposed by the groups present.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you for your commentary, I think it is something that the various people making presentations should bear in mind. It's quite right; there will be other opportunities - will there not, Mr. Minister? - to give details on presentations when the regulations are being formed. We really are at this stage reviewing the basis of the Act. I wouldn't want to narrow the Act this far, but the Act is in a way Enabling Legislation so that regulations which are more flexible and can be adjusted more easily are established within the Act.

At the same point I think it's very worthy and worthwhile for the members of the Committee to hear how people would wish to see the Act or at least, a tone that the various people making presentations wish to see the regulations follow in. I think that's very worthwhile, that before the process of the regulation even starts that a tone towards the regulations is set. So with that I wouldn't want to close off the detail but I would ask the people making presentations if they could stay more to the general part, leave the Briefs, and I can guarantee you the briefs will be gone over thoroughly by the Minister's staff and most likely the Minister himself before the regulation process starts.

So, next could we call Pauline Russell, please? Is she present, Pauline Russell from the Equal Opportunities Centre? Not present.

Next on the list then, is Mr. Ross McIntosh. He has a brief with him, so if you could just hold off for a second please, Mr. McIntosh, until she starts.

**MR. R. McINTOSH:** Yes, I'm just speaking about the first page which deals with the Act and comments on the regulations are on the pages following which, as you indicated, you will be dealing with at another time. My remarks will be fairly brief.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, Sir, would you like to start, please?

**MR. R. McINTOSH:** Yes, I am Ross McIntosh representing McCare, which is the licensed family based/home based child care Centre. Bill 21 as it is presently written is denying, saying no to McCare, being the family Centre it is; secondly, does not spell out how we can meet the felt Child Day Care needs of our community and province; thirdly, mentions the comprehensive development of the child, but no definitions on development are given in the body of the Act and no specific upgraded dollar amounts through fees and grants are named for the creation of this quality province-wide program that I'm certain we all want and that the children of Manitoba need.

In addition, we as McCare, have to ask to what extent any Child Day Care models from around the world are being researched for input into the Manitoba creation. A question now would be, are our children really going to be taken seriously? We have a unique opportunity to create a quality piece of legislation. Let this legislation say yes to good Child Day Care in its present forms and no to recognizing just some good present forms; say yes to new and exciting experimental forms of Child Day Care that are yet to be conceived and no to stifling brand-new creations; say yes to putting quality money beside quality standards and no to little money beside quality standards; say yes to meeting the felt Child Day Care needs throughout the province and no to addressing just some Child Day Care needs in just some parts of the province; say yes to having a vision that deals simultaneously with 2002 and 1982 and no to parochial and short-sighted proposals; say yes to providing fair and equal treatment to Child Day Care Centres and rural children, for example, Thompson, Pilot Mound and Winnipeg and everybody else and no to discrepancies in the application of licensing regulations; say yes to the child being on centre stage being the focus for the Act and regulations and no to the facilities surrounding the child being more important than the child.

McCare, a licensed Family Child Day Care Centre, was created by my wife and I to meet some of the Child Day Care needs of our community, Wolseley, and through conversations with parents, friends, educators and other concerned people, we discovered that, first, few infant care spaces existed; second, Centres were reluctant to take children who weren't toilet trained; third, parents working shifts had great difficulty placing their child in one Centre; fourth, parents with a child one year old, another of two years of age, another of school age found it virtually impossible to place all three children in one Centre; fifth, parents had great difficulty placing a handicapped child in a Centre such as ours; sixth, a shortage of lunch and after school spaces existed in the community; seventh, a shortage of good programs existed for two- to five-year-old children whose parents are working full time and are unable to participate in a co-operative style of Centre and someone suggested to me that maybe most important, parents wanted a Centre with a family atmosphere and not an institutional atmosphere.

We believe we've attempted to meet these needs by enrolling infants, preschoolers, nursery and kinder-

garten pupils and school age children and through engaging everyone in a curriculum designed to care for physical, intellectual, emotional and social needs of each child and at the same time using weekly and daily themes for our curriculum and, I guess, at certain points of the year continuous themes come into play, for example, the celebration of a child's birth or when we have special seasons of the year, Christmas, Easter and so on.

Through a vision and plan created by my wife and I and one other co-worker, and operating in our home with the assistance of our two girls Chris, aged 9 and Brenda, aged 5 we have created a family atmosphere. I've made available to Ms Phillips some letters from parents who have children in our care; who have had children in our care; a letter from the principal of the Laura Secord School; a nursery school teacher who has had students of ours and also taught both Chris and Brenda who could share some of those with you. As it isn't just my perception that we're offering a Centre with a family atmosphere, it is indeed their perception as well.

At present the bill and even the present regulations say we must be a Day Care Centre and cannot be called what we are and what we do, a Family Child Day Care Centre. The Act tells us that as a Day Care Centre, we must be a nonprofit corporation with a Board of Directors if we choose to be government subsidized. You ask and I ask, what would that mean in concrete terms for our family and Centre? I guess in short, a family business of caring for children would no longer be a family business of caring for children in our home. As our entire home is needed to operate the program, the Board of Directors acting on behalf of the nonprofit corporation would control the operation of our home, would own the contents of our home, would make us more institutionalized and bureaucratic in our decision-making and operation.

In short, the family atmosphere would be destroyed, the business of caring for children as we intend to do it and do do it, would be wiped out. You might ask, as we did, what is the magic about the number 12 as it's spoken of in the definitions part of the Act? Why is it impossible to have a family home based Centre called just what it is and defined in that same manner as soon as 13 children or 13 licensed Child Day Care spaces come to our Centre or one such as ours? And I must confess that we were surprised at this decision. We asked what is the rationale for the number 12 being so important. The second presenter this morning suggested the same rationale as I heard. It has been suggested to me it's because a mother is not likely to give birth to more than 12 children under the age of 12 years.

I suggest that certainly this procreation - or should I say breeding - argument is not well-conceived. This Act is not talking about how many children a family may or may not have, it's not talking about parents caring only for their own children and it's not talking about being the child's home. It is talking about, as I understand it, Child Day Care in a home setting or other premises with parental care being done on occasion in home settings. As you see in the text there on the first page, I say, in order to be consistent in placing family based/home based Centres in a separate category from care Centres in other premises, to

recognize the fact that McCare is a family based/-home based Centre with more than 12 - but let me suggest for us to think about or you to think about - not more than 25 children.

To be comprehensive as regards the definitions of different care Centres in the province now and in the future, we would recommend the addition of the classification called Family Child Day Care Centre, that defined as Family Child Day Care Centre means premises in which Child Day Care alone or in combination with parental care is provided or offered at any time to more than 12 and not more than 25 children and which is in the home of one or more of the persons providing or offering the care.

It would be understood that the same licensing conditions would apply to the Family Child Day Care Centre as for a Day Care Centre licensed for 13 to 25 children. Again on Page 1, in addition, an amendment needs to be made to Grants on Page 12, 30(1)(b) in order to be consistent with the current practice and principle behind the wording of Grants 30(1) on Page 12, of authorizing grants to persons, not the Board, but to persons operating family based/home based Centres.

We recommend the following change to Grants 30(1)(b) to persons who operate licensed group Day Care homes, licensed Family Day Care homes and the addition would be, or licensed Family Child Day Care Centres. I'm leaving with you the document outlining the two amendments and other recommendations follow on the pages after that.

I thank you for your time and attention.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much, Mr. McIntosh. Is there any questions?

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you. Hello, Ross. On the first page of your Brief you have suggested that the same licensing conditions would apply to what you are recommending as another category as we already would have for a Day Care Centre. With that then, just on the licensing in terms of numbers and space and that kind of thing, I'm wondering what your concern would be, why would you have a different name if you were to meet the same licensing requirements as a Centre which is already in the Act.

**MR. R. McINTOSH:** We are a family home based Centre, which I think is in a separate category from those which would be outside of the home. I think that's set out in the Act itself. It suggests that there's a category for 8 and less; there's a category for 12 and less; there's a category for 8 and less; there's a category for 12 and less; there's a category of private for four and less. I don't know what the number is on the occasional but I think both current regulations, current practise under the Act are something different that's in the family context, or the home setting, something different than happening outside of there.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** It seems to me that if your operation is called a Day Care Centre versus a Family Day Care Centre and you're suggesting that the same conditions apply, then why would we need to separate out a

different category, if you're saying that your situation would be covered by the same licensing provisions as a Day Care Centre?

**MR. R. McINTOSH:** I'm suggesting that the description under Day Care Centre doesn't describe us as we are. We are a family operation and we have a family atmosphere and that's not my perception of what's happening at other Centres that are out of the home. Ours is a situation where we have a husband and wife team and another staff person. We involve our two girls in that setting. I want to avoid, again, the current practise, and what's suggested here that the people operating Centres in the home may qualify to receive grants. I'm not saying that we will, at anytime, apply for grants but I'd like us, as people, to have that opportunity within the framework of this Act to do so, if we choose to do so. Right now, if you are going to ask, we are private; we don't make any profit and we're offering the subsidies to parents, but that's the way we've decided to operate because we've discovered that's what the people around us in our community want.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Taking the issue of definition and licensing alone, without the second issue you raise which is of grants or subsidization, just the situation of licensing and names, terms to cover your situation, it seems to me, in your brief, are you saying that you would meet the same licensing conditions as the Centre or are you saying . . .

**MR. R. McINTOSH:** If it's 13 to 25, yes, of course, in terms of the child-staff ratio and space and so on.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Chairperson, then if there is flexibility in the Act for the determination, in a Centre, of what philosophy of programming one wants to offer and you have your family philosophy, and say, one across the street in a church basement wants to offer a Day Care program with some segment of religious philosophy in it, other than the philosophy of the way you want to run your programming, are you agreeing that, when you have that many children, then you should meet the same licensing requirements as the church?

**MR. R. McINTOSH:** Yes, in terms of the number, of those parameters.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** So if that's already in the Act, I'm curious as to why you would feel you would need a special name?

**MR. R. McINTOSH:** Because we aren't named what we are. I don't believe that we are named what we are. It does address the spirit of the Act. On another page I say, "The title of the Act is Community Child Day Care Standards Act. The title of the Director is Director of Child Day Care Services." But suddenly the word "child" evaporates somewhere and we're going to say, "I'm going to send Susie or Johnny to the day care." Its a Child Day Care and it's not a Senior Citizen's Day Care; it's not a Youth Day Care but it's a Child Day Care and I want things to be consistent in terms of the

language of the Act. We're going to call the Director such; we're going to call the Title of the Act such; let's say that it isn't a Day Care co-ordinator, it's a Child Day Care Co-ordinator. It's not a Day Care Centre, it's really a Child Day Care Centre, if we want to be consistent in language throughout the whole Act. I certainly would be pleased if there's flexibility on philosophy but I would like to be named what we are. That's my concern because it suggests, if it is a family thing, then grants may be offered to persons operating these family-type things. But if you're some sort of other animal, like a Day Care Centre, as presently defined, you have to have the Board, which represents the non-profit corporation and, as I've suggested, you're not running a family operation in your home if you have another layer of that and then they can control the operation of the home and so on, as I was saying here.

As long as we understand that the same standards would apply, but I'm not a Day Care Centre, but I am one certainly with family orientation and want to be called such.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Excuse me, if I could break in here for a minute, the Hansard reporter is having trouble identifying people so could you wait to be recognized before speaking?

Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. First of all, if there is no difference in substance, in terms of what you would be required under this Act to do in licensing — (Interjection) — No, not grants, just licensing, in terms of physical standards programming, qualifications for yourself and the staff people. If your not asking for any difference in that, then doesn't it come down to a rose by any other name situation? I'll go on. In terms of a Board, there's nothing in this Act that requires a private organization to have a Board. I know that's been recommended by some of the briefs, but at this point there's nothing that says you must set up a parent Board.

In terms of the facilities for licensing, the regulations, even just taking the ones we have in place now under the City of Winnipeg would require that, for a certain number of children, you have certain facilities, whether they be in your home, modified to take into account physical space, etc. You were saying that you would be able to meet those kind of standards but just would like to be called something else. Considering, I think you would agree with me, Sir, that your situation is rather unique, to put a special name in for maybe yourself or one or two other Centres in the province that would be similar to yours, if we are saying you must meet the standards that a Day Care Centre, as you call an institution, seems to me to not quite be necessary, regardless of grants, just the licensing. Does that make sense to you?

**MR. R. McINTOSH:** I understand your position but I would prefer that.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** We make a special category for you with a name.

**MR. R. McINTOSH:** No, not just for me. I was asking

that the law be looking into the future and, yes, I recognize there may be ourselves and there's, I believe, 20 Child Day Care spaces in a home operated on Honeyman, The Tree House. I'm not privy to their philosophy of operation but they are in a home setting. I don't know how many others. I haven't researched the province to know how many others there would be.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler:** Ms Phillips. Are there any other questions for Mr. McIntosh? Seeing none, I'd like to thank you for your presentation, Mr. McIntosh.

The next person wishing to present a brief is Mr. W.G. Burns. Is Mr. Burns present?

Is Mrs. Carol Draper present?

**MRS. C. DRAPER:** I have some copies of the Brief that I didn't get to her ahead of time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Clerk will circulate them.

**MRS. C. DRAPER:** Before I start, I would like to say that I'm representing the Manitoba School Age Child Care Support Committee which was formerly known as the Before Noon After School Child Support Committee. I'd also like to make a comment that our Brief deals strictly with School Age Child Care. Though we have concerns for all areas of Child Care, our brief deals strictly with our own age group.

We represent the Directors, staff and parents and concerned citizens of School Age Child Care Centres. There are approximately 40 Centres in the Winnipeg area and a growing number in communities outside of Winnipeg. As we are directly involved in these programs, Bill 21, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act, is of prime importance to us. We are very pleased that our elected representatives have recognized the need for legislation of standards in Child Care. We realize the impact this legislation could have throughout the province on improving the quality of Child Care. Therefore, at this time, we would like to direct your attention to the specific needs of School Age Child Care in relation to Bill 21.

Section 1, Definitions: We request the term "Day Care" be changed to "Child Day Care." Rationale:-

From past experience we have found that the general public associates the term "Day Care" with the care of two- to five-year-olds. Our Centres are for children six to twelve years and are referred to as "Child Care Centres," therefore, an incorporation of the terms "Child Care" and "Day Care" to read "Child Day Care" would more accurately describe all facilities.

Section 27(1), Day Care Staff Qualifications Review Committee: We request an equitable number of people with expertise in School Age Child Care be appointed to sit on this review committee. Rationale: The staff qualifications for the care of school age children differ greatly from those of preschool staff.

Section 29(2), Dispute as to Qualifications: We request a further means of appeal. Rationale: Presently there are no recognized accredited courses in the School Age Child Care. Staff now entering this field are from varied educational backgrounds. To ensure a fair hearing, a further appeal procedure should be incorporated.

Section 33, Regulations: We feel it is imperative

that we be given the opportunity to have input into the regulations which will be set forth under this Act. Rationale: The regulations directly affect the operation of our Centres. We request that our specific needs be considered before these regulations are formalized. The following are some suggested regulations for School Age Child Care. At this point, I would like to say, we were told this may be the only place we could talk about the regulations. Most of our regulations go very much in line with the MCCA and the Coalition. There are only two areas that are slightly different and I would like to go through those two areas.

One is Staff Qualifications. There must be a mixed system for the staffing in child care with a minimal allowable number of trained persons in a Centre. Transition periods will have to be negotiated for some Day Care Centres.

The Director must have formal training in Child Care with at least two years' experience in Child Care.

There must be a standard qualifying program for Child Care and it could be an extension of the Red River Community College course. Other relevant programs offered outside of Manitoba or relevant university education should be made interchangeable for the purpose of establishing qualifications.

In the event that a qualifying program was offered, then one person per group of children must have formal training in Child Care services or other related education.

If a Child Care program is offered at the Red River Community College, it must also be offered at Assiniboine and Keewatin Community Colleges. The number of spaces in these programs must be increased.

Child Care programs offered at the community colleges must be expanded to include the following courses: administrative training and training for School Age Child Care.

There must be a grandparent clause allowing those who presently work in Child Care Centres to remain with the option of obtaining certification of formal training in Child Care in the following manner: the right to take Challenge Credit Exams to show qualifications; access to courses in their community or in a nearby community; paid in-service programs; the right to leave to take courses and extension courses.

The province must licence trained child care workers. The only other area where there would be some difference is the child/staff ratio.

Child-staff ratio for School Age Care programs should be one staff member to every 10 children. The staff in the child-staff ratios only includes those in regular care of the children and does not include the Director, cooking staff or maintenance staff, but any time they spend regularly caring for the children must be prorated and included in the child-staff ratios. The maximum number of children in a Child Care Centre at one time is 60. There should be an exceptional facility clause for Centres which have space and facilities to handle more children and there must be two workers in a Children's Centre at all time. Most of the other regulations are very much in line with the MCCA.

In conclusion, we can only state again that these regulations and standards directly affect staff, parents and children of School Age Child Care Centres and we ask for your support of our submission.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mrs. Draper. Are there any questions?

Mr. Evans.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you very much for the Brief and there are again, a lot of good ideas and some interesting points. We're not supposed to make statements so I'll do this by way of a question.

Are you now aware that you will be given an opportunity as well as anyone else in any other organization, anywhere in Manitoba hopefully, some time in the next - well, after this Session, in the next few months after the Session - to give us comments on the more detailed standards which will form the basis for the regulations? You are aware that you'll have that opportunity?

**MRS. C. DRAPER:** We became aware of that this morning.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Okay, very good.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any further questions? Mr. Kovnats.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I'm not going to get into too much detail because the only questions I can really ask are the regulations and we don't have the regulations at this point. But in your Item 3 here in Child-Staff Ratios and Group Service, the maximum number of children in a Child Care Centre at one time is 60, if your facility is large enough.

Would you make a recommendation at this time that more children be allowed? Because I think that from what my knowledge of Children's Day Care Centres is, they're limited for the amount of children that can attend, not only by the amount of space, but I think it's sort of a figure that seems to come out of the sky and they say you can only have so many children there. If the Centre is large enough to accommodate more children, what would you do to recommend to the Minister who is making these regulations, that you'd be allowed to have more children?

**MRS. C. DRAPER:** Part of the reasoning of putting in the 60 children was because we think that it's very difficult for any Director or for staff to handle more than 60 children at one time, to get to know them and to understand their problems.

We did look at areas where there could be a facility where people had, with more schools becoming available and a possibility of renting schools to open up Centres, that there could be a possibility that more than 60 children could be accommodated in one centre, but not in one facility as such. So that was one of the reasons that clause was put in.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Again, I've mentioned this to one previous person making a presentation - there's been no discussion at all about the relationship with children as far as the staff is concerned. What is your recommendation concerning relationship with children over the professional training as such?

**MRS. C. DRAPER:** The prime concern of any Children's Centre is the way the people relate to the child-

ren, but I don't know if you can put that in a regulation saying that people have to do that.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Well, I don't think you have to at this point because the Minister now knows. Thank you, very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Sherman.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** I'd like to ask Mrs. Draper, if you had to make a choice, Mrs. Draper, given the limitations in funding which obviously face us with respect to any program and you as a taxpayer know that; if you had to make a choice on expansion of Child Day Care with respect to increasing number of spaces or moving into the staging of the qualification spectrum, which would you choose or would you care to say?

**MRS. C. DRAPER:** I will reiterate what Doris said, that I am happy that I don't have to make that choice. I can speak only personally, I cannot speak for the Committee but, on a personal level, I think I have to agree with Doris that I think the quality of care that is given to the children today is of prime importance, but there is a very strong concern for all of us for the number of children who are out there who aren't getting the care. So I wouldn't want to have to make that choice.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** But would you agree that, as was suggested by an earlier delegation that without a considerable increase in funding by the province that scarcely any of these proposals that your committee has put forward would be practical; they might be practical but scarcely any of them would be possible.

**MRS. C. DRAPER:** It would be very difficult to institute a lot of the regulations that will come from the standards without an increase in funds. I think there are some centres that now are working very hard and very diligently toward that but funding definitely is the key issue.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** So the main thrust of your approach to the government for the foreseeable future will be for an increase in funding, otherwise there is no point in talking about these objectives.

**MRS. C. DRAPER:** I think that's pretty obvious, yes.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MS M. SMITH:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask whether you felt that the way the question is put before, that you have to choose either improved quality care for the existing children or an expansion is the only way that one can approach the funding; or whether government should be encouraged to look at the needs of children compared to the whole range of other government programs and needs?

**MRS. C. DRAPER:** If we had our choice we would obviously like to see both and I think that's a very difficult question that Mr. Sherman gave us to answer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any further questions?

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** That's all I have, Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Mrs. Smith but it's . . . If I can leave it on the record, my question to Mrs. Smith would be related to the \$2.4 million budgetary increase, that's what we're looking at for 1982-83. So the decision does have to be made.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. Thank you Mrs. Draper for your presentation. The next person on the list is Mrs. Marilyn Bouw. The written brief will be distributed tomorrow. Mrs. Lydia Giles' brief are you referring to? That will be distributed tomorrow.

Ms Ruth Moir, is Ms Moir present? Mr. Glen Inkster. Is Mr. Inkster present? Is either Mrs. Leyah McFadyen or Mrs. Barbara Marguand present from Family Services? Ms Sandra Oakley or Mr. Dick Martin from the MFL? Mrs. Joanna Hayward? Either Mrs. Linda Todd or Mrs. Linda Whitford Ms Jacqueline Butchart? Ms Butchart.

**MS J. BUTCHART:** Thank you. Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. I want to thank you for the opportunity to present this brief on behalf of single parents.

I would like to read the Preamble to the Constitution of Parents Without Partners, Inc. As conscientious single parents, it is our primary endeavour to bring our children to healthy maturity with the same prospects for normal adulthood as children who mature with their two parents together.

From the divorce or separation which divides a family, or the loss of a parent by death, it is the child who suffers most. For children in such circumstances to grow unscarred requires the utmost in love, understanding and sound guidance. To provide these is a responsibility inherent in parenthood; it does not end with the separation or divorce for either parent.

The single parent in our society is isolated to some degree. The difficulties of providing both for ourselves and our children a reasonable equivalent of normal family life is increased by that isolation. The established patterns of community life lack both means of communication and institutions to enable us to resolve our special problems.

It is with this in mind that qualified Child Care is of prime concern to the membership within our Chapters. At the present time in Manitoba we have well over 1,000 members with Chapters in Winnipeg, Selkirk and Brandon and more are being established in other towns and communities throughout Manitoba.

As the majority of marriage breakdowns occur in families with school-age children and the needs of this age group are of utmost importance we are not minimizing the need for Preschool Day Care, but we feel there is a lack of recognition of the needs of the school-age child. Our areas of concern are:

(1) These programs be referred to as School-age Child Care, not Before Noon and After School Programs. Rationale: This name would more clearly define the services offered for school-age children.

(2) Staff Training, subsection 28(a):

Provisions be made within the regulation that accredited courses be provided to facilitate the needs of the staff within School-age Child Care Centres. Rationale: At the present time there are no courses for staff within these Centres.

(3) Day Care Staff Qualifications Review Committee, subsection 27(1):

That provision should be extended to include parents, staff, professionals and government representatives who are aware of the special needs of school age children. Rationale: A person or persons not aware of these specific needs are not knowledgeable regarding the requirements necessary.

(4) Dispute as to Qualifications, subsection 29(2):

We feel this is too rigid and needs to be expanded to include an appeal procedure. Rationale: As these standards will be new to this province we would not want a qualified staff person unjustly denied certification.

(5) Further Assistance, subsection 32:

That provision be made within this regulation to provide that, upon remittance of receipts from alternate private babysitting, the parent receive the same subsidy normally received if the child were in a recognized Day Care facility. Rationale: We realize government, at this time, cannot provide round-the-clock qualified care and until such time that this becomes feasible we feel the shift worker should not be penalized because he has no choice but to make private babysitting arrangements for the children outside normal hours of Day Care operation. This provision should only apply to children who are in a qualified Day Care centre during part of the day.

In closing, I can only reiterate by saying that these concerns directly affect the membership of our organization and should be seriously considered by our representatives of government present today.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any questions for Ms Butchart?

Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you. I appreciate the sentiment contained in your Brief, Ms Butchart, having been a single parent for nine years and faced many of the dilemmas that you're outlining.

One question I have is concerning 29(2) in terms of dispute arising about qualifications. You are saying that is too rigid?

**MS J. BUTCHART:** May I ask our legal representative, Eleanor Medway, to comment on that?

**MS E. MEDWAY:** We felt that because there were no accredited courses in this area and because these standards would be new, and the review board would be new to the whole procedure, that an appeal procedure should also be included.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any other questions?

The Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms Butchart, I think that your submission deserves a great deal of consideration and is very worthwhile. I have one difficulty and it's probably my obtuseness with the caveat that you place on the provision for subsidy support for shift workers who have to pay for baby-sitters outside of the normal hours of Child Day Care operations. I would be more favourably disposed

to the provision, as you lay it out in your submission to the Committee and to the government if you left that caveat out, the caveat under which you say the provision should only apply to children who are in a qualified Day Care Centre during part of the day. I wonder if you could explain the reason for that being there?

**MS J. BUTCHART:** We felt it would be easier to implement. Then you would know that they really are in care centres. Would you care to comment on that?

**MS E. MEDWAY:** Just that it would be easier to implement. If the children were already in a qualified Day Care Centre and the Director of the Centre could be given an employee's letter stating the hours of work and shown the receipts, it could be more easily monitored by the government, but this could be implemented quite easily. To give subsidization to all parents that are shiftworkers would be very hard to incorporate at the present time - anyone that was requiring private baby-sitting.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** So you would see this, perhaps, as a first step, Mr. Chairman. Ultimately, the inequity exists for those shift workers who need baby-sitting duties and baby-sitting assistance completely outside the hours of normal Day Care operations.

**MS E. MEDWAY:** Yes, this would be a first step.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Well, then I can accept that suggestion and my suggestion to you would be that you go for broke and go all the way and that you urge the government when they're looking at the application, of that \$2.4 million which I'm reminding Mrs. Smith of, the increase in the Budget for this year, that some of it be considered as support funding for that initiative, which I think is a very worthwhile one.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are there any other questions to the delegation? Ms Butchart and Ms Medway, thank you very much for your presentations.

Next I will call Norma Buchan. Norma McCormick. She'll be back in a minute I understand. We will come back to her. Ms Fay Ferris. Mr. Bob Russell. Is Bob Russell present? Dorothy Young. Maryanne Haddad. Mrs. Norma McCormick.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** I'm Norma McCormick. I have indicated I'm speaking to you as a private citizen although I am the Director of the Day Nursery at Health Sciences Centre and as well, on the National Day Care Policy Task Force.

I am pleased to be here tonight to talk to Bill 21 and I would like to give you some principles that I believe you ought to be considering in your deliberations about the setting of Day Care standards for our province. The setting of Day Care standards for Day Care facilities and services is the prerogative of provincial and municipal governments in Canada. With the exception of the Northwest Territories, all provinces and territories have regulations which define Day Care services for licensing purposes and set standards for their operation.

Historically, licensing developed as the mechanism



by which the community exercised its responsibility for safeguarding the health and well being of its citizens. Day Care licensing has grown out of this tradition. Two assumptions are implied. First, that the community considers the provision of Day Care services to young children an important undertaking; second, that the best way to safeguard the children while apart from their parents, is with a strong licensing requirement. This protection is vitally important and the objective of licence cannot only be health protection, as it is with the licensing of restaurants, beauty parlours, pet shops and other things which most communities licence.

Much is known about the effects of the early experiences of children's later emotional, social, physical and intellectual development. Day Care constitutes a very significant part of the early experiences of an estimated 97,700 young children in Manitoba whose mothers are in the labour force, or who may join it before their children reach the public school system. The responsibility for safeguarding their well-being is of an enormous proportion.

The extent to which this responsibility is unmet is almost of an equally enormous proportion. Approximately 55.1 percent of children, aged three to five, and 39.5 percent of children under the age of three, have parents who are employed outside their home, yet only a small percentage of these children are cared for in licensed or approved facilities.

Two issues must be addressed in a discussion on licensing and Day Care quality. First, while it cannot be stated unequivocally that children in unlicensed care facilities are receiving care which is inferior to that provided to children who are cared for in licensed facilities, it can be stated that this care is of unknown and uncertain quality; second, at this time there was no clear connection between the provision of quality Day Care and Day Care licensing. I would refer you to a statement made by Howard Clifford, who is the National Day Care Consultant with the Day Care Information Service of Health and Welfare Canada. He's on record as stating that some 50 percent of the care provided in licensed facilities in Canada is not adequate to meet the needs of children. This unfortunate phenomena can be attributed to several factors. Firstly, minimum standards, which are set by provinces are not necessarily compatible with what is known to be the indices of, or contributors to, quality care; secondly, minimum standards have yet to become viewed as maxims and the funding levels are at best, adequate to meet the bare requirements of the regulations; thirdly, a lack of a will or a way to enforce licensing standards in most jurisdictions renders their existence meaningless.

Where and when the level of compliance are called into question, enforcement is often actively resisted by parents who lack available options for child care and who are thus desperate to maintain the status quo. As well, when the parent's fee is allowed to rise to cover the full cost of care, parents have a strong financial incentive to keep the cost affordable at the peril of violating standards.

Centres for which tightly controlled revenues are not adequate to meet licensing standards and cover expenses incurred to this end, must keep the cost of the care down so as to keep it affordable to parents. As

a note, I would like to comment that the permitted unsubsidized surcharge of a dollar a day is not collected by most Centres in Manitoba.

As well, Centres who are committed to quality programming must make difficult choices about what they provide to the children and how many people care for the children. Day Care standards in the 10 provinces and the Yukon place great emphasis on size and safety standards. Of obvious secondary importance is the licensing of the human aspect and elements relating to adult care givers and the children in their care. This is a strange paradox, given that the literature on Day Care quality has as a common theme that the Day Care provided can only be as good as the person or people providing it. This is not to render as irrelevant the need for certain requirements of space and facilities which are essential to the comfort and safety of children in care. Zoning, health and sanitation regulations and fire codes should be written in recognition that children are not yet able to accept full responsibility for their health and safety.

Furthermore, the absence of capital funding for the construction of purpose built Day Care Centres for young children has resulted in the likelihood that children will be cared for in space which was built or designed for some other purpose. Much of the group care of children is now provided in church basements, community recreation centres and other buildings which are no longer serving their intended purpose. In many instances, a shortage of operational capital has forced Centres to seek free or minimally expensive accommodation and this has resulted in the use of older buildings which may be in need of upgrading to meet present day standards required by fire and building codes.

Similarly, the well-being of children brought together in groups may be threatened by unsanitary or unhealthy conditions as much as by an unsafe building. Group Care of children increases the risk of cross infection and it is important to assure that the regulations which govern sanitation facilities, food preparation and handling, waste and garbage disposal and general cleanliness be aimed at the maintenance of healthful environment.

My presentation has tended to concentrate on the care of children in Group Day Care Centres. But the maintenance of a safe and healthful environment is of no less importance to children cared for in private homes of Family Day Care providers. Most jurisdictions have minimal regulations which require the Family Day Care home to meet certain standards. However, the regulations which apply to the Family Day Care homes are not as rigorous as those which apply to Centres. The underlying philosophy seems to be that the more dissimilar the substitute care arrangement is to the child's own home, the more there seems to be a need for definitive regulations governing the physical setting. While most group care is provided to children in Centres which are licensed and assumed to conform to these standards, most in-home care is provided outside the jurisdiction or supervision of any licensing authority. Both the quality of the care and the safety of the physical facility are undetermined.

Another assumption appears to be this. The larger the facility and the more different it is from the child's home environment, the higher are the standards set

for personnel. The licensing of a Family Day Care provider seems to concentrate primarily on their age, physical and sometimes mental health and personal traits or character. In the licensing of Group Care facilities, more recognition is given to the need for specialized knowledge or training in child development or early childhood education. Personnel qualifications reflect the recognition that, while a good facility and equipment are important, even more important to the provision of good Child Care is the quality of the staff. In no jurisdiction is completion of an educational or training program required except for Quebec and British Columbia which requires formal training for supervisors.

I would like to, at this point, digress briefly to raise the dilemma Centres face when hiring and paying staff. A quality Child Care program has as its basis a competent, consistent staff. The workers in Manitoba's Day Care system are among the lowest paid in the province. Although many of them have considerable education and training for their work, their wages are extremely low. The majority of workers in the Day Care field are female and the low wages paid in the Day Care field are characteristic of female job ghettos. I speculate that the reluctance on the part of policy makers to recognize the necessity of Day Care staff training is based solely on economic grounds.

Simply stated, a requirement of staff training will have the effect of raising salaries paid in the Day Care field. Since salaries constitute the major cost to a Day Care program, 80 to 85 percent, the only way in which Day Care Centres can stay within their externally controlled budgets is to pay low wages. The Day Care system in Manitoba and all across Canada is very heavily subsidized by the people who provide the care. This is of particular significance in the experience of Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery, the Centre with which I have been associated since 1975. Like all Centres, we began paying salaries which were consistent with those being paid in other Centres in the Day Care community. While in those early years, we never fully paid our way, our deficits were small and related primarily to our enriched ratios which allowed us to provide infant care which was deemed to be important to the Health Sciences Centre. In 1977, the Canadian Union of Public Employees and the Health Sciences Centre jointly conducted a job evaluation program in which the work of the Day Care Centre staff was compared with work done by other hospital personnel. The evaluation established salary levels based on the principle of equal pay for work of equal value, but no recognition was given to the relevant formal education or added value placed upon this education in determining the salaries. The net result was the increase from \$100 to \$250 per month to bring the Day Care salaries into line with other hospital salary rates.

I might also point out that we pay our staff on pay grade 5 of the CUPE scale which pays transportation aides, dietary pot washers, dishwashing machine operators, bakery assistants and this kind of thing. They are not paid as professional Child Care Workers even though the length of training for many of our staff is two years which would be equivalent to a two-year community college nursing program.

In the long term, the effect of these salary adjust-

ments which occurred in 1977 and of a government funding policy which has continued to assume that Day Care is a minimum wage activity, has been a \$200,000 deficit to March 31, 1982. During this time our centre has lived under continuing threat of being closed down. I bring this to your attention to help you to understand the difficulties faced by Centres who have to choose between hiring fewer staff than they need to provide good care, hiring untrained staff because they cannot afford or attract trained staff, or paying their trained and experienced staff missionary wages.

Now, back to my main point. If Day Care is to become widely accepted as a developmental program for young children, there must be increased awareness of the importance of specialized knowledge and training as well as personal qualifications and the importance of remuneration in recognition of these factors.

Another human aspect, commonly reflected in licensing is the ratio of adults to children. The ratio is likely to vary depending on the age of the child in care and the setting in which the care is provided. As well, the mandate of child-staff ratio for children in groups varies from province to province. The relationship in the number of children to the size of the facility is reflected in licensing requirements governing the space required for each child in care.

Regulations distinguish between indoor and outdoor space and a few provinces consider the age of the children and the unique requirements of children with special needs. Where the age of the child is considered, it appears that the younger the child in the group, the larger is the indoor space required and the smaller the outdoor space. Only in New Brunswick and Newfoundland is there a condition that floor space be usable or accessible to the children. Even more rarely do regulations include a maximum on group size in which the child is cared for or on the size of the Centre.

The findings of the National Day Care Study undertaken by the Office of Child Development of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, are of extreme importance in a discussion on the relationship between Day Care quality and licensing. The major objective of the four-year study which was completed in 1978, was to determine the influence of child-staff ratios, the number of care givers, group size and group qualifications on both the development of pre-school children and the costs of Centre care. In this study, the concept of quality Day Care is tied to the maximizing of developmental benefits for children, as determined by observational measures and results of standardized tests of selected school readiness skills and to day-to-day behaviour of children and their adult care givers.

While this study recognizes that there is universally no consensus on what constitutes quality in Day Care, it focused on positive outcomes for children and positive behaviours in both children and their adult care givers.

The study pointed out that it is good for children to achieve higher gains on tests as an indication of developmental benefit and also good for children to display a high degree of interest and participation in the activities of the Centre. The study assumed that it

is good for adult care givers to engage in positive social interaction with children - questioning, responding, instructing, praising and comforting; and for adults to spend less time interacting with other adults and to show less tendency to engage in controlling behaviour, such as, commanding and correcting of the children.

The majority findings of the National Day Care Study give credence to the belief that the human aspect of Day Care is vitally important, although presently vague and ill-defined in most regulations governing the licensing of Day Care facilities. For example, the findings that different Centres have different effects on children and the quality of the human environment very significantly from Centre to Centre. These differences are linked to the Centre's characteristics, such as, classroom composition, both in terms of group size and the number of adult care givers, which were found to effect both the care giver behaviour and the child behaviour and, as well, to care giver qualifications.

The most significant impact on the quality of care was determined to be group size, with the finding that smaller groups work best. For children aged 3 and 4, groups of 15 or fewer children, with a corresponding small number of care givers, are positively correlated with a desirable child and care giver behaviour and higher gains on standardized tests than are groups of 25 or more children. Yet, in Canada, only 2 provinces, British Columbia and Nova Scotia, set limits on maximum group size and both have set maximums of 25 children.

The study further determined that for pre-school children minor variations in child-staff ratio have less effect than group size. If the group is too large, adding care givers is not associated with better care of children. Furthermore, in groups with smaller number of children than care givers, minor variations in ratio have little or no significance.

For the care of infants, defined by the study as children under 18 months, and toddlers, who are children from 18-30 months, high child-staff ratios, as well as small group size, are associated with quality care and less stress on children and staff.

While most provincial regulations reflect the importance of higher child-staff ratios for infants and toddlers there is no consistency among provinces. Some provinces have set enriched ratios at levels which compare more closely with those set for pre-school children in other provinces.

Another important finding relates to the relationship between quality Child Care and care giver qualifications. While formal education per se does not make a difference, staff specialization in child-related fields is linked positively to the quality of care provided. This is found to be true with the care of infants and toddlers, as well as with pre-school children.

Specialization in developmental psychology, early childhood education and special education were associated with positive patterns of care giver behaviour and with highest gains on test scores for children. In Canada, specialization in Child Care fields is never required for Child Care staff and only rarely for supervisors and directors of Centres. In undertaking the step that you are in Bill 21, Manitoba will be setting a very important precedent in this country.

These findings have far-reaching implications and should be considered as regulations and licensing standards are developed in Manitoba.

A second section entitled "The Implication of Results" in the publication of the National Day Care Study entitled "Preliminary Findings and Their Implications" is unequivocal.

This is a quote

First and most fundamentally, any regulatory strategy designed to foster maximum developmental benefit for children should specify allowable numbers of children and care givers in each classroom group and should also require that at least one care giver per classroom have specialized preparation in a child-related field. To achieve maximum effects, regulations cannot focus on any one component of group composition, care giver qualification or any other qualification that may be found to be important for quality of care in isolation. To be effective, regulations should specify configurations of children and care givers with minimum qualifications defined for at least one care giver per group.

Secondly, although child-staff ratio regulations have been the focus of most public attention and controversy, clear findings on the importance of group size in the the pre-school classroom suggests a shift in regulatory emphasis toward those more easily understood and measured factor. The shift in emphasis does not mean that ratio requirements should be omitted from future regulations, but rather that ratios should be seen as outcome of setting limits on the number of children and care givers in a group and not as a principal means of ensuring quality.

Third, even in effective Centres, group size and child-staff ratios vary from time of day, type of activity, season of the year and often by children's ages. Therefore, while standards themselves must be specific, regulatory codes and monitoring practices should be designed to take this dynamic aspect of Centre Care into account.

Fourth and finally, because no major differences in effect from site to site have emerged so far, the study offers no evidence that the key components should not be included in a single set of nationally applicable standards. It's a matter of practice for the National Day Care Task Force to be —(Interjection)— The point I'm trying to make is that the National Study Task Force felt that there were national standards which ought to be recommended and this is the focus of our National Day Care Policy Task Force here in Canada, is to encourage the enactment of a National Day Care Act which could set the framework within which provincial programs could be cost shared.

Still another popular notion which is neither reflected in licensing standards nor explored in depth in the U.S. Day Care Study, links quality of Day Care to parental control. The argument is made that where parents are actively involved in the decisions around Centre policies and programs, the continuity which exists between the Centre and the home is maximized, thus enhancing the likelihood that the gains made by the child, accruing from experiences in the Centre, will be sustained.

Furthermore, this meaningful parental involvement is thus thought to reduce the need for external moni-

toring. Similarly, this argument can be extended to include Centres under the governance of community boards made up of knowledgeable and concerned citizens. However, while these models are likely to be associated with the provision of care which is deemed acceptable and appropriate according to parental or community standards - and this ought to be encouraged as positive features - there should not be an exclusion from public monitoring or exemption from adherence to licensing standards.

Furthermore, to put the onus for the development of Day Care services solely on the parents whose children require the care is no more reasonable than to expect the parents of ill children to develop hospitals with appropriate medical services, or for vehicle owners to be responsible for building the streets, roads and highways. The direction we are to take to ensure the availability of quality child care alternatives for the growing number of Manitoba children who require them depend on several factors.

Are we willing and able to re-order our priorities to ensure that the developmental needs of children take precedence in an adequate Day Care system. Are we prepared to formulate relevant and measurable licensing standards which reflect our knowledge about the developmental needs of children and the importance of both the human and the physical environments on the provision of quality care.

Furthermore, are we, as government, taxpayers and parents prepared to finance a Day Care system to a level which would make the provision of quality Day Care, and the meeting of developmental needs of children an achievable and affordable goal.

Finally, are we prepared to enforce licensing standards in such a way that licensing becomes not merely a vehicle to close down facilities which are actually or potentially damaging to children, but rather one which ensures the provision of developmentally beneficial care to children.

I thank you for your attention.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you very much, Norma. You gave us a lot of food for thought and hopefully you will bring that back and present it to us again when we're talking about regulations, the part about ratios and group size.

You talked about staff training, about cost implications, and about requiring family homes also to meet standards, both for physical and staff training. You are aware that those provisions will be in the Act.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** The point I wanted to make beyond that was that is not going to come free.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** Okay. I guess I just want to add to that we certainly are aware of the cost implications that the Member for Fort Garry has been pointing out. I would like, personally, to move that decimal point over one, where he says 2.4 million. Finally, I guess the test will be our term in office, in terms of our commitment to funding these regulations.

I thank you very much for the thoughts you presented. We'll consider those seriously.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Sherman.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mrs. McCormick, I'd just like to ask you whether you're worried at all about regulations that could impose standardization and conformity to this. Do you have worries about regulations that could impose a form of standardization and conformity, that attempted or reflected or implied that the system was homogenous across the province, do you have concerns about that or not?

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** No, it depends on what the nature of your question is. If you're addressing a rural-urban thing about the inavailability of trained staff in the rural areas, I would like to hearken back to my childhood. I grew up in Wawanesa, which is a little town in southwestern Manitoba, and when I was in Grade 9 and 10 and 11 we used to be educated by what were called permit teachers. These were people who were between second and third year university and trying to struggle to get enough money to go back to finish their degrees. They had no formal education and nothing beyond first or second year university, not always relevant to the subjects they were teaching, and it was assumed that was the best this one-horse town could manage. We've gone beyond that and I think that ought to be our goal, ultimately, for a Day Care system in Manitoba. If it's indeed to be comprehensive and universally available then that means that it's got to be available to those children in Wawanesa with the same level of qualified staff that one could expect living in an urban area.

Now this is going to require several things; one is, those people who are now working in our profession in the rural areas, who lack formal papers to prove their training, I believe, ought to be allowed to challenge for credit in order to get their qualification. I, as well, believe that we ought to make available training so that these people can get their credit while they continue to work on the job. But by no way could I ever encourage a retrogressive compromise to say, they ain't there now and they're never gonna be.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Sherman.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** But given the recognition that this would have to be phased in, it would be an objective that we would work toward in stages, you recognize that the regulations have got to be written in such a way to accommodate the opportunities that some region, some cultural segments of society, and certainly some communities, would have in meeting any kind of rigid set of regulations in the short term.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** I can't quite relate the cultural thing. I don't know a culture which says that just anybody is good enough for children. In terms of the availability of staff, I think there's no question that, in addition to some kind of time frame within which we target for achievement, this goal, there has to be a companionate affirmative action strategy which trains the people power to get them into place. But I don't think that I would say I can agree that there are certain communities which ought to be exempted simply because their cultural mix is different from what you'd find in an urban community.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well it's not a question of the cultural mix. I'd suggest it's a question of social disadvantage or lack of opportunity. It's been recognized by everybody who's come before the committee, including yourself, that qualifications imply standards in terms of training, educational and training qualifications. That may be difficult for some parts of Manitoba, for some social and cultural communities of Manitoba as well as geographic communities in Manitoba, for awhile.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** I agree. I think we face that in other areas. The reason I grew up in Wawanesa was my father was a physician and he was put through Medical School on the condition that he go and practice in rural Manitoba for a certain period of time and he stayed there.

I think nobody said that Wawanesa should let the local barber be the doctor. They made extra efforts to attract physicians and to give them incentives to go and practice in the rural areas and I would like to see Day Care given the same advantage.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** How far do you think regulations, with respect to standards, should go? Standards of education and training, yes. Certainly physical facilities and public health requirements, etc., yes; but do you think that they should also extend to programming; do you think they should also extend to fees?

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** I'll deal with the programming issue first. I think that while I don't envisage we would set out a curriculum which would say that all two-year olds in the province be given numbers at 9 o'clock, what I do envisage would be that elements of developmental programming - and we know a great deal about the development of young children and what kinds of enriching and stimulating experiences ought to be put in the way of children of tender years - that the professional staff, once hired, be encouraged or obligated to develop programs which are age appropriate and which are presented to the children so that these various aspects are addressed. Children need opportunities to develop their fine and gross motor skills. Any program, in my estimation, which did not address that would be remiss. Children need to have the opportunity to learn cognitive skills, to learn the basic colouring, things; they need the opportunity to have free play where they are doing what they want instead of what somebody else wants them to do. I think if you go from Centre to Centre, as I have, not only across the city but across the country, you can walk in and tell when a program knows what they're doing vis-a-vis the kids that are in the care.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** What about limits on programming? Do you think there should be limits on programming? I cite the example of your own experience with the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery which has certainly offered programs that would be described as enriched, in comparison to some other Centres.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** It seems to me that all children require a nurturing and stimulating environment. If we have programs which are content to sit them

down in front of a television set and knock off for coffee, then that's no good for the kids. It may be cheap for the people providing the care.

I would say also that you have to look at the developmental and the special social needs of the kids in the program. Our program is somewhat unique because of the age range that we have, and also in terms of some of the disadvantaged kids that come to us on referral from the hospital. But when you get into areas where the disadvantaged kids are in a larger mix that means you have to do more and not less for those kids.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Can we assume though that you as a private citizen or as a representative of the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery would be asking of the government, at a point when representations on the regulations are being sought, for a flexibility and a mix in terms of programming limitations provided there is a minimum quality standard?

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** I don't believe that standards ought to be set as minimum. I really want to couch my definition of program standards rather than as minimum, as adequate and there is a very fundamental difference and that was the point I was trying to make here, is that we quite often think of standards as being minimum standards that you can't fall below and they get interpreted as the maximum. I think we have to look to setting standards that all children and all parents have a right to expect from the programming and within that, allow for the creativity and innovativeness of the professionals we put in charge.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, I accept the suggested change in terminology, adequate is certainly more desirable and suitable but given that then, are you going to be suggesting to the government that provided there are adequate standards, that there should be flexibility and freedom to go beyond those standards. For example, what would the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery do if a regulation imposed a universal adequate standard which was also a standard limit?

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** Well, the limit comes not from the regulations but either from the genius of the people who are addressing themselves to the implementation of that standard because they themselves can't think beyond what they're obligated to do, or from the dollars attached to do it.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Exactly it translates into dollars and therefore I guess that leads inevitably to the question of are you in favour of limits in terms of what funding is required based on the number of spaces, etc., etc., and considerations of that kind? Or are you in favour of the freedom to charge in excess of the set fee for those parents, those communities, who desire something more and something more expensive?

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** I have worked since 1967 in childrens' programming and it is my desire in my lifetime to see a universally available and free program. I recognize the limitations that governments are under at this time and I'm willing to be patient, but I'm not

willing to give up my ideal and my goal. In the interim, a suggestion which means that we transfer more and more of the burden to parents is not a new one; this has been happening since the inception of the Child Day Care program in 1974. For the submission that went to government both to your government, Sir, and to the government presently, on the history of the funding of Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery we have been able to demonstrate that the maintenance grant has represented a significantly diminishing percentage of our revenue. So this is not a trend which is new and I'm learning to live with it.

However, I would like to point out that Day Care which is allowed to continue to develop in this direction becomes a luxury of the working poor in the sense that if you are very low income and can qualify for subsidies then you are not put into financial distress by providing adequately for your child. If you are highly paid and money is no object you are also not put into the difficult position of deciding whether you eat or send your kids to a developmental Day Care program. The middle income and low middle income earner - and this is, I think, an increasingly growing group - are getting it from both sides. They are winding up paying with their tax dollars for the care of other people's kids, for a service that they cannot afford for themselves. This is a concern that I have, because the Economic Council of Canada indicated in a report that was released not long ago that 58 percent of the families in the country would go into that sort of poverty area if there was not a second income in the family. It's getting very, very difficult for families to manage on one salary and now a two-income family is not an unusual thing; it's a fact of life; it's the typical Canadian family. A working mother is not a statistical curiosity anymore.

Those people themselves are taxpayers. I think we really got to keep in mind that we're not parasiting on the system; we are paying for it; we are working and paying our taxes like everybody else. My taxes went for a lot of years to the public school system before my kids got into it and they will go for a lot of years after my kids are out of it. So I just can't apologize to you for the six years that my kids are preschoolers and that I am a taxpayer for my belief that that ought to be a tax-supported system. Also the advantages that my kids get while they're in those early years, coupled with the advantages that my husband and I can give them at home are going to make them less of a drain on the system for the rest of their lives. You're not going to have to remediate them once they get to school.

But how much money goes into looking? I'd really like to see somebody put some effort into comparing the advantages or the base level of readiness at the kindergarten year in Manitoba for kids who've had an enriched and developmental Day Care experience as opposed to those kids who've been glued to Sesame Street in the basement of some lady's home. I'd really like somebody to look at that.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Sure. Well, I don't disagree with you on that and you don't have to apologize to me for anything but my point is you have enriched programming at the Health Sciences Day Nursery, there is no question about that. Would you be happy if regula-

tions drafted by the government said these are the limits to which Day Care can be offered, that's an adequate quality level, but you can't go beyond that.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** The upper limit?

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Yes.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** I figure I'm smart enough to figure out a way around anybody's upper limit.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** But you have to charge for it.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** There's another point that needs to be made here. Programming is not the expensive component, 15 percent of my budget does everything but pay my staff.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Sure, 75 percent is staff.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** That's right and if I've got the money to hire good staff . . . Day Care people are the most phenomenal scroungers in the world. We had a birthday party today and a bunch of the kids were running around with styrofoam plates, with styrofoam bowls on top and they were all wearing cowboy hats, for heavens sake - that's what it looked like to these little kids. That cost nuthin, you know? Programming is cheap. It's the staff, the creative and the dedicated and the committed staff that costs you the money and that's the bargain.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Are you in favour of Day Care Centres being able to charge directly to parents who are willing to pay for it to provide additional staff?

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** Back to my original point. I know that I can't expect a universal free program, which I would prefer. I would say that if all we can afford to give the kids of this province is lousy Day Care then we ought to give parents the option to pay more.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you very much.

**HON. L. EVANS:** I have a couple of questions. First of all, I want to thank Mrs. McCormick for a very thoughtful and thought provoking presentation and I know your concern, your experience and your dedication to the cause of good Child Day Care standards through the province. I think there is agreement between yourself and the Committee that standards are directly tied in, more or less, to the funding level. If we want more standards, let's face it, we need to get the money and I'm assuming efficient spending of the money and that should be implicit and understood.

You made mention of meeting federal standards and I don't have a copy of your Brief and I didn't follow everything you said but there was some comment about having adequate federal standards and so on. Now earlier today, I mentioned that my information is that while we have a 50-50 sharing program with Ottawa. Manitoba - the total bill that we have now for this Year of our Lord 1982, more or less, is only 40 percent funded by Ottawa. In other words, it says to me, very simplistically perhaps, but it says to me that

we in Manitoba, by and large, must have higher standards than is presently set by Ottawa, in terms of the amount of money Ottawa is prepared to give us. So I just wondered, and I know you're on a national council on day care or some such organization, how do we . . . It would seem to me that we must be above the average in Canada at the present time.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** I don't think you can draw that conclusion. First of all, I'd like to say that not only your government, but three previous governments in this province and at least three Federal Governments have been subjected to my harassments and I'll continue to harass Ottawa with the same vigilance that I will you people. Given that, I think Day Care, funded through the Federal Government is as a welfare alternative, is through the Canada Assistance Plan, and it's got all these sort of needs, are likely-to-be in need strings attached to it. Its only concern, through CAP, is for the incomes of the people who are the recipients of the service. They could give a tinker's damn - pardon my Greek - about the quality of care that those kids get. There is nothing in the CAP regulations which say that you can't dump that money you're spending for Day Care down any convenient sink. So we've really got to make sure that if we're challenging the Federal Government to come up more generously, that we, in the provinces, who are developing the program, are making sure that both their money and your money is well spent. I think that's one of the travesties right now, is according to Howard Clifford, 50 percent of the Day Care given in licensed and approved Centres in this country is not worth it; it's lousy for kids.

Now if we can take the money we're spending on lousy care, add to it enough money to make it good, then it's going to be better for everybody all the way around. What I would propose, and am about to propose to the Federal Government, in a paper that we've written for the Canadian Advisory Council on The Status of Women, is a national Day Care act which has as its prototype, The National Medicare Act. What we would require is that Provincial Governments, in order to qualify for cost-sharing, which would be extricated from CAP, because CAP is not a useful funding tool because of its welfare implications, would be obliged to provide care which is comprehensive, affordable, universally accessible and publicly accountable and that, given those four provisions, then provinces would be given the right to develop within whatever jurisdiction they would choose, either through education or through social services or whatever, a Day Care program which meets those objectives and therefore would qualify for Federal Government cost-sharing.

I do agree with you that CAP is from the Good Old Days - a 1960 solution to 1980's problems isn't doing us much good right now.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Really, I had a second question but Mrs. McCormick really answered it and if I may be permitted to comment, to thank her again for her brief but also to wish her lots of luck in helping us get as much money out of Ottawa as we can so, together, we can have higher standards in Manitoba.

**MRS. N. McCORMICK:** I came in at 10 o'clock this morning hoping that, when I got my call to come at ten, that I was on at ten, and I spent the morning here, but on my way in I happened to be thinking about ratios and when I was coming up the front steps this morning, they were planting a flower bed out in front of Queen Victoria. There were two gentlemen with trowels, down on the ground, and six people standing up watching them, and I thought, jeepers, if we had the adults-to-children ratio that they've got adults-to-flowers out there, we'd be pretty well off.

Thank you.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you Mrs. McCormick. I'll run through the rest of the list and see if anyone else has come in and then if there's anybody else here who would wish to make a presentation tonight that we don't have on the list, we will hear that. So the next I had was Mrs. Jocelyn Cowern or Louisa Bormann; Wayne Fraser; Dr. Kelvin Seifert; Mr. Steve Ishmael; Elaine Taylor.

Is there anyone else here this evening who would like to make a presentation to the Committee?

The next scheduled meeting is tomorrow at 2 o'clock. Normally we would now go into clause-by-clause, but I think that given the number of people who were here earlier and left feeling that they would not get on tonight, that we would not be doing our public duty if we closed off and started going clause-by-clause at this point.

I propose to Committee that we continue tomorrow at 2 o'clock with hearing presentations from the public. With a bit of luck we'll finish tomorrow afternoon or early tomorrow evening.

Mr. Sherman.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, just one point. I suggest that we do place a limitation along the period during which the Committee is going to hear public representations. Tomorrow afternoon, I suggest, would be fair and sufficient but those who are unable to make their presentations tomorrow afternoon, I suggest, will either have to have others make them for them or submit them in written form. They'll be distributed to the Committee anyway and that the process not be extended into Friday evening.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Ms Phillips.

**MS M. PHILLIPS:** I would like to speak against that suggestion, Mr. Chairperson, in that if there are people who are not able to attend tomorrow afternoon because they happen to be working parents or can't make arrangements, I think we should leave it open and allow some flexibility. If there are enough to get through the afternoon Session and there's just a few who can't attend in the afternoon and want to bring us their Briefs in the evening, I would be quite willing to hear them out.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's basically hypothetical at this time. Tomorrow afternoon we'll make a decision whether we go. There's no sitting scheduled for tomorrow evening by the way. The next one after

Thursday, 24 June, 1982

---

tomorrow afternoon would be Saturday morning; that was the next scheduled meeting for the Committee. We'll be going through clause-by-clause then whether we have presentations or not.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Committee, the Clerk, can contact those who had indicated that they wished to make presentations and advise them. I think it's been fairly standard procedure that those who wish to make representations are advised, they come here, and of course, sometimes the time inconveniences them. But, nonetheless, we have a schedule that we have to work to, in addition, and perhaps the Clerk could advise them if they can be here tomorrow afternoon. If not, perhaps a special arrangement, certainly could be made, for one or two who are working tomorrow afternoon. But there has to be some order to the appearances, otherwise we get into a very difficult schedule from the House point of view.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise.