

we know that where a company is granted a power it can exercise that power. Do not let us pass the bill on the assumption that the company says it is not going to exercise the power.

The WITNESS: Don't you think you should clarify that. You have told the committee we have made loans against endorsements last year.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: You made one.

The WITNESS: Would you not like to know what that was?

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Very well.

The WITNESS: That was a case where a man had his security by his landlord for arrears of rent, and we took a renewal note.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: It does not alter my argument a particle. My argument is this that they have the power to grant loans on endorsed paper. Furthermore, I know from my experience with companies that the board of directors can meet any time and change the policy of the company. This company may find it attractive to go into that field, and they can do it if they so wish. But to come back to this point I raised a moment ago, I have not had time and one should not be asked in a discussion of this kind—one should not be expected to present the exact worked-out figures. I present this and I think any member of the committee who will look at it with an open mind will agree with me that this constitutes a relinquishment of the protection to the borrower: "The company shall expressly permit the borrower to repay the loan, or any part thereof, at any time before its due date without notice or bonus."

Let me say to hon. members that I listened to the discussion last year and to the evidence given before the senate committee which has been so frequently referred to. I followed it carefully, and this particular point was raised over and over again and the senate found difficulty in finding a formula that would accomplish this point; and it is one of the things that has been resisted; but here we find the company in its substitute bill very calmly and skilfully eliminating that. The substitution—

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Stevens has invited my interruption, which he objected to before. I think he has made a statement there that is not supported by those who were sitting day after day before the senate committee. We were encouraged to leave in the provision to take a bonus. We thought it was better for the borrower to take it out. Now, we were not asked to take it out this time, and we thought it might be appreciated. Now, apparently, Mr. Stevens is appreciating it now and wants us to give way on both points. If we got 2½ per cent we are prepared to leave it in, but don't kick us both ways.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: With all due regard to the interruption—

Mr. WALKER: You asked for it.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: I asked to be advised on fact.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I was there every day, and I say that Mr. Stevens' recollection does not coincide with mine.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Very good. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the practice of contradicting flatly what a person says is not in order with the procedure of committees, but we will let that pass. As I stated before I sat in that committee—not all the time, because I was not so vitally interested, but I sat very frequently as a spectator, and while I am not going to dispute the statement that has been made my recollection is, and I discussed it with several senators, that many of them at least were very strongly of the view that this