

penalty against that parent who chooses to stay home to raise his or her own child out of their own convictions.

• (1755)

Relating to the government child care activities in the national day care program, let me read yet another interesting quote from the social policy review discussion paper: "Linking child care and child development could represent a comprehensive and preventative approach to social problems at the earliest point in life. Rather than using our money to rectify social problems which eventually occur as a result of a lack of support or security for young children, investment at the front end could save us enormously in both human and financial costs 10 to 20 years down the road".

The parent state seems alive and well in this government's agenda. What I read here is a government that feels it is a better parent than a parent of the child. It is no secret that failed full employment policies and failed nanny state systems of the past 10 to 20 years are now being lived out through social turmoil in the former Soviet Union. It proved, and it will be proved again, that the state is not the best parent. A healthy family with a full choice for child care is the very best way to create a healthy society.

We propose that child care programs must subsidize financial need and not the method of child care chosen. Any such subsidy must be directed to the children and to the parents, not the institution and professionals, in order to allow a full choice of that care including the choice of the parent to stay home.

Surely a government which would consider direct payment of fees to students in its latest program of student fee transfers would consider the validity of a direct payment of child care costs to the parents of the child.

We support the regulation of day care standards but at the provincial level. It is at this level that medical and social services and the decisions that go with them are made. These relate directly with the needs of day care regulations. More fundamentally, as so much of the issue of the need for child care stems from economic factors, we support the concept of income splitting between legally married couples to help support and nurture families. Why should a family with a single wage be penalized with higher taxes than dual earners with the same total income?

Another more possibly distant solution would be a system of flat tax for all Canadians. I am encouraged as members from both sides of the House investigate this as a possibility. Within such a system accommodation could be made for the needed care of children through social assistance program support where it is needed, at the level closest to that need.

### *Government Orders*

This government can continue to promote short term solutions. More government programs will demand more taxpayer dollars. The need for the increased taxpayer dollars means less money for individual use. Decreased disposable income will create fewer real jobs and less incentive to work and in turn will create more poverty, which in turn will create more poor children.

We need long term vision for the solutions. We reject a national day care program. Fewer government programs will allow individual Canadians to have choice and self-reliance. Families and their importance in our society will be enhanced for stronger communities.

We speak often of citizenship and the necessity of participation in the community. It is time the government dropped the rhetoric and faced reality. I believe, and may I add that single mom agrees with me, that our sense of citizenship and belonging will come through our strength as families and our participation as families in our communities.

**Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam for her remarks. I have to say that I think she makes some very good points. The member talked about a national day care program. There are still a lot of questions that have to be answered with respect to day care.

• (1800)

If I may, I will point out to her a little experience I had just recently with respect to that issue which might throw some light on it for her. It concerns a meeting I was at where a for profit lobbyist found her firm in a confrontation. They were hired by a private day care centre in a community to get established in that community. They were up against a publicly funded day care advocacy organization, in other words a special interest group. This special interest group which was supporting national day care and government controlled day care won the issue and the privately funded day care centre was forced to close.

When we approach the issue of a national day care program, I think we all agree that the opportunity must be there however the opportunity is expressed. I think government has to be alert to the fact that we have a lobby group out there now that has for many years been funded by government and that lobby group is very alive and active.

I certainly agree with the member that this is something we should debate. I certainly do not have my mind made up on it. I think we can carry it forward but I hope the debate will be done between ourselves or out in the community rather than without the intervention of special interest groups.

I do not know whether the member would like to comment on that but I would invite her to do so.