

The Address—Mr. MacEachen

ed jobs for himself and three other people. That is the kind of initiative we see in Canada.

If the Department of National Revenue received any direction from this Government, its auditor would have seen the ridiculous situation in which he was placing this young man and those who work for him. He would have seen that these people were going to be put out of work and added to the unemployment insurance rolls. He could have seen the drive that this man had, the initiative he had to get his business going. He was not prepared to listen to him.

People do not want welfare or unemployment insurance. I ask Hon. Members to stop and think about this for a minute. Just think if tomorrow you were told that you were out of a job and had to go on unemployment insurance. How could you face your wife and children? Imagine how this would undermine an individual's feeling of self-worth. Imagine how it would undermine someone's confidence to have to say "Daddy hasn't got a job" or "My spouse cannot support me; he is no longer the breadwinner, he is on unemployment insurance".

No wonder child abuse is increasing, as well as marriage breakdown. This is happening at a time when we have the resources, education and wherewithal. If only people would sit down together and work out their problems. For the past six or seven years we have had government by confrontation not government by co-operation. The Prime Minister said over national television that co-operative federalism is dead. If co-operative federalism is dead, Canada is dead. We have not seen the last of separatist movements springing up on the East and West Coast of central Canada.

In some areas that I represent, people are saying that if they do not soon get a fair shake, they are going to separate. They are ready to give it another chance, but not ready to do that indefinitely. We have the resources and we have educated people. We have people with enthusiasm, initiative and energy. What we need is a government that governs in a co-operative way, not by confrontation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions, comments?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) leaves late today to pursue his efforts for peace and security. Just over the weekend I returned from the Conference on Security and Disarmament in Stockholm. I was pleased to have associated with me at least meeting a number of my fellow parliamentarians, including the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae) and the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett). It is in the context of these events that I would like to make some comments to the House as we pursue this debate on the Address in Reply.

May I begin by drawing attention to the fact that it is well-known to all Members that since the period toward the end of the 1970s there and has been a steady deterioration in what we describe as East-West relations, or the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, the NATO

countries and the Warsaw Pact countries. It became obvious that quite a number of contradictions had developed within the concept of détente. On the Soviet side, that concept in its view was not incompatible with an arms build-up and with different treatment of human rights from what the West had expected. Certainly the events in Afghanistan and Poland had their own impact upon the state of East-West relations. Indeed, by last summer, relations had deteriorated so badly between the United States and the Soviet Union that high-level dialogue had virtually ceased. That had not even happened during the bombing by the United States of North Viet Nam. Meanwhile, the allies in NATO countries developed their minimum response to the Soviet military build-up, particularly the deployment of the Cruise and Pershing II missiles in response to the deployment of the SS-20s by the Soviet Union. That occurred in the face of worry in many countries, a worry based upon the fear that these developments were inexorably leading to military confrontation and possibly war.

● (1700)

That is the state of affairs which is well known to us. It was addressed, for example, last May at Williamsburg by the seven leaders of the industrialized countries. I mention that meeting because it was the first time that these leaders at their summit addressed international security questions. At the summit at Williamsburg they issued a declaration which developed from a suggestion that had been made by Canada and carried through the meeting by the Prime Minister. That declaration was quite important because it contained two very important elements which have been, in a sense, the basis of policy on the part of Canada certainly and of some other countries since the Williamsburg Summit. The leaders at that time undertook to maintain sufficient military strength to deter any attack, to counter any threat and to ensure peace. That was, in a sense, the deterrent aspect of the policy.

The second aspect was that the summit leaders undertook to devote their full political resources to reducing the threat of war. That was a very important message carried from Williamsburg throughout the world, that the leaders of all these countries had determined that their full political resources were to be used in that direction. We all know that a month later that basic message was endorsed in the communiqué by the NATO foreign ministers at their meeting in Paris.

We had this double-track policy very much on our minds when we decided to accept the American request to test the Cruise missile in Canada. When we made that decision, we determined at the same time that we would carry forward as much as we possibly could the political commitment which had been made at Williamsburg. On the day we took the decision on the Cruise missile, I wrote to Secretary Shultz and said that we were prepared to approve the testing as a contribution to alliance solidarity in the negotiation of a verifiable agreement on medium-range nuclear weapons. We also recognized an even greater obligation to join in the search for a secure peace. I also noted in that letter to Secretary Shultz, which was made public, that it was the Government's firm intention to redouble