

Minimum Working Age Consultation: Comments from Employer Questionnaire

1. What type of business do you operate or manage? (e.g., diamond drilling, electrical contracting, food service, hotel, trucking, municipal or First Nation government, painting, retail sales, road construction, welding shop, etc.)

SUMMARY:

Retail sales: 14	Tourism: 4
Fast food restaurant + food service: 12	Gas station: 3
Mining, including placer mining: 8	Transportation/trucking: 3
Professional and other offices: 7	Campground: 3
Hotel/motel: 6	Utility: 2
Municipal and First Nation governments: 6	Construction: 2
Food retail: 4	Manufacturing: 2
Auto repair: 4	Other: 13

Retail sales
Fast food restaurant
Motel, convenience store, and gas station
Building construction
Retail sales
Food service
Retail sales
Building supply yard and truss plant
Fish farm
Big box chain food retail
Hotel
Big box chain retail
Retail sales
Fast food restaurant
Retail sales (automotive)
Retail sales
Grocery store + gas station
Auto repair
Diamond drilling
Landscaping
Janitorial services
First Nation government
Fast food restaurant
Welding shop
Fast food restaurant

Retail sales
Hospital
Food service
Food retail
Recreation facility
Food service
Retail sales
contract mining, road building
municipal government
full service hotel
placer mine
campground
Golf Club
manufacturing
Security
consulting practice
Placer mining, exploration, consulting
food service
Tour Operator
Professional Office
touring service - transportation & tourist services
food
retail sales
Guiding and Outfitting
Hotel
Motel & RV campgrounds
Tourism
Retail sales
placer mining
Food service and motel
Municipal Government
Municipal Government
Placer Mining
Placer mining
food service

food service
Retail Sales
retail sales
Marketing / Communication Services
potable water delivery, education, services
municipal government
Museum
Campground
Municipal Government
RV Sales and service
film industry
trucking
retail sales, garage
manufacturing
non profit association
utility
Fuel Industry
placer mining
placer gold mining
Insurance office
trucking
Gas station/garage/retail store
Surveying/Engineering
retail
utility
Non-Government Organization
electrical utility

2. Do you employ or have you ever employed workers under age 18?

Probably only 3 of 55 employees under 18
90% of staff is under
About 25% of our workers
Usually it was some parent who already works for us wanting to bring their kid to work during the summer.
Only during summer--as office help, youth support workers running language immersion camps, and doing work in the community garden planting, harvesting, and delivering vegetables.
only as job shadowing
As lifeguards, activity coordinators and camp staff
We have in the past, employed younger workers
No, but I feel strongly that I should be allowed to!
Golf Clubs have traditionally always employed children under 18. The youth we employ are a huge component of our success.
summer employment high school students
relative of a relative who worked here - thought it would be good experience for a young city boy
High school students working as waitresses, dishwashers etc. Many 12 to 15 yr olds are ready and eager to work in such capacities and should not have a restriction of only 2 hours per day of work but a restriction of no work after 8 pm on weekdays Sun thru Thurs; no limitations on Friday and Saturday of hours allowed to work.
Summer Students working for Public Works (cutting grass, hauling garbage, etc.), Pool Assistant, and Museum's Assistant
Both my son and daughter have worked at the mine doing misc. tasks. my son started at the age of 13 and was a fully qualified rock truck and excavator operator by the age of 15. I feel that in the family mine scenario with the personal training given to my children they were both well trained and qualified to perform the work task given them.
Family operation
nature of business requires employees who have reached the age of majority
Unfortunately, and with exceptions, the younger workers tend not to be as dependable as older workers and need more direction in daily work projects.
youth in focus groups, workshops and training sessions
In other jobs that I do, I work alongside workers as young as 16.
Personally, I do not believe that there should be children working in any field under the age of 16. For work around construction sites or forestry it should be 18.
For doing yard work and painting of pipes and railings.
insurance disallows drivers under the age of 25
Only my daughter, (family) who is 8.
I don't need these people, I employ them as a favour to friends and or when I see a young person who really wants to work and would benefit from the money and the experience

3. Bill 109 proposes that workers under age 18 would not be allowed to work after midnight in the following workplaces:

- **Businesses engaged in retail sales of food or beverages (whether alcoholic or not) and any other commodities, goods, wares, or merchandise.**
- **Retail businesses that sell gasoline, diesel fuel, propane, or any other petroleum or natural gas product.**
- **Hotels, motels, or other places that provide overnight accommodation to the public.**

Do you agree with this proposed restriction?

Under 18 is too young to work after midnight in any job that entails cash handling or dealing with people who have consumed alcohol, because the worker is vulnerable.
After midnight a lot of organizations don't have supervisors on shift, so that could be a potential safety hazard to employees.
There are young people who do not have a support system (family) who need to work to support themselves and are under the age of 18 & not attending school. With adequate proof of need, these youngsters should be permitted to work.
While it could be qualified to say "unsupervised" the reality is that it would be impossible to police and there are numerous safety and other issues to consider
I think it good experience for young people to work in retail sales.
One of the most important health issues to youngsters is a minimum amount of sleep. Staying to a normal daily rhythm would be definitely best for them. Besides, during night time hours they could encounter matters and situations which they are not able to master due to lack of experience and maturity.
I agree in general, however, I really don't like one size fits all hard rules because I believe there are always going to be exceptional situations like lack of labour availability, or a family run business in a remote location where everyone has to pitch in. I would like to see provision for application for exemptions.

4. Bill 109 proposes that workers under age 18 would not be allowed to work after midnight in the following workplaces:

- **Businesses engaged in retail sales of food or beverages (whether alcoholic or not) and any other commodities, goods, wares, or merchandise.**
- **Retail businesses that sell gasoline, diesel fuel, propane, or any other petroleum or natural gas product.**
- **Hotels, motels, or other places that provide overnight accommodation to the public.**

Do your under-age-18 workers ever work after midnight?

Only older workers work the graveyard shift
Only when we're doing inventory and only if it goes awry. We do try to send our younger workers home first.
Not currently open after midnight, but a move to being open 24 hours is imminent. Our goal is to hire over-18 workers, but especially in the summer time it would affect us if we couldn't schedule under 18s after midnight.
Unless they are doing inventory (twice a year)
and neither do I (if possible)

If they're working a closing shift they might not get out until after midnight. (We have no set closing time; it depends on when customers leave, but typically we close between 11:00 and 11:30 p.m. weekdays and 12:00 - 12:30 Friday and Saturday.)

Sometimes there is night shift work for a junior person - washing equipment, fuelling pumps etc. or things such as "claim staking after midnight - in summer with long daylight hours),

I fit none of the categories above but if you think about it mining should be one of the categories as we work 24 hours per day

5. If you were prohibited from scheduling your under-age-18 workers to work after midnight, would your business be negatively affected?

We are open to midnight on Friday and Saturday, so sometimes our younger workers might not get away until 12:15 or 12:30.

We don't have this demand in the first place.

more to the point the workers would be negatively affected as they would lose respect from the other employees and they would know that they are receiving special treatment and are virtually being told that they are not capable of doing their job

6. How would your business be affected?

When you're impeded by what you're allowed to do versus what people want and don't want, it really restricts your options. Not all under-18s are in a two-parent family situation; some of them really want and need to work.

A big chunk of my workforce (55 - 60%) is under 18. If they couldn't work after midnight we would have to seek out older workers, and if we couldn't find them we'd have to revise our operating hours, which, as a business, we would not want to do.

There would be additional cost to hire a more senior person to do the job that a younger person can do and gain experience.

I would probably not hire these young people so it would affect them, not me. this is so wrong

7. Do you employ or have you ever employed workers under age 16?

Extremely rare

About 5% of our workers

If a student is within six months of 16th birthday, will hire if he/she shows exceptional verbal skills and maturity through three interviews. 90% of these hires have worked out.

The only time I've had high school students is part of a work experience program through the school.

I employed a friend's daughter once because they asked me to.

I don't think we have any under 16s working for us now.

Only in office positions

I want the option to employ my own children/family members when they become 12
Our family and key employees like to have their children work with them on the site. This is a key part of the lifestyle for both our families and employees.
Simply too young to deal with overseas customers.
I would consider hiring a 14-16 year old on a casual basis to clean vans or prepare equipment for tourists (picnic planning) ... but he/she would be supervised at all times by an adult. And I would only hire during school vacations.
but not the norm
Did not work alone, worked as a support staff to senior staff members
As dishwashers and waitresses for maximum of 4 hours per shift after school such as 4 pm to 8 pm and on weekends split shifts from 10 am to 8 pm to cover busy periods
Family members who grew up at the mine
Under age 16 I insist upon participation of parents in setting hours
Only once
We may be looking at this in the future
However I have worked alongside under-16 workers during film shoots. I have concerns that they be tutored by certified teachers when a shoot of 3 days or longer.
There is not much to comment about. the workers loved their job

8. Bill 109 proposes that workers under age 16 would not be allowed to work more than two hours on school days? Do you agree with this proposed restriction?

Some people have travel time to and from work, and it might not be worth their while for two hours.
I don't think they should be allowed to work at all.
They can't make enough money working two hours. There's nothing wrong with a three-hour shift on a Thursday or Friday night. A lot of youth, that's when they want to work.
That wouldn't be far to students who are more capable of handling more than two hours a day.
Kids going to school shouldn't be dealing with juggling work and homework.
When I was in high school I would work more than three hours a day, and it was very beneficial.
I come from a strong background that education comes first. I think it's easy for kids to get a misconstrued view of the world when they're making money. It can affect their values, whether they're working to support a habit or so they can go shopping. Also, students shouldn't have to bear the burden of school and work.
Two hours is limiting. A lot of young folk do have a second job and not too many places will hire you for just two hours. A lot of students work after school starting at 3:30. They could reasonably work more than two hours.
Don't want to choose one or the other. A student's primary concern should be education and no student should be in a situation where he or she is trying to work enough hours to make a living, but a part-time job is a good introduction to work and life experiences. I come from Ontario where co-op programs have proved quite successful at getting students to balance educational and work pursuits.

They need time to do homework.
I think a two-hour shift is pretty useless. You'd have to hire more part-time workers, and hiring and training costs are expensive. (Even though this business doesn't have any under-16 workers, the high school students that we do hire put in a 4:30 - 10:00 p.m. shift.
It should be up to the parent to decide
Yes provided that they are actually attending classes in a recognised school. Those on home study or correspondence should not be affected.
I also do not think they should be working 2 hours a day 5 days a week either.
If the person wants to work more they should be allowed. I think 4 hours more reasonable.
I think children under age 16 should not be allowed to work at all.
Yes ... but there should also be a weekly maximum of 6 hours a week. 2 hours a day x five days is 10 hours a week ... which is too much for a youngster going to school.
Too much pressure on children. More focus on school is a good thing.
I would also agree to a limitation on the number of hours worked by those under age 16 on school days as well. Perhaps more than two hours but now more than 4
As an umbrella rule I don't believe bill 109 makes sense. For some specific scenarios this may make sense but limiting work schedules to 2 hours during school days will be too taxing on businesses in general. Point #1 - it is already onerous for businesses to management employee work schedules and this proposal will only add more burden to employers. Point #2 - the reality of the Yukon labour market is such that staffing is already a significant burden for employers and this proposed change will only add to that burden. Point #3 - it will force many businesses to look elsewhere for staff and reduce valuable work experience options for workers under age 16.
Some discussion on even hiring someone under 16.
I think for a child under the age of 16 - and for that matter, any child currently enrolled in secondary school - 2 hours of outside work per day should be the maximum.
I agree with the intent and so have answered yes, however, when I think about the other options on which teens choose to spend their time, like 4-5 hours a day of TV, then I think this provision can not achieve its intent. I would rather see a teen under 16 working four hours a night than watching TV four hours a night or choosing some even less desirable activities on which to spend their time. By comparison with some of those other choices, working, even more than 2 hours, is by far preferable. Perhaps 2 hours should only be a guideline rather than a rule, and parents should be the ones to decide.
What about shortened school days where perhaps only one or two classes are involved? Should be a decision made in concert with parents.

9. Do your under-age-16 workers ever work more than two hours on school days?

Weekday shifts are four hours. We ask them if that's going to be a problem for them when we hire them. If somebody's not doing well in school, then obviously they should be focusing on that. We have let people go for that reason.
Usually work from 5:00 - 9:00 p.m.
Usually three-hour shifts
4.5 hours is average shift.

This is usually limited by parents, and two hours seems about right.
Four-hour shifts
Shifts start at 3:45 or 4:00 p.m. and run to 8:15 or 10:15 (so approx. 4 - 6 hours).
They're employed only during the summer.
They come in after school and work 4:30 to 9:00 or 10:00, unless their parents say that's not okay. We have a lot of students from -----, and we work around their schedules.
four-hour dishwasher shifts
4:30 - 10:30 p.m. is a typical shift (about 10 under-16s at one store and more than 10 at the other)
However, I have had babysitters who have had to work over 2 hours on school days.
They work only during the summer
Some of them may be home schooled, so yes, depending on whether you consider a school day.
Sometimes
summer seasonal only
summer holidays only
with parental approval according to the child's scholastic reports and not after 8 pm on school nights
Shifts are 3 hours but, as parental involvement in mandatory for persons under 16, I expect that we will limit interference with school work and other important activities by limiting the number of shifts assigned to these people.
Would you consider a Friday night as a school day?
worked in summer only
they don't work school days

10. If you were prohibited from scheduling your under-age-16 workers to work more than two hours on school days, would your business be negatively affected?

We need a minimum four-hour shift to be cost-effective, so we wouldn't hire under 16. Would disagree with this restriction because most students get off at 3:00 p.m., and if they're diligent they can get their homework done, eat, and be at work at 5:00. Then they're off work at 9:00 if they have something else they have to get done.
Students represent 40% of my 200 employees. A lot of them work 4:00 - 8:00 because that's a really busy time for us. (Personally, though, I have five kids and don't agree with them working on school days.)
We need people to cover the after school rush and evenings on the days the store is open longer than our full-time staff can cover. Isn't there a law that you have to pay for a minimum of three hours? Would we have to pay for three hours if they worked only two hours?
Dramatically! This is ridiculous. Our minimum shift is 3 hours, and that's a pretty common labour standard across the country. Five hours is the average shift (5:00 - 9:00 p.m.).
Retail is always busy, and I rely on kids to close the store (which is open until 10:00 p.m.) If I didn't have these kids I'd probably have to hire full-time employees and it would cost more.
They'd work over supper time instead.

I have to pay them for a minimum of two hours, but if everybody could work only two hours, that would be ridiculous. If have to hire way more workers.

We would be unable to schedule the employee on a school day if they were prohibited from working more than two hours.

there are specific times when extra hands are required - generally between 4:30 pm and 7 pm. Adults will not work such a short shift and as a mom and pop business we cannot afford to provide full time shifts during the week to adults yet neither can we do everything ourselves in a safe and timely fashion during these peak hours....hence students.

I would simply not be able to hire anyone under 16.

It would affect the under 16 that may want to work. It limits his ability to work.

11. How would your business be affected?

I just wouldn't hire them. Frankly, it would be too much trouble. I would probably look at foreign workers. It's getting tougher and tougher to find people.

Would have to cut hours of operation because most workers are students, and I need to schedule them for minimum four-hour shifts to cover the hours the business is open.

Would have to look at more mature workers.

Our flexibility would be out the window. Would mean more work and greater expense devoted to hiring people

I don't think we could find enough workers so we'd have to reduce store hours.

It would very tough. I'm not sure if we could operate but I don't want to say that.

I like to have these kids on my staff because they know what's happening, they know what the trends are, and what the kids are wearing. They're a real help to the business.

I have about 6 workers aged 14 and about 10 in the 15-16 range.

I'd probably have to hire people from out of the country.

I would probably have to have four times the number of workers. They are all part-time, and if they're in school they have to available for one shift on the weekend and one during the week. A two-hour limit would mean I'd need three people to cover one six-hour shift. It would be really difficult to schedule, and I probably wouldn't hire anyone under 16 is what'd probably happen.

Wouldn't hire the employee.

12. Bill 109 proposes that workers under age 16 would not be allowed to work more than eight hours on non-school days (weekends, Christmas, spring breaks, and during the summer). Do you agree with this proposed restriction?

They are the most vulnerable. They're anxious and eager to make money and aren't going to say no.

That's when they look to make money.

Eight hours is enough. You don't want young people getting sour on work; they're going to be doing it for the rest of their lives.

No one should work more than eight hours; productivity drops dramatically.

Again, during spring break that's when our students are augmenting their income. They're looking to work more than 8 hours.
I don't think anyone under 16 should work overtime. (However, business pays employees for 7 hours but has them work an 8.5-hour shift with a one-hour lunch break.)
I don't think anybody should work more than eight hours.
Should be parents decision
In my experience young people today have a hard enough time putting in an honest 8 hours.

13. Do your under-age-16 workers ever work more than eight hours on non-school days (weekends, Christmas, spring breaks, and during the summer)?

Occasional overtime
The regular shift is eight hours, but maybe once a week if we're stuck someone might work 10 hours.
No one's scheduled for that, but there might be occasional overtime.
Yes, our shifts are over 12 hr periods with appropriate breaks. We can not have people who go to site that have different shift lengths as then we would have to hire someone or pay overtime for them to cover for the youth. Most placer mining kids start working full shifts at 14 or so and it has not adversely affected our development.
Sometimes
Due to circumstances like moving to other camps and being on the trail, weather etc., how long the client takes to move workers have to be out in the field longer the 8 hours some days.
Our work days are 10 hours
only because the work did not call for extended hours
We hired youth to teach ----- in communities. The travel time was considered work time, and combined with the time teaching ----- at the workshop, it would have worked out to a > 8 hr workday. (Note: the youth had parental permission AND slept in the vehicle during 'work' hours - travel time). A special circumstance for sure.

14. If you were prohibited from scheduling your under-age-16 workers to work more than eight hours on non-school days, would your business be negatively affected?

Tourism is a huge industry in the summer it is a short season with some days being long. We are there to serve our client and hope they want to come back to the Yukon. Our staff are well aware of what is needed in the industry and what it takes to offer a first class service. If they had short days we would not be able to provide the level of service and safety that is required.
This would not normally happen. We have had excellent young workers with lots of energy and they would rather work and make money than go play all day in a skateboard park or just walk the malls.
I probably would not hire them so they would be negatively affected you keep on forgetting that for them to work long hours they have to agree too so that their is an interaction between worker and employer

15. How would your business be affected?

My kids and employees' kids would not be able to work on site. We would have to hire additional people at higher cost (not only wages, but likely less knowledge and without the extra that comes from family employees that are looking out for the best interest of the company).

This question would have varied answers. It would impact at various levels.

We can always manage, but why not let the young workers spend their time being productive members of society if they choose? Don't portray business and work as something that is "bad and having a negative impact on a child's development."

16. Bill 109 proposes that workers under age 16 would not be allowed to work after 9:00 p.m.? Do you agree with this proposed restriction?

Not in favour of restricting choice

In anticipation of this legislation we have been trying to move to more full-time, less part-time workers.

By the time they get home and unwind, which we all need to do, it's 10:30. Any later than that would interfere with their schooling.

They should get their rest. 9:00 is a good cutoff.

They'd probably be working retail, and that would probably be when they'd be needed.

They should be home getting rest. After 9:00 probably means a bar or convenience store, and that's an atmosphere a kid shouldn't be working in.

Kids need to sleep. By the time they wind down after working until 9:00 it's already 10:00 or 11:00 at night.

Maybe when they're in school (they need their rest), but I don't see a problem during the summer.

If an individual wants to work, he should be able to.

Sometimes you need them to work a bit after 9:00 p.m. (until 10:00 p.m.) to help clean up and do floors.

They need to be concentrating on their schoolwork, but on school breaks they could work later.

I think that should be left up to the individual and the parents. If the parents are okay with their child working in a controlled environment it should be okay. I think, if done right, it can have a responsible influence on a child. ("Done right" might look like: no more than two shifts a week where the student works after 9:00 p.m. Obviously we wouldn't put them down for 4, 5, or 6 shifts a week.

This would be a major problem for the reasons already given.

Even during the summer, a young person who works until 9:00 is not going to go right to bed, and if you're going to get up in the morning and do whatever you'll do, it's important to keep some kind of routine.

Kids of that age should be close at home.

They're still pretty young. There's an issue of getting to and from work. We have a lot of 'kids' that walk home, and we had one kid who got jumped and beaten up pretty badly.

Except in child care.

They should be home getting their sleep.

I agree BUT only on school evenings
same reasons as above
There are many capable youth under 16 that can work until 10pm or even 11pm when not in school and with parental consent. The number of hours we have light in the Yukon forces businesses to operate until later hours. It is part of our tourism/retail responsibility and vital to our success.
I think the parents should have input in this proposal
This could be a situation where each work place is different. Some places could be perfectly safe to be in after 9.
I think it is up to the parent, the youth and the employer. Every household is raised differently with different work values. Young people do not even know what hard work is anymore. Leave this up to us to work with the families to decide what is best. We do not need any more legislation.....
maybe . . . depends on how OLD the 16 year old is . . . some are still 12 and some are 22

17. Do your under-age-16 workers ever work after 9:00 p.m.?

9:30 on weeknights and 10:30 on Fridays and Saturdays
Store closes at 9:00 so most workers leave at 9:15
If they help to cash out or if we have a special sales event.

18. If you were prohibited from scheduling your under-age-16 workers to work after 9:00 p.m., would your business be negatively affected?

There's not much business between 9:00 and 10:00, so we could manage with older workers
I could make the business work, but what about the kids? It would make me not want to hire them if there'd be so many strings attached, and that would be a shame.
Same reason as before: I rely on kids to close the store (10:00).
We close at 10:00 or 11:00 p.m. on Fridays, so I'd lose flexibility.
See previous comments. They need to be able to work night shift.

19. How would your business be affected?

I would have to close earlier. Customers already ask if they can stay on later; evenings are busy.
--

20. Bill 109 proposes that children under age 12 would not be allowed to work. Do you agree with this proposed restriction? (This restriction would not apply to newspaper carriers or private babysitting.)

There are exceptions; they're usually kids who are brought up in a family business or on a farm. Most 16-year-olds aren't even that aware of safety issues.
There are jobs geared to 10 and 11-year-olds (some of them under the table), and if they have their parents' permission they should be permitted to work.

<p>Up to age 12 it's a critical part of their schooling, and they need plenty of rest.</p>
<p>I grew up working for family, and I've been pushing lawn mowers for as long as I can remember.</p>
<p>At 12 they're still getting into puberty. They're finding a balance in their own bodies. Extra stress at that age wouldn't be good.</p>
<p>I don't feel that they're of age to be able to deal with customers.</p>
<p>That's way too young (for the employer and the worker).</p>
<p>Anyone under 14, it gives them a negative outlook on work because they can't retain the skills they need to do the work. They typically leave in a short period of time with bad feelings about the experience.</p>
<p>Mature kids find suitable employment which only adds to their well being. Such as working in a book store or a day care.</p>
<p>It really depends what is covered. For example, I had a paper route at 10 as my first real job but almost 50 years ago things were different. A lot depends on the level of supervision and I agree family members should be exempt.</p>
<p>I think it should be 14 years of age.</p>
<p>Again it is up to the family and employer. If it is a family run operation then the family as the employer has a vested interest in working with their family members to help out with the business. We need to get back to the old way when everyone worked and pitched in. Young people are very capable and many parents and society treat them like they can't do anything I think safety is very important and proper training and supervision but let's get people working and not have young people sitting around playing video games.</p>
<p>If a child wishes to work I believe that they should be allowed to with certain restrictions applied such as parental approval, scholastic records showing their grades are maintained or improved, hours restricted etc. Children are fast learners, are motivated and when we tell them no they cannot do something to earn money such as wash dishes at a cafe for 6 hours a week they feel slighted. They learn to handle money, work with others, and so forth....it is great training grounds for all young people if handled properly. Families that own and operate their own businesses always have their children working alongside of them....the majority of these kids grow up with much more business savvy than those young people that never step outside of the box.</p>
<p>As an all encompassing umbrella statement I do not agree with this proposed restriction. If additional work types (grocery bagger and other limited labour types) were added to the exemptions I would probably agree with this.</p>
<p>Some children would benefit from working rather than hanging out. Mentoring is a big part of employment. Probably should not work alone though depending on type of work. private babysitting should be minimum 12 years</p>
<p>I find the exemption for immediate family members a bit dicey. You can not assume that just because a guardian or family member is present, they will have the youth's best interests in mind or ensure a safe and healthy work environment.</p>
<p>Actually, as stated in the beginning, I do not believe that children under the age of 16 should be employed.</p>
<p>I started working in the summer for my mother when I was 11 doing dishes and chambermaiding and it taught me work ethics. It didn't hurt me.</p>
<p>It all depends on the type of work. Children 12 and under can be very good workers, they have lots of enthusiasm and as long as they are very well supervised and only do the type of work suitable to their age, (ie sweeping, cleaning windows, watering flowers,) it should be fine.</p>

Can't stop the child from working at their family business. It would just happen under the table more than it already does.

I see newspaper carriers and babysitting as responsible and demanding jobs which leaves me to wonder why the age restriction would not apply. No doubt, there are many other such work opportunities in which a 12 year old could be appropriately engaged, and again, I think of farm work such as caring for farm animals or volunteering at the shelter or belonging to a 4H club, or neighbourhood work such as cutting grass or shovelling snow. If they can do it as volunteer labour, why can they not do the same type of work and receive compensation? Having said that I am concerned about the limits of engaging such young labour so I generally agree with the proposal.

21. Do you employ or have you ever employed workers under age 12?

Tried it once because the parents pressured the kid to work. It was too stressful for the young person. Now we don't hire anyone under 13.

That's just way too young. Ideally, we wouldn't be hiring anybody under age 16, 15, or 14, but there's a shortage of worker.

20 years ago we had an 11-year-old on the grass cutting crew, and he was the hardest worker we've ever had.

It is great for kids to learn to work early ages. If the older kids can work, but the younger ones can not it creates a lot of jealousy. While younger kids do not work for a long period, they can do useful work. We have as young as 7 or 8 who like to do a few odd jobs. They take great pride in having jobs to do and doing them well. It teaches them the value of work, responsibility and also gives them self confidence.

22. If you were prohibited from employing workers under age 12, would your business be negatively affected?

It would be a very give change to our lifestyle.....Being able to employ kids means that they are covered by WCB if they get hurt on site. We can't allow employees to bring their kids and have them work with them if they aren't covered.

23. How would your business be affected?

I would loose some of my best employees, which are very hard to replace and I don't think we would continue in the lifestyle as it would be too stressful on our family to be apart.

24. Do you believe that workers under age 18 require more or different supervision than older workers?

The jobs would have to be different. I wouldn't stick a kid on a rider mower.

They're new to the workforce. They don't have the expertise or the wiseness of older workers.

They simply have to learn the walk of life. Working and responsibility are part of that. You cannot expect from young people to have that experience, so obviously they'll need different supervision and guidance.

Each worker would be different, and assessment necessary accordingly.
Absolutely, this may be their first job and they need to understand concepts like safety, responsibility, appropriate dress and behaviour. Instill the right traits when they start out and the benefits last a lifetime. If young people are to be covered by WCB then there should be clear standards and safety requirements that employers must follow
Absolutely. I think mandatory safety training programs must be attended by employers and employees re: workers under 18.
This is a very open ended question. Depending on the circumstance of the duties on the job. As sometimes older workers are not very good role models. I think some level of supervision and support is required.
Different supervision in combo with continual training and mentoring.
As these people have less life and work experience, they need more training and supervision at the outset - some more so than others, of course.
It all depends on the individual's maturity.
Without a doubt more supervision is required for younger workers as compared to older / more experienced / skilled workers.
entry level workers at any age need to be taught work ethics and there is an element of mentoring that takes place with young or new workers
However, this is not always the case. I have had adult workers in their 30's and 40's that never learned how to work and needed lots of supervision. Some under 18 need very little supervision if they have learned good work ethic at an earlier age.
Yes, they are still inexperienced and very much in the learning stage and even when they have got the routine of a job cased, situations may arise for which they do not possess the judgement capacity to make a good decision. On the other hand, there is only so much time a supervisor can be watching over someone's shoulder, and employees both young and old have to learn to do by doing and learning from mistakes.
Not if the job is new to both ages
Assuming that older workers have more experience/life experience and common sense in some situations it stands to reason that the inexperienced need more supervision.
If workers under 18 need more supervision than adults, they aren't mature enough to work. A job is not daycare. They should be adequately training but if they require constant increased supervision they are not suited to work.
If not more supervision, certainly more education and training with respect to personal safety.

25. Do you provide more or different supervision to your young workers (under age 18) than to your older workers?

Nothing mandated. We focus attention when and where it's needed.
Pay attention to scheduling because older kids often influence younger ones (in good and bad ways).
The workers we hire are expected to be able to do their jobs with the training provided.
Because they're more likely to do something stupid and cover it up. It's not great business sense to let them work alone. e.g., they break things or they hide non-obvious injuries.

We provide adequate supervision to all.
There are kids that we trust and that's why we've hired them. It's more the individual than the age would dictate.
I ride them equally!
Supervision is kind of equal.
I think we've had only two guys under 18, and they were usually with their parents.
It's all the same. Employees work in three- or four-person teams, always with a supervisor.
They have to have someone over 21 working with them.
I have to. Most of the time they don't take direction well.
We might spend a lot more time with them initially, but once they've demonstrated initiative and that they understand what's expected of them, we try to give them as much responsibility as possible for their shift. Most of the supervisors are over 18 but the restaurant does practice peer supervision.
Only because we want to get them up to a certain level of ability. It's not necessarily a function of age; it's a function of maturity and experience.
I think you have to. They need to be shown what to do. They maybe don't have any work experience.
As appropriate, to the skill and knowledge. They know how to find or communicate with others on the site and are only alone in jobs where they are well trained or are low risk.
Sometimes

26. How does your young worker supervision differ from your supervision of older workers?

Young workers are monitored during training.
We paired a 16-year-old with an older worker. Currently working on a better safety program. More conscious of that work gets assigned to a younger person (don't let an under-18 operate a forklift, for example)
mostly just in the initial training stage
We also don't let them work alone.
Have had only one worker under 18. That person did office work, and we just spent more time with them.
I wouldn't put somebody 15, 16, or 17 with another 15, 16, or 17-year-old; they'd be with an adult. There are too many situations that can occur in retail that a young person isn't equipped to deal with--theft, for instance. I've had hold-ups in stores down south.
All of the above
It really depends on the individual. Under-18s never supervise each other. They are always in the presence of an adult.
Usually 5 or 6 on the grass cutting/garbage pickup crew, with a supervisor driving the truck.
Parents are good about car-pooling, but if it's really cold and a kid needs a ride, I'll call a cab or drive them myself. I don't leave anyone stranded.

Lots of times I'll have a young worker shadow someone more experienced for a few shifts.
Under-18s don't work in the kitchen, only at front of house and there's nothing there that can really hurt them.
The jobs they're doing aren't really technical. They're sweeping floors, clearing mats, emptying garbage.
They have to have a supervisor around at all times. I think supervisors would be over 18, but I'm not sure.
The frequency depends on the individual. Supervisors would be over 18.
We have written guidelines for managers and supervisors, but they aren't specific to young workers. It's more a matter of individual need basis. Our supervisors are typically over 18.
We've hired some people who do an amazing job and work quite independently.
What happens with younger workers is there's more onus on them to report in as well. There's shared responsibility for making sure they understand what they should be doing.
We try to get somebody 18 to drive but we can't compete with the mining jobs so we mostly seem to get people in grade 12.

28. Does your company have a minimum age hiring policy?

No franchise policy; follow laws of province or territory, Our minimum here in the Yukon is 13.
Company follows whatever legislation exists in each province or territory. In Yukon we've generally drawn the line at 13. For workers under 16 we require a letter of parental consent on file.
Most times, younger workers are relatives of someone who works here already.
Company-wide, not just Yukon
The chain goes with whatever legislation exists in a given jurisdiction.
Just a personal practice: I usually don't hire under 14 years old. I need somebody who's mature enough to understand how business works: that people are coming in to spend money and that money pays employees' wages. They need to understand customer service.
A driver's licence is key, more than whether someone's under 18.
But as a rule I would never hire under 14. Usually I know the people who come to me asking if I can hire their kids, and so I know they're good people and they have good kids. I have hired my own kids when they were younger than 14, but it was like, "How would you like to make \$5 for doing this?"
Not 100% sure if we have a policy.
But being in the business we are, there wouldn't be much joy in hiring a younger person. We need a certain maturity level. It has bearing on whether a person is responsible.
We would follow whatever legislation was in place.
Hiring is based on maturity, presentation, individual experience.
We don't hire under 16 and we don't allow our under 18s to work after 9:00 p.m. (chain policy).
No written formal policy. However, we have not hired young workers in the field for years. I was a young worker and went to my first work site, when I was 16. I learned a lot that year.

Not a specifically written one, but employees must have a sufficient level of "maturity" and experience to deal with overseas customers.
We were looking at it, but it seems like kids who are more eager to work are getting younger and younger. We used to hire 15- and 16-year-olds but now, once they hit 15 they think they're worth more. And in the last few years the 13- and 14-year-olds are looking for higher-paid jobs
no policy per se . . . but . . . prefer older workers - only hire young ones as a favour to parent.
No policy but I wouldn't hire anyone again under the age of 15.
I have never hired anyone under 15.
14
we prefer not to hire under 16
we have no policy but certain aspects of our business are restricted due to other factors such as: experience, safety, insurance, legislation
Not formally but we do not hire anyone younger than 16 years at this point
I am not aware of any
I am a sole proprietor and do not employ anyone. If I were to employ someone, it would definitely be minimum age 18 in my profession.
25 with proper credentials
We are currently owner/operators and have no staff outside of family; however if we were to hire someone to do painting or cleaning they would have to be 16.

29. What is your minimum hiring age?

Because the motel has an off-sales licence
Nation-wide policy
Nationwide policy (system won't accept a birth date under 14)
Because no legislation in the Yukon, it's up to the owner/operator. We started with 15 as the minimum but just had so many 14-year-olds wanting to work. During the two hiring blitzes we did last summer, the majority of applicants were under 14 and we had to say no.
That's the age I find they're mature enough to handle the consequences of having the job and dealing with scheduling school and work.
For the chain it is 17, but I'll hire 16-year-olds with an adult's written consent. I have two 16-year-olds working for me now, and I consider these mentoring situations where the employees are being exposed to consistent work experience one shift a week.
Lifeguards, camp staff and activity coordinators must be at least 17 and, in the case of lifeguards, must have specific qualifications. Anyone hired at a younger age is considered to be in a training capacity.
I think that's a chain policy but I wouldn't want to say for sure.
We require our employees to have a driver's licence with a clean abstract.
Have to be able to serve alcohol
age of majority in province/territory

Guiding and other outdoor risk-management activities are no place for inexperienced younger workers who may not yet have arrived at the experiences that lead to good judgement.

30. Do you believe there should be a general minimum working age in Yukon that applies to all occupations?

This isn't Mexico; we aren't a Third World country.

Say it's a small business like a Chinese restaurant. I think even young kids can learn quite a bit by helping out. There's lots of kids helping out in placer mining, and I think it's better that they be panning for gold than roaring around on a 4-wheeler.

I think it should differ depending on the occupation. You don't want a 12-year-old doing something dangerous.

I'm not very familiar with other occupations.

I think it depends on the job. Selling clothes is a great way to get experience dealing with people, but there are lots of workplaces where there are safety issues that kids of 15 shouldn't be exposed to.

It depends on the occupation. Some industries are far more dangerous--firefighting, for instance.

I have an 11- and a 13-year-old and yes, they can do some part-time work but I don't think they should have jobs.

I'm torn: yes and no. From the village's standpoint there probably should be, but it's getting hard to find workers and there might be a kid who's 11 who is a really good worker

Children under 12, other than paper carriers and other related jobs, could work for immediate family, but should be protected from having to work until they are 13.

There are valid exceptions which should be considered. A blanket statement acts as a hindrance to progress for both businesses & young people.

Parents are best to decide how young a child should work. For some kids there is a specific trip or item that they want to buy that parents think they should work to earn. This can be at a fairly young age. We have also found that kids that do not do well in school gain confidence and often improve in school when they work. We have had several delinquent kids that were getting into trouble, that came to work for us and it completely turned their life and attitude around. If they could not work they would have continued to hang out with the "bad crowd" at the convenience store, get into trouble with pranks and general boredom.....

14 yrs ... with a higher age for high risk occupations such as construction, mining.

Each situation is different.

NO - if an employer is a responsible employer - there should be no need for a firm regulation (law) on age. but - YES on certain industries that could injure (woodcutting - equipment operator etc.) this is a hard one - most young people would be thrilled with a job - but - parents and employers need to make a responsible decision here.

More dangerous occupations require higher restricting ages.

Only to be able to set min wage standards. entry level workers are costly to employers and should start at a lower wage scale than the present minimum employers can define if employees doing the same job will be paid at the same level

Some exceptions may apply (e.g., babysitting etc.)

Let young people work if they want to. Most of the time the problem is that there is no ambition or desire to work and make money. So don't take the position that young people need "protection from big bad business" that might have a negative impact on their development. It's too much free time to play, and no responsibility that keep young people from growing up. It is proven in the past that some of the most successful people learned to work and be responsible by the time they were teens. Government regulations do not develop mature, responsible adults.
Too general - again, it depends on the type of work. A 16 year old could sweep and cut lawns, but not be involved in logging or manufacturing.
Wouldn't a minimum working age be discrimination? You're already not allowed to decide to hire someone based on age.
I think consideration should be given to a classification system - perhaps the codes used to determine assessment rates.

31. What should the general minimum working age be?

16, with lots of conditions. Parents often let kids out to work too young. Employers are going to take advantage of that because they can pay less, so they ought to be regulated.
No one should start working before age 14. I've seen the difference between the Maritimes and Alberta, and I believe that allowing younger age employment discourages youth from pursuing higher education, which depletes the future pool of highly-trained, skilled workers.
Up to 15, let them be kids. This year we had two accidents that came out of the blue. We've never had any before, and I hope we don't have any more. I wouldn't have wanted a 13 or 14-year-old to have had that experience.
At 15 you really know what you're taking on with school, with recreation, with sports, and with life. We have a better retention rate with students 15 and up.
If they're responsible enough to drive, they can hold down a job.
You're only a kid once. I don't think we should be asking kids to work. It's called slave labour in other parts of the world.
They're a little bit more responsible and hungrier for jobs at that age.
Kids should enjoy being kids. The maturity level isn't here at younger age.
At that age they're starting to mature a bit.
I think it should be based on injury statistics. A lot of 15 and 16-year-olds would love to work, but if they're getting hurt on the job they obviously shouldn't be working.

32. Do you believe there should be minimum working ages in Yukon for certain occupations and workplaces?

If there's a minimum working age it should be applied across the board or it will be confusing.
Not unless there's a specific danger.
The more dangerous jobs, kids shouldn't be doing--equipment operators, for example.
Again, you look at your accident rates. If you have kids getting hurt in construction, maybe they shouldn't be in construction.

There are some jobs that require more maturity because they're dangerous.
It should be up to the employer and the employee to decide.
That's too open-ended a question. You can go work for a mining company but you're working in the office. It depends on the job, the work environment, and what the parents have to say. I wouldn't want a 13-year-old hanging trusses on my house, but if there are jobs a 13-year-old can do for a construction company, he should be allowed.
Just from our workplace I know I wouldn't want 14-year-olds working here. We work with a lot of hot things.
Where people are working in situations where there is inherent risk to them or others the age should be higher.
Anything with higher risk of injury like construction
Some workplaces are really difficult (like drilling or mining). Kids should have a certain level of maturity to work there.
Yes, this is common sense and should reflect complexity of the work task, safety, risk etc
I don't think it is right for me to comment on another industry and profession with what 'age' I believe would be suitable as I do not work or have little experience in that industry. Just like if someone was to comment on what age they think I should start my staff. They have no idea what the jobs entail.
No I think parents and children and the employer should be able to determine whether a child should or should not be employed in some aspect of a business as a part time employee. However, for full time work in mining, construction etc I do think all young employees should be able to prove grade 12 graduation prior to hiring on...this prevents more drop-outs due to high income earning potential which at 16 and 17 is often a huge drawing card to young people.
The minimum of age 16 for construction work sounds too young to me. Are there limits to what type of construction or duties they are permitted/not permitted?
If there are any serious safety issues where the young worker would be at risk. They should not be serving drinks unless they are at a legal age to drink what they are serving. There needs to be some protection or guidelines to determine when a person can work at bars, nightclubs and some types of work in the entertainment industry.
For outdoor education roles or guiding the minimum working age should be 21.
Age 18 for working construction, equipment or forestry.
Again, restrictions would depend on the type of work. In a pizza restaurant a teenager would be very effective at clearing tables, doing dishes, sweeping floors; but not cooking, using ovens, delivery, etc.

33. What do you believe the minimum working age should be for the following occupations and workplaces?

AVERAGES

General retail: 14

Food retail: 14

Food service: 14

Construction: 17

Drilling or servicing rig: 18

Sawmills or pulp mills: 18

Industrial or manufacturing processes: 17

Working at heights: 17

Forest industry: 17

Working alone: 17

Confined spaces: 18

There are no real safety issues in retail.
I don't think anyone should work alone; it's just too dangerous.
Anything in a medical setting, where there is access to drugs: 18 18 for any job where there is cash or alcohol on hand
Working with explosives, caustic chemical, high-voltage electricity or in an underground mine: 21
Some of these jobs require heavy lifting, and if the worker is not strong enough they can put themselves and others at risk.
No one under 18 should work alone.
Nobody should work alone at gas stations.
Prospecting/staking: 18 Workers need specialized training for some of these jobs.
Transportation (truck, taxi drivers): 18
Retail: 12-year-olds can stock shelves, but should be 16 to work at a cash register.
Kids that are 16/17 don't have that maturity. They think they do but they do not.
Maybe it's okay to be counting trees in the forest industry at 16 or cutting grass at the golf course, but at 16-year-old shouldn't be working alone in a gas station.
Forest industry: 16 for outdoor jobs (as opposed to mill).
I don't have the facts in front of me to have an opinion on this question. The facts should speak for themselves. Look at your injury rates, and why would you put someone in danger? Obviously, once someone is an adult you can't think for them, but kids shouldn't be placed in danger.
OTHER: Office administration: 14 Food retail: stocking shelves Food service: They'd need to have their Food Safe, and you'd need someone older around. Sometimes you go to ----- and see no one but kids working there. Construction: I'm just speaking for myself here, not for [my employer], but I think construction work depends on your physical ability. I have a grandson who's been really big since he was 12. He could do that work. Forestry: They could do tree planting at 12, but you should be 16 to do logging.
In food service they're working with hot trays. Plus, customers can be impatient, and that can be difficult for a 14-year-old to handle. I assume the other jobs (construction, drilling rigs, forestry, etc.) require a lot of training. They'd be working with machinery that could do serious damage. And although it would be horrible to be injured at any age, at 14 or 15 you'd be cutting yourself off from a lot of possibilities.
Usually they have a little bit more common sense at 18.
Worker should be out of school to work in construction, on drilling or servicing rigs, in sawmills or pulp mills, in jobs involved in industrial or manufacturing process, in jobs that involve working at heights, in the forest industry, and in jobs that involve working alone. I don't like to see anyone under 16 serving people in a restaurant. First, they handle a lot of booze; second, unless the restaurant has a uniform, there's often an expectation that waitresses dress a certain way and there's an association that certain behaviour goes with the dress--which is often scandalous. Young girls start making that connection.
Health care: 18. We're dealing with patient care, so right from a support worker in nutrition services up to an RN, we need a certain maturity level. Work on drilling or servicing rigs is really dangerous!
Packing groceries is a great job for kids.
I think 18 if they're working by themselves all the time with no supervision.

Younger people with less experience are often the ones who wind up with those grunt jobs and that's not the way it should be. Workers should have a couple years' experience in the situation before they work alone.
Guiding and outdoor education activities, often paid for in the Yukon as 'substitute teaching' should be age-limited to age 21 and up. Having 18 year olds doing risk-management for 18 year old clients is high risk.
Depends on what they're doing. For food retail, you could probably have an 11-year-old stocking shelves, but operating a till might have to be older than 12. For food service, frying burgers might be okay: you expect kids to help out in the kitchen at home. For jobs that involve working alone, you'd have to find the right employee. For jobs that involve working in confined spaces, I know they'd have to have specialized training, and they can't work alone.
I don't have enough knowledge to comment on all of the above businesses.
The more dangerous the job, the older the person should be.
Not informed enough about most of the categories to make an opinion
Common sense should prevail...parents have to be involved, employers need to be aware they are not hiring an adult but an impressionable young person that is very interested in some aspect of the employers business otherwise they would not be applying - this is the employer's chance to mentor a young person for future hiring prospect and a parent's chance to mentor their child in the many intricacies of the world of work and finance and the young persons chance to learn more about the real world than any school book will ever teach them...so rolled into one, it is the chance to educate all sectors.
The first 2 can have certain jobs such as stocking shelves that are good for all ages. All jobs will depend on the safety of a child or adult regardless of age that are left alone or with other people.
In any of these areas there could be exemptions if the young worker can prove exceptional abilities/training or have other factors that need considering. Or if working with family members
For building and road construction, driving age as a minimum. For drilling or servicing rigs, some guys would be physically capable of doing this work and those who aren't at school have to make a living. For work in sawmills or pulp mills and in the forest industry, and for jobs that involve industrial or manufacturing processes--anywhere you can lose limbs, it should be 18. For working in confined spaces, if things go wrong the worker needs a certain level of maturity.
I am at a loss to choose a number for the jobs listed. so much of it is situational.
some people mature much sooner than other if they have been involved in family business compare to the other whose specialty is video games, they may be sharp but lack experience and common sense, at the of 15 I was a hirigger in our family business on weekends and holidays, but I was no smarter than my friends, except I knew were to put the under cut so not to injure myself, it was a long way down..
Any job where an employee has to work alone should have certain safety policies in place; teenagers should not have to work alone between 9 p.m. and 7 a.m. , no matter what the job.

35. Who do you believe should primarily be responsible for deciding at what age a person can begin working?

Parents + employers
Parents + children
Parents + kids

Parent + child
Government + parents
Parents + employers
Parents + employers
Employers and parents
Parents and kids together
I believe that it should be a joint decision between parents, young person and employer
a combined decision by employer, with parental approval under 16 yrs.
should be the other 3 - together making that decision
in consultation with the young person
The young people should also have a voice if they want to work and can prove it during a trial period
With parents' input.
It should be a collaborative process.
We think we know best as parents, but there are some that don't.
Parents know their kids best, but parents who are in financial difficulty might let that influence the age they let their kids work.
Employees can have financial reasons for working; employers can gain financially by hiring younger workers; and parents can be manipulated by their children. If government sets the law, it's consistent across the board.
Government should definitely have guidelines, but I've seen 18-year-olds who shouldn't have been in retail; they didn't have a clue about job safety. On the other hand, I've seen 10-year-olds who could probably operate equipment. That's something that parents are best able to judge.
Parents, government, employers, in that order
Someone has to give overall direction or there would be anarchy!
Unless it's a family business
Hopefully with input from parents, employers, and young people
Responsible parents and responsible employers are going to do as in the best interests of youth. Any time government gets involved it takes away that responsibility. We ask parents to be involved in their children's work schedule. Not a day goes by where I'm not talking to a parent.
Parents are more likely to act in the child's best interests.
They know whether their children are ready, able, and fit to work and cope with their schoolwork.
It shouldn't be government dictated. I say parents + kids because it's not up to a parent to say, "OK, you're old enough to work and push their kid out the door" and most kids aren't smart enough to say, "I want to work" and understand what they're getting into.
Answer stems from being a parent myself. If my daughter was getting a job I'd like to be the one deciding whether it was suitable and whether she was ready.
Until a child has reached the age of majority, parents are responsible.
Every household is different, but I think right across the board there should be laws. Sometimes

parents don't have a say in what a child wants to do, and young people are young people: They think they can do anything.
With my grandchildren, if they were applying for a job that had an age limit I'd support them because they're exceptional. Parents should decide as long as the kid wants to work and they're mature enough to handle working.
Government should set a standard, and then it's up to parents. Parents might pressure their children to start working right away if it's up to them.
A parent or guardian has the best grasp on what an individual can handle.
I believe parents should have a say, but ultimately there should be across-the-board laws.
Parents know their children best--what else they have going on, how they're doing in school. Employers have to think about safety.
Employers, because they know the job and what they need from their workers; parents because they know whether their kids are capable.
Government needs to set a minimum standard with some flexibility. Then parents need to consult with their children and make choices in their best interests and the children need to decide what they are able to handle.
I think businesses should be able to set the age of their workers
That filters out all the special interests and personal opinions. It's a topic that if left to self-regulation opens the door to abuse.
Sometimes government is too limiting. It should be a family decision. You always hope parents would talk to their kids about the workplace.
It is up to the parent or guardian to make this decision after discussing it with the child!
it has to be a combination of some kind. Parents decide, government enforces, and employers support and create certain pay standards?
Government sets minimum standards but ultimately, it is up to parents and guardians to determine whether the person is ready to work and in what type of work and under what type of supervision and circumstances. There could be a provision that also allows an employer with the support of a parent to apply for an exemption.
Some kids have to work to pay rent, buy groceries and yes sometimes support their families- this isn't the 1950's anymore. We complain about the work ethic in today's youth and yet for those who want or need to work- you are considering not allowing it. Perhaps it would be better for them to sit on social assistance?? Come on! It is not the job of government to raise our children.
It is a combination between employer and parent. Most parents are too soft on their children nowadays they need to get them off the darn couch and get them out working. When parents ask us to hire their kids. We do not want to hear from the parents we want to hear from the young people themselves asking for a job so they learn skills. Not the parents. That drives us crazy when parents ask. The young people have to show the motivation and then we might consider working with them.
and that's too bad . . . I don't like more regulations in this world - but. . . .
The people themselves with parental/guardian's option to 'veto' employment if under 18. If a business is willing to hire a young worker and the young worker wants the job, the government should not interfere.
with input from parent or guardians, employers and other Canadian governments
I believe Parent or Guardians are best equipped to make such a decision. It is too subjective to

make broad rules governing this as capabilities, maturity and experience can vary wildly on an individual basis.

Every child matures at a different level and certain jobs require more maturity than others. Government is the only body that can generalize the age that is acceptable without emotion or vested interest. Employers need workers, kids want to work, parents don't always participate

If a young person has the desire to work, shows an aptitude or enthusiasm for work or a certain type of work, and is seen and known as generally responsible for their age, I think they should be accorded some say in whether they are ready to begin working.

you can tell when you have someone with intelligence and common sense

The government should set guidelines; however parents should have a say as to whether or not their particular child can handle the responsibility/physical strength/common sense to do the job. There are always going to be employers who take advantage of youth; unscrupulous operators who wouldn't think twice about putting a young person in a dangerous situation. If the government has policies then at least those individuals will be held accountable and might think twice.

Employers are not hiring the parents, they're hiring the child. If the child cannot make a decision for themselves or they aren't mature enough to work like an adult, they shouldn't be working.

37. Bill 109 contains a number of provisions intended to prevent work from having a negative impact on young workers' schooling and to safeguard their health and safety at work. For example, it proposes to prohibit 12- to 15-year-olds from working more than two hours on school days and more than eight hours on non-school days, and from working after 9:00 p.m. It also proposes to restrict younger children from working in certain types of jobs. If these rules were put in place, do you believe parents or guardians should be able to exempt their children from them?

Would need a signed letter from parent.

If it's the law, it should apply to everybody.

There has to be an appeal process that takes into account everybody's best interests in a given situation.

As an employer I don't want to be in a situation where the parent says, "Johnny can work because I say he can." I imagine part of the reason this legislation is being proposed is because parents are pushing their kids.

If there's a general rule it has to be applied consistently

Maybe exemptions could be permitted if there was a review committee that parents to appear before

I don't think these rules should be put in place. And then you get into, "Is that really your mom's signature on that paper, or did you forge it?" I don't think we should even go there!

Some kids are way more mature at 12 than others.

BUt parents and kids should make the decision

What would we make the rule for if parents could just "punt it"?

In case there was some kind of extraneous circumstance, like working at a lodge where there's nowhere else for the kid to go anyway. But you don't want to see sweat shops.

Parents don't have a clue what goes on at work. They don't have a clue if there are safety issues.

They know their child, and there are those exceptional cases I already talked about.

I think when rules apply, they should apply to everybody.
Everybody's circumstances are different. It shouldn't be set in stone.
If there are rules in place, they are in place.
Based on certain criteria. There would have to be some sort of application process. Some children excel in school, and if you could demonstrate that they're able to handle their schoolwork and a job they should have the choice. There are a lot of single-parent families where it means a lot to have that extra income.
Parents should know their children best.
The standard needs to be low enough that it provides for the physical and emotional well-being of all young people but provides flexibility for them to work in a way that benefits their particular situation.
Ultimately the parent should have the choice because kids are capable of different levels of responsibility. I think it should be a formalized process--kind of like the New Workers Program.
Then an employer could say, "I'm sure the kid told me his parents said it was okay."
Some households believe their 15 year olds should work 3 hours on school nights. Occasionally a 15 year old may be living on their own and need to support themselves
Parents should have a say in what their kids are capable of. There might be extenuating circumstances.
Once again, these rules are not necessary!
with the proviso that they are not family members in a family run business and with an adult working alongside the child
I think as stated previously, they could be allowed to apply for an exemption and independent review by a third party.
Work often keeps kids out of trouble and gives the incentives. It is important for their self confidence to be a positive contributor.
But, I agree with restricting younger children from working in certain types of jobs
Take a look at the fundamental systems that are in place right now both in Education and the WCB- perhaps you should look at the methods of measurement and the policies surrounding these first. The kids that are doing poorly in school are not the ones working- perhaps they have social issues or perhaps it is the education that is being presented to them. Have you done your research and have you looked at all factors prior to this? This seems like the cart before the horse.
I would rather have parents say for 12-15 year olds. Any older 16-18 let the young person make the decision. We as parents have to make sure our children can balance school and healthy work relationships/ I say yes, to exempt because I would like the flexibility depending on the job task. Exemplifying working on the farm we need to get some things dealt with and it might be a longer day. It teaches our children responsibility with work tasks and what needs to happen in certain situations beyond our control. ie. weather and haying
in spite of my protest against more regulations - the above provisions are more than fair and adequate to protect the young workers against adults and themselves.
Yes, government should never have the last word to determine what a young worker can do.
DEFINELY! There should be an allowance for exemption.
only in family owned and operated businesses

If you mean parents or guardians of younger children when that parent or guardian is operating a family business wherein everyone in the family has a "job" description and duty then those parents and guardians should be able to exempt their children from the restrictions as the majority of individuals do know the limitations of a young worker. Most younger children are incapable of doing certain jobs anyway such as drive ore trucks, weld, do electrical work, do large scale mechanical work, carpentry and heavy lifting etc so the restrictions would already be in place due to the size and age of the younger child. If you start regulating too much, you will be killing the family business which is already overburdened with too much governmental baloney already.
It would depend primarily on the type of work the young worker's were doing for the family, and if removing that person from the family work force would pose a hardship to the family.
Sadly I have seen too many parents whose interest was in getting their children's wages, and not in their child's well-being or safety.
However, I do not believe children under the age of 16 should be working.
In many cases it would be better for the young person to be productively employed during those hours than engaged in some less desirable activity.
if it is a home based or family business
If the government implements a policy, it has to apply. To allow exemptions only opens the door for grey areas, misinterpretation, 'bending the rules'. Family members in family owned businesses are a different matter.
Yes, but only after consultation with employers and an adequate assessment of risks involved in the job in question.

38. If age 12 were to be established as the minimum working age in Yukon (as proposed by Bill 109), do you believe parents should be able to employ their own children in a family-owned business if those children are younger than 12?

Shouldn't be operating equipment.
Would depend on business
They've got a much bigger stake in making sure their children are working in safe environments.
Should be able to work with your parents at any age
Think of all the outfitters who get their kids to help. It's good for the kids. When my kids come and help out they learn what I do all day and they learn that it's not all fun and games, so maybe they stay in school. Or maybe they really love it. I worked in retail when I was a kid and I loved it, and that's why I'm in it now.
Depends on the business
Providing they're being paid a decent wage. It helps develop work ethic, which we have a great lack of these days.
Shouldn't be a blanket exception: If dad runs a sawmill his kid shouldn't be allowed to run the saw, but if dad owns a grocery store it would be okay for his kid to work in the store. There has to be some consideration of the specific occupation.
But would depend on the type of business. You'd have to take into account the risks.
But it would depend on what the kid was doing.
That's just too young.

<p>As long as they don't make little slaves out of them. If it's a family business, then everybody's benefiting. It's not like you would use them all day or all night. If we were running a B & B I'd like to have my kids help out--washing dishes, etc. They do that anyway, but if it was a business I'd pay them.</p>
<p>Parents know their kids best. And it's good for kids, builds character if they understand what their parents are doing and see that they are to help out, to contribute to the business</p>
<p>Parents are going to be looking after their kids' best interests. Kids working in a family business are learning life skills, and that's better than watching TV. No parent wants to see their kid get hurt. But sometimes accidents happen. They can happen at home; it doesn't have to be an accident in a home-based business.</p>
<p>I hate showing up at a family business and having a six- or eight-year-old ring me through. Kids don't have the experience or life skills to deal with lots of the situations they might find themselves in. Customers can be nasty or offensive.</p>
<p>But it depends on the industry and the job.</p>
<p>Depending on the business. If it was a restaurant or retail that would be okay.</p>
<p>Sometimes children need to be protected from their parents.</p>
<p>If it's a family business they should have the choice.</p>
<p>You see this in fast food restaurants a lot. I think it enables people to be successful in their business as long as they looking out for their kids. I've had my kids working for me in the past and I find you're even more aware of practising due diligence when you're supervising your own kids.</p>
<p>My parents bought [fast food restaurant] when I was 10. It was right by my school, so I'd come quite early in the morning and then go to school. Speaking from my own personal experience, I would have preferred to be a kid for awhile longer.</p>
<p>doesn't mean that they cannot help the parent but they should not have sole responsibility for the overall work shift</p>
<p>And children of key employees....</p>
<p>Not as paid employees.</p>
<p>Definitely, any family business needs to engage their children at some level into the business after age 12 it is too late as they start to have other interests. Especially if one day they want to run the business. We need to empower them not push them away or tell them they can't work. What kind of message are we sending?</p>
<p>Absolutely - good training ground again - as long as the adults involved are responsible and have the child's best interests at heart</p>
<p>in relation to that child's capabilities.</p>
<p>DEFINITELY!!!</p>
<p>as long as the child's safety is considered</p>
<p>Do not agree that the minimum age should be 12; minimum 14</p>
<p>Again, depending on the type of work the individual was engaged in.</p>
<p>These are the best places for young workers to learn responsibility. I personally have had 4 of my 5 children work in our family business. They all grew up being responsible, have happy families and are successful. They learned good work ethic, customer service and money management skills</p>
<p>how are you going to enforce it</p>

My daughter loves working at our shop; she greets customers, answers the phone, prices stock and puts things on display, works the credit card machine and the till and takes real pride in a job well done. I would not want to dissuade her from learning such important lessons! HOWEVER - I am ALWAYS with her, I do not let her use the gas/diesel pumps, and I watch everything she does. I do tend to be a paranoid parent, but with locals and tourists I can't be too careful! I am pleased that she is learning an important work ethic that will hopefully carry on to other areas of her life. I will never let it interfere with schoolwork and I would never burden her with more than she can handle. As long as she is enjoying it she can do it. If she stops enjoying it, she can quit anytime - but when she turns 16 I do want her to get a job and if it's with us that's fine; if not, then I will have the last say as to whether she can work there or not. I would always abide by government regulations when it comes to her working elsewhere when she is older; and I would certainly NOT allow her to work anywhere else at the age she is now because I couldn't be there with her!

39. Who do you believe should primarily be responsible for young worker on-the-job safety?

Everybody is responsible
Supervisors + employers
Everyone
All of the above
Employers + supervisors
All of the above
Employers + young workers themselves
Supervisors + young workers
Supervisors + employers
Employers and employees
It's something we all have to be concerned about
All of the above + parents
All of the above
All of the above
All of the above
Everyone has a role however it is the parents, employers, supervisors and yes the youth themselves that must work together and be educated
Government set standards and ensure compliance. Government provide training at a cost to employers. Incumbent on employers to take the training and make sure employees take the training and follow the regulations.
This one is a combination between parents, workers and employers.
all of the above
The employer/business owner, young worker and parent, supervisor and government
all of the above

Government inspectors as there will always be employers who attempt to skirt the regulations.
in cooperation with the supervisors and young workers
All of the above.
the fact is government through WCB has already made themselves responsible for all workers
all above
As well as the employee, no different than adults.
Any worker should be involved in their own safety; it's not a one-sided affair.
Workers can't leave it up to their supervisor; they have to be aware of the risks.
Employers can't be everywhere at once, but they have to set standards. Supervisors have to be diligent and monitor conduct.
Managers and supervisors aren't absolved from making sure workers know what they need to know, but employees have to speak out if they don't understand.
Ultimately it's owners who are on the hook; shouldn't rely on supervisors
Also think WCB needs to do a better job of using more of its resources for enforcement instead of advertising. Employers are more likely to be responsible if there's someone checking up on them.
Supervisors are the ones who are on the floor, but employers have to set the rules and back them up.
All of us employers, from top management down, should be responsible for our workers, but employees have to be responsible for themselves, too. (They can't go climbing too high on ladders, for instance.)
Supervisors are responsible for all employees working under them. That's why they're called supervisors.
After all, that is their job. The business owner might not always be there.
It's everybody's job to make sure a worker is safe. If somebody's doing a job, they should know what they're doing.
Sometimes the owners aren't there. You would hope you have good supervisors who look after workers' safety.
When we hire supervisors we tell them they're the ones responsible for their workers.
Responsible employers look out for their workers, but the employee has to ask questions if they don't understand or know what's expected.
Supervisors need to make workers aware of any dangers and guidelines, and workers are responsible for adhering to these guidelines.
Employers should make sure their staff have the proper training, but if an employee has the training and is just goofing around, that's their responsibility.
All it takes (for parents to satisfy themselves a workplace is safe) is for the parents to visit the workplace and ask questions and satisfy themselves their kids are adequately supervised.
But business owner has to be the one with primary accountability
It's up to employers that their employees have the information they need, but I think it's up to employees not to do anything reckless.
Regulations should be put forth by the Employers, enforced by the Supervisor and paid attention to by the employee

<p>a combination of all, again: Parents have expectations, government sets standards, employers fulfill certain requirements and supervising staff supports and ensures safety requirements are being met.</p>
<p>Young workers need to be taught common sense and how to look out for their own safety. If they are not taught this at a young age they are at a disadvantage later. To be a young adult and have no work experience is the highest risk as employers assume a basic level of common sense. Young people that have been pampered and do not have exposure to any work do not have much common sense and put themselves at risk. We think seriously before hiring anyone who is 20 with no work experience as they want to get paid a lot but have no common sense and often are more a risk to themselves and others than someone who is 16 and worked by their parents or started young. Safety is an attitude. It needs to start young.</p>
<p>Everybody should have safety in mind. Employers have to have rules and regulations; supervisors have to train young workers; and young workers have to say, "If I want to keep all my fingers and toes, I'll listen to what my supervisor is telling me."</p>
<p>We are all responsible for the on-the-job safety of each and every soul be they a young person or not. No one individual is to be expected to be responsible. Training which is on going, daily discussions, reading material, oral history (as in stories) and so forth all play a role in developing a safe work atmosphere for young and old.</p>
<p>Like all work safety legislation, the worker is responsible for their own health and safety. A young worker is the same. Employers are responsible for the health and safety of their employees regardless if they're 12 or 82.</p>
<p>Ultimately any business who hires young workers has to be prepared to assume a significant degree of responsibility for the on-the-job safety of young workers.</p>
<p>Employers should ensure all safety measures and proper training is in place. This includes providing adequate supervision, so although supervisors are responsible, it is ultimately the responsibility of the employer to provide on-the-job safety.</p>
<p>There are already safety regulations in place for work place safety. Don't create another whole set of safety criteria for young workers.</p>
<p>Young people tend not to recognize many unsafe situations due to lack of experience, and perhaps, lack of training. Immediate supervisors are the people in the best position to point out basic safety considerations as well as dangerous situations and how they ought to be handled. Employers are responsible for ensuring that such safety supervision/education/training is provided, but there are limits to what an employer or supervisor can be responsible for. At the end, it is the worker, whether young or old, who must be alert to safety and take responsibility for working safe. I believe our society has become so safety oriented and litigious, that we can barely breathe anymore and we spend millions on the premise of 'if it saves only one life/prevents only one injury'. Kids can't even climb trees anymore. Parents (and people in general) would rather misplace blame upon someone else than acknowledge their own responsibility. This is not healthy.</p>
<p>If taught the proper instruction and precautions about the job , youth and adults alike would be better equipped to do the job safely</p>
<p>There must be support systems in place. Required training and reporting when a new young worker is hired.</p>
<p>Difficult choice, but basically all of the above (should make that choice available to respondents).</p>

41. Additional comments

<p>We have too much government.</p>
<p>I'm glad this issue is being discussed.</p>
<p>There needs to be a balance between legislation that provides for the health, safety, and importance of education while also giving young people the opportunity to get into the workforce. Parents have to be involved because they know their children best.</p>
<p>I don't think the government understands how savvy these kids are. The average student knows more about safety and what's good for them than a lot of adults.</p>
<p>Not in favour of this legislation</p>
<p>Young workers have to be reminded of safety concerns all the time; it's a constant thing. We finally put up a sign that said, "No seat belt, no job," and that is working. But we've had people hit on the head by falling ice, and we say, "Well, where was your hard hat?"</p>
<p>We don't need more regulations, especially around the hours students work. Working is good for young people. It teaches them really great ethics. We have to put faith in employers and parents. I work with parents all the time because we are concerned about our employees' education.</p>
<p>There should be some form of youth legislation, but the pendulum is swinging to the extreme here. I know there are not good employers out there, but you can't tar everyone with the same brush.</p>
<p>Even if they start out a year before high school, a lot of these guys turn out really good. If a guy's intelligent and conscientious, it's almost a benefit if he's young, rather than a liability.</p>
<p>My blood pressure rises when I hear young people are getting hurt. If there's legislation, it should automatically say, "Okay, nobody under that age should work in that occupation if there have been a certain number of injuries to kids that age."</p>
<p>With regard to children working in a family business, school should always take precedence, even though it's important for people to learn responsibility in a work environment. I made lots of money in a family business, but if I hadn't done that maybe I'd have concentrated more on extra-curricular activities. Once you start making money, it's hard to give it up. I'm torn: I went to university for two years, but the [business] needed staff and now I'm back here. 14 or 15-year-olds are thinking about the future, but 12-year-olds have no concept of that; they just want to play. We don't hire workers that are really young because we're dealing with a lot of different kinds of people (customers), and sometimes they can be nasty. Young kids don't know how to manage that sort of thing.</p>
<p>I'm surprised they're thinking 12 as a minimum age. For starts, how are they going to get to and from work? They'll be relying on the bus or their parents. Then there are ethical problems. Parents might steal from their kids. Kids don't understand about things like statutory holidays, so employers might take advantage of them. Even some 16-year-olds don't understand about time and a half. I don't think you should be able to work until you're old enough to manage your money.</p>
<p>I don't see work as separate from education necessarily. Work experience can be educational. It's a question of where is the line between health and safety and continuing education for growth. There needs to be some recognition of flexibility around the fact that it's not necessarily the industry but the job a worker is doing. When you talk about road construction, for instance, is the worker driving a truck or holding a sign? 12 - 15 are the really formative years in the educational system, so you need to ensure students are focusing on school work, but at the upper end of that age range, you may have students for whom school just isn't working, and they need to have an alternative.</p>
<p>These regulations are not necessary.</p>

I agree that kids should not work more than two hours on school days; they need time for homework. Eight hours is quite a long time [for an under-16-year-old to work]. They're still young and they have to be introduced to the workforce gently. Our paid shifts are six hours (seven, with time off for lunch).

This is something that's probably long overdue. Any minimum working age legislation should be linked to minimum wage legislation. I personally believe that if you want people under 14 to be able to work then you shouldn't be able to pay them less than minimum wage.

You are ignoring the negative impacts that this legislation will have on young people. young people need challenge and they don't need to be treated as if they were lesser people. we learn how to work when we are young. Work in our society is a opportunity we are a long way from the sweat shops where young people and older people are abused.

Children should not be engaged in the wage economy. They have more important things to do than be workers and consumers. Adolescents need to make a gradual transition into being part of the wage economy but it is important to communicate that schooling and recreational activities are more important. Young people have many years of working ahead of them. They do not need to become locked into the consumer economy before they are adults somewhere between age 18-21 years.

Not an easy questionnaire - every answer depends on adults (parents, guardians, employers) being responsible

A minimum age for workers is fine if there is allowance for exemption.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.

There should be no further restrictions on youth working. Parents should decide and be able to exempt their kids from the government rules. This is particularly important in the north where rural and remote lifestyles require kids to help out. Yukon does not need the rules from southern Canada that work in big cities...or maybe they don't work and that is why we have so much youth crime and young people who don't want to work....maybe if they changed their laws we would have more people develop a work ethic young and be more productive in the work force.

this is a very good motion considering the number of young workers that are injured annually and 1 out of 3 are in home business, but there has to be other acts, regulations or legislation that does cover the majority of the protection that is needed, duplication of acts with out enforcement is useless

Thank you for letting me have my say. I must admit that if I didn't have a business and a child my answers might have been completely different. There aren't a lot of individuals in my position so it was great that I was able to bring some issues to your attention. Good luck with the survey and I hope my answers helped provide some insight.