

the member could get up on a point of order to explain why.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is only fair that the House have some explanation.

These motions were never placed in the finance committee. They were discussed but no one was prepared to move them at the time. As a consequence they were never moved.

In the Senate a pre-study hearing indicated that there was more reason to do it than had been explained to the finance committee at the time.

• (1700 )

One of the advantages of having the other place is that in it there are some people who have been involved with these companies in a senior management position. It is useful for the government to have their advice. We talk about the other place being useless and tired and so on. However, may I suggest to my friend from Nickel Belt that it may be that some senators are also very expert in the area of how institutions like insurance companies operate.

That is why there are a number of amendments coming from the hearings in the Senate that we think are exceptionally useful. This is one of them. We are prepared to accept the kind of release that we were prepared to accept with other officers and employees.

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this amendment, which we support because it will protect an insurance company actuary from being sued if he or she blows the whistle on the company.

Actuaries are the people who calculate the risk of insuring an individual and they come up with an appropriate premium for that person to pay. Therefore, they have a great deal of information about a company. They are in a position to know if a company is either breaking the law or is in troubled waters.

This is why the actuarial profession is seeking protection for an actuary who blows the whistle. For example, an actuary may tell the Superintendent of Financial Institutions that a company is not being run properly or is not being run according to statute or the law.

### *Government Orders*

Unlike auditors, who work only temporarily for a company and then move on to another company to do another audit, actuaries are generally employees of the insurance company. They become identified with the company. An actuary who blows the whistle on his company therefore would probably lose his job, put his reputation at stake and has a great deal to lose.

We on this side of the House support the amendment. I want to also mention that Monday and Tuesday we suggested another whistle blowing amendment to the trust and the bank acts. It protects the individuals who give information to the auditor in good faith, information that would allow the auditor to prepare a more thorough audit and be more accurate.

We will be supporting this amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The question is on Motion No. 5C. A vote on Motion No. 5C applies to Motion No. 11B.1.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion No. 5C agreed to.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (for the Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

Motion No. 6A

That bill C-28 be amended in clause 408 by striking out line 48 on page 216 and substituting the following:

“Common shares, had total assets in an amount”.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion No. 6A agreed to.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (for the Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

Motion No. 7A

That Bill C-28 be amended in clause 441 of Bill C-28 be amended

(a) by adding, immediately after line 24 on page 239, the following:

“(d) provide information processing services in Canada that the company has developed for its own use and that are an integral part of the company's operations to entities in which the company has a