

Government Orders

Mrs. Hayes: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's comments. I certainly am interested in the anecdote that he mentioned.

This is probably the way things will progress given the present scenario of government involvement in day care. It will become increasingly impossible for an alternative to exist. This is the point I was trying to make. It will take away the choice from parents in communities and force on them a government dictated and funded program which will end up being more expensive.

The root of this problem and so much of what has happened with government funded programs is around those special interest industries, shall we say, the very people who are employed and get their future security rally around the programs that the government proposes and then build their industry on that. I have seen it in immigration and in different areas of government involvement. If there is money to be had, security of employment and an opportunity for garnering government funds, we can be sure hands will be out and people will be there.

This is certainly a problem with national day care especially as the government funds the institutions and the professionals that are involved rather than the families. Maybe that comes back to me underlining what I mentioned in my talk. If funds are needed to support child care that money should go to the parents for them to make the choice and be able to put wheels on that choice by choosing what they feel is the best care.

Giving the money to the professionals, giving the money to the day care centres simply creates that special interest environment. Those people will be there to encourage a self-perpetuation of that system. That is not to the betterment of our families, our kids or our communities. I thank the member for his comment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Madam Speaker, I was interested to hear what the hon. member had to say, especially when she talked about preserving the family unit, which is the nucleus of our society, and I think everyone in this House would agree wholeheartedly with that view.

Today, however, we must realize that as a result of this reform, the family as we know it will change. We will be left with only two kinds of families. We will have very rich families with a lot of tax shelters and very poor families. The middle class will disappear altogether. What kind of country will we have as a result? A very wealthy class and a very poor class. No more room for the middle class.

• (1805)

You also pointed out that you were against introducing measures for spouses. I respect that, and I agree.

Today, employers and employees pay very high unemployment insurance premiums. You said that to help families, it was necessary to create jobs, and not temporary jobs but well-paying jobs. In that case, in order to create jobs and to help employers and SMEs create jobs, present UI premium rates should be reduced.

I would appreciate hearing the views of the hon. member and her caucus on the possibility of reducing UI premium rates for employers and employees in the very near future.

[*English*]

Mrs. Hayes: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments. There were two major points made. I will address the first one. There are two kinds of families, the wealthy and, increasingly, the poor as indeed the middle class seems to be buffeted on all sides.

What is it that is destroying our middle class? The very thing that is taking the power and the resources from that middle class is the increase in the government programs that are ever increasing its taxes.

The poor become trapped in a cycle of not breaking out of poverty because, for instance, single parents families get jobs but earn hardly more than they receive on welfare. They choose not to because it works against themselves to do so.

I believe the best way is a fair taxation system and government only doing what it has to do so that the resources are left in the hands of Canadians. A fair taxation system, for instance the flat tax system I suggested, would fairly treat wealthy and middle class, and allow and accommodate for poorer people so that Canadians would be able to use the money to address the needs they have. That way I believe the middle class can survive and the families of the middle class can survive. The more government we have the worse it is.

I am not sure I quite understood the second half of the member's question. Again it may go back to the same philosophy. I agree we should not be asking for more government assistance for programs. The government money should go to people who need that money. Our social assistance programs should be designed to be targeted only to those who need them and if it is a social program, whether it be day care, UI, or any of the other many programs that are there. We could take it right to the equalization to provinces. Social spending should go only to the people who need it. Perhaps then employees and employers and indeed the families represented in those relationships would have more money to do what they need to do.

I am not sure I answered the question but again it goes to less government involvement, therefore less government spending, better targeting for government spending long term. That is a solution to most of these problems.