

*Private Bills*

subsidiary of a United States parent company. The company we are dealing with gets part of its finances from the United States parent company. I do not know the extent to which it was financed prior to the declaration by President Johnson of certain guide lines with respect to sending money out of the United States, but it certainly received a hefty chunk of finance from the parent company in years past, and this ties the company in even more directly with the United States parent.

As I understand it, even though the capital stock of the company is to be \$500,000 there is no intention of disposing of any of this stock through the stock market or otherwise. I may be wrong in this assumption, but from reading the minutes of the proceedings in the other place I got the impression that this company would be in the same position as the Ontario company, that is, a wholly-owned subsidiary of a company in the United States. I also got the impression that the company which was incorporated under Ontario law would cease to function as a company making loans under the Small Loans Act, and would become a holding company engaged in some activity which escaped me, in my quick reading of the Senate minutes. It appears that the company before us will be the one engaged in the small loans field, from which it will undoubtedly realize a fairly lucrative income. I say this because, as we all know the interest rates charged by this company will be no different from those charged by other companies operating under the Small Loans Act, and these rates range in the order of 18 per cent, 20 per cent, 24 per cent or maybe even more on the borrowings made by individuals.

It seems to me that this parliament should take a long, hard look at a company which comes before us as this one does, saying: We want to be incorporated because we desire the prestige which comes from incorporation by the parliament of Canada, because we want to protect our name and because we have been doing business throughout Canada, anyway, and we should like the sanction of the federal parliament to continue.

I say we should take a serious look at this bill before giving endorsement to a company which is charging interest rates up to 24 per cent, and maybe more. We all know how difficult it is for an individual in present circumstances to meet even what we now consider to be normal interest rates in the area of 7 per cent or 9 per cent. When people are faced with repayment of the capital they

[Mr. Howard.]

borrowed, plus these extremely high interest rates we can realize what this squeeze on their incomes means.

We are all aware of the blandishments and the enticements offered by companies such as this in order to encourage people, for example, to consolidate their debts—“Why make seven or eight payments a month when you can make just one?” Borrow from us, the advertisements say, and we will help you out. I remember an advertisement which read: “Live within your income, even if you have to borrow from us to do so.” Rather than close on a note which would invoke objections from the hon. member for High Park I will refrain from repeating the name which I think should be applied to this kind of company.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hour for consideration of private members business has now expired. It being seven o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At seven o'clock the house took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**CRIMINAL CODE**
**AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DEATH SENTENCE  
AND LIFE IMPRISONMENT**

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pennell for the second reading of Bill No. C-168, to amend the Criminal Code.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, in the portion of my remarks which I made before this debate was interrupted at six o'clock I gave in capsule form my reasons for favouring the total abolition of capital punishment. It is my belief that it is a barbaric practice for which there is no place in civilized society. I believe that an intelligent and resourceful people should find a better answer to the problem of crime.

Now I turn to a look at the bill itself which is before us and I should like to address myself in particular to those members, most of them retentionists, who have argued that we who are abolitionists cannot vote for the bill because it does not go all the way. I also want to address myself to any abolitionists in our midst who may feel