

reservations about the wisdom of that proposal. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway) and others have spoken most effectively. They presented very persuasive arguments why this should not be, not the least of which is the footdragging of the government which has in effect had ten years of notice of the revision of the Bank Act. It may well be, as I indicated earlier, that events will catch up with the Bank Act revision.

I indicated earlier there is presently before the courts in Vancouver a situation involving a chartered bank and Arvee Cedar Mills Ltd. I suppose it is quite common in this day and age, indeed in any day, to have banks involved in cases of law with clients. However, when the situation gets to the point that the Inspector General of Banks feels it necessary to have a solicitor from his department sit in to observe the circumstances of this case, the degree of seriousness escalates at once.

As I mentioned earlier, the Inspector General of Banks does not have the capacity to act in a very specific way in terms of any punitive—Mr. Speaker, I am having great difficulty hearing myself, let alone the rest of the members. I wonder if we could have a little order in the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) has the floor and I suggest we all listen.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brisco:** It would be helpful if the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) would simmer down.

**Mrs. Holt:** What was that again?

**Mr. Brisco:** There is very little teeth in the Bank Act to allow the Inspector General to participate in a real and punitive sense with regard to the activities of a bank, whether they be legal or illegal. However, in the case I mentioned earlier today, it is significant that the Inspector General of Banks has seen fit to send a solicitor to Vancouver to observe this particular case.

● (2012)

It is further significant that the federal Department of Justice should have assigned two of its solicitors to be present and to look into the background to this case. Even greater significance can be attached to the fact that the same Mr. Raugust of the Vancouver *Sun* is shortly going to publish a feature story running, as I understand it, through several editions, dealing with this very case and the abuse of the individual by a chartered bank. It is more than passing strange that this particular case, which involves a cedar mill which went into receivership and was subsequently sold for the paltry sum of about \$85,000, should now be back in receivership in the hands of the same receiver, a Mr. Sigurdson of Vancouver, who incidentally handles about 70 per cent of the receivership cases in Vancouver.

**An hon. Member:** And a Liberal!

### *Bank Act*

**Mr. Brisco:** And a Liberal. It is passing strange he should have this kind of corner on the market. Certainly he has had that corner on the market in Kootenay West in terms of Arvee Cedar, Quadra Manufacturing, Carefree Enterprises, and what other companies I know not. I find it strange indeed that this gentleman should have his oar in to such a degree that when a pressman from the Vancouver *Sun* approached him and asked "What is your interest in this case?", he should have replied, "I had better talk to my lawyer."

If there was ever a shadow of concern that perhaps he was skirting the bounds of legality, that kind of statement would certainly have made the Vancouver *Sun* reporter suspicious. And, indeed, he was. He said: "You know, that is the strangest statement I have ever heard in response to a simple question". Here is a man who is busy putting all kinds of companies in Vancouver into receivership for the chartered banks. I think it should also be noted that the solicitor who represents the Vancouver *Sun*, a man of no mean repute and ability, is also the solicitor who is representing Arvee Cedar Mills in its case against the Bank of Montreal.

It should also be noted that lawyers in smaller communities, who are often overlooked but who have a great deal to contribute and whose skills are often equal to, if not greater than, those of lawyers in the larger cities, have also taken part in this case in one way or another. I refer to a man who, as I understand it, is a good Liberal. I am not sure there are many good Liberals around, but at any rate, he is a Liberal, a man by the name of Warren Ferguson from Nelson, a very competent solicitor in any event. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when this bad smell emanating from Vancouver involving the chartered banks—the Canadian Bank of Commerce and Nelsal, and the Bank of Montreal and Arvee Cedar—comes before the public there will be a great deal of pressure on ministers of this do-little government to get off their collective backsides and bring in the Bank Act for revision.

I wonder whether Sir Josiah Stamp ever visualized that the Bank Act would get this kind of treatment or that some banks would treat the act in the manner they have since he introduced the original legislation in 1931. Sir Josiah Stamp, as hon. members may remember, was chairman of the royal commission in 1931 which recommended that Canada set up a central bank, following which the Bank of Canada was incorporated and has since then advanced all our legal tender.

**Mr. Woolliams:** R. B. Bennett did that. R. B. Bennett was there.

**Mr. Brisco:** I could go on at some length about the necessity of reviewing the Bank Act at this time. After all, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Allmand) has done nothing with his borrowers and depositors protection legislation. That was a total disaster. There is no way in which the underprivileged individual, the low income earner, can approach any chartered bank and expect the kind of treatment which you, sir, or I might expect to receive. Let us draw a credit line at that point, however, and say it is my understanding, as a result of serving on the committee and listening to