

Finally, I want to refer to the whole question of day care, which I noticed the Minister avoided. I thought he would be discussing that with the provinces as well. Many people are very concerned about this issue and they want to know if the Minister is or is not in favour of day care for profit as was reported recently in the *Ottawa Citizen*. Is he willing to take the Canada Assistance Plan money away from existing non-profit day care centres to give to profit-making commercial day care centres without creating any extra facilities? There is no way that we as taxpayers should subsidize commercial day care operators for a profit. Experience has shown that commercial day care centres often violate standards, pay staff indecent wages, have lower adult-child ratios, less enriching programs for the children, and less involvement of parents which is very essential. We cannot afford to use children for profit and I urge the Minister to go on record opposing this type of day care.

I also ask the Minister to speed up, if he can, the report of the task force on child care which, I am sure, will recommend a plan for affordable, accessible day care which is non-profit and which incidentally, is not part of our welfare system. I hope that we will consider that. In closing, I think that the proposed changes to make the Canada Assistance Plan more flexible are based on a sound premise and I commend the Minister and his colleagues. However, the goal of independence will only be achieved if there are jobs at the end of this so that people will not wind up on the welfare rolls again.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Gordon Towers (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, question No. 380 will be answered today.

[Text]

FAIR WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOUR ACT

Question No. 380—**Mr. Murphy:**

1. Since September 4, 1984, have any construction agreements been signed with the government under Section 5 of the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Act and, if so (a) how many (b) what were the names of the parties (c) on what dates and, in each case, did the Government exempt the agreement from the provisions of paragraphs 3(1)(a) and (b) of the Act?

2. In which of the cases outlined in part 1, was the grant or payment made by statutory authority?

Mr. Len Gustafson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. None. 2. Not applicable.

[English]

Mr. Towers: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Family Allowances Act

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the Ministerial statement consideration of Government Orders will be extended by 35 minutes this day. Therefore, Private Members' Hour will begin at 5:35 o'clock p.m.

* * *

● (1540)

[Translation]

FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT, 1973

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Epp (Provencher) that Bill C-70, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, be now read a second time and referred to a Legislative Committee, and the amendment of Mr. Frith (p. 6625).

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have an opportunity to take part in this important and momentous debate on the future of Canada's family allowances program. I am sorry to see that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) had to leave, because he was really put to the test in recent months when he attempted to slash old age pensions and had to reverse his decision as a result of pressure from the public and from various quarters. Here he is now searching for a logical explanation to do exactly the same thing at the expense of families.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the logical reasoning which prompted the Government to change its mind about old age security pensions should do similar wonders with respect to family benefits.

Mr. Speaker, estimates show that the net loss brought about by changes advocated in the Budget in the case of a family with an income of \$15,000, for instance, will amount to \$1,879. A family with a \$35,000 annual income stands to lose \$3,452, but another one earning \$80,000 will lose only \$1,125.

If that is what they want to call justice, it is injustice, nothing less. It is totally unacceptable that they should want to deprive low- and middle-income families of such social benefits. I see that my colleagues opposite are wondering just where the Government is leading them.

Mr. Speaker, you know very well that Canada needs a policy which supports the family and a rising birth rate. Young couples cannot feel overly enthusiastic when they think that the Government is abandoning them to face their family responsibilities, especially after hearing the Prime Minister say that those social programs were a sacred trust, that they need not fear since he would not tamper with them.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed umpteen attempts aimed at undermining our social programs. They tried that with old age