

What we mean by that is, of course, the key amendments. I have tried to explain why we voiced our disagreement.

These are essentially the reasons why we formally disagreed with the amendments being put forward by the Liberal majority in the Committee.

We do not accept that the Senate, to which Bill C-21 has been referred, should grant itself a new and outrageous veto in the process relating to the assistance schemes stipulated in clause 20 and the unemployment insurance regulations pertaining to fishermen.

We do not accept either that some additional \$2 billion be taken from the budget deficit, which would be contrary to the whole basic direction of Bill C-21.

From what I could make out, the hon. senator MacEachen said earlier that the deficit does not result only from some programs, such as the ones we have mentioned. It can result, for example, from our monetary policy.

He told us for example that interest rates can have an impact of \$4 billion to \$5 billion on the deficit. But the thing is, our deficit is at \$30 billion.

If we look at the development of our deficit these last ten years, under three different Finance Ministers, including first Mr. MacEachen, then Mr. Lalonde and nowadays Mr. Wilson, we see that the deficit, at the level it has been maintained, has been recurrent throughout the years.

That being so, it seems to me we can conclude that under the proposed amendments, this additional \$2 billion, compared to what is in Bill C-21, would inevitably add to the deficit.

Senator Tremblay: So, it is a proposal which would have the effect of adding almost two billion dollars to an already intolerable deficit. In his speech, Senator Hébert—

Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard: Where is Senator Hébert?

Senator Tremblay: I'm talking from some recollection I have of him.

Senator Simard: He did not think it important to be here today.

Senator Tremblay: In his speech, Senator Hébert talked of the committee proposals as compromises. It may be so, but at two billion dollars, it is a very expensive compromise.

It was also Senator Hébert who said, and I conclude my remarks on this point—

● (1550)

[English]

Senator MacEachen: Senator, may I ask a question about the \$2 billion? What is the \$2 billion?

Senator Tremblay: It is half of the \$2.6 billion or \$2.8 billion coming from Table 2, as you have modified it, divided by two, or 50 per cent, which means \$1.3 billion or \$1.4 billion, plus the \$450 million for development programs, notably training for the unemployed. That brings us to \$100 million or \$200 million less than \$2 billion. That is what I am saying. It may be a little more. As you just said, the exact

numbers are difficult to establish; that is why I am saying it is something in the order of nearly \$2 billion. That is the result.

Senator MacEachen: All right. I should like to follow it up to see if I can understand the figure of \$2 billion. Amendments 9 and 10 have been ruled out, so any cost there has disappeared. That leaves the government contributions, the penalty clause and the developmental uses. I do not know where the \$400 million comes in there. The honourable senator may have data from the department. If he does, I wish he would share it with us.

Senator Roblin: \$1 billion is pretty substantial.

Senator MacEachen: \$2 billion is even more so.

Senator Frith: It is just twice as substantial; half full or half empty.

Senator Tremblay: I asked myself the same question about the implication of the ruling on your proposal, which is on page 4 or 5 of the report. That is where you present the principle of the tripartite financing system. That amendment was not declared out of order, if you noticed.

Senator MacEachen: Oh, yes, I sure did.

Senator Tremblay: I am just starting from that amendment, which does refer to Table 2.

Senator MacEachen: Oh, yes.

Senator Tremblay: So I think it is clear that if you start from this amendment, which has been declared in order, and take its wording as it is, to establish numbers you have to act as if Table 2 could be considered. However, if it is out of order, and if we have to exclude amendment No. 7, or whatever number we have in mind—

Senator MacEachen: No. 7, yes.

Senator Tremblay: If I have to exclude all that in my analysis I am left with \$450 million for training and other activities like that, which will be financed through the general budget of the government.

Senator MacEachen: But where does the \$400 million come from? I would just like to know that.

Senator Tremblay: It is what I get from the department as the best estimate of the expenses coming from the items covered in amendment number—I will not have to go back to my office to find it. I have it here, if I can ask for a few seconds of your patience. I believe it is 26. Anyway, in French, those are the items.

[Translation]

a) for paying the costs of courses and programs mentioned in section 26;

d) for assisting claimants in starting a business or becoming self-employed; and

e) for providing to claimants incentives to accept employment quickly, including bonuses and temporary earnings supplements.