

Mr. LANDERYOU: Until we have the opinion of the law offices of the crown as to whether or not the Central Finance Corporation has been entitled by law to charge the rates they have been charging up to the present.

Hon. Mr. DUNNING: It was on that qualification I desired to say a word. If the committee desires such an opinion from the Department of Justice it should indicate in writing upon what it desires an opinion and, perhaps, the Superintendent of Insurance would refer the question. The Department of Justice, of course, considers such questions quietly. You cannot summons law offices of the department here and ask them to give an interpretation of the law. The question will have to be set out. I suggest that if it is decided to adjourn, probably the Superintendent of Insurance may be entrusted by the committee with the job of formulating the question and submitting it to the department, provided it is made clear what the committee wants.

Mr. LANDERYOU: This whole matter is going to be before the courts before long. I understand there is going to be an appeal.

Hon. Mr. LAWSON: Mr. Vien raised the question that the motion to adjourn is not debatable. First, I want to take exception to that. It is not a motion to adjourn; it is a motion to adjourn for a specific purpose and, therefore, I say it is debatable. If you, Mr. Chairman, rule that way I can say all I have to say in a few minutes on the question of the motion to adjourn for a specific purpose. You will accomplish nothing but delay by this adjournment for this reason—

Mr. LANDERYOU: I would not say that.

Hon. Mr. LAWSON: All right. Disagree with me if you like, but let me finish. First, there has been a decision by a court of inferior jurisdiction in the province of Quebec that 7 per cent interest should not be allowed as a discount in the case of another company. Secondly, there has been a decision by a superior court in the province of Quebec which is directly contrary to the decision of the inferior court in the province of Quebec, and that second decision is in appeal. Now, how on earth can the law offices of the crown come before this committee and give an opinion, in view of the fact that the question is now before an appellate court, when the superior court decision was yea and the inferior court decision was nay. I submit that we cannot get anywhere that way, and, therefore, I oppose the motion to adjourn.

Mr. TUCKER: I was speaking when the point of order was raised and I would like to finish.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you speaking to the resolution?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes. The Central Finance Corporation, if this decision—the Kellie decision—the only decision, as I say, that stands and is not under appeal—is correct—

Hon. Mr. LAWSON: It cannot be appealed.

Mr. TUCKER: I do not care whether it can or not.

Hon. Mr. LAWSON: That is an amazing answer from a lawyer.

Mr. TUCKER: If you think it is, all right. According to that decision, with which I happen to agree in a humble sort of way—I believe when this parliament said that 7 per cent interest per annum can be charged it meant what it said. All right, the Household Finance Corporation or the Central Finance Corporation could charge 7 per cent and 2 per cent service charge discounted, and the—

The CHAIRMAN: Are you speaking to the motion?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes. I am speaking to the motion. I will come to it. And then there is \$7 that they can charge in regard to that chattel mortgage charge running the total amount that they could possibly charge up to a rate of 18 per cent per annum if that view of the law is correct. Now, we are in this