

loans made per year by legal companies, the average size of these loans, the average cost to the borrower per \$100.00 per year, the type of security sought or required, the company's policy on selecting credit risks, the number of applications for loans refused and the most common reasons for making such refusal. As indicated in the earlier discussion regarding interest rates, the figures above mentioned relative to the average cost to the borrower per year for \$100.00 should include all charges made for investigations, brokerage or otherwise and should take into consideration whether interest is discounted in advance and whether the loan is paid in instalments, etc.

The Junior Bar Conference has carefully avoided detailed suggestions as to what the reports of the local committees should contain, because these reports if they are to have significance in the community where made, should be primarily the product of the local committee. Obviously the recommendations of a local committee necessarily depend on the facts found by that committee. The Conference therefore believes it would be unwise for it to suggest what the recommendations should embrace.

Even from this condensed résumé of the theory of the Conference program, it appears that the elements are there for genuine accomplishment in each state where the surveys are being made. The program of legal aid alone will be a real service to each community. By finding and publishing the facts the Conference will offer a basis for future progress toward solving the problem of the illegal high rate lender. Some difficulties were anticipated because the program is dependent solely upon volunteer workers. In practice, however, this has not proved to be a serious problem. The young lawyers have entered into it with enthusiasm and the response of the public has been so encouraging as to raise the hope the surveys will be completed during the year 1941.

### INDEX—COMBATING THE LOAN SHARK\*

#### BANKS

entrance into consumer credit field, 29, 170-1; consumer indebtedness handled by, 31, 32; relations with finance companies, 33; methods of personal loan departments, 34-5; evasion of usury laws by, 56-8; activity charges by, 59; regulation of personal loans by, effect on small loan laws, 129, 131-2.

#### BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEES

work of, in Missouri, 190, 192, 193-4.

#### BETTER BUSINESS BUREAUS

work of, in Missouri campaign, 189, in California, 195; suggested use of, in campaign against loan sharks, 199.

#### BORROWERS

lack of bargaining power of, 12, 90; effect of exorbitant interest upon, 13; economic background of, 15-18; remedies of, under usury laws, 46-7; costs of loans to, under unregulated lending, 73-7; case histories of, 74-6; inability of, to exercise legal rights, 90-1; protection of, as a matter of public concern, 91; prepayments by, 120; protection of interest of, under New Jersey law, 151-3; full loan service for, 151; renewal of loans by, in New

Jersey, 152; reasons for, from personal finance companies, 165-6; earnings of, 166; occupations of, 166-7.

#### BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

avoidance of usury laws by, 59.

#### CALIFORNIA

campaign against loan sharks in, 194-6.

*Cash Service Co. v. Wurd*, 64.

*Columbian Athletic Club v. State*, 104.

*Commonwealth v. Continental Co.*, 103.

#### CONSUMER CREDIT

social and economic background of, 14-22; institutional organization of, 23-35; economic basis for, 27-8; financing of instalment credit by retailers, 28-9; fluctuation in debts of consumers, 29-30; distribution of consumer debt, open account and instalment, 31-2, 155-6; necessity for regulation of all agencies providing, 129-34; instalment credit, competition between providers of, 130, 157-8; regulation of providers of, 154-72.

\* USLL used in this index for Uniform Small Loan Law.

## CREDIT

see CONSUMER CREDIT

## CREDIT UNIONS

development of, 25-6; consumer indebtedness handled by, 31, 35.

## EMPLOYMENT

relation of, to small loans problem, 16-18; unemployment and family security, 20-1.

*England v. Mutual Loan & Thrift Corp.*, 66.

## EVASIVE DEVICES

see USURY LAWS

*Ex parte Hughes*, 70, 104.

## FLORIDA

legislative campaign against unregulated lending in, 176, 178-82.

*Floyer v. Edwards*, 55.

## FINANCE COMPANIES

consumer indebtedness handled by, 31, 32; regulation of, effect on small loan laws, 129-30, 132-3.

*General Finance Co. v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue*, 71.

*Glover v. Buchman*, 64.

*Graupman v. Danner*, 71.

## GREAT BRITAIN

usury legislation in, 23-4; recent legislation of, affecting small loans, 26-7.

*Gunnells d.b.a. Acme Finance Co. v. Atlanta Bar Ass'n*, 72.

*Hogan v. Thompson*, 64.

*Hornsby v. Rush*, 64.

## HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORPORATION

analysis of, 165-7.

## HOUSING

relation of, to small loans problem, 19-20.

## INDUSTRIAL BANKS

see MORRIS PLAN BANKS

## INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

against loan sharks, 100-7; requirement of property interest in, 105; suggested use of, against loan sharks, 202.

*In re Debs*, 101, 102, 103.

## INSTALLMENT CREDIT

see CONSUMER CREDIT

*In the matter of Pyramid Finance Corp.*, 70.

## JUNIOR BAR CONFERENCE

program of, against loan sharks, 197-204; preparation of Manual by, 198; publicity program recommended by, 200-1. See also BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEES.

*Kansas City v. Markham*, 104, 105.

## KENTUCKY

campaign against loan sharks in, 185-7.

*King v. State*, 70.

## LABOR UNIONS

work of, in Missouri campaign, 192, in California, 195; suggested use of, in campaign against loan sharks, 199.

## LEGAL AID BUREAUS

work of, in Kentucky campaign against loan sharks, 185-6; suggested use of, in campaign against loan sharks, 198-9.

## LOAN SHARKS

distinguished from early usurers, 3-4; development of business of, 5-6; charges of, 5, 73-7; search for remedies against, 6-7; present activity, 7-11; increasing intensity of operations by, 7-8; loan balances of, in states lacking regulatory legislation, 8; loan balances of, in states with ineffective legislation, 9; evasive devices of, 10-11; evasion and avoidance of usury laws by, 54-72, 91-3; interstate organization of, 69-72; extradition proceedings against, 71; illegal use of mails by, 72, 97; collection tactics of, 78-87; use of justice courts by, 78-81; threats of legal action by, 82-3; appeals to employers by, 83; collection tricks of, 83-4; garnishment proceedings by, 84-5; strong arm collectors, 86; threats of criminal prosecution by, 86-7; legal techniques for combating, 88-99, 201-3; weakness of borrowers exploited by, 90-1; laws applicable to activities of, 93-5; criminal prosecution of, 96-7; damage suits against, 98; *quo warranto* proceedings against, 98; injunction and receivership proceedings against, 97-9, 100-7; effect of small loan laws on, 121-2, 125-7, 171-2; enforcement of New Jersey law as applied to, 150-1; legislative tactics of, 173-82; campaign of confusion by, 173; organization of lobby by, 174, 175-6; organization for combating lobby of, 177; method of lobbyists for, 178-81; legislative fight against in Florida, 178-82; organization of public opinion against, 183-204; public records of operations of, 203.

*McConnell v. Peoples Finance & Thrift Corp.*, 66.

## MEDICAL CARE

relation of, to small loans problem, 18-19.

## MISSOURI

campaign against loan sharks in, 187-94.

## MORRIS PLAN BANKS

development of, 25; consumer indebtedness handled by, 31, 34; avoidance of usury laws by, 59; practice of, without legislative approval, 66-7.

## NEWSPAPERS

part played in campaign against loan sharks in Florida, 176, 178-81, in Kentucky, 187, in Missouri, 189, 192; suggested use of, 200-1.

## NORTH CAROLINA

interest rates paid in, 75.

## OKLAHOMA

interest rates paid in, 76.

*Page v. Johnson*, 64.

## PAWNBROKERS

consumer indebtedness handled by, 31, 35; evasion of usury laws by, under Utah law, 67-8.

*People v. Seccombe*, 103.

## PERSONAL FINANCE COMPANIES

consumer indebtedness handled by, 31; methods of, 34; competition of, effect on loan sharks, 126; competition with unregulated agencies of consumer credit, 131-2; growth of, in New Jersey, 147; licensing of, in New Jersey, 148-9; size of offices, in New Jersey, 148-9; enforcement of New Jersey law as applied to, 149-50; operation of, under regulation, 154-72; regulation of, in New York, 161-4; earnings of, in New York, 163-4; expenses of, in New York, 164; analysis of average office, 165-8; income and expense of, 165; reasons for borrowing from, 165-6; analysis of borrowers from, 166-7; analysis of loans of, 167; security taken for loans of, 168; earnings of, by states, 168; competition between, 169-70.

*Personal Finance Co. of N. Y. v. General Finance Co.*, 71.

## PUBLIC OPINION

loan shark plan for confusing, 173, 176; organization of, for effective measures against loan sharks, 183-204; organization of, in Kentucky, 185-7, in Missouri, 187-94, in California, 194-6; use of radio in organizing, 196-7; publicity program outlined, 200-1.

## RECEIVERSHIP PROCEEDINGS

against loan sharks, 100-7.

## RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

early investigation of loan sharks by, 6; general work of, 184; work of Department of Consumer Credit Studies, 184-5.

## SALARY BUYING

provision concerning, in USLL, 120-1; in Missouri, 189. See also USURY LAWS.

*Sherrill v. Brantly*, 58, 189.

## SMALL LOAN LAWS

early attempts, 6, 110-11; drafting of USLL, 7; theory of, 11-13; American and English contrasted, 26-7; development of, in general, 108-45; essentials of, 109; experimental period with, 111-2; coordinating period, 112; era of USLL, 112-4; structure of USLL, 114-8; analysis of USLL by sections, 115-8; requirements of licensees under USLL, 117-8; progressive drafts of USLL, 119-22; discretionary powers of administrators under, 122; classification of laws now in force, 122-5; criteria for judging, 123; states with effective, 123-4, 159; states with partially effective, 124; states with ineffective, 124-5, 159; states without, 125, 158; effect of, on loan sharks, 121-2, 125-7; effect of competition in enforcement of, 126; trends in enforcement of, 127; effect of other legislation on, 127-8; effect of absence of other regulatory legislation on, 129-34; citations and legislative history of, 134-6; table of cases construing, 137-8; sixth draft of USLL, 138-45; administration of, 146-53; history of, in New Jersey, 146-7; operation of, in New York, 161-4; summary of, 160-1; summary of maximum rates under, 161; most effective rate

for, 108-9; competition under, 169-70; legislative fight for, in Florida, 173-82, in Kentucky, 185-7, in Missouri, 187-94, in California, 194-6.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

interest rates paid in cities of, 74.

*Spicer v. King Bros. & Co.*, 70.

*State ex inf. McKittrick v. Universal Finance Co.*, 69.

*State ex rel. Beck v. Basham*, 70, 105.

*State ex rel. Boykin v. Ball Investment Co.*, 70.

*State ex rel. Goff v. O'Neill d.b.a. Metro Loan Co.*, 56, 106.

*State ex rel. Moore v. Gillian d.b.a. Local Finance Co.*, 71, 103.

*State ex rel. Thompson v. Dixie Finance Co.*, 103.

*State v. Haymond, d.b.a. Colonial Discount Corp.*, 65.

*State v. McMahon*, 102.

*State v. Whaley*, 66.

*Stephenson v. Fidelity Loan & Thrift Co.*, 66.

*Taylor v. Salmon*, 101.

## UNIFORM SMALL LOAN LAW

see SMALL LOAN LAWS

*U. S. v. American Tobacco Co.*, 104.

## USURY

early history of, 36-7; attitude of Church toward, 36-7, 54; moral v. legal, 39-40; elements of, 54.

## USURY LAWS

effect on loan sharks, 5-6; inability of legitimate lenders to operate under, 12; development of, in England and U. S. contrasted, 23-4, 55; contribution of, to development of loan sharks, 24-5; survey of, 36-53; repeal of, in Europe, 38; development of, in America, 38-9; nature of defense under 40; element of intent under, 41-2; status of holder in due course under, 42-3; penalties for violation of, 43-6; remedies of borrowers under, 46-7, 94; conflict of laws, 47; tabular presentation of, by states, 48-53; *evasion* of: 55-8, midget loans, 55-6, side agreements, 56, outright disregard of statute, 56, rate statement in disregard of instalment repayment, 56-7, use of insurance requirements, 57-8; *avoidance* of: 58-62, sales financing, 58, salary buying, 58, dual contracts with legislative approval, 59, charges for collateral activities, 59-61, brokerage charges, 61, legislative exceptions, 61-2; *devices which may permit evasion* of: 62-9, 91-3, hazard agreements, 62, repeated purchases of salary, 62-3, endorsements, 63, merchandise coupons, 63, store order plan, 64, cash order plan, 64, form of purchase and sale, 65, alleged attorneys' fees, 65, statutory minimum fees, 65-6, Morris Plan practice without legislative approval, 66-7, pawnbroker exception in Utah, 67-8, fee for motor vehicle laws in Missouri, 68-9; study of, in campaign against loan sharks, 199.

*Waggaman v. General Finance Co.*, 71.

*Willis v. Buchman d.b.a. Alabama Loan Co.*, 64.