

going to permit a region of the country to be so severely disadvantaged.

Honourable senators, I think those amendments are extremely reasonable and I hope that they will find favour among senators, particularly Atlantic senators, who know the fishery, who know the history of fishermen's benefits, who know how threatened they are. I hope honourable senators take this opportunity to try to protect those benefits as much as we can in the Senate.

**Senator Perrault:** Hear, hear!

**Senator MacEachen:** Honourable senators, I have just a few more comments. I am not going to deal with all of the amendments, but I want to deal with one or two more of them.

As senators know, if Bill C-21 is approved, there will be a big transfer of funds, from direct payments to the unemployed, to funds for training programs. That is a big feature of Bill C-21. The bill provides that each year the minister will lay before Parliament a plan, telling us how these moneys are going to be spent and where they are going to be spent. But one big question that arises, if, for example, Nova Scotia loses \$40 million in benefits as a result of the passing of Bill C-21, will it get that money back in the form of training programs? Well, nobody knows. The deputy minister will say—and I believe that he is truthfully speaking his mind—that he does not foresee any drastic or significant change in the apportionment of these funds. But we do not know. We have proposed an amendment, saying, "Well, give us some more detail."

If the bill is read literally, all the government would have to do would be to produce a four-line plan—four statistics, that is all. The deputy minister acknowledged that and said, "Of course we intend to put in more detail. We provide that more detail should go into the plan."

We also ask: When you tell us in your plan how much you intend to spend in Quebec next year, tell us how much you spent last year under the UI benefits so that the citizens of Quebec will know whether they have gained or lost or whether they stayed the same. We would prefer that information for every province and every UI region. If members of Parliament were to say, "Well, this is awful; here is Alberta, or Manitoba, with hardly anything," the members of Alberta and Manitoba in the House of Commons could put down a petition to have the plan debated and voted upon. It could be approved or disapproved, that is all. We are not rocking the Constitution. We are not pillaging the Treasury. We are simply saying, "Give us some more information and give Parliament an opportunity to decide on the plan." That is rather reasonable, in my opinion.

There is one other amendment I want to talk about briefly—the "Henry VIII" amendment. Senator Forsey and Mr. Eglinton appeared before the committee and described one of the proposed changes in Bill C-21 as being beyond even the powers that the British Parliament had conferred upon Henry VIII—namely, that he was entitled to pass laws on subjects which Parliament had not specifically dealt with. We think

[Senator MacEachen.]

that this amendment in Bill C-21 deserves the title of "the Henry VIII amendment" or "the Henry VIII law", because it gives the Unemployment Insurance Commission the power to develop programs that are different from those contained in the bill.

**Senator Macquarrie:** Even we Stuarts would not do that!

**Senator MacEachen:** Well, of course not. One wonders why that is done. Of course, the argument runs: We cannot foresee what we will require in the future and we would like to have that power. After all, it is in those fishermen's regulations that were given to the commission in 1971 by those farsighted Grits. Or, borrowing from that: Well, I don't like what is there from 1971 and I don't like what is here in 1990 under this clause. As senators know, under subsection 26.1(3) the commission is given extraordinary powers to vary the developmental use rules:

Any scheme established under subsection (1) may, with respect to any matter, be different from the provisions of this Act relating to that matter.

Well, the witnesses thought it was pretty bad and I think it ought to be drawn to the attention of the Senate, because there are persons like Senator Macquarrie who will strike a blow for liberty when given the opportunity. This is one opportunity that is right at his disposal.

Honourable senators, when I spoke on second reading of this bill I spent a long time talking about impact studies. The department said that the loss to Newfoundland would be "X" dollars. The CLC said that it would be "Y" dollars. The Province of Nova Scotia said that it would be "Z" dollars, and the Province of Newfoundland said that it would be "X" dollars. In each case the estimate of the impact was wildly and widely varied. So wide were the differences that it would be rather frightening if the most extreme assessments were accepted. I thought it would be easy to resolve that matter in the committee. Well, it wasn't.

In committee we heard much evidence from the Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower and Immigration, who defended his impact study, I must say, with much knowledge, dedication and tenacity. He was very tenacious. I believed in his impact study. He had that extra weapon which we all wish in an argument—namely, extra knowledge. If you know something that nobody else knows you are in a very strong debating position, and that is what he had, because he had access to the data. As Senator Cools would say, he had access to the data set and to the assumptions underlying the econometric analysis. No one else had that. These others were labouring in the dark and Mr. Carin was labouring in the light. We had no way of entering the light because we had no access to his data. We cannot tell you, honourable senators, who is right and who is wrong on this. Arguments have been advanced on both sides. One day a discerning member of the committee asked if we could have access to this vital information and the officials responded that there was no legal objection, but that it required a decision of the minister. They told us that if we received a favourable decision, then, of course, they would