

Small Businesses Loans Act

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: All those opposed to the motion please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: In my opinion the nays have it.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Amendment (Mr. Gagliano) negatived.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: We shall now move to the next question. Mr. Gagliano, seconded by Mr. Baker, moved:

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".

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: All those in favour please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: All those opposed please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: In my opinion the nays have it.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Amendment (Mr. Gagliano) negatived.

• (1640)

Mr. Baker: Point of order. I wonder if the Chair can explain why it changed the pattern of voting on this clause.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: There were two ways of doing it. The first time I did not call the yeas and nays and count the votes. If Hon. Members had wanted a count I certainly would have asked for it. As I was told the amendment was negatived on division a count was not necessary.

Shall Clause 3 now carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (for the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion) moved that Bill C-63, as amended, be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): When shall the Bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Valcourt (for the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion) moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Madam Speaker, this Bill receiving third reading is one of the worst Bills presented to the House of Commons probably in this century.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker: It is a black mark against fishermen. I am surprised at certain Members from fishing provinces where hundreds of fishermen thought they had guarantees from the Government. They do not have money to spare. They are not rich people. They do not get a guaranteed income like Members of Parliament do. They do not get a salary cheque every month. They are at the whim of the weather, the fish, international affairs, the French, American and Russian fishing fleets, and the European Economic Community. Now we see the Government of Canada removing the only guaranteed loans program they had. The Government has removed the guarantee and put in a fee. It has created two classes of primary producers. We have just dealt with the Fisheries Improvement Loans Program and told the fishermen of Canada what we are going to do with them, and in a few minutes we are going to deal with the Farm Improvement Loans Program. The fishermen's program is thrown clean out the window.

You will notice that the two programs are almost identical, only one word is different. Yet that one word makes a big difference to the Government. The Government has said it is going to throw one Act out the window and reinstate the other one. The fishermen are going to wonder why.

Does anyone really believe that under this Act the fishermen in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland or P.E.I. are going to get a loan from a bank manager? Why would a bank manager issue a fisherman a loan under this piece of paper here? They will not. There is no 100 per cent guarantee. They are not going to