Small Businesses Loans Act

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The Hon. Member's question should relate to Clause 3.

Mr. Gagliano: Before putting my amendments I would like the Minister to clarify the difference between the 100 per cent guarantee and the 85 per cent guarantee. It cannot be found in Clauses Nos. 3, 4, or 5—anywhere in the Bill. Will fishermen have a loan guarantee of 100 per cent or 85 per cent? That is what I want to know.

Mr. Valcourt: When a Bill before the House intends to modify only certain sections of the Act, only those sections are reflected.

The section about which the Hon. Member is talking is in the Act but it is not one of those which are being amended. I cannot tell him how he should procedurally try to make an amendment in this regard; it is not my job.

Mr. Gagliano: Then I will move my amendments. I regret that we cannot get more information. This is the type of thing that happens when we pass Bills at the last moment. The difference between a loan guarantee of 100 per cent and one of 85 per cent is very important, especially where fishermen are concerned. However, because of the technical problem, we are unable to present a specific amendment to the portion dealing with the loan guarantee. Hopefully we will have another chance to come back to it.

Therefore I move:

That Bill C-63, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 5 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"one hundred and fifty thousand dollars."

As I mentioned earlier, this is to ensure that the limit of each loan will be $150,000. As the Small Businesses Loans Act now stands it is $100,000, and we propose that it should be $150,000 as was the case before under the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act. I think we should take this opportunity to amend the Small Businesses Loans Act in that regard. The amount of $100,000 was set under the Act in 1980. If we take into consideration only the inflation from 1980 to 1987, it is normal that it should be $150,000.

I hope the Minister will support such an amendment.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Does the Hon. Member have other amendments which he wishes to introduce at this time?

Mr. Gagliano: Yes, Madam Chairman. I move:

That Bill C-63, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 19 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"knowledge, did not exceed one hundred and fifty"

It is a technical amendment which goes along with the one I proposed before. Also I move:

That Bill C-63, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 24 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"not more than fifteen years after the date of"

This is to comply with the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act so that they have 15 years to repay their loans, since it is a reasonable length of time on a long-term loan. Under the Small Businesses Loans Act it is 10 years, so I have moved that the 15-year term should apply in the case of fisheries.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: To facilitate everyone, and with the permission of the Hon. Member, perhaps it would be easier to change the order in which he presented his amendments. Perhaps the first one could be the one striking out line 19 at page 2, followed by the one striking out line 24 at page 2, and finally the one striking out line 5 at page 3. Do I have the agreement of the mover and the seconder to do that?

Mr. Gagliano: Yes, Madam Chairman. I apologize. The amendments have been passed back and forth between my colleagues and I, and we must have inadvertently changed the order.

Mr. Valcourt: Madam Chairman, before we consider the amendments, I would like the Chair to rule on whether they are in order.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The Chair considers that the amendments are receivable. Mr. Gagliano moved:

That Bill C-63, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 19 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"knowledge did not exceed one hundred and fifty"

Is the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate.

Mr. Baker: Madam Chairman, I think the original motion is in the name of the official fisheries critic for the Official Opposition, the Hon. Member for Egmont.

• (1620)

Mr. Lewis: Madam Chairman, for my clarification, I heard you call the amendment and I heard the noes. Then the Hon. Member rose to speak. I want to know whether the Member is speaking on the amendment that, in my opinion, was just lost or is he speaking on the next amendment?

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: I did read the first amendment and asked the question before realizing that someone was rising on debate. We are debating the first amendment.

Mr. Baker: Madam Chairman, the Hon. Member will realize that you have to put the question before there can be any debate. Always. The question is put and then debate takes place. There cannot be any debate without the question being put. The Chair was absolutely correct in what the Chair did.

The first amendment, as I was saying, is proposed by the Member from Prince Edward Island, the official critic, the