

103176

Georgetown, Ont., Apr. 23rd, 1934.

Dr. R. K. Anderson, M.P.,  
Parliament Buildings,  
Ottawa, - Ontario.

Dear Sir: Re Senate Bill F; Insurance Act 1932.

It has been drawn to my attention through the press and otherwise that the above Bill has been passed on by the Senate and it now comes before the House.

As an insurance man and one who makes his livelihood from the same, this Act would be very detrimental to our business and not only myself, but there is a total of 24922 agents besides the different offices that maintain help and who also pay commissions, salaries, travelling expenses and taxes to the Government, and who keep on deposit certain sums of money, so that it would be unfair to allow Lloyds to come into this Country without a deposit. Other Countries do not allow it.

The following two paragraphs will give you an idea of what these people are asking Canadians to do for them.

Lloyd's Underwriters maintain no office in Canada, therefore employ no Canadians. Lloyd's pay no taxes in Canada. Lloyd's maintaining no offices, disburse no monies by way of salary, office, travelling and general maintenance expense. Lloyd's do not support an Agency plant. To allow them entry into Canada without deposit is a gross injustice to thousands of Canadians who benefit directly or indirectly as agents, employees and recipients of monies spent by the Licensed Companies in Canada.

To permit Lloyd's Underwriters to register in Canada without maintaining any deposit or any Head Office and agency plant in Canada would be to discriminate most unfairly against the Licensed Companies who for many years have maintained ample deposits with the Receiver-General, maintained Head Offices in Canada with appropriate staffs and paid large amounts in taxes to Dominion and Provincial Governments, and in fact complied with every requirement of the laws of both the Dominion and the Provinces.

Lloyd's Underwriters escape paying taxes because of the peculiar manner in which they operate. Each Underwriter, being a separate entity, can only be sued as such, and as lately as March 2nd, Premier Taschereau stated on the floor of the Quebec Legislature that "Lloyd's was not a Company but a group of Englishmen who join in taken risks of various natures but do not constitute a Company which could be sued and the profits of which could be taxed."

I trust that you will give this matter your attention.

Yours very truly,

*Elmer G. Thompson*

E.C.T./R.M.

MEIGHEN PAPERS, Series 5 (L.G. 26, 1, Volume 166)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES  
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES  
CANADA