Subject: [Fwd: Re: Little Rascals Daycare]
Date: Mon, 07 Apr 2003 17:07:08 -0700
From: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>
To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Subject: RE: Little Rascals Daycare
Date: Mon, 07 Apr 2003 20:09:10 +0100 (BST)
From: Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>
To: Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>, Kathleen Hill <kghill@telus.net>
CC: "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, Mayor and Council - DNV <council@dnv.org>, Directors Team <managecomm@dnv.org>

Dear Clr. Crist:

Thank you for including me in discussion of this issue. I suspect, however, that you and I will have a severe divergence of opinion in the matter, since I do not consider access to universal, government-subsidized, daycare as a right.

I consider myself to be a fiscal conservative with a social conscience. I have no problem with government providing short-term relief for those who are truly in need to enable those who can to get back on their own two feet.

I have 'been there, done that', raising a daughter, for much of the time, as a single parent. I understand that it's tough, no doubt about that, but I considered it my responsibility to locate and pay family members or reliable friends, neighbours, etc. to spell me off so that I could go to work. I did not feel that, because I had been divorced, it was now my right to maintain my lifestyle - complete with all mod cons, including your SUV's, while looking to government to provide for my daughter's care.

It used to be that two people would get married, rent, or save to buy a house and then, when they could afford it, start a family. Nowadays, it's totally different. Everything is considered to be "a right" and, if one cannot pay for it oneself, not to worry, government can do it.

As far as I'm concerned, it's time to change *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* to read *Charter of Rights, Responsibilities and Freedoms* and return to at least a few of the old-fashioned values.

As you are more than aware, government at all levels is besieged with a deluge of "must haves", societal "rights", and grant applications for all manner of good causes. Just recently, District Council spent a whole evening discussing such things as leases and grants to various community activities. These ranged from the impressive R&B Dance group - which had made a tremendous effort to improve the value of District capital assets and to become profitable, not just self-sufficient - all the way to the unimpressive and ill-prepared Deep Cove Yacht Club delegation which, for some peculiar reason, seems to feel it, too, has a "right" to District money, merely because it has had it for years.

As far as I am concerned, it's long past time that municipal councils concentrated on their traditional mandate: i.e. planning/zoning, by-laws and the provision of water, sewage, waste-removal, and transportation infrastructure services - period. If, when, councils' can get those things efficiently and economically dealt with, then they can start looking for other things upon which to spend our money.

Moreover, if such services were to be the sole concentration and fiscal responsibility of local governments and if other levels of government were to trim their activities back in a similar fashion, then maybe, just maybe, we'd have a whole bunch more money left in our pockets with which to support our own families.

In summary, then, given the wherewithal, I am more than happy to support the less fortunate, especially when I see them making a personal effort, but I am not prepared to go the "universal" route. To me that only smacks of, "I work all day, I hand most of my salary over to politicians and bureaucrats, and let government decide how it should be spent - after they've taken their cut and paid off their friends and supporters." That hasn't worked for decades in this country and it's not likely to work in the future.

Sincerely,

Liz James

Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org> wrote:

> Dear Ms Hill:

The present delay in the Little Rascal agreement occurred because the District Mayor and management failed to to take into account that under the Local Government Act a municipality does not have the power to make a twenty year agreement with any organization without taking it to referendum and or provide an opportunity for a counter petition. This is notwithstanding that some persons deny this. This is the second time that the District blundered for the same reasons.

Funding for childcare is NOT a municipal responsibility as you seem to believe nor is it a factor in the delay as far as the District is concerned. The District does provide however some funding towards childcare but NOT in the form of direct support for either childcare facilities or individuals per se in the District. The same is true by the City for childcare in the City. On the other hand the District is subsiding the Little Rascal facility by making land available free of charge for 20 years. This is definitely a subsidy. You may not be aware however, that in the rest of the developed world, childcare is universal and part of the education system. In Europe for instance this has been in place since 1919. We are truly backward in this regard. On the other hand we do have more SUV'S. This is just bye the bye of course.&nb! sp;

Also we do not ask whether individual childcare facilities such as Little Rascal allow children from the City. If this question was raised than it was purely for purposes of information. I was somewhat perplexed however by your statement that the District Taxpayers should fund childcare for the City because people residing in the City support business in the District. This is a specious argument to say the least since the argument could also be made that District residents also shop in the City.

The District is already subsidizing the City on an enormous scale in the form of playing fields of which there are 54 in the District and only 9 in the City at least in one category just by way of example. This is the case even-though the City has 50 % of the population of the District. There is also the question of recreation facilities of which the District has 4 large facilities as against one in the City. The City does not provide any funding for capital maintenance. There is a saying which goes somewhat like this - the City is building the high-rises and the District is providing the parks and the playing fields free of charge. At the same time any and all overtures toward amalgamation of the two jurisdictions has been ridiculed by the City. To put it bluntly, the District taxpayers are being "played for suckers" by the City fathers. But I do n! ot blame the City since this is the fault of the District for allowing it rather then the fault of the City for taking advantage of the "stupidity" of the District Council. Forgive me for being so blunt.

But once again this is just bye the bye and has nothing to do with the delay of the Little Rascal Childcare facility. The District after having "goofed" again, will now provide an opportunity for a counter petition which should have been done in the first pace and if it is approved by District residents which it undoubtedly will, the Little Rascal project should be able to proceed as early as the middle of May of this year. I hope this will clarify the situation for you.

Thank you,

Ernie Crist

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathleen Hill [mailto:kghill@telus.net]
Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2003 1:58 PM
To: Ernie Crist
Subject: Little Rascals Daycare

> I am writing to express my concern about the funding for Little Rascals Daycare Centre. We are a family who has lived in the District for 30 years. Our concern is for a child in our family whose single mother totally relies on it's continuation. Although they live on the street that divides the City from the District, they support all the surrounding businesses, as well as her son's soccer and baseball clubs. We are all citizens of the; North Shore and our needs should not be determined by municipal boundaries.
> Little Rascals Daycare has a 22 year history in North Vancouver and should be supported. It is an excellent. affordable Daycare for those who need it. Probably the only one in this area.
> Gerald and Kathleen Hill
