



Manitoba Ombudsman

2011 Annual Report under **The Ombudsman Act** and **The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act**

Independent, Impartial, Fair

The Honourable Daryl Reid
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
Province of Manitoba
Room 244 Legislative Building
Winnipeg, MB R3C 0V8

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with section 42 of *The Ombudsman Act* and subsection 26(1) of *The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act*, I am pleased to submit the Annual Report of the Ombudsman for the calendar year January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011.

Yours truly,

Mel Holley
Acting Manitoba Ombudsman

Message from the Ombudsman



This report covers the last year of activity under Manitoba's fourth Ombudsman, Irene Hamilton. Ms Hamilton was the first woman to hold the position of Manitoba Ombudsman and served from April 2005 until January 2012, when she left to pursue other goals. Ms Hamilton came to the job of Ombudsman with a wealth of knowledge about the workings of government, and a staunch belief in the importance and independence of the office.

Ms Hamilton believed that the Ombudsman should be neither a defender nor a critic of government, but rather a catalyst for necessary improvements to the administration of government programs, identified through fair and impartial investigations.

Under Ms Hamilton's stewardship Manitoba Ombudsman began to look at the broader systemic issues behind the most common complaints to our office. Systemic reviews of broad scale government programs such as the child welfare system, the employment and income assistance program, and the water rights licensing system were completed during her term.

While refining our systemic review processes was important to Ms Hamilton, she was equally committed to ensuring that every individual complaint was addressed thoroughly and each complainant given an opportunity to be heard. During her tenure, Manitoba Ombudsman continued to be a voice for the most disenfranchised in our society. At the time of her departure from the office, Ms Hamilton was particularly

concerned with the treatment of the mentally ill and vulnerable people in our correctional facilities.

Also during her tenure, *The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act* (PIDA) was proclaimed, and the Ombudsman became one of the parties to whom a person could make a disclosure of wrongdoing. While the investigation of an alleged wrongdoing can be significantly different than traditional administrative investigations, Ms Hamilton oversaw the implementation of a process that emphasized the protection of the rights of disclosers while ensuring fairness for all parties involved in PIDA investigations.

Early in her first term as Ombudsman, Ms Hamilton recognized the importance of reaching as many Manitobans as possible to promote knowledge and understanding of the office. "Joining the Herd", a curriculum guide for students and teachers, was first developed in 2006 and revised in 2011. In 2009, "Understanding Fairness", a guide for municipal decision makers, was developed in collaboration with stakeholders to improve municipal government for all Manitobans.

During her last year, the office undertook a review of its own operations, standards, and processes with a view to ensuring that we provide the same high quality of service, to both the public and government, that we expect to find when we investigate complaints about the administrative actions of government.

Ms Hamilton's efforts have shaped the future of Manitoba Ombudsman and laid the groundwork for continued success as we enter our fifth decade of service to Manitobans.

About the office

Manitoba Ombudsman is an independent office of the Legislative Assembly and is not part of any government department, board or agency. The office has a combined intake services team and two operational divisions - the Ombudsman Division and the Access and Privacy Division.

Under *The Ombudsman Act*, the Ombudsman Division investigates complaints from people who feel they have been treated unfairly by government, including provincial government departments, crown corporations, municipalities, and other government bodies such as regional health authorities, planning districts and conservation districts. The Ombudsman Division also investigates disclosures of wrongdoing under *The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act* (PIDA). Under PIDA, a wrongdoing is a very serious act or omission that is an offence under another law, an act that creates a specific and substantial danger to the life, health, or safety of persons or the environment, or gross mismanagement, including the mismanagement of public funds or government property.

Under *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (FIPPA) and *The Personal Health Information Act* (PHIA), the Access and Privacy Division investigates complaints from people about any decision, act or failure to act relating to their requests for information from public bodies or trustees, and privacy concerns about the way their personal information or personal health information has been handled. "Public bodies" include provincial government departments and agencies, municipalities, regional health authorities, school divisions, universities and colleges. "Trustees" include public bodies and additional entities such as health professionals, medical clinics, laboratories and CancerCare Manitoba. Our office has additional powers and duties under FIPPA and PHIA, including auditing to monitor and ensure compliance with these Acts, informing the public about the Acts and commenting on the implication of proposed legislation, programs or practices of public bodies and trustees on access to information and privacy.

A long-standing issue: holding of youth under *The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act*

Since 1998, Manitoba Ombudsman has reported on the issue of the detention of intoxicated youth at the Manitoba Youth Centre under *The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act* (IPDA).

Police sometimes have to detain adults and young people who are intoxicated but have not committed any criminal offence. These individuals are in need of care and a safe place where they can be supervised until they may be safely released. While intoxicated adults are temporarily held in police holding cells or other community facilities, youth are detained at the Manitoba Youth Centre, a correctional centre.

In 2005, our office made a formal recommendation to the Minister of Justice that this inappropriate practice cease. Intoxicated youth who have not been charged with a criminal offence should not be detained in jails.

We are pleased to report that in early 2012, the Deputy Minister of Healthy Living, Seniors and Consumer Affairs advised that they will be removing the IPDA youth beds from the Manitoba Youth Centre to a more appropriate community-based facility.

Youth who do not pose a safety risk will be housed in the community. Youth who are aggressive or threatening and cannot be safely managed in a community-based facility will continue to go to the Manitoba Youth Centre. It is anticipated that these changes will take effect in late 2012.

While this change has been slow in coming, we note that numerous government departments, entities and individual employees have been persistent in pursuing this change. It is a welcome improvement and those responsible are to be commended for their persistence.



In Winnipeg:
750 - 500 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, MB R3C 1X3
204.982.9130
1.800.665.0531 (toll free in Manitoba)
Fax: 204.942.7803

In Brandon:
202 - 1011 Rosser Avenue
Brandon, MB R7A 0L5
204.571.5151
1.888.543.8230 (toll free in Manitoba)
Fax: 204.571.5157

On the web:
www.ombudsman.mb.ca

2011 case summaries

Disclosure of wrongdoing

An employee of a government body contacted our office to report what they believed was a wrongdoing as defined by *The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act* (PIDA). Subsequently, two more employees of the same organization contacted our office and registered their concern about the same alleged wrongdoing. All disclosers believed that another employee of the organization ordered and obtained goods intended for personal use, not related to an approved work activity. All disclosers indicated that the alleged wrongdoing had already been brought to the attention of management of the organization but they were dissatisfied with the manner in which their disclosures had been addressed.

When we notified the organization of the disclosure made to our office, the organization explained that an internal audit was underway. In light of this, we agreed to wait for the internal audit results before conducting any investigation of our own.

The internal audit panel did not conclude that a wrongdoing had occurred. When we reviewed the internal audit results, we identified a number of concerns with both the audit process and the conclusion reached by the audit panel. In our view, the organization's decision to close the matter was premature, based upon inadequate review, and not supported by the evidence available. We subsequently conducted our own investigation.

We noted that signing authorities were required by policy to verify the coding provided by the purchasing employee. We were advised that it was the signing authorities' responsibility to query the need for specific purchases to ensure that goods purchased were for legitimate purposes. The internal audit provided

no evidence that the various signing authorities' responsibilities had been met, nor that they had been required to provide an explanation for this apparent breach of policy.

Our investigation determined that in some cases the employee had provided reasons for the purchases that did not appear to be relevant to work activity but the purchases were not questioned. There were coding anomalies in the way some purchases were recorded, and there were questions about whether the items purchased actually remained in possession of the organization.

The evidence we reviewed and the explanations provided by the organization about the manner in which the suspect purchases occurred raised serious questions about the adequacy of the financial oversight in place at the organization during the period in question.

We also examined the process followed by the organization in initially responding to the disclosure. With the introduction of PIDA, public institutions were required to develop procedures for responding to whistleblowers. In this case an employee attempted to use the procedure developed by the organization, but it was inadequate and the outcome of the process was not effective.

Because of these troubling circumstances involving the alleged misuse of public funds and the adequacy of the mandated disclosure process, we made recommendations designed to address the shortcomings that enabled such a situation to occur and to hopefully prevent such a situation from occurring again.

At the end of the investigation, the Ombudsman recommended that the organization:

- implement financial controls that will effectively govern situations such as these, and send copies of these policies to the Ombudsman and to the appropriate governing oversight authority.

We were also concerned that there may have been a violation of a statute, but deficiencies in the internal audit made that determination impossible. The Ombudsman recommended that the organization:

- engage an external auditor to conduct a forensic audit of the employee's suspect purchases to determine if there is evidence of a breach of a provincial or federal statute that should be referred to a law enforcement agency for further investigation.

Finally, we were concerned about the organization's own whistleblower policies and procedures. The Ombudsman recommended that the organization:

- revisit its whistleblower policies and procedures to ensure that matters are handled promptly and thoroughly.

In response to these three recommendations, the organization engaged a forensic auditor, it revised its purchasing policies for greater accountability and its responsibility with more clearly defined processes, and it completed a revision of its internal policy regarding whistleblowers.

We were advised in early 2012 that neither the employee who was alleged to have committed the wrongdoing, nor the individual who had led the internal audit panel, continued to be employed by the organization.

Out-of-Province Health Benefits

At times individuals come to our office because they have attempted to follow rules and government processes but have essentially slipped between the cracks. One such case involved a complaint regarding the reimbursement of out-of-province medical expenses by Manitoba Health. In order to be eligible for reimbursement for out-of-province medical expenses, two criteria must be met. The first is that the service could not, in the opinion of the Minister, be adequately provided in Manitoba or elsewhere in Canada. The second criteria is that the service is provided outside of Canada as a result of a referral by a qualified medical

practitioner who practices in Manitoba and who is a specialist in the appropriate field of practice.

In a complaint investigation we concluded in 2011, an individual was required to pay for service that he received out-of-province because he was unable to obtain a diagnosis by a qualified medical practitioner in Manitoba. Three Manitoba physicians refused to refer the man for further testing to confirm what he believed to be a serious condition which, if left undiagnosed and treated, would have negatively affected his life expectancy. The individual was faced with the harsh reality of not receiving timely treatment in Manitoba, or seeking help out-of-province and hopefully finding

the cause of his deteriorating health. He had a test performed in the United States and the results indicated that he did have an illness which required medical intervention.

Given the circumstances of this case, the individual did not appear to meet the criteria for reimbursement as set out in provincial legislation. Nevertheless, despite the legislative confines, our office was able to find a remedy to address what appeared to be an unfair situation.

It is our understanding that upon his return to Manitoba with a correct diagnosis, the man was able to receive necessary treatment.

Municipal Issues

In 2011 we investigated a variety of complaints about municipal actions and decisions. Common themes that continue to appear in complaints relate to perceived conflicts of interest, the appropriateness of councils using "in camera" sessions in the decision making process, and the lack of reasons provided by municipal councils for their decisions.

In one case, residents of a municipality felt that they had been treated unfairly because their request for boat access on public reserve land was denied. Access to the residents' home was by water in the summer and river ice in the winter. The residents previously had docking arrangements with a private landowner, but when the landowner subdivided his property, docking privileges were withdrawn. When the residents applied to council for docking privileges on public reserve land, council denied the request without providing reasons for their decision. When they asked why their request was denied, they were told that council has the authority to approve or deny a request pertaining to the use of public reserve lands. Dissatisfied with the response from the municipality, the residents made a complaint to the Ombudsman.

A municipal by-law governing activities on public reserve lands indicated that council would consider and decide on such requests on a case-by-case basis. We learned that in this case, the municipal council did not want to set a precedent of granting this kind of access on its public reserves and, furthermore, the municipality anticipated using the land for future drainage purposes. They had also previously approved a request from the same residents to construct a stairway and dock at a different location along the river, but the residents did not find this other location convenient.

We concluded that while the decision to deny the residents' request did not appear to be unreasonable, council should have provided reasons for its decision.

Giving reasons for decisions can help reduce the perception that decisions are arbitrary. It is a form of transparency that generally promotes confidence in the administrative decision making process. We also remind decision makers that one of the implications of not providing reasons is that, in the absence of clearly stated reasons for a decision, people are free to speculate about the reasons and are more likely to complain about a decision.

Inmate Discipline Boards

The mandate of Manitoba Corrections, a division of Manitoba Justice, includes the rehabilitation and successful community reintegration of individuals who have been in conflict with the law. Each year, several thousand inmates are released back into society after serving sentences in Manitoba's correctional centres. Adherence to the principles of natural justice is no less important to the decision making process in a correctional setting than it is outside of prison. People do not forfeit the right to be treated fairly when they are incarcerated. Canadian courts have examined what is required to achieve fairness within a correctional setting. A fair decision making process within a correctional centre can include the right to know the case against you, the right to an impartial and unbiased decision maker, the opportunity to be heard, and the right to be informed of the reasons for a decision that affects you.

In our 2009 annual report we identified a concern regarding the composition of discipline boards in provincial adult correctional centres and the potential for reasonable apprehension of bias when correctional officers investigate disciplinary offences, prosecute these offences, and serve as adjudicators at discipline board hearings. Individuals who wish to appeal discipline board decisions are then required to do so with the superintendent of the same correctional centre.

In 2011, Manitoba Corrections committed to:

- Assign a hearing adjudicator from an adult correctional centre, other than the one where the disciplinary infraction occurred, to hear the matter.
- Utilize higher ranking correctional officers, who do not directly supervise inmates, to serve in adjudicative roles.
- Emphasize mediation and dispute resolution to informally address disciplinary infractions where appropriate.
- Allow inmates to appeal disciplinary board decisions directly to the Executive Director of the Adult Custody Branch.

We were advised that amendments to *The Correctional Services Act and Regulations* are necessary to effect some of these changes. Our office is hopeful this will occur in the near future.

It is our view that the decision to continue using correctional officers to hear discipline board matters may not address the issue of apprehension of bias to the fullest extent possible. Nevertheless, we acknowledge these changes, when implemented, will be a significant administrative improvement over the current discipline board process in adult correctional centres. On this basis our file was closed but we remain prepared to further examine the impact of these changes should the Ombudsman receive similar complaints in the future.

Environmental Assessment and Licensing

We received a complaint from an individual who was not permitted to appeal the issuance of an operating licence for Manitoba Hydro's Selkirk Thermal Generating Station (SGS) issued under *The Environment Act* by the Environmental Assessment and Licensing Branch (EAL) of Manitoba Conservation.

An earlier version of the licence contained a clause that if the plant was not retired as a thermal generating station in or before the year 2005 the licence would be reviewed. As SGS was still in use at the beginning of 2005, the Director of EAL undertook a review of the licence. As part of this review, Manitoba Hydro was asked to submit an updated and comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the continued operation of SGS. The EIS was sent to a Technical Advisory Committee and Environment Act public registries, as well as advertised in Selkirk newspapers for comments and/or concerns from the public. The revised licence was issued in April 2008. Individuals affected by the issuance of such licences can appeal to the Minister of Conservation within 30 days. EAL had a practice of notifying interested individuals when such licences were issued.

Later that year, an individual wrote to EAL and asked why he was not informed about the issuance of the revised licence, thus making it impossible for him to exercise his right of appeal within the required 30-day time frame. EAL did not respond to that letter, and the individual wrote to the Minister. The Minister

explained that since there was never an application to issue a new, or alter an existing, licence, there was no appeal process (the review was initiated by EAL). The individual complained to our office.

In the course of our review, EAL explained that the individual was not notified of the issuance of the licence because there was only a minor alteration to the licence, and that this minor alteration did not trigger the statutory appeal provisions. Our office disagreed with this interpretation, because the appeal provisions are triggered by the *issuance* of a licence, not by the nature of the alteration.

Although he should have received notice of the issuance of the licence, we did not make a recommendation that the individual be given an opportunity to appeal after the fact. The appeal process allows affected individuals to raise concerns about EAL decisions with the Minister. In this case we confirmed that the licence in question did not appear to result in any adverse environmental impacts. It was, as suggested by EAL, issued as a "housekeeping" matter. We also confirmed that on numerous occasions the complainant had been invited to raise any specific concerns with the department, being advised by the Deputy Minister in writing that "if given the opportunity, I am confident staff will be able to answer any concerns you may have regarding the environmental effects of this station. If you wish, staff also would be pleased to meet with you personally to discuss the matter." The complainant declined this offer.

Manitoba Lotteries

Every day, about 10,000 people visit Manitoba's two government-run casinos in Winnipeg, Club Regent and McPhillips Street Station, for gaming and entertainment.

One casino patron complained to our office after he was unable to resolve a dispute with Manitoba Lotteries Corporation over keno winnings of \$590.

During one of his visits to the casino, the patron played both bingo and keno on an electronic gaming device. Before the conclusion of the bingo game, the individual "cashed out" and wanted to collect his keno winnings of \$590. He mistakenly tried to cash out his bingo voucher, and when he returned to the machine to retrieve his keno ticket, he discovered that it was gone. Surveillance video confirmed that another person had taken the ticket, claimed the winning amount, and left the casino. The video did not capture a clear image of the other person's licence plate.

After the incident, Manitoba Lotteries staff met with the patron and recommended that he report the theft to police. The individual wanted to be reimbursed for the loss of his \$590 winnings. Manitoba Lotteries instead offered a "goodwill" entertainment package. The individual declined the customer service gesture, and made a complaint to the Ombudsman.

During our review, Manitoba Lotteries advised that it adheres to gaming

industry standards and does not pay out for lost or stolen tickets. They also have specific procedures to be followed when there is a dispute over tickets. As part of these procedures, Manitoba Lotteries explained that staff will approach the "person of interest" who redeemed the cashout ticket if the person is again seen in the casino.

Manitoba Lotteries also demonstrated for us what happens when a patron leaves a machine to cash out winnings when a bingo session is still in progress. Two vouchers are printed. The first is a bingo voucher. The second cash-out ticket follows. The machine clearly displays exactly what it is printing. In this particular case, the machine would have displayed "CASHING OUT, PRINTING BINGO VOUCHER," followed by "CASHING OUT, PRINTING CASHOUT TICKET". It is the player's responsibility to check ticket values before leaving a machine.

Based on our review of this situation, it appeared that Manitoba Lotteries took reasonable action in response to this incident, including review and preservation of the video surveillance footage, advising the patron to contact the police regarding the theft, and meeting with the patron to review the incident in an attempt to resolve it. Manitoba Lotteries also offered an entertainment package as a goodwill gesture. Established policies and procedures were followed in this case. In light of all of the above, the Ombudsman did not support this complaint.

2011 education & outreach

"We need to reach as many Manitobans as possible to promote their understanding and knowledge of the office as a means to ask question of, and challenge the way government is working. If people don't know about our office and its mandate, we cannot be effective in what we do."

Irene Hamilton, Manitoba's 4th Ombudsman

In 2011, the Ombudsman and staff gave 66 presentations to various audiences around the province.

Throughout 2011, Manitoba Ombudsman staff visited Friendship Centres in Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Dauphin, Swan River, The Pas, and Flin Flon, to share information about our office. While in The Pas, staff also spoke to students at University College of the North.

Staff presented at regional seminars for municipal officials led by Manitoba Local Government and the Association of Manitoba Municipalities. Seminars were held in Arborg, Birtle, Dauphin, Gladstone, Headingley, Ste Anne, Souris, Thompson, and Winkler.

Staff also spoke to students at Carman Elementary School and Arthur E. Wright School about the work of the Ombudsman, to three classes of students at the University

of Winnipeg, and to students at Neeginan Institute. A presentation was also made to residents of Fred Douglas Place.

Since 2008, our office has delivered training to correctional officer recruits as part of their regular training program through Manitoba Justice. In 2011, 10 correctional officer sessions were delivered. On several occasions, staff also spoke to youth in Agassiz Youth Centre and Manitoba Youth Centre.

In 2011, display tables were staffed at the Association of Manitoba Municipalities' Annual Convention, Law Day (Winnipeg and Brandon), the Manitoba Metis Federation General Assembly, and the Manitoba Social Sciences Teachers Association conference.

On October 18 and 19, 2011, Manitoba Ombudsman hosted colleagues from across the country whose provinces have legislation similar to ours that provides public interest disclosure and whistleblower protection. The meeting provided an opportunity to share experience and insight in relation to public interest disclosure schemes currently in effect.



2011 in numbers

2011 Statistical Overview of the Office

General Inquiries responded to by administration staff (caller was assisted, without need for referral to Intake Services)	1448
Inquiries responded to by Intake Services (information supplied or assistance provided)	264
Concerns handled by Intake Services under FIPPA, Ombudsman Act, PHIA and PIDA	1615
Cases opened for investigation under The Ombudsman Act	106
Cases opened for investigation under The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act	1
Cases resulting from inquest report recommendations under The Fatality Inquiries Act	9
Cases opened for investigation under Part 5 of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act	268
Cases opened for investigation under Part 5 of The Personal Health Information Act (PHIA)	22
Cases opened under Part 4 of FIPPA and PHIA	30
Total Contacts	3763

2011 Office Budget

Total salaries and employee benefits for 31 positions	\$2,537,000
Positions allocated by division are:	
Ombudsman Division 12	
Access and Privacy Division 8	
General 11	
Other expenditures	\$505,000
Total Budget	\$3,042,000

Geographically speaking...

In 2011, of the new complaints our office investigated under *The Ombudsman Act*, the distribution between the City of Winnipeg and other areas of Manitoba was relatively equal:

- 49% of complainants lived in Winnipeg
- 47% of complainants lived outside of Winnipeg in other areas of Manitoba
- 4% of complainants lived outside of Manitoba



Child Death Review Cases

Manitoba Ombudsman has responsibility for monitoring and reporting annually on the implementation of recommendations resulting from special investigations of child deaths by the Office of the Children's Advocate.

In 2011/12, 26 cases resulting from recommendations made by the Children's Advocate under *The Child and Family Services Act* were received.

In late 2011 we released *Report on the Process for the Review of Child Welfare and Collateral Services after the Death of a Child*. The report highlights the administrative processes implemented to date, their strengths and weaknesses, and areas where improvements have been and can be made. Five recommendations were made to improve the process. This report, and other public reports, can be viewed on our website at www.ombudsman.mb.ca.

Of the 165 cases closed in 2011:

- 26% were informally resolved in whole or in part
- 4% went to recommendation
- 12% were completed
- 39% were not supported
- 5% were concluded after information was provided
- 14% were discontinued either by the Ombudsman or the complainant, or declined

	Case Numbers			Case Dispositions								
	Carried over into 2011	New Cases in 2011	Total Cases in 2011	Pending at 12/31/2011	Information Supplied	Declined	Discontinued	Not Supported	Partly Resolved	Resolved	Recommendation	Completed
This chart shows the disposition of 243 case files in 2011 under The Ombudsman Act, The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act, and The Fatality Inquiries Act.												
The Ombudsman Act												
Aboriginal & Northern Affairs	1		1							1		
Agriculture, Food & Rural Initiatives	1		1			1						
Conservation	3	3	6	1		1	2			2		
Education		3	3			1	2					
Family Services & Consumer Affairs												
General	1		1									1
Automobile Injury Compensation Appeal Commission	1		1							1		
Child & Family Services	5	2	7	2		2	1			2		
Consumer Protection Office		1	1					1				
Employment & Income Assistance	1	3	4			1	2					1
Residential Tenancies Branch	1	2	3	1				1		1		
Residential Tenancies Commission	3		3					2		1		
Supported Living		1	1					1				
Ombudsman's Own Initiative OOI	2	3	5	3						1		1
Finance												
Securities Commission	2		2	1	1							
Health												
General	3	2	5		1		1		1	1		1
Health Appeal Board	2		2					1		1		
Protection for Persons in Care Office	1		1							1		
Mental Health	1		1					1				
Regional Health Authority		2	2	1			1					
Ombudsman's Own Initiative OOI	4	1	5	2							1	2
Housing & Community Development												
Manitoba Housing Authority	4	1	5					4		1		
Ombudsman's Own Initiative OOI	3		3	1						1		1
Infrastructure & Transportation	1	5	6	3		1		1		1		
Justice												
General	4		4	1				1		2		
Brandon Correctional Centre	1	2	3					1		2		
Headingley Correctional Centre	1		1							1		
The Pas Correctional Centre		2	2	1				1				
Winnipeg Remand Centre	1	4	5	1				1	1	1		1
Manitoba Youth Centre		1	1									1
Maintenance Enforcement	2	4	6	2				1		3		
Human Rights Commission	8	6	14	3	1		2	8				
Law Enforcement Review Agency		1	1							1		
Legal Aid	2		2					2				
Public Trustee	1	2	3	2				1				
Ombudsman's Own Initiative OOI	9	6	15	8					1	2		4
Labour & Immigration												
Manitoba Labour Board		1	1							1		
Local Government	1		1					1				
Water Stewardship	3	7	10	2	1	1	3	2		1		
Corporate & Extra Departmental												
Manitoba Housing & Renewal Corporation		1	1	1								
Manitoba Hydro	3		3					2		1		
Manitoba Lotteries Corporation		1	1					1				
Manitoba Public Insurance	6	8	14	3		1	1	7	1			1
Manitoba Review Board		1	1	1								
Workers Compensation Board	1	2	3	1				1		1		
WCB Appeal Commission	1	2	3		3							
Ombudsman's Own Initiative OOI		1	1					1				
Municipalities												
City of Winnipeg	6	10	16	7				1	4	4		
Other Cities, RMs, Towns & Villages	15	14	29	13	2	2	1	9		2		
Local Planning Districts	3	1	4	1				1		2		
Subtotal	108	106	214	63	9	6	17	63	3	39	1	13
The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act												
Crown Corporation & Government Agency	2		2	1						1		
Educational Body	4		4					1			3	
Government Department	1		1	1								
Health Care Facility		1	1	1								
Subtotal	7	1	8	3				1		1	3	
Cases Resulting from Inquest Report Recommendations under The Fatality Inquiries Act												
Family Services	2		2	2								
Health	4	3	7	4							1	2
Justice	3	1	4	1							1	2
Labour & Immigration	1	2	3	3								
Liquor Control Commission	1		1									1
City of Winnipeg	1	3	4	3								1
Subtotal	12	9	21	13							2	6
TOTAL	127	116	243	78	9	6	17	64	3	40	6	20

Pending: Complaint still under investigation as of January 1, 2011.

Information supplied: Assistance or information provided.

Declined: Complaint not accepted for investigation by Ombudsman, usually for reason of non-jurisdiction or premature complaint.

Discontinued: Investigation of complaint stopped by Ombudsman or client.

Not Supported: Complaint not supported at all.

Partly Resolved: Complaint is partly resolved informally.

Resolved: Complaint is resolved informally.

Recommendation Made: All or part of complaint supported and recommendation made after informal procedures prove unsuccessful.

Completed: Case where the task of monitoring, informing or commenting has been concluded.