

the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and the Western Diversification Initiative are cases in point.

The Canadian Jobs Strategy and the Labour Force Development Strategy programs have already had a major impact on the labour market. When the Senate finally passes Bill C-21, I am confident we will see positive results from the initiative as well.

I notice that the motion before us today did not define full employment. This is understandable. Organizations such as the Canadian Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, who are also keen to see full employment have stated:

It would be impossible to come up with a definition of full employment with which everyone agrees.

In effect, the advisory council acknowledged that defining full employment could be as complicated as Rubik's cube.

In its recent report on unemployment, the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council suggested that the figure of 4 per cent unemployment might be considered full employment. It is our view that the selection of a single unemployed target, such as 4 per cent, is not feasible, nor is it realistic because Canada remains a country of great regional diversity.

Governments cannot push a button to replenish cod stocks in the Atlantic or force automobile plants to be relocated on the Gaspé coast where unemployment is particularly severe. On top of that, Canada, like the rest of the industrial world, is facing rapid economic changes as international trading and manufacturing patterns evolve in a new and unprecedented global economy.

The choice of a target such as 4 per cent to view as full employment can also be very misleading. In fact, an unemployment rate of 4 per cent or less can even mask great disparities. To illustrate my point I need only mention the state of economies in eastern Europe where so-called full employment was the norm.

But we do not have to go to eastern Europe to point this out. We can compare the unemployment rate in Canada in 1967 with that of 1988 to clarify the situation. The unemployment rate in 1967 was 3.8 per cent, and 1988 was 7.8 per cent. A single comparison of two numbers would suggest that Canadians were better off in

### *Supply*

1967 than in 1988. After all, if we stick to the advisory council's definition of full employment in 1967, we were actually there with an unemployment rate of 3.8 per cent.

However, a closer look at the numbers suggests that not everything was quite so rosy, particularly when we compare for the two years the numbers of people who held full time jobs year round. In 1967, with apparent full employment, 39 per cent of the population worked full time all year. In 1988, a full 5 per cent more—44 per cent of the population—held full time jobs year round.

Let us compare what this has meant in dollars for Canadians, and let us adjust the comparison to 1988 dollars so there will be no confusion. In 1967, the year that meets the Advisory Council's definition of full employment, 14 per cent of the Canadian population had adjusted annual earnings of \$25,000 or more. In 1988, we had an unemployment rate of 7.8 per cent and 25 per cent of the youth and adult population who earned that much. Were we closer to full employment in 1967 or 1988?

What I am pointing out is that full employment is much more complicated than this motion suggests. The government believes that increased employment is desirable. We also believe that the federal government has a significant role to play in achieving this goal. We also believe that, to meet this objective, we must enlist the resources and the energies of the provinces, the private sector, employers, and workers.

I believe the government's record on job creation speaks for itself. Since September 1984, almost 1.6 million jobs have been created, which is one of the best job creation records in the industrial world. Almost 85 per cent of these new jobs are full-time jobs employing people year round.

Over the same six year period, the unemployment rate has fallen a solid 3.2 percentage points. It was 11.6 per cent in September, 1984. This year, it is 8.4 per cent. We intend to do even more.

We have recently authorized a new ceiling of \$130 million for work-sharing agreements in 1990. That is double the amount of money that we set aside for work-sharing programs under the current unemployment insurance plan. Because of these allocations,