

*Oral Questions***CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION**VANCOUVER—TELEVISION RECEPTION OF PROCEEDINGS OF
HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. As the minister will know, this House authorized the broadcasting, on a live basis, of the proceedings of the House to be transmitted by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

I would like to ask the minister why it is that the CBC was unable, as of three-quarters of an hour ago, to bring this service to the city of Vancouver, and when he might expect that to begin.

● (1200)

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of the arrangements which have been made. Of course, arrangements have been made in conjunction with cable companies across the country, and it may be that there is some difficulty in the Vancouver area with finding a cable company interested in availing itself of the services which the CBC is offering. I will look into the matter and report back to the hon. member.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

LOANS UNDER SMALL BUSINESSES LOANS ACT

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue and Minister of State for Small Business, and it has to do with loans made under the Small Businesses Loans Act.

Statistics issued by the minister's department last week tell of drastic increases in the number of loans made in 1978. However, many small businesses in southern Ontario still find that bankers will not make loans under the act. Can the minister say when he will take steps to put teeth into the legislation so that more small businesses can take advantage of this program?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of National Revenue and Minister of State (Small Business)): Mr. Speaker, unquestionably the banks have in the past shown a lack of enthusiasm for the Small Businesses Loans Act, but the statistics last year, considering that the changes were only implemented in March or April, indicate that well over twice the number of loans were made under the act in 1978 compared with the previous year.

A good many more Canadian businesses are applying and qualifying for loans under the act, and I feel sure that if the hon. member encourages bankers in his own area, as I do, to offer the benefits under the act, more businessmen will be able to take advantage of it. The fact is that it is a useful act and that more businessmen and bankers are taking advantage of it every day.

[Miss Bégin.]

Mr. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Departmental statistics show an increase last year of over 750 loans in Quebec and over 500 in British Columbia. Yet in Ontario the increase was only 275 loans. Can the minister explain why action is not taken to make these loans equally available to Ontario businessmen who find their applications rejected by bankers who would rather make loans at higher interest rates than those provided by the act?

Mr. Abbott: I do not doubt that when the hon. member offers some numbers, he is drawing them from some source, but I would like to check those figures. I question the figure stated by the hon. member when he says that only 275 loans were made in Ontario under that act; I cannot believe that that is accurate.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. COSSITT—DISALLOWANCE OF STANDING ORDER 43 MOTION

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which stems from my motion under Standing Order 43 which I attempted to raise in the House a short while ago, and I do so with all due respect to the Chair. I should like to make, if I may, the following points. First, in dealing with the preamble to the motion which I was not permitted to read, I would say that it was short and could not be ruled out on the basis of being lengthy. It is probably one of the shortest preambles—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before the hon. member goes any further I have to call to his attention a ruling which I made in the House about a month ago, on February 13, which was, as he knows, a ruling made after a prolonged discussion of motions pursuant to Standing Order 43 and the entire procedure in respect of that. That discussion took place before Christmas and I reserved my judgment on it for a very long time.

As I indicated in the ruling—and I want to quote the specific language which appears at page 3164 of *Hansard*—there was a consensus on all sides of the House that enforcement of that order should be a little more rigid in order to rule out a number of applications of a certain nature which might be of interest to the House but do not appear to be urgent. On that day I said the following:

Drawing upon this consensus, I hope members have noticed that since the day of this discussion I have intervened on several occasions to reject applications from both sides of the House which contained inflammatory preambles which are of a purely partisan nature, which lack urgency, and which are frivolous; and even today I set aside one of those applications which came from the government side of the House.

On that day, the hon. member may recall, the application which I set aside was made by a member on the government side to introduce a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43, and the preamble was critical of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) and about some speech he had made. I did not permit him to go even so far as to put the motion because, drawing, as