

parliament legislated that it meant that we could charge 2 per cent a month in effect as interest." Now, is that not creating a vested right in a company to come to us later on and say, "you have passed a law under which we gave up our right as a creditor to become only a shareholder." If that is not creating a vested right, then I would like to hear somebody prove that it is not.

The CHAIRMAN: That is why it was suggested that Mr. Stevens examine the company, and then we can form our conclusions after hearing the result of the examination.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, but counsel has spoken for the company.

The CHAIRMAN: No. He spoke in reply to one question. Mr. Stevens asked the right to examine the company if that is the wish of the committee. Now, is that the wish of the committee?

Hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: I take it that the committee's opinion is that we should proceed on the assumption that this clause is to be adopted and the power of increasing the capital granted.

Mr. TUCKER: To test the attitude of the committee, I was attempting to make a motion that section 2 be struck out; because if it is the opinion of the committee—and the members understand the question pretty well—that section 2 should be struck out and the company should not be given the right to increase its capital, we will save a lot of time. I would move that if I could get a seconder.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: You do not need a seconder.

Mr. TUCKER: I shall make a motion that section 2 of this proposed bill be struck out.

Mr. CLEAVER: I have an amendment which I would like to move to section 2, if Mr. Tucker would not mind me crowding in ahead of his motion, so that the whole matter could be before the committee when the motion is voted on.

The CHAIRMAN: Speak to Mr. Tucker's motion in the meantime.

Mr. CLEAVER: In the meantime, speaking to that motion, it seems to me that from time immemorial people have been borrowing small loans from their fellows on account of unexpected contingencies which necessarily arise in human life, and thinking the matter over it does seem to me that there are only three sources from which these loans could be borrowed: one, from government sources—and no one has suggested that the government should go into the small loan business—secondly, from credit unions—and this committee has heard evidence to the effect that many borrowers, and some of those who need the loans most urgently, are unable to borrow from credit unions because their credit is not good enough—therefore, it seems to me necessarily to follow that the only source from which these needy people can borrow money is from private capital. Therefore, I am rather firmly convinced that in the interests of these private borrowers—and I am interested in them, and I am interested that they should borrow at the lowest possible rate—it does seem to me that a properly constituted and properly regulated source is the best place from which they should borrow rather than from a private individual who has turned shylock, shall I say, and rather than from provincial companies who are operating without any regulations at all. Now, that being the case I have not any hesitancy in saying that I believe a company such as the one we are now discussing is the right type of set-up and is one which we should encourage rather than discourage. These men have been shrewd enough