

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I should remind Hon. Members that their comments should be addressed to the Chair at all times.

**Mr. Stevens:** I thank my colleague for the question. I was not aware of the incident to which he referred as having occurred in Afghanistan.

I can say that in meeting with the Chinese Premier and foreign Minister Wu while they were in Canada, I was most impressed with how much they emphasized the atrocities which have been taking place in Kampuchea and indeed in Afghanistan at the hands of what they felt were purely Soviet troops. If one wants a quick perspective on that entire area I certainly believe the Chinese are very well equipped to give chapter and verse on what they feel is happening and should not be allowed to happen.

With respect to the question of unilateral disarmament, I think that history would show that any nation that has tended to disarm quickly in the hope that its rival or possible enemy will also disarm, has always been disappointed.

Over the Christmas period I had an opportunity to read two works of history, and I found it remarkable that at the turn of the 1800s Napoleon used exactly the same argument we often hear today, that is, "Let us lay down our arms in the name of peace". At that time Britain responded by reducing its defence budget by 70 per cent and it mothballed much of its fleet. We know what happened. It was not until Waterloo that Napoleon was eventually stopped.

Hitler used exactly the same terminology of "let us have peace". He always made it clear that he would be willing to disarm if only the other side would disarm. Unfortunately, most of the western world did exactly that, leading up to 1939, and we know the struggle that ensued.

I would say that the program which has worked for 38 years in keeping the world out of a major war should be continued at least until we have a better solution. That program consists of maintaining reasonable deterrents in the face of a militant enemy.

**Mr. Murphy:** I have a short question for the member for York-Peel. The Hon. Member for Assiniboia talked about human rights in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. I think that is a concern we all share, that human rights must be respected everywhere.

Would the Hon. Member for York-Peel explain the Conservative policy on human rights for the black population in South Africa?

**Mr. Stevens:** Mr. Speaker, again I would invite the Hon. Member to read many of the things we have said with respect to the situation in South Africa. I can tell him that this Party does not in any way countenance apartheid. We feel that it is foreign to the way of life that we enjoy and would like to see others in the world enjoy.

**Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I was actually rising to ask a question but since the time for questions has expired I will lead into the

*The Address—Mr. Roberts*

subject which I wanted to discuss today, and that is, employment problems within Canada. The generation of employment is the most serious challenge which the Canadian economy faces. It is not an easy challenge to which to respond. The structural problems and the international situation which lead to unemployment in our country are not likely to be resolved easily.

As Members of the House are aware, there are no easy, quick-fix solutions to the problems which we face.

In discussing employment creation I will necessarily deal with statistics and sometimes use bureaucratic jargon. But none of us in the House, certainly not on this side and certainly not I, underestimate the human tragedy and suffering to which those statistics provide a faceless visage. Unemployment is an extraordinary human waste, a traumatic tragedy for the individuals who suffer it. It is also an extraordinary economic waste in our society, the failure to use our productive human capacity.

• (1550)

Today I believe I owe it to the House to review the progress that we have made in creating jobs in Canada and to give some sense of the future as the Government sees it in terms of job-creation. While there are some grounds for optimism for the future, there are certainly no grounds for smug satisfaction at the progress we have made or, indeed, at the progress we are likely to make over the year to come.

I would like to start by reminding the House what our overall strategy is to job-creation. Our response to this challenge is not simply one that lies with my Department or the Commission of Employment and Immigration. Our policies are not the whole response to the unemployment problems in Canada. They are, rather, part of the response, one of the component elements of the employment creation strategy which this Government pursues. If one were to put very simply what the substance, the foundation of our strategy is, it would be this. It is a belief in the private sector as a motor force for job-creation; the belief that the long-term permanent jobs which Canadians need are likely to be produced by the initiative of entrepreneurs, by the private sector in our society. Therefore, the overall approach which the Government is taking is to try to help establish the conditions of economic recovery and to strengthen the context which will enable the private sector to undertake that job creating work. There are two essential bases to the Government's approach so far, two overall bases to its approach. The first of those is the restraint policy which the Government has followed. Scorned by the Opposition and some commentators when it was introduced, the six and five program, it was argued, could not possibly succeed. We stuck with that program and it has succeeded. It has been an important element in reducing the pressures on inflation within Canada. It has given us the restraint to bring Canada into a more competitive situation internationally. It has made consumers in Canada better off than they otherwise would have been. But it is sometimes forgotten that the success of the six and five program has also assisted the workers in our economy.