

sell to any one else? You might just as well interfere with the man who sells sugar and pork, which are just as necessary to my family as insurance is. If you say that an insurance agent cannot sell me insurance except at such a price, you have just as much right to say that a grocer cannot sell me sugar or pork except at such a price. I was never able to understand the reason for these provisions at the time the Insurance Act went through. It seems to me we are simply drifting in the direction I have indicated, and unless a stop is put to it no man can tell what the end will be. After a while they will be telling us we cannot do anything except under the instructions of some public authority; individual action will be taken away entirely. If the Government would go a little further and say that the munition makers and profiteers could make only so much money, there would be some sense in that. They fight shy of touching these people, however, but when it comes down to the average man who is trying to get a living, they make legislation of this kind. I do not know that I can object to the amendment, because it makes the law uniform, but I object to the principle of the whole thing.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are not introducing these provisions now, because they have been the law since 1910, and are applicable now to all companies under the jurisdiction of this Dominion Parliament. Moreover, may I say this, as a reason for differentiating between selling insurance and selling sugar and pork and other things of that kind? The insurance business, of course, has to be carried on in such a way that the premium charged shall provide the means to make up the losses; perhaps that is especially true with regard to life insurance. Now, when you let one man contribute for the same risk less than another to the creation of that general fund that is to pay all the losses, you necessarily make the cost to that other man or men larger than it otherwise might be. The fact that you have given to one man insurance at a price less than it is necessary to charge in order that according to the actuarial calculations the business may be carried on so as to sustain itself, makes it necessary in order to make up that deficiency to charge some other man something extra. It creates an absolute inequality between people, who—this is the case referred to in the section—are absolutely in the same class of risk, and enables one man to get covered at a price less than he ought to

[Mr. Carvell.]

be charged on a business basis, inevitably necessitating that some other man be charged more than he ought to be charged.

Mr. CARVELL: I can quite understand that argument. It is very plain, and I think it is perfectly logical. At the same time, this amendment goes a great deal further, and is aimed at the insurance agent who is willing to divide up his commission on the first premium with the insured. We all know, a very large proportion of the first premium goes to the agent as his commission. I do not think any one ever heard of the insurance companies charging anything except the uniform rate of insurance governed by the age, the mortality tables, and other considerations which enter into the fixing of the premium. The intention is to reach the insurance agent who, in order to do business, makes a little cut to the insured. That cut comes out of the agent, and does not impair the fund out of which the policy will ultimately be paid. It merely reduces the agent's profits by that much. This Bill simply prevents the agent from dickering, or doing business at all. It makes every insurance agent practically an automaton. So far as concerns the premium which goes to the company, of course that should be uniform, but why an ordinary insurance agent cannot make a discount of fifteen dollars, or twenty-five dollars, or fifty dollars, out of his commission on the first premium is something I cannot understand.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not profess to be an expert in the matter, or to be able to explain it absolutely. At first glance, it would certainly seem as if there might be something in what my hon. friend says. I understand, however, that in the carrying on of the insurance business it has been found that if the practice is allowed, the agent, in his zeal to get business, is exposed to do it very largely, and there is a great temptation to the companies to use that method of getting business, which leads them not impossibly—and I believe in practice it happens quite often—to give some compensation to the agent in lieu of that rebate. However that may be, I may tell my hon. friend these practices are legislated against universally, throughout North America at all events, and so legislated against as the result of inquiries made in different countries at different times as to the abuses that might arise in connection with the insurance business. This having been our law since 1910 as we all understood applicable to