

Inspector or Commissioner—I do not know what the title is—of Massachusetts threw some doubt upon the position of this company and it left its business to a number of individuals connected with insurance in different States. His report was published in the *Montreal Herald*, a copy of which I have in my hand. The company was organized in 1849 and commenced business. In 1876, the expenses of its management had swelled up to \$654,408.45. Seven years after—in 1882-83—they found that they could conduct the affairs of this company for \$266,667.07, much less than one-half. It is no wonder that the Commissioner of Massachusetts began to doubt the standing of this company, and how it was conducting its affairs. With respect to salaries, in 1876 it was found they amounted to \$72,300.85; in 1883 they were reduced to \$41,971.60—nearly one-half. I think the duty of Parliament would be to get such returns from those companies as would guarantee to the public the necessary information as to how the affairs of those companies are conducted. It will not do in these returns to say merely that the expenses of management are so much; we ought to require them to show how much they receive from the assured; how much of this goes to meet death liabilities; how much of it is set apart for the reserve fund; how much the balance is, and how much they return to the assured, because that is what they promise—to return all the savings or profits to the assured. Unless we know that, the public is not properly protected. I think I have made my views plain, and I ask the Minister of Justice whether it would not be a suitable time to require those companies to make such returns. I have had myself \$55 returned at one time, and it got down the next time to \$22 and a few cents, and I believe that the next year there was nothing divided at all, whereas I was assured in the policy that the profits would be increasing from year to year because I paid a very high premium.

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend did me the honor to call my attention to this matter, and I took the trouble to look into it, and I am under the impression that it is already provided for by the Act of which this is an amendment. The

original Insurance Act of 1877 applies to such companies as my hon. friend has spoken of, and there is there a very stringent provision as to returns to be made by such companies under that Act. In the 20th section there is a provision that applies to companies incorporated in Canada, and I only notice it for the purpose of calling attention to the oath that is to be taken to returns made by such companies, and in a subsequent section applying to returns made by companies incorporated out of the Dominion. Then the next clause provides a severe penalty for not making the return. The Act seems to have met every possible contingency, and I am happy to find from reading the Statute that those provisions embrace the very class of cases that my hon. friend from Fredericton refers to, and it is fortunate that the public are protected in this way. If there are any cases where it has been overlooked, it is not the fault of the law, but because the law has not been enforced. Now that is very full in the 21st section, that is the section which affects the class of companies referred to “incorporated elsewhere than within Canada and at present licensed, or heretofore licensed, under this Act, which make annual statements of their condition and affairs under oath of their chief agent, and furnish the same to the Minister of Finance at the same time as Canadian Companies.” Then the next clause provides a severe penalty for not doing that. That is not all, because under section 24, subsection 3, of the same Act, there is fortunately this further provision, of a most inquisitorial character, with regard to these companies that are incorporated out of the Dominion:—

“The Minister of Finance may, from time to time, instruct the superintendent of insurance to visit the head office of any Company licensed under this Act and incorporated elsewhere than within Canada, and to examine into the general condition and affairs of such Company; and if such Company declines to permit such examination, or refused to give any information necessary for such purpose in its possession or control, its license shall be withdrawn.”

Now these provisions seem to have met every possible contingency and I am happy to find, at least according to my reading of the Act, that they embrace every class