

*Guarantee of Loans to Small Businesses*

granted by the government is something difficult to understand. It is certainly a limitation of the scope of this bill, the function of which is to assist small businesses.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** It is quite clear from the remarks of the hon. member that he realizes himself that the amendment is extending the scope of the bill and, consequently, the charge upon the crown.

**The Chairman:** I would be interested in hearing the hon. member for Cartier address himself to the question of whether or not his amendment would be a repetition of the one moved by the hon. member for Levis or the one moved by the hon. member for Laurier.

**Mr. Crestohl:** First of all, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Laurier was an attempt to add a new definition to clause 2. As I said before, clause 2 does not contain a definition of "lender". If you look at the amendment moved by the hon. member for Laurier you will find that his objective was to add a definition of "lender". Since that was defeated I have attempted to extend the interpretation of the word "bank", which is not the same thing.

In this case, of course, banks are the ones that would be the lenders. I respectfully submit that adding a wider definition of what may be a bank under this bill is not the same as adding another subclause to define the word "lender".

As to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Levis, he addressed himself to credit unions or caisses populaires. I have distinctly not included or named credit unions or caisses populaires. Not one of the amendments submitted so far have requested the addition of trust companies, insurance companies or loan companies, which are authorized by their charters to make loans. I am now making this request for the first time. I should like to ask the minister just why he wants to limit this power to the banks. Trust companies are certainly as reputable as banks; insurance companies are as reputable as banks, and they are all privately owned organizations operating under government charter. I cannot understand the minister's insistence upon limiting the measure to banks.

*(Translation):*

**Mr. Caron:** Mr. Chairman, I rise with regard to the objection raised by the minister. The minister said that, if the amendment were agreed to, it would have the effect of enlarging the charge upon the crown. Now, if we read the bill a little further we see that in section 6 there is a limit of \$300 million—

**The Chairman:** I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. member, but I asked the com-

mittee to give me their views on the possibility of this amendment being substantially different from the one suggested by the hon. member for Levis (Mr. Bourget) and the amendment moved by the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Chevrier). It is mainly on that point that I want to hear hon. members.

**Mr. Caron:** I am sorry to have to differ from you, Mr. Chairman, but when the minister stated his position, he mentioned the fact that the charge upon the crown would be enlarged. Now, in view of this part of the legislation being as important as the other and also in view of enabling the chairman to render a decision with regard to this matter, I believe that we have the right to reply to the minister's objections before any ruling is given.

**The Chairman:** I want to point out to the hon. member for Hull that it is the Chair's discretion to hear any arguments. Apparently, I have not made myself clear, and I wish to say that what I want is to hear arguments on the suggestion that this amendment is but a repetition of the former amendment. That is the only point on which I want to be enlightened before I give a ruling.

**Mr. Caron:** Does Your Honour intend to rule at this time that the argument advanced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) is not valid? If that is your intention, my argument is useless and you are right in asking me to sit down. But if the Chair rules that the views expressed by the Minister of Finance are valid, well, there—

**The Chairman:** I thought it was unnecessary to make a blueprint for the hon. member.

**Mr. Caron:** Without wanting a blueprint and this is an important matter, because there are all kinds of blueprints—I say that when a minister or any member starts a discussion, we are entitled to reply.

**The Chairman:** This is not a question of debate, we are simply dealing with a point of order, and I see that the hon. member for Hull has no argument to bring up on the point I emphasized. I shall therefore immediately give a ruling.

*(Text):*

The only point which I think important in appreciating this new amendment is whether or not it is, in substance, a repetition of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Levis, which was ruled out of order because it was, in substance, the same amendment as one moved by the hon. member for Laurier which was negated by the committee today. Although I would say that