

down the road? Honourable senators, I am sure you are aware that people convicted of manslaughter can be released after two or three years. That is not the case for poor people who leave their job.

Does the government understand what kind of menacing weapon this puts in the hands of employers, and what uses may be made of that menace? It can hang over the heads of workers if they do not do exactly what they are told. If they are five minutes late, or unable to come to work because of sickness, they may be deemed to be guilty and penalized for up to six years.

I would again ask my friends on this side to think about the gravity of this kind of legislation. I hear our Prime Minister saying that we are a tolerant society, and I believe Canadians are tolerant—we have shown over the years that we are prepared to help the poor in our society. Why don't my colleagues wake up? I appeal to their better human nature and ask them to tell Mrs. McDougall that in 1990, after six years of economic boom, we are now heading towards a slowdown in the economy, when everyone agrees that there could well be more unemployed next year. Where has the Government of Canada been for six years? If they wanted to be so radical, why did they not introduce this kind of legislation in 1984 or in 1985, when the economy was on the upswing? Don't they realize what they are doing to the people of Canada who cannot defend themselves? They say they will train these people. In Canso I talked to a 53-year-old woman who worked in the fish plant. She asked us, "What are they going to train me for—singing and dancing? I'm kind of old for that." I agree that training is needed.

This afternoon someone mentioned Walter Gordon and the suggestion he made about moving people from Atlantic Canada. As you know, the Liberal government and the Liberal Party certainly paid the price for listening to that suggestion in 1957. My friends, if you think that this government is not going to pay the price, you have another think coming.

The government is saying it will give \$15,000 to people to move. To move where? To do what? As bad as it is in the Atlantic provinces, a family—a husband and a wife and three or four children—is better off without a job in Atlantic Canada than getting \$15,000 to move to Toronto and then not being able to find a job there. This is one of the things the government says it is going to do under Bill C-21.

● (16:40)

I am pleased that we are at least amending the penalty clause, if the bill is not to be killed, because the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate felt that it might be too much to ask the Minister of Finance to absorb what he might have planned with respect to Bill C-21. No one will ever make me believe that Bill C-21 is a product of the Minister of Employment and Immigration. It is a product of the Minister of Finance.

I do not know how many people have figured this one out. I do not know what the budget says, but people are saying that the Minister of Finance should cut \$3 billion or \$4 billion out of the deficit. Do you know that Bill C-21 is a \$4 billion item?

[Senator Thériault.]

It is a \$4 billion item, \$2.8 billion of which the Government of Canada contributed in 1988 to help finance the unemployment insurance program in areas of high unemployment. It is at least as much this year, \$2.8 billion or \$3 billion, plus \$1.2 billion that the government is going to get from the employers and employees of Canada, starting in 1990. It has already started collecting higher premiums, which would provide it with another \$1.2 billion.

If the budget contains a reduction in the deficit of \$4 billion today, it will mean the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Employment and Immigration have gone into the pockets of the employers and employees of Canada to plug that \$4 billion hole. Honourable senators, we are suggesting that we return the penalty clause to what it was before. There are stories to be told. If I repeated some of the things I heard from the employees and some of the employers, not a single person in Canada would support Bill C-21 if they really knew what it was aiming to do.

Honourable senators, like my leader, I respect the decision of His Honour the Speaker, because I agree with the theory that the Senate should not levy taxation or increase expenditures. I accept that, but I will not be satisfied with the accuracy of the figures supplied to the Speaker until two years have elapsed. There is a fundamental difference between what the government says will happen as a result of Bill C-21 and what four or five other reliable organizations have told us will happen.

According to the government, my province of New Brunswick could lose \$70 million; but three other organizations, with all of their facts and figures, have said we could lose up to \$165 million. Can you imagine what that could do to the economy of my province, especially when that \$165 million would come from the poorest people?

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Norbert L. Thériault: Honourable senators, I would not have accepted all of the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition if I had not been assured that I could move another amendment. I am about to do that.

Honourable senators, I move, seconded by—Senator Kirby is not here, so maybe Senator Simard.

An Hon. Senator: Don't hold your breath!

Senator Denis: He will never do it!

Senator Thériault: Honourable senators, I move:

That the Report be not now adopted but that it be amended

(a) by deleting, on the third page of Appendix A, the first three lines of amendment number 8 and substituting the following:

"8. Page 33, clause 53: Strike out clause 53 and substitute the following new clause:

53.(1) All that portion of subsection 130(1) of the said Act"