

This appears on page 14 of Bill C-21. I've just read lines 13 and 14. It is written this way in the appended amendment and on lines 38 to 43. These are the items I am referring to.

It is the costs of financing those items excluded from government funding by Bill C-21 and returned to the regular budget by the proposed amendment which are estimated at \$450 million.

● (1600)

[English]

Senator MacEachen: But that is a saving for the government, because, for example, we struck out the assistance.

Senator Tremblay: I am not discussing the total expense now; I am just discussing the mode of financing, which refers to your principle. You say that the government should finance that, not the unemployment insurance fund. Bill C-21 proposes to finance that through the UI fund; you propose to finance that through the general budget. That is what I am discussing.

Senator MacEachen: Yes. I will not interfere with your discussion, but I gather that you stated—and maybe I misunderstood you—that there was an additional cost occasioned by the amendment to the developmental uses in the amount of \$400 million. I sought to find out in what respect, because in the section with respect to developmental uses we have stricken out certain expenditures.

Senator Tremblay: Yes, with the implication that if the same programs that are meant by those sections are implemented the government will have to pay for them. In other words, there will be no cost to the government if we do not have programs of that type.

Senator MacEachen: Well, we would reply that we should not have one and save some money. That is what we are saying.

Senator Roblin: That is a cynical comment!

Senator MacEachen: We have said, "yes."

Senator Roblin: No training?

Senator MacEachen: No, no. We think that some of the items that we struck out under developmental uses make no sense.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): And I suggest that you do not look at them, because you will be embarrassed to find out that he is correct!

Senator Tremblay: You said that those items do not make sense?

Senator Roblin: That is what he said.

Senator MacEachen: I said that some of the items that we struck out do not make sense; that is why we struck them out.

Senator Tremblay: Because they do not make sense? Let me read the first one at least.

Senator Frith: Those amounts struck out do not make sense!

[Senator Tremblay.]

Senator Tremblay: It reads: "for paying the cost of courses and programs mentioned in section 26."

Senator Frith: It does not make sense to finance them the way the bill does.

Senator Tremblay: That is what I am trying to say.

Senator Roblin: That is what Senator Tremblay is saying.

Senator MacEachen: The government has the option not to spend money if it wishes.

Senator Roblin: That is what he is saying, but you will not let him speak.

Senator MacEachen: We are saying that some items here should be struck out. In other words, they have no place in this bill and will save some money.

Senator Tremblay: It is either one way or the other. On the one hand, if the programs make sense and should be implemented, they will cost something; but, on the other hand, you are saying that they should not be charged to the UI fund.

Senator MacEachen: No, they should not be proceeded with.

Senator Tremblay: They do not make sense?

Senator MacEachen: That is right. That is what I said.

Senator Tremblay: And you say, "Do not have that sort of program." That is what you are telling us.

Senator Roblin: Go tell the unemployed that!

Senator Tremblay: You are saying that paying for the costs of courses and programs and so on—that is, the whole field of training—makes no sense.

Senator Roblin: That is what he says!

Senator Thériault: That is right; it makes no sense.

Senator Tremblay: Make your choice.

Senator Frith: That is casuistry!

Senator Tremblay: I must confess that, because of the language, perhaps I have not succeeded in expressing myself clearly the right way.

From what I understand of your position I must admit that I cannot see the meaning of it, if those programs make no sense. If they are not implemented and there are no programs, of course, then it will not cost anyone anything. We assume that have training programs is one of the basic thrusts of Bill C-21—that is, the creation of more elaborate programs for training unemployed people to enable them to be in a better position in the labour market. There is some sense in that.

Senator Roblin: He does not think so.

Senator MacEachen: Oh, yes; I agree with that.

Senator Tremblay: Then you have the problem that I stated with it. If you say that there is no sense in doing that, then you are right that it will not cost anyone anything. But the unemployed will be deprived of one of the best means to