

Selected letters to the editor: Nanny-gate? ^[1]

Author: Various

Source: The Globe and Mail

Format: Article

Publication Date: 2 Dec 2015

EXCERPTS

There is no hypocrisy here (People Remember The Little Things – editorial, Dec. 2). The Prime Minister campaigned against giving wealthy Canadians access to public money for child care. His point was that wealthy Canadians didn't need these funds, which are available to all. The nannies looking after his children are not something offered to all Canadians out of public funds. They are specifically offered to assist the Prime Minister in the difficult task of trying to have a life and function as the head of government. The nannies are a legitimate expense associated with his office. No one could reasonably expect the Prime Minister of Canada to pay for his chauffeur, or a host of other expenses attendant on his being fully occupied managing the country. Child care is no different.

-James Johnson, Toronto

Stephen Harper had it wrong when he said Justin Trudeau wasn't ready. Within a month of becoming PM, the Leader of the Liberal Party has sashayed up to the trough and is using taxpayers' money to pay for his child care.

-Raymond Gilbert, Dundas, Ont.

This taxpayer doesn't begrudge the public purse assisting the Prime Minister with child care. His mid-\$300 K salary is modest by corporate, even professional standards: A president of any big Canadian university makes more. The public can't expect Justin Trudeau to be up half the night with a vomiting child, then go rushing off in the morning to do Canada proud at another international conference. Or do we expect Sophie to be the good little wife and pick up the slack? Not if people also expect her to appear at public events and have her life scrutinized by the press. The public seems to be enjoying the Camelot-like atmosphere in Ottawa right now. I do, it's exciting, but we can't then become pikers about helping to pay for it.

-John Goyder, Oakville, Ont.

When is a nanny not a nanny? When she is a "special assistant." Just as I was beginning to come around to accepting another Trudeau as Prime Minister, we get the twist on "special assistants." Mr. Trudeau needs to accept financial responsibility: I don't deny the need for one nanny, but two?

-Anne Hayden, Tsawwassen, B.C.

Somewhere, far down entitlement road, former Liberal cabinet minister David Dingwall - he of "I'm entitled to my entitlements" fame - is (pick one): laughing out loud; cringing with fear; beaming with pride. Is Justin Trudeau really this foolish?

-Ken Johnson, Lindsay, Ont.

It matters not that Pierre Trudeau and other PMs had taxpayer-funded nannies. There is one very good reason why Justin Trudeau should fund his own child care. Because it's 2015!

-Tony Burt, Vancouver

Yes, the Trudeaus should certainly be paying their own child care costs, just as Justin Trudeau said he would. But aren't we missing the point here? Who is paying Sophie Grégoire-Trudeau's salary for the - conservative estimate - 50 or 60 hours a week she is giving to the nation? I guess it isn't 2015 after all.

-Leslie Maitland, Ottawa

The nanny situation has been overplayed by the media. Any disparagement of our new PM's ethics is minimal, and since the cost of the Trudeau nannies is less than a rounding error for Canada's finances, can we focus on matters of far greater import? One example is David Price signing with Boston, which will likely impact Canadians - Blue Jays fans at least - more in 2016 than nanny-gate (Gone - Sports, Dec. 2).

-Peter D. Hambly, Hanover, Ont.

Region: Canada ^[2]

Source URL (modified on 27 Jan 2022): <https://childcarecanada.org/documents/child-care-news/15/12/selected-letters-editor-nanny-gate>
Links

[1] <https://childcarecanada.org/documents/child-care-news/15/12/selected-letters-editor-nanny-gate> [2] <https://childcarecanada.org/taxonomy/term/7864>