

The Hon. the SPEAKER: It is moved by Hon. Senator Robinson that the debate be adjourned until to-morrow. Are you ready for the question?

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I think my honourable friend from the East (Hon. Mr. Robinson) is up to his old tricks again and is perpetrating a joke on us. It seems to me very clear that nobody objects to the passage of this Bill, but everybody in either House is agreeable to it. Then why postpone it for another day to see if something may not turn up? I think my honourable friend would be well advised to wait for another Bill on which to move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: Honourable members, I am always prepared to take the advice of the right honourable gentleman from Eganville (Right Hon. Mr. Graham). I suggested a postponement only out of deference to the honourable gentleman from North York (Hon. Sir Allen Aylesworth), who, I thought, might like to make some comments, and would appreciate an opportunity to read the discussion. I think there is a great deal of legislation that ought to be repealed.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Does the honourable gentleman withdraw his motion?

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: Yes.

The motion for the second reading of the Bill was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

Hon. Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH: Honourable members, I would suggest that there is nothing in this Bill needing the services of any committee, and with the consent of the House I would move the third reading now.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.

PRIVATE BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. Mr. MARCOTTE moved the second reading of Bill B, an Act to incorporate Domestic Finance Corporation.

He said: Honourable senators, I do not think the House will need much explanation of this measure, because it is exactly along the lines of previous bills that were passed in both Houses, more especially in 1933-34. The Bill incorporates a company to go into the business of lending money to the public. A most important part of such bills, as a rule, is that

governing the charges that can be made, or the rate of interest. As honourable senators know, this is covered by general legislation, under the Interest Act, the Money Lenders Act and the Loan Companies Act, especially as amended in 1934. If second reading is given to the Bill I should like to have it referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, where it would be thoroughly explained.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable members of the Senate, during the last few years—the period may extend back eight or ten years, for the years pass very rapidly—we have incorporated a certain number of similar societies or companies, whose object is the lending of money under certain safeguards or restrictions. I understand that one or perhaps two such companies will seek amendments to their charters this session. So far as Canada is concerned, such legislation as this is experimental; but I believe there has been a longer experience with it in the United States. I think the Banking and Commerce Committee will have to give some study to the whole question of how this past legislation has worked, and that may influence the committee in dealing with the present Bill. I do not object to the second reading.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Honourable members, I do not intend to object to the second reading either. I know that in previous years measures have been passed somewhat parallel to this, but whether or not the feature to which I now call attention is the same in those previous measures I am not certain. It appears that there is need for this class of company. At all events, legislation of the more advanced countries of the world seems to provide for it. The essential feature would seem to me to be that the company be compelled to make plain to its customers exactly what they are paying, and that the Bill prevent any device or subterfuge that covers up the real cost of the borrowing. I thought I found in some of the terms of this Bill expressions which would make it possible for that cost to be somewhat misunderstood by the borrower. While I consent to the giving of the second reading, I do not want it understood that with respect to this feature I am in agreement.

It would seem to me that the time has come when we might have a general measure. Why a separate bill should be required for every finance company wanting to make these small loans is a mystery. It is true that up to now it has always been necessary to have a bill in each case. I have the