

very great inducements to call in their loans in the Province of Quebec, which they may do on the slightest pretext whatever. I venture to say that in less than twelve months from this day the larger proportion of the money lent will be withdrawn, and lent again at 8 or 9 per cent., instead of at present at 6 per cent., including the cost of management. This is a very serious matter indeed to the agricultural community throughout the country; and I think any member of this House who represents an agricultural constituency may very well oppose, in their interest, the passage of this Bill in its present form. Hon. gentlemen have suggested that this company should be placed on the same footing as other companies. If they would consent to that, they would remove one of the strongest objections we have to the Bill. Although the monopoly clause has been given up, there are other advantages which this company possesses over other companies. I have no hesitation in supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford.

Mr. MÉTHOT. I wish to ask only one question of the hon. member who has just sat down. What are the other advantages which the Crédit Foncier possesses over other companies? I must say, also, that I do not think it fair for the hon. member to say that this company will charge 9 per cent. when the promoter of the Bill has just agreed to limit them to 8 per cent.

Mr. AUGER. I repel the accusation that I oppose this Bill on party grounds. I am not here, Sir, as a Liberal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AUGER. I am not, also, here as a Conservative. I want hon. gentlemen to understand that I was elected as an Independent member to support good measures, and I am ready and willing at any time to support any measure that comes from the other side if it is a good measure in my judgment. I am here as an Independent member, and whenever either side of the House brings forward a measure that is for the benefit of my country and deserves my support, you will always find me there if I am alive and well. You will always find me ready to do my duty, and I will not be deterred from doing it because this is a French company. I am reminded of the story of a foolish boy whose father used to horsewhip him almost every day. Some of his companions asked him: "Why don't you behave yourself and save the horsewhipping?" The boy answered: "It doesn't hurt; it is the same whip." So it does not matter if this company is a French company; it must be put on the same footing as other companies. If these hon. gentlemen are not able to frame their own Bills, why did they not come to me, and although I am a layman I might have been able to put them right? But I have to get them right inch by inch. The other day, when the hon. member for West Durham proposed this amendment, it was not accepted, because they thought they could force the Bill through the House without it; and it is only to-day, when they find the sentiment of the House against them, that they are willing to accept it. But there are other objections to this Bill. There is a clause which gives the company the right to force a borrower to insure his building and deposit his policy with the company. If the man is burnt out they may draw the money and keep it, and if the property is diminished in value they can claim the whole amount of the loan. They will say you must pay the whole money or we will sue you. The farmer will say I cannot do it. Then they will say: "Give us 8 per cent. and we will let you off." Have the other companies the same privilege? No. The Crédit Foncier du Canada has not that privilege. This company have the insurance in their hands. They draw the money; but there is one clause that says if the debtor builds within the year the company is bound to pay the money back to him. Suppose a man burns his house, the

company draws the money and keeps it. He can go to any one and say build me a house. When the house is built he can go to law, claim his money and get it back, and thus get his building. But with this company it is not so. They keep the money, and if the property decreases in value they foreclose him. They say pay us 2 per cent. more. Hon. gentlemen say that the hon. member for Shefford is opposed to French money coming into the country. There is none coming in. The money is here. They brought it here. They only asked to change this law when they almost failed in France, and had no more money to bring in. Every hon. member remembers the difficulties La Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas fell into a little more than a year ago. This company have lent all their money, and now they want to force those who borrowed it to pay 2 per cent. more. Why was it, last Session, the motion made by my hon friend from St. John (Mr. Bourassa) for six months' hoist, was carried by seventy majority? Did not those that raise the French cry now vote for that motion?

Mr. MÉTHOT. Because the interest was not limited.

Mr. AUGER. I think it was because the elections were coming on, and they dared not go before the public with that measure. But now they think they will be in for five years, and can explain their vote at the end of that time easier than they could after two or three months. I want hon. gentlemen to understand that I am not here as a Frenchman, but as a Canadian in the true sense of the word, and will not support anything French simply because it is French. I will support anything just, and oppose anything wrong whether it comes from Ireland, France or China. I think these hon. gentlemen are wrong in raising the French cry. If these men want to be placed on the same footing as others, let them withdraw their Quebec Act, and I will vote to give them the same privileges as the trust and loan and other companies. This House is taken by surprise. There are about ninety new members here who know nothing about this case, and they come before us with this little Bill. I am not a legislator, and never supposed a man could come before this House with such a Bill and have it passed. Did they bring before this House their rights in Quebec? Did they say we want the Dominion Act repealed? I have to show up this question piecemeal, and it is only when forced by the sentiment of the House that they are willing to amend their Act. That is not the way to legislate. They have no money coming in now, and will not have any for a year. Their money is loaned for a long time. Let them wait for another year if they cannot withdraw the Quebec Act this year, and then let them ask to be placed on the same footing as other companies. They will then find me ready to support them.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). Last year, when I had the honor of presenting to this House a Bill on behalf of the Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadian, asking for certain special privileges, the objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by some hon. gentlemen on this side, were, in the first place, that this company enjoyed a great monopoly for fifty years, and, in the second place, that they asked the unlimited power to charge what rate they pleased. The Crédit Foncier took steps to meet those objections by renouncing the monopoly and by asking for the limited power of charging interest at a rate not to exceed 8 per cent. We thought we had thus met the views of hon. members. The only objection raised by the hon. member for East Hastings was that the company was instituted for the purpose of lending money at 6 per cent., and the question of monopoly was raised on the other side. Why so many new objections now after we have met the only two raised. The monopoly has been abandoned and a limited rate of interest asked for. Is that an extraordinary privilege to grant? How many loan companies have