

Also yesterday I tabled a statement by my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, along with the amended agreement between Chrysler and the Canadian government and the revised operating and financing plan of Chrysler Canada Ltd.

On the specific details, I would refer honourable senators to that material for guidance. Senator Doody mentioned the figure of \$681 million. This refers to planned expenditures by Chrysler Canada only, in Canada, through 1985. These expenditures are detailed in the company's revised operating plan.

In support of these investments, the federal government is making available a total of \$150 million in loan guarantees in 1983 and 1984. That \$150 million consists of \$100 million for the van/wagon project and \$50 million for the K car project.

Reference was made yesterday to an additional \$50 million in loan guarantees over and above this. That will be available only if, and to the extent that, significant projects, such as the reopening of the Windsor engine plant, are introduced by Chrysler into its plan and are acceptable to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

With specific reference to the question raised by Senator Balfour, I am assuming that the honourable senator was referring to Chrysler's production-to-sales ratio requirements under the Auto Pact.

As my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, has indicated, it is not the intent of the government to penalize the company during its current difficulties.

Given the complexity of the issue and the fact that there will be continuing consultations amongst the parties concerned, including the United States—which, I am sure, honourable senators would not wish to prejudice—I am limiting my remarks to what I have said and would refer honourable senators to the agreement.

● (1450)

THE CONSTITUTION

ABBREVIATED FORM OF MOTION FOR ADDRESS AUTHORIZED

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, with your permission I should like briefly to deal with a housekeeping problem. Honourable senators will have noticed that, since the introduction of the motion for the Address to Her Majesty, the full motion and the full text of the Constitution Act, 1981, and all of the provisions including the appendices, are printed each day. The like situation has obtained in the other place, but they solved their problem yesterday by passing an order to the effect that the entire material I have referred to will be printed only at the beginning of each week, and all that will appear then in the *Votes and Proceedings* of the House—which is their version of our *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate*—will be the following short statement:

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Roberts, for an Address to

Her Majesty the Queen respecting the Constitution of Canada.

Without wishing to follow slavishly what they do there, we could adopt the same procedure here. To that end, I have conferred with my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, and I understand that he is willing to second a motion that I should like to put.

I ask leave to move:

That it be ordered that the motion for an Address to Her Majesty the Queen respecting the Constitution of Canada be printed in the following abbreviated form in the Orders of the Day, the *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate* and the *Debates of the Senate*:

“Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Perrault, seconded by the Honourable Senator Frith:

That an Address be presented to Her Majesty the Queen respecting the Constitution of Canada.”,

and that the full text of the main motion be printed in the Orders of the Day for the first sitting day of each week; that the full text of any motion in amendment be printed each day until disposed of; and that the full text of the main motion be printed in the *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate* for the day a vote is taken on an amendment and for the day that the main motion is finally disposed of.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, is leave granted?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Frith, seconded by the Honourable Senator Flynn, P.C.—

Some Hon. Senators: Dispense.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Hon. John M. Godfrey: Honourable senators, why is it felt necessary to republish the entire text every Tuesday? That only has the effect of avoiding its publication on Wednesdays and Thursdays, and it has already been published several times and will also be republished each time an amendment is moved.

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, the reason for publishing it at the beginning of each week is that the debate will be recommenced each week and it is expected that the matter will be on the Orders of the Day each week. However, if it is the wish of the Senate to make an order requiring us not to reprint it at all, I would be content with that. I suggest, though, that we try the procedure set out in my motion for a week or two, and if that, too, seems burdensome, perhaps we could dispense with it at that point.

Senator Godfrey: I was not suggesting that it not be reprinted at all but that we could simply do away with its being reprinted automatically.

Senator Frith: It would be reprinted automatically only at the first of each week.

Senator Godfrey: Because it will be reprinted when amendments are moved, I thought that the automatic reprinting on Tuesdays could also be done away with.

Hon. Jacques Flynn (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I wish to confirm that I do agree with the Deputy Leader of the Government on this motion. I should also like to suggest that the matter be considered by the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, which could deal not only with this particular problem and the suggestion made by Senator Godfrey but also with the problem of other matters that remain on the order paper for lengthy periods of time, which is both costly and useless.

I am not, incidentally, criticizing senators for having questions that are long outstanding. For instance, I am certainly not criticizing Senator Macquarrie because he has questions concerning Irish moss which have been in the *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate* since last May; but I suppose that if they had been printed once every two weeks or so that would have been sufficient. In other words, there is the problem of economy. However, I realize that there would also be a problem, from the individual senator's point of view, that senators desire to have their questions replied to as quickly as possible, and that might require having their questions printed frequently.

In any event, I think the whole problem should be referred to the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, and that for the time being we should adopt Senator Frith's motion.

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I support the observations made by the Leader of the Opposition on the additional matters.

Hon. Douglas D. Everett: I should like to say to the Honourable Senator Flynn that I can sympathize with him in respect of Senator Macquarrie's not receiving an answer to his questions, because I put a question, I believe it was five times, to Senator de Cotret when he was sitting on this side, and I still have not had an answer. It just occurs to me that perhaps Senator Flynn could get an answer for me some time.

Senator Flynn: I think that would be rather irregular, but I find it interesting. It might be more appropriate if you were to put your question to the new administration, since it has had more time to deal with the question than we had.

Senator Everett: That is a good point; I will do that.

Senator Frith: You might have to wait a long time, if you wait for another administration to deal with the question.

Motion agreed to.

[Senator Godfrey.]

INCOME TAX ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

The Senate resumed from Tuesday, February 10, the debate on the motion of Senator McIlraith for the second reading of Bill C-54, to amend the statute law relating to income tax.

Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I am bold enough to trespass on your patience this afternoon to discuss Bill C-54, although I know there are other important matters scheduled to come to our attention today. It has been a long time since this bill had its genesis in October of last year, and I sometimes wonder what the relevancy of a debate can be after such a period has elapsed.

Nevertheless, it may be useful to acknowledge the fact that I was much interested in the introduction of Bill C-54, which was presented to us, if I may say so, in a proper and commendable manner by the Honourable Senator McIlraith, who gave us an abbreviated reprise of the budget introduction of October of last year.

I must say that when I listened to Senator McIlraith I thought of that old wedding jingle that we all know: "Something old, something new, something borrowed, something blue." That, in a few words, describes my opinion of the budget speech that we heard last year. As you will gather from the tenor of my remarks, mine is not an altogether favourable opinion, because Bill C-54, in spite of the jingle, is no happy marriage of progressive economic forces, but rather a sullen union of inflation and unemployment.

The borrowed items stand out pretty clearly. They all come from the Progressive Conservative budget of November, 1979. I will mention some of them. The tax credit relief to be provided in respect of wages for spouses surfaced again in October, and I am glad of that. It was good to know that recognition was given to the work of volunteer firemen, not an important matter in terms of dollars but important socially, and I am glad of that. I was happy to see in that budget, too, a repeat of the proposal of the Progressive Conservative government that there should be a form of interest relief for the small business sector of our economy. Heaven knows that in these days of interest rates of unheard of proportions such a consideration is justified. I am glad to see that some of these happily borrowed items survived from the notorious—I think that is the correct word—the notorious budget of Mr. Crosbie of December, 1979. But if that is all that was borrowed, then I believe the taxpayers are entitled to feel not only a little blue but a little bruised. The October statement included no relief from energy taxes and energy pricing problems, or for people in the lower half of our income structure. It seems so long ago that perhaps we should remind ourselves of what was included in the budget of 1979, of which the deputy government leader does not approve, although I believe it commends itself more to him than he thinks.

● (1500)

That budget provided monthly \$80 per adult and \$30 per child in protection against energy price increases. Everyone