

Guarantee of Loans to Small Businesses

NAYS

Messrs:

Badanal	Howard
Benidickson	Leduc
Bourget	McMillan
Bourque	Martin (Essex East)
Caron	Mitchell
Carter	Nixon
Chevrier	Peters
Crestohl	Pickersgill
Denis	Pitman
Dumas	Racine
Eudes	Ratelle
Fisher	Richard (St. Maurice- Laféche)
Forgie	Roberge
Godin	Robichaud
Habel	Tucker—31.
Herridge	

And the house having resumed in committee:

The Chairman: Order. Now that the house has confirmed the decision of the Chair with regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cartier the committee will resume consideration of clause 2 of Bill No. C-40.

(Translation):

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I have a question concerning subsection 3, paragraph 4 of section 2. Could the minister tell the house whether rural telephone companies are included among service businesses?

(Text):

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Service businesses naturally cover a wide range of enterprises. Some of them, for instance, cleaning establishments, are already covered under the industrial development bank. There are various service categories under the heading, and that is one example.

(Translation):

Mr. Racine: My point is this, Mr. Chairman: Are rural telephone companies included among the service businesses mentioned in this bill?

(Text):

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I would say, no, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Having in mind the number of people who are out of work in this country, I take it the minister has given some consideration to the number of men and women who would likely be put back to work as a result of these measures which the government is bringing forward at this time. Would the minister make a statement with regard to this matter?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I made a statement on that subject over a week ago when the bill was before the committee of the whole. If the hon. member will look back in the record he will find that I gave the committee the estimate which was given by

the leading organization of retail merchants in Canada, that there is work in the renovation and improvement of premises which would probably involve \$75 million in loans. That amount of work is, in their view, available, and would go forward if this measure ever is passed. We have been discussing this measure for four days now, and I suggest that the time has come to get on with this legislation and show that we really mean to help small business and provide the employment.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The minister says he wants to get on with this bill, and so do we, and we have been co-operating in this house.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The Minister of Finance, who now displays synthetic anger, ought to indicate to the committee in precise terms how many men are going to be put to work as a result of this measure. He says it is possible that \$75 million will be provided by guaranteed loans but that is no indication how many men and women will be put to work under this scheme. The scheme is restricted under clause 2(d)(i)(ii) (iii) to a limited form of assistance. If the hon. gentleman had accepted an earlier amendment providing for assistance for the purchase of enterprises in order to assist the private sector, then the bill would really be an effective measure for putting people back to work, but in the absence of a more precise reply from the minister we can only conclude that the government has no idea how many men this measure will put back to work.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): And the government can only conclude that the opposition has had its tongue in its cheek all the way through this session to date. They started by professing their desire to expedite legislation designed to increase employment. Well, we have been engaged on this measure for four days. The hon. member talks about co-operation. We were on the second reading and the discussion of the clauses of this bill all day yesterday and all day today; far from seeing any evidence of co-operation, I see a succession of frivolous amendments introduced for the purpose of obstructing this measure. We have now spent the equivalent of a full day just discussing the definitions in the measure, the definition clause of the bill.

Mr. Howard: On a point of order, I understood the Minister of Finance to say that the amendments which had been introduced and, presumably, the one I had introduced, were frivolous and for the purpose of obstruction.

An hon. Member: All right, admit it.