

Government Orders

It is not just New Democrats in this corner of the Chamber who argued for the two audit system for financial institutions. There was one Conservative member on the committee who agreed with the requirement for two auditors. The member for Markham voted yesterday with this party to have the two audit system.

My colleague from Cambridge pointed out yesterday in a point of order, because I had erroneously lumped him in with other Conservative members who were for eliminating the two audit system, that other countries of the world with a one audit system are now looking at establishing a two audit system.

An hon. member: Do you mean we are going backward while they are going forward?

Mr. Rodriguez: That is right. They are coming from a one audit system and want to put a two audit system on their financial institutions. While they are going forward, we are taking a step backward.

Again I appeal. I know that *their loco ministerio* who is sitting over there from Mississauga South loves this position. If you cannot be a Minister of State for Finance you can at least be *in loco ministerio*. I know that he could run into the back rooms and consult with the officials because this again is his last chance to do something for the depositors the investors and the people of Canada. He could run back now, even as you wait to take the vote. He could go quickly and come back and say: "We will put the two audit system in place".

Mr. Pat Sobeski (Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, just to clarify, I think he has misled his colleague from Oshawa. The banks had a two auditor system and yesterday, against my wishes, the banks now have an option of going to one auditor. However, the insurance companies currently have only one auditor. Now the member for Nickel Belt wants to bring in two, so it is quite different.

The other thing I would point out is when we were in committee not a single word of debate was raised on this particular point.

Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, this again is a motion which is similar to the motions we discussed on the floor of this House in the last couple of

days regarding the Bank Act and the Trust Companies Act.

This whole issue was raised in the finance committee and it was felt that there was no need for two auditors. As well, the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, who is a very knowledgeable person in this whole area of financial institutions, has indicated that there is no obvious reason to have two auditors.

It may sound like a great idea but if it is not necessary, as the Superintendent of Financial Institutions has indicated, then why should we inflict this added expense on the insurance company? In the long run, it will be passed on to the people who use the services of the insurance company in increased premiums and other ways.

This party believes it is an unnecessary expenditure and if it is unnecessary, then we certainly are not prepared to go along with this.

So we on this side of the House will be voting against this amendment.

Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cambridge suggested that the member was going too far in asking for two auditors in this case since there is only one auditing firm required now. What he did not hear perhaps was the argument from my hon. colleague to the effect that the new legislation, the whole package of legislation that has been put together, is going to allow the insurance companies to become very much larger institutions than they currently are and they will be able to do everything, including what the banks are doing.

We are looking at a totally different situation. There is an argument going on, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Cambridge says they will not be able to take deposits and the hon. member for Nickel Belt says they will be able to take certain deposits. I do not know which ones and I do not think it matters. Certainly one of the reasons that this legislation is being considered by this House is that certain people with the right influence in the right places who want insurance companies to become much larger and much more important in the financial affairs of Canada are urging that this legislation be passed. Indeed, it is working its way through the process.