one arrest only. Somebody was found to have one ounce of drug in the trunk of his car. He was arrested, so much the better, but I definitely feel, Mr. Speaker, that the person was planted there to get arrested in order to divert attention from the true drug traffickers, who went off unscathed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the fight against the usage of drugs is not waged seriously. It seems increasingly easy to go through customs with drugs that are later peddled in a variety of forms among our youngsters. This has been noticed in the past. Research is done on the matter, and we are told that international agreements exist for the tracking and capture of drug traffickers. This has been up to now definitely unproductive, because the drug keeps on flowing into the country. It is still distributed everywhere. British Columbia is mentioned in the motion. It is certainly through that province that the entry of drugs is the easiest.

Mr. Speaker, it is urgent to cope with that problem before our people, more especially our youngsters are contaminated by drugs. A press release which the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) published on March 30, 1973, read partly as follows:

—extensive statistics on the numbers of persons known to have used or been involved in some way with mood-modifying drugs including heroin and other narcotics, cannabis and hallucinogens during 1972. "I received these statistics on March 29, 1973", the minister explained, "and after evaluating them considered they should be released promptly to the public".

A total of 8958 illicit narcotic users were made known to the department in 1972. Of this number, 7719 are definitely known to have used heroin; most of the rest probably did also.

Mr. Speaker, we can learn who are the illicit narcotic users, but we must above all be in a position to identify those who provide them with those narcotics and I think that by cutting off supply sources, we would more effectively control their use.

● (1610)

Needless to recall here the way drug peddlers, profiteers and pushers act. They have all sorts of clever tricks to force drugs into the habits of young people, and once these have taken to addiction, they feel compelled to buy drugs, and are thus almost ineluctably led to become criminals.

Mr. Speaker, in respect of drugs as well as crime in general, several discoveries have been made especially in the past two years. I should like to emphasize the fact that we fight or want to fight crime as such, but pay little or insufficient attention to criminals, whether they are thieves, arsonists, drug pushers or underground leaders. In trying to fight crime, we forget criminals. In the past two years, according to an enquiry of the Office for the Prevention and Treatment of Alcoholism and other Toxicomanias, drug consumption has increased noticeably among young people. It was also found out that in 1971, 30.4 per cent of students who answered the questions of a public survey, declared they had already used drugs, as compared with 11.7 per cent in 1969. Such a considerable increase, Mr. Speaker, should alarm everyone, educators and governments. I quote:

This is one of the outstanding facts in an enquiry on student drug consumption at high school and college levels in the island of Montreal in 1969 and 1971. That enquiry was carried out by Mr. Léandre Bilodeau, a sociologist, under the direction of Mr. Aimé L. Raic, research director at the Office for the Prevention and Treatment of Alcoholism and other Toxicomanias. It was released by Doctor André Boudreau, the director of OPTAT.

The comparison between the 1969 results and those of 1971 reveals:

That the barbiturates consumption was tripled and the consumption of hallucinogens other than LSD almost tripled;

That the consumption of marijuana and LSD was more than doubled;

That the consumption of stimulants and tranquilizers had increased by one third;

And that the consumption of alcoholic drinks and tobacco had increased by approximately one tenth;

That the proportion of glue sniffers is the same in 1971 as it was in 1969.

In 1969, the highest proportion of consumers for each type of drugs was recruted among the twenty-year-and-over age group, while in 1971, it is recruited in the seventeen-year-and-over age group.

Mr. Speaker, this inquiry has confirmed what I was saying a moment ago, namely that efforts are being made to reach our young as soon as possible, even when they are still children, and adict them to drugs. This situation is alarming enough, Mr. Speaker, for the governments to take immediate steps to combat this type of crime.

Mr. Speaker, in the second part of his motion, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe mentions loan sharking. Mr. Speaker, I have here the perfect example of loan sharking, and I intend to have it read into the official report of the House of Commons. When we talk about loan sharking, we do not refer only to the criminal activity of racketeers in the slums of Montreal, Vancouver or elsewhere. There are some people who are legitimately in business and who may be considered by some as the saviours of our people, I mean, the finance companies.

Mr. Speaker, finance companies that operate under the acts, and sometimes even outside them, are in the same class as any member of organized crime operating in the usurious loans field.

I have here the copy of a contract registered on October 7, 1971 and passed between a finance company and one of my constituents. This man needed the sum of $8,200. He went to this loan company. I do not think there is any need to name it because they are all alike and they all act in the same way. He obtained the amount of $8,200 very easily, because he could provide good collaterals. He was required to take out life and health insurance policies. The agent explained that if he paid health and life insurance premiums for 10 years, as this was to be the loan repayment period, it would cost him a great deal of money. He was told that a three-year insurance policy would be less expensive than a 10-year policy. He therefore accepted the price reduction he was offered, but the finance company agent also made him sign a loan contract for a period of three years rather than ten. The contract specified that there would be 35 equal payments and that the 36th should make up the full reimbursement, or else the rest of the debt would have to be refinanced.

After 35 months, the man realized that he had paid $5,053.65 in three years. He had also paid $299.98 for notary fees when signing the contract. He had paid $369 in life and health insurance premiums, and he realized that, while he had paid all this money, the capital of his debt had been reduced by only $1,100. The company was offering to renew his contract for the balance of his debt, or