

from reconsidering a bill. In fact it is often done. If I were to adopt the suggestion that the name "Fidelity" be removed now, I should be doing the work of the committee. I have no authority to do so, and, as I have stated before, I wish to receive further instructions before considering the suggestion. The argument with regard to the confusion of names is a good argument, and should be addressed to the committee.

Hon. Mr. COTE: It was.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: I am therefore asking that the Bill be referred back to the committee for further consideration after the Easter adjournment.

Hon. CREELMAN MacARTHUR: I agree with the honourable member from Ottawa East (Hon. Mr. Coté) in everything he has said. There is bound to be confusion if the Saskatchewan Company is permitted to make the change of name as requested. Why cannot the Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company stick to its present title? Why does it want to assume the name Fidelity? Is there anything so obnoxious or shameful in the name Saskatchewan? I am rather surprised that a man like Mr. Finlayson, so astute and capable, did not consult a list of all insurance companies doing business in Canada. He must have such a list. As the honourable member from Ottawa East has said, if this company were allowed to do business as the Fidelity Life Assurance Company, considerable confusion might result, for there is a Fidelity Insurance Company already operating in the Dominion. In fact the whole thing would be a mess. I have no objection to the changing of the name, but I do not think we should take action without looking into the list of insurance companies and making certain that there can be no danger of conflict or confusion. It seems to me it is a matter for the committee to work out.

Hon. Mr. COPP: That is the motion before us, to refer the report back to the committee.

Hon. F. B. BLACK: Honourable senators, I am a member of the committee before which this Bill came. I have no interest either in the Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company or the Fidelity Insurance Company of Canada. I am inclined to support the motion of the honourable member from East York (Hon. Mr. McGuire) to recommit this Bill to the committee for further consideration.

In the past insurance bills have been very largely, if not entirely, referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and consequently the members of that committee are perhaps somewhat more conversant with

applications of this nature. I think this Bill should have been referred to that committee. I recall an application made by an insurance company to the Committee on Banking and Commerce for a change of name. The proposed change made it similar to the name of another insurance or assurance company, which opposed the application. Yet with such able members as the late Senator Dandurand and Mr. Meighen present, the committee granted the application. In view of their action I am not so much impressed by the argument put forward by the honourable senator from Ottawa East.

I might point out that the Superintendent of Insurance recommended the change of name. He told me he could see no objection to the application. Mr. Finlayson's opinion goes a long way with many of us who have sat on committees and listened to his views on insurance matters.

I recollect several bills of almost similar nature recommended by the Banking and Commerce Committee, notwithstanding opposition such as was presented to us yesterday. For example, an application was made to change the name of Imperial Underwriters Corporation of Canada to Imperial Insurance Officers. Objection was taken by the Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada and the Imperial Life Assurance Company of Canada, but their objections were overruled and the bill was reported favourably. Another instance I have in mind is an application by a Canadian company to be incorporated as the Travellers Life Assurance Company of Canada. The application was opposed by the Travelers Insurance Company of Hartford on the ground that "Travelers Insurance" and "Travellers Assurance" are similar names, but again the committee overruled the objection and recommended the passage of the bill.

It seems to me that the committee was not thoroughly satisfied with the argument, pro or con, for only nine members of the committee voted. The vote was four for and four against and the chairman cast the deciding vote. In view of these circumstances, I think it is only fair that we should give the promoters of the Bill an opportunity—

Hon. Mr. TANNER: I am entirely neutral in this matter, and I want to say—

Some Hon. SENATORS: Order.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: My honourable friend has no right to divulge the vote. I do not care a button, but I repeat he has no right to divulge the vote. The vote was held at a private meeting of the committee.