

*Private Members' Business*

of turning our welfare state into a secure society which requires a new philosophy of social security.

In discussing the issue of child support payments, it is best to lay out some principles and then determine if the bill adheres to the principles. There are five principles that we should be following in the debate.

The first one would be the self-reliance of Canadians and to recognize the family as the primary caregiver.

The second one would be to empower families, community and charitable organizations to play an increasing role.

The third one would be to focus social spending on the need.

The fourth principle would be to entrust resources and responsibilities to the level of delivery where it is most effective or decentralized.

The fifth would be to reduce spending and limit government spending.

• (1430)

On the first principle we must realize the increasing importance of families and their role in the nurturing of children and the viability of the economy.

Reformers support policies that allow families to be recognized as serving a unique and important role and to be given a choice in the method of child care their children receive.

There is a clear and fundamental philosophical difference between the Liberals and the Reformers on the whole child care and day care debate. Liberals believe in a state run day care and promised \$120 million for day care in their red book, which incidentally was not met in the recent budget. This promise was essentially fuelled by special interest forces and would result in increased cost to all taxpayers. It is also an anti-family choice.

Reformers oppose a state run day care. We believe that day care is most efficiently run by the private sector and that government subsidization of day care, the nanny state, is not financially sustainable. In these views we are supported by a majority of Canadians who according to a recent Maclean's poll prefer to raise their children in the home. They also believe that parents must have the right of choice.

The second principle to follow is that a dollar left in the hands of a family is more effective, more efficient and more desired than in government programs. The present child care expense allowance is intrusive. It interferes with parental decision making by discriminating against those with families where one parent stays at home to raise children. The bill would empower families with a real choice.

The third principle is focusing on social spending on need. It may appear that the bill does not focus on need since the bill provides a deduction regardless of the income of the parents. It

should be noted that the bill is intended to work within a flat tax system.

The fourth principle is to entrust resources and responsibilities to the level of delivery where they are most efficient and most effective. Under this principle it would be prudent to eliminate the child tax credit and replace it with a tax deduction.

Why should more money be sent to Ottawa, churned through the government bureaucracy and then funnelled back to Canadians? This results in less money being available to those who are really in need.

Under a tax reduction the parents would determine the best use for the money. They could apply it to their own needs. It would make them choose responsibly and they would see the direct result of the money.

The fifth principle the bill addresses is the reduction of government spending because the cost of a tax reduction would be offset by the elimination of the tax credit. The bill would allow parents to stay at home resulting in greater employment opportunities. There would be no need for a national day care program. Savings would also result because funding would be directly to individuals and families and not to institutions and professionals.

In conclusion, the bill recognizes that families are the best hope for a bright future and that healthy families, not dysfunctional types, are a source of strength for future generations.

The bill moves away from the folly of state run day care programs generated by special interest groups that favour government intervention and social engineering. We must rethink our responsibilities and our priorities.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The member for Calgary Centre had given an indication that he wanted a few minutes under right of reply.

The House must understand that no other member can speak after the member closes under right of reply. I hope he can do this in the matter of two to three minutes.

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, there are two comments I would like to make, just to wrap up. When we heard from the Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, basically he said that the program would cost an extra \$6.5 billion.

I want it entered into the record that what he is not doing and has failed to recognize in my comments is that this bill would consolidate the current existing programs which add up to slightly over \$8 billion and offset the cost of this program. Even if we use \$6 billion as the cost, what he has failed to do in his budgetary planning is to recognize that those people who make \$30,000 or more get \$2.1 billion of the child credit out of that \$5.2 billion. We must subtract that from the \$6.5 billion.