

Department of Insurance Act

member for Edmonton West on September 22 more than I liked him this evening. Naturally I am not talking in a personal sense, but he did raise some questions that deserve to be answered. However, Mr. Speaker, I would not like to offend Your Honour, or the house, by dealing with detailed questions which I am sure you would rule could be better discussed in committee. So, if my hon. friend will forgive me, I shall try to stick to the principle of the bill this evening, but I assure him that the points he raised will be carefully considered and will be answered fully when the bill reaches committee stage. As an example, he referred to the question of fabriques, the qualifications they would have, and whether they would come under this bill. This is the kind of technical question that could be better handled in committee.

One other point of principle was touched on by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken). He questioned the desirability or the wisdom of permitting insurance companies, trust and loan companies to lend up to 75 per cent of the value of real estate on mortgages. I would remind him that this was a recommendation of the royal commission on banking and finance.

Mr. Aiken: Are royal commissions always 100 per cent correct?

Mr. Gordon: Some have a better batting average than others, and I can think of one whose batting average is going up.

Mr. Knowles: Would that be the Hall commission?

Mr. Gordon: My hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre seems to be going a little astray from the principle of this bill in that comment, although I sympathize with his interest in the subject to which he refers.

On this question of whether it is wise to allow these lending institutions to lend money up to 75 per cent of the value of real estate, or whether the limit should be retained at 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent, I think this is a matter of judgment and opinion. I must say I was impressed by the views of the royal commission on this point, and after careful consideration and full discussion with my colleagues in the government we felt this was the kind of recommendation that we were prepared to recommend and implement.

I think those are the main points of principle that were raised, and I assure hon. members they will have ample opportunity of discussing the clauses of the bill in com-

[Mr. Gordon.]

mittee. As I said earlier, I would move that it be referred to the standing committee on banking and commerce.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the standing committee on banking and commerce.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

1. Departmental administration including fees for membership in the international organizations listed in the details of the estimates, \$5,180,500.

Mr. More: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to hold up the passage of these estimates but I would like to bring one or two matters to the minister's attention.

I have no fault to find with the general statement he made, which contained some interesting things that I was glad he mentioned. I remember the great cries of Liberal party spokesmen that Conservative policies were ruining our economy, yet in the minister's statement he referred to 44 straight months of advance, and a partisan Conservative like myself was glad to hear him make that statement and to see it in print.

There is a most interesting article in tonight's *Ottawa Citizen*, headlined "Wheat Sale" and written by Garth Hopkins, associate editor of the *Financial Times of Canada*. This rather concise article points out the impact on the economy of at least the prairie provinces, and in retrospect upon Canada as a whole, of the benefits received from the sale of wheat and flour under the deal that was announced with Russia last September. It points out that this sale meant direct increases of \$205.8 million in the income of farmers in prairie provinces in the first six months of this year, as compared with the amount they received in the first half of 1963.

Indirectly this sale meant much more than that because it provided extra work for the railroads, for ports and shipping, and all other industry which dealt with the moving and delivering of the grain to the export market. I note that the article points out that the increase during the first half of this year for Alberta was \$46,703,000; for Saskatchewan \$155,305,000 and for Manitoba \$3,784,000. I think the minister would be the first to admit that this has had a terrific impact on the economy of the country.

Certainly no politician was responsible for the bounteous rains, good climate and growing