

*Private Bills*

private bills, public bills. As there are no notices of motions (papers) on today's order paper, the house will proceed to the consideration of private bills.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion among the interested parties in connection with the bill standing as item No. 5 and I believe there is unanimous agreement among those members—it does not necessarily extend to all members of the house—that item 5 might be called first for the purpose of sending the bill to the committee on transport and communications without delay. Then we could proceed with the list as it stands.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The house will recognize, of course, that this can only be done by unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Cameron (High Park):** On the basis outlined by the hon. member who has just spoken, that there will be no debate.

● (6:00 p.m.)

**PRIVATE BILLS****TRANS-CANADA PIPE LINES LIMITED**

**Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat)** moved the second reading of Bill No. S-26, respecting Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and referred to the standing committee on transport and communications.

**AETNA CASUALTY COMPANY OF CANADA**

The house resumed from Thursday, October 31, consideration of the motion of Mr. Cameron (High Park) for the second reading of Bill No. C-112, to incorporate Aetna Casualty Company of Canada, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Gilbert (p. 1746).

**Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on the amendment which is before the house. I recognize, of course, that in the history of the proposal which is contained in this bill the terms of the amendment have been met on more than one occasion in the sequence of events which surrounded the introduction of this proposal at various times during various sessions. I believe that the events of the past, so far as the particular proposal contained in this bill is concerned, were desirable. Therefore in my view the amendment now before the house will further continue a desirable

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

situation in that the bill will not be read a second time.

I realize that at various times during various sessions there has been fairly extensive discussion about the questions involved in the proposal that this company be incorporated as a company under the laws of this country. These discussions have taken place in a scattered and desultory manner and therefore it is perhaps difficult to get the whole picture in one piece, as it were, unless one does a fairly extensive amount of research into the records of the debates in this house.

Perhaps I should recall to the attention of hon. members that this bill, if passed, would enable this foreign owned concern, if its announced intentions and desires were fulfilled, to expand an operation in the insurance field in this country which has been carried on to a point even though not by the company which is proposed in this bill. The proposal would authorize this firm to engage in a very wide range of casualty insurance. In fact, as has been pointed out previously, this is the bill which coincides with the alphabet inasmuch as the classes of insurance listed run from "a" to "zee", if I may use the Americanized version of the pronunciation of the last letter of the alphabet. So in order that the bill may be identified in the minds of members as the clauses come up for discussion, I suppose it could properly be called the alphabet soup bill.

I believe I should point out to the house, as I believe I did during earlier discussions, that this company would merely be duplicating the kinds of insurance coverage that are offered to the Canadian people by an almost innumerable body of insurance companies of various kinds which have been incorporated at both the federal and provincial levels. Apart from anything else, if we accepted the proposition of this company we would in my view be further duplicating the very costly and unwieldy methods under which at the present time the Canadian people are able to secure insurance coverage of the types enumerated. I find it difficult to imagine any procedure for meeting the desire of Canadians to protect themselves against loss more costly and inefficient than the system that already exists in this country because of the multiplicity of these companies with their heavy overhead, duplication of sales efforts and all the rest. These costs are inevitably tacked on to the premiums Canadians have to pay. From this point of view, so far as I am concerned it is a completely unnecessary