

get it. I am expressing it in a rough way, but that is what the government means. In the past we have been getting money from the insurance companies. Insurance companies receive money for one purpose, namely, in return for policies. A company will sell an insurance policy on a man's or a woman's life at a yearly premium, and when the insured dies the company will pay to his estate or beneficiary a certain sum of money, according to the contract. It is true that the insured, while living, may borrow on or cash in the policy, but the main purpose of the policy is to insure his or her life. I venture to say that every member of this house has the same idea about an insurance policy. Whenever I have discussed insurance policies with people I have usually found that they took out insurance in the same way as I did. I had quite a lot of it, and it has been fully paid up for some years. My wife was the beneficiary. I never cashed or borrowed on my life insurance, because I wanted to know that if I predeceased my wife she would get the face value of the policies and have enough money to live on. No doubt most men buy as much insurance as they can pay for. Protection is the primary purpose of life insurance in this country, and that is why its promotion has been so successful. Men and women—especially men, who earn most of the money—know that if the bread winner is suddenly taken out of the picture his wife and their children, if any, must have as good a chance of survival as if he had lived.

On the other hand, the function of the banks in our economy is to accept money on deposit, and to have it available to the depositor at a moment's notice. Any experienced practising lawyer will have seen many estates pass through his office, big ones and little. In my practice it was the small estates that caused me most concern. I am thinking of a case such as that where a father dies and leaves an estate of a total value of \$5,000, including about \$300 or \$400 on deposit in the bank. The minute the death occurs the family want that money, because somebody may be sick or for some other reason. But anyone at all likes to have \$200 or \$500 or \$1,000 on deposit in a bank account, which he knows is available to him at any time he needs it. That is the true purpose of the bank as an institution. I challenge anybody to point to financial institutions with a better record than our chartered banks have had, even throughout the depression years of 1930 to 1935.

The government is now proposing to take the money on deposit in the banks and lend

it to every Tom, Dick and Harry, tie it up for the next thirty years. Somebody has said that properties can be sold and loans liquidated. Let me say emphatically that when the going gets tough you just can't sell houses. As a lawyer I have had people come and plead with me to help them sell or get loans on houses they owned, and I have had to say "I am sorry, but no matter what your property is worth, it just can't be sold for a reasonable price."

The crux of the problem posed by this bill is that it would risk the savings of the thrifty people of Canada who have saved their money and put in the bank, only to have it taken out and lent over a long period to someone who himself has not been able to save enough to buy a house.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: But the banks are not obliged to lend the money.

Hon. Mr. Haig: If I did not know that my honourable friend was an experienced man I would be surprised at his innocence in making such a remark.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: I am not as innocent as I may appear. I say, there is nothing to compel the banks to lend money.

Hon. Mr. Haig: My honourable friend will have his chance to talk; I would prefer not to have any interruptions. I say quite candidly that if the banks did not lend money under this legislation they would soon have a visit from Mr. Graham Towers. He has been given power under this proposed act to invest large sums of money, and he can force the banks to make money available, because they are under his control. Yes, make no mistake about it: if the banks do not lend money on houses, there is nothing to this legislation at all. No bank will lend money voluntarily on anything but gilt-edged security. How many banks in Saskatchewan would lend money under this legislation, if they did not have to? They would be foolish to subscribe to loans on real estate, for the law in that province provides that no proceedings may be taken against a homestead without first obtaining a judge's order. And what happens in a typical case when the parties appear before a judge asking for an order? The mortgagor will point out that he is out of a job, that his daughter is working for \$75 a month, and is paying as much as she can to help keep the home together. He will say: "We cannot pay the \$50 a month we owe under this mortgage; we can pay \$10, \$20 or \$25 a month, and if you do not take that we will lose the house and have to move out with our five children". Do you think the judge will make an order? Well, not if I know anything about what is usually done