anyone, I shall quote textually the summary handed to us by the minister of his proposed review of the Bank Act.

According to him, that review of the Bank Act comprises 14 key proposals. Let us go over them briefly:

1. Banks will be forbidden to hold more than 10 per cent of voting shares in other companies, including near banks.

2. By forbidding directors of near banks to sit on the board of directors of banks, the new act will remove the overlapping of boards of directors which prevents competition.

3. Directors may not sit on the board of two banks.

4. Not more than one fifth of the directors of a company may be directors of the same bank.

5. Agreements between banks on interest rates are prohibited. The basic principles of the Combines Investigation Act will apply to the banks.

6. The ceiling on bank interest will be eliminated when credit conditions ease off.

It seems that it will be done.

7. In the meantime, there will be a slight relaxation of the maximum rate to help immediately the small borrowers and to take into account the general trend of the interest rates.

8. Banks will be required to disclose in detail their revenues and expenditures and, for the first time, their hidden reserves.

9. A federal provincial conference on consumers' credit is foreseen.

10. Federal project of insurance deposits—

11. Federal plan of insurance deposits to promote the setting up of new banks.

12. Banks allowed to grant mortgage loans—

13. Issuance of bonds—

14. Two levels of cash reserves will be required in respect of these two classes of deposits—

I find all this very good, except that it does not entirely remove worries from those I would call "the poor devils".

I already see that there will be conflict with at least one province about insurance deposits. When you look at the list of those bank directors, you find that at the same time they are all directors of large Canadian corporations. Now, this means that, in the final analysis, it boils down to a not so long list of big financiers who are the directors of our banks and large corporations. In looking at all this, well, the poor soul wonders: Is the purpose of all this not to make sure that banking institutions will get protection against the hazards of the various financial seasons, which have their ups and downs, or against competition from foreign banks, or against the cost of certain modern progress, rather than to make sure that these banks will really serve the poor, to help them have a minimum standard of living to which they are entitled in the democracy in which they live?

I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that it is a worry. I lack the competence to say to what extent or in what way that could be avoided. I am just saying that after studying the theories put forth here in this house, I have reached this conclusion: what seems lacking in this bill is the human touch, some concern for the problems of the people which remain forever unsolved, for instance unemployment, the lack of capital which forces the small contractor or the owner of the corner store or the worker to deal with finance companies which make them pay prohibitive interest rates. That does not seem to solve the problem ever. I admit that it worries people who, like me, are seeking the truth, so much so that they have to ask themselves questions.

And we see some astounding things. For example, in the *Financial Post* of January 19, I read a report which struck me and pleased me because I had said to myself: It is a good sign; when the Minister of Finance brought out his last budget he told us that it would prevent a too painful inflation period. I voted with the government in that respect; it achieved some success. Consequently, I will quote that editorial of the *Financial Post:*

[*English*]

The government's venture in restraint has been remarkably successful. By the last quarter of 1966, living costs were rising less than half as rapidly as in the first quarter. Prices of industrial materials at wholesale dropped 4.4 per cent during the year (against) a 4.5 per cent rise in 1965.

[*Translation*]

I then said to myself, that is good. But after another look, in March 1967, I said: There is not less unemployment, there is not more money. We have been hearing about such things for years. Some may tell me: if the minister had failed to act as he did, the situation would have been worse. Yes indeed, and I am grateful to the minister for having had the foresight of taking such action last year. But I am beginning to think: would it not be advisable to change the system instead of simply changing a few parts of the machine, as is being done at present? I now wish to quote an item of the Canadian Press from Vancouver reporting a statement of the president of the Laurentide Financial Corporation:

Mr. Peter Paul Saunders did, however, admit that the monetary restriction would have the advantage of slowing down the economy which is presently overburdened and to check the actual threat of inflation.