

Hon. Mr. DUNNING: I am not dealing with excellent reasons for being away. I want to put on the record now precisely everything connected with this matter. The discussion with respect to these bills took place in the House of Commons and covered both of the bills then before the house. Only one got through, although the discussion ranged over the two. The bill originally presented by this company differed from the one presented by the other company. In the House I attempted to draw the distinction. Later on at one of the early meetings of this committee I indicated what I have said here previously to-night what was the attitude of the government on the matter. I was so authorized and was within my right, I think, in communicating the decision of the government to the committee with regard to the disposal of the question in the future. I have read in such leisure moments as I have had such record as is available, and I understand there is a lot more. It is upon what I have read and upon what I have learned that I base the statement that I fear—let me put it this way—I fear there is an intention on the part of some of the members of this committee that this committee should not reach a decision on this question. If that is the case, then I say that I am of opinion that this committee in so acting is depriving the House of Commons of what is its right. That is the right to decide whether or not the bill shall pass or to decide that it shall not be further considered. The house can do that. But this committee, by not reaching a decision, is depriving the House of Commons of its right. I want to leave that thought with the committee. You can please yourselves with regard to it. It is your own business, but I suggest it is a very bad precedent to set.

Mr. LANDERYOU: I would like to point out that these companies have said they are only in an experimental stage. They do not know all about this business. They operate only in an area where there are 50,000 people within a radius of twenty-five miles. The experts and those who have been up for questioning have not been able to give us all the evidence. They do not know for sure whether they are operating in opposition to some of these loan branches of the banks. And we want to gather all that information so that we can arrive at a proper understanding of the whole matter. I do not think there is any question of anybody trying to hold anything up.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TUCKER: Mr. Chairman, I have had quite a bit to do with trying to delve into the reasons for this legislation, and I have probably taken up as much time in the committee as anybody; but I want to refute, as strongly as I can, any suggestion that there was any intention on my part to prevent this bill being fully considered in this committee and the committee being able to make a report to the house as soon as possible. I have sat here time after time. On at least three occasions I have had to wait for a quorum, and on several occasions I have remained here when, by leaving, I could have broken the quorum. I want to assure the minister—

Hon. Mr. DUNNING: I was not making any personal reference. I had no individuals in mind.

Mr. TUCKER: I am anxious to see this bill get into parliament where it can be dealt with right in the eyes of the whole Canadian people.

Mr. HOWARD: I move that the question be now put.

Mr. McGEER: I do not think the question I asked has been answered. That question was that if we incorporate this company with a capital of \$5,000,000 and allow an interest rate of 24 per cent, upon what ground could we refuse the merchant banks with similar loans up to \$500 a similar rate of interest? Now, that answer the minister gave us to the effect that the banks are not in this business—

[Mr. Arthur P. Reid.]