

He commented on the fact that in the summer of 1984 he campaigned with the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson). At that time he asked why they were not saying what they planned to do, why they were not telling the people of Canada what their policies would be if they formed the Government. The Minister of Finance told him at that time that they would not get elected if they did that, that he should not press them to be explicit on these matters. In effect, I guess he was following the Crosbie strategy.

That is immediately relevant because on August 24, 1984 the present Minister of Finance issued a statement about the Canadian aerospace industry. He said explicitly that he envisaged the two Crown corporations, Canadair and de Havilland, being brought under the direction of a new entity, one Crown corporation, which would ensure that the substantial public investment in these companies, particularly in Canadair, did not go to waste, that the corporations were effectively managed, and that they carried out their operations in a business-like way. He suggested that there might be some participation by the private sector in sales of aircraft. He clearly indicated something of his dislike for public enterprise with regard to ideology.

In the statement made during the election campaign there was a very clear promise to the employees of Canadair and de Havilland, to people in Montreal and Toronto, and to the people of Canada that a Conservative Government would use the public enterprise forum to ensure that substantial investments in the aerospace industry were made to the benefit of the people of Canada.

In light of that, what is one to say of what was actually done? When this gentleman became the Minister of Finance he issued a budget paper on privatization in which he said explicitly that Crown corporations will not be sold at distressed prices merely to transfer them quickly to the private sector. My friend from Winnipeg North has pointed out how cheaply Bombardier acquired this company in relation to its value as determined by experts in the industry, its book value and its break-up value. By all those standards Bombardier has been given a gift. Canadair is being privatized merely for the sake of ideology.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It is with regret that I must interrupt the Hon. Member. It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS--MOTIONS

[English]

THE FAMILY

GOVERNMENT COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM—THE FAMILY AND MARRIAGE

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West) moved:

The Family

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of sponsoring, with the provinces, a communications program, including the use of television, that will affirm the importance of marriage and family life.

He said: Madam Speaker, this is the first time I have had the opportunity to speak while you have been in the chair. Belated as my remarks may be, may I offer my compliments, congratulations and hope that you will enjoy the House as much as I am sure the House will appreciate your presiding over us.

● (1700)

The motion I introduce today was introduced earlier this year in a debate during Private Member's hour that occasioned so much enthusiasm on the part of Members that at six o'clock they were still talking. Therefore, I have brought the resolution back to the chamber so that we may have another opportunity to address it. However, I do offer the caution that I hope Members will be restrained in their enthusiasm sufficiently that we might conclude the debate today with an affirmative vote.

Having said that, I must offer a word of explanation and apology to you and other Members of the House. As luck would have it, I am chairing a meeting of a Standing Committee of the House and have just come from its session which is still progressing. Due to the nature of the agenda, I must go back after I conclude my remarks. I regret that very much because, otherwise, I could look forward to the contributions of fellow Members from all parties. I regret that I will have to delay that experience until *Hansard* is printed and I can read their contributions.

The motion before us would have been debated yesterday, but the House will recall that the agenda for last Friday was postponed until yesterday, and yesterday's until today because of a very worthy cause last Friday, as some would see it. Consequently, there has been a conflict in my agenda, having a committee meeting at the same time as my Private Member's motion is debated.

I want to begin by reminding the House of the fundamental importance of the family, not only to the persons who comprise a family unit but to society itself. Regardless of other changes in our society, social history shows that the family is permanently the foundation upon which any society must rest. The family offers a unique satisfaction to the basic permanent universal human need for belonging, regardless of what culture, what region of the world. We have a common humanity with certain common needs, including the need to belong to each other, the need to care for one another and be cared for by one another. The family has met that need to an extraordinary degree, since time immemorial.

The form of the family has varied from time to time. We have had the patriarchal family, with its stretched out membership. We have had the narrower domestic family, and in latter years we have had what sociologists have called the