

Canada. I asked the minister to explain that and he has failed to do so.

● (1425)

Senator Olson: Honourable senators, I fail to follow that kind of convoluted reasoning. If my honourable friend wants to pick out selected figures and does not want to look at both sides of the ledger, then that is his option if he wants to make that kind of distorted convoluted argument. What I gave him was a balance between the two. He claims that in 1981 there was an outflow of \$15 billion, which he said was something like six times larger than some other date that he arbitrarily picked. That kind of selected statistic does not impress me. I told the honourable senator that for the first three quarters of 1981—and these are the only figures that are available—there was a net capital inflow of \$10.4 billion. If he wants to selectively pick out this one or that one, he can get even more distorted figures than he gave, but it is not a very intelligent exercise.

Senator Balfour: Honourable senators, I am sorry that the minister finds it necessary to denigrate my intelligence.

Senator Olson: I said that if the honourable senator wanted to select convoluted figures, it meant nothing.

Senator Balfour: I put to the minister two straightforward figures. The first was the average capital outflow during the 1970s, a 10-year period, which is very simple for the minister to understand. I also presented to him the capital outflow figure for four quarters ending September 30, 1981. I pointed out that the figure was six times the average in the preceding decade and I asked him, as the Minister of State for Economic Development, to offer an explanation for that alarming figure. He is a member of the government and he should have those figures at his fingertips, and also the explanation.

Senator Olson: Honourable senators, it is like a lot of other things. We can always take dollar figures and flows for a certain year, back 10 years or whatever, and pick out certain figures. The honourable senator is picking out capital outflows, but what he does not put into the equation is that the totality of flows in both directions has gone up rather substantially. I am also saying that he should balance it out and be fair about it by looking at both sides of the account. The interpretation that he tried to put on his analysis—wherever he got his figures from, I don't know—is an unfair assessment.

Senator Balfour: Honourable senators, I now ask two short supplementary questions. First, does the minister disagree with my analysis?

Senator Olson: Yes.

Senator Balfour: Secondly, is the minister refusing to answer the question?

Senator Olson: Honourable senators, the minister disagrees with the type of analysis that is being made, and he is not refusing to answer the question because he has just answered it in great detail.

INDUSTRY

MASSEY-FERGUSON LIMITED—GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Hon. Nathan Nurgitz: Honourable senators, I have a question for the Minister of State for Economic Development. Massey-Ferguson is currently seeking to ease the terms of its refinancing agreement reached last summer—at least, its officers are talking about this matter, and certainly accounts in the media indicate that the private bankers are saying that the company will have some considerable difficulty in renegotiating with them for more financial aid. Could the minister indicate if Massey-Ferguson has made any overtures to the government seeking either an increase or some modification of its present loan guarantees over and above the \$125 million given last year?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of State for Economic Development): Honourable senators, no, not to my knowledge. I do not believe that Massey-Ferguson has approached the government for any change at all, but I will check into the matter. All I know is that there has been some speculation in the press that the company is trying to ease—I believe that is the word used in the press—some of the terms and conditions in connection with the refinancing package with the banks. However, I have not heard of any overtures being made to the government.

● (1430)

THE SENATE

SEATING PLAN—REQUEST FOR CHANGES IN BROCHURE

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have a delayed answer to, or at least a follow-up on, a question that was asked by Senator Godfrey on the subject of the seating plan for this chamber. I told Senator Godfrey that I would be making this report, and he advised me that in his opinion this is a propitious time for doing so because he first asked the question a year ago today.

What has happened in the meantime, as some honourable senators may know, is that work has gone forward with regard to the seating plan, the brochure, and information material intended to be handed to guests, tourists and others who may be interested. It has been studied by the Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration Committee, and of course there will be a more detailed report from the chairman of that committee at some later stage. At the moment, I just want to report on the specific question asked by Senator Godfrey.

You remember, honourable senators, that Senator Godfrey's question referred to the problems arising from the seating plan with regard to the designation, province and party affiliation of senators. The plan is to have a printed brochure, telling something about the Senate, with the picture that was taken earlier. That picture is excellent, by the way. In general, I would say that a lot of promise is demonstrated in this brochure.

The intention is also to include with the brochure, but separate, a seating plan. It, of course, will change from time to time for various reasons.