

The Family

that is non-violent and pro-family. It is expensive to show *Anne of Green Gables* rather than to import some violent American programming. It will cost money to produce our own Canadian content shows which portray our different values.

Anne of Green Gables is an example of a very fine program which has been widely shown.

I would hope to see more such programming in Canada, but it does cost money. The main source of Canadian programming, the CBC, has had to cut back on Canadian programming. There has been very little Canadian production on the part of the other networks. The CTV, the English-speaking private network, produces almost no Canadian drama or entertainment. Of course, it is out to make money. It can make money by importing these relatively cheap American and very violent shows. It can get away with importing these, rather than producing its own. We must look at the economics of television broadcasting. If we want solutions, we must have better rules on violence. I note that the Canadian Association of Broadcasters is developing some guidelines on violence. They are not very strong ones, and I do not think they are adequate. These must be developed. There must be Canadian content regulations that will be good, strong ones. We need good public television, and it will have to be funded.

● (1730)

I see that my time is almost up, Madam Speaker. In closing, I wish to congratulate the Member and say that I certainly support the intentions of his motion, but we will have to look at the economics of broadcasting as part of the solution. There are no easy solutions. I am with him in spirit. We should be looking toward the solutions. We must look at how we will manage our own broadcasting, if we are going to have a television communications policy that actually does support the Canadian family.

[Translation]

Mrs. Monique Tardif (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I sincerely appreciate this opportunity to debate the motion introduced today by my colleague from Scarborough West (Mr. Stackhouse) because it enables me to repeat and comment further on some of the last throne speech observations pertaining to the family. In the speech, Madam Speaker, Her Excellency the Governor General emphasized that the Government is resolved to defend and strengthen the institution of the Canadian family.

Because the well-being of Canadians generally is predicated on the well-being of Canadian families, we must remain ever aware of the current evolution of family structures and expectations.

Most Canadians look upon the family as the institution which can most influence the education and social upbringing of children. Fortunately, most of them equate as well this influence with the sound physical, affective and intellectual development of the family members throughout the various

stages of life, and a healthy family will always foster the physical and psychological well-being of its members.

No one can deny that, in recent decades, the tensions harboured by Canadian families have given rise to new family structures, as evidenced by the ever increasing number of single-parent or reconstituted families.

The growing number of incidents which attest to the existence of violence against children, older people and women, as well as other family problems, prove that such tensions did have a very strong impact on the family's capacity to adapt and function. Fortunately, those families have shown the strength and flexibility needed to face that kind of problems. But some of them need help in times of strain in order to continue adjusting themselves, and it is towards the latter that governments have a special responsibility for providing the kinds of support that are appropriate to their new requirements.

I would like to mention two achievements that illustrate what is being done now in support of families. The first is a study conducted in Montreal, with funding from the Department of National Health and Welfare. The study dealt with a program of family enhancement. It had interesting results because it showed that consolidating adjustment potentials within the family has preventive benefits. The study showed that one is not born a parent. Child rearing techniques can be learned and should be taught, and those basic techniques that can solve problems can apply in a number of situations. The study also showed that early action and information reduce the need for later treatment to reduce the devastating and long-lasting effects of family breakdown.

The second example I would like to point out is the result of work done at the Health Promotion Directorate in the Department of National Health and Welfare. It is a unique program entitled "Family Passport" aimed at getting family members to carry on together various activities related to the family group's health and welfare. The program was tried in the field, results are very encouraging and developing work will be further advanced next year.

It is often said there is a danger that the government may ask the wrong questions, get the wrong answers and act accordingly when trying to solve a problem. My view is that that is not necessarily the case. Quite the opposite, I believe that the more co-operation and consultation there is, especially when the welfare in a society is involved, the less chance there is of that kind of error happening. It is also obvious that in an atmosphere of strong co-operation, the government and non-government sectors can form a powerful alliance to do what neither one could achieve by itself. That is exactly what the Government of Canada, through its National Health and Welfare Department, has done in various respects to support marriage as an institution and the family.

For instance, the Department co-sponsored a series of workshops on marriage preparation and family mediation in divorce cases. The objective was the gradual building of a