

*Private Bills*

assumed and has been assumed by the hon. member. These are mutual companies, mutualized under the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act. Therefore the assets of very many Canadian policyholders are involved, and very many Canadians might suffer if we adopted in this house a policy of narrow nationalism and rejected this bill.

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my remarks will of course be brief. I only want to say that I was very interested in what the hon. member for Rosedale just said. If I understood correctly, he was saying that there are a large number of United States-controlled companies in the life insurance field now doing business in Canada, and this being the case it would be just as well to let them continue and even increase in number. This is something like saying if a person had smallpox he would not bother doing anything about it until it ran its full course and killed him.

We have to start somewhere in dealing with the question of Canadian ownership. We started briefly, we thought, into this field a few years ago when we were dealing with the question of a pipe line company. We spent many, many hours in this house trying to establish, with respect to pipe lines, even the relatively very minor point that the directors should be Canadian citizens ordinarily resident or domiciled in Canada. It took many, many hours of discussion in this house at that time to establish even that point. But we have to start somewhere to deal with this question of repatriating the ownership and control of our own economic welfare. We cannot do it by throwing up our hands and saying, "After all, the Americans own it all now. Let us forget about it and let them carry on".

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I disagree with the original proposal made by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. He anticipated my disagreement, because we have had general discussions about this question on other bills. I will say, inasmuch as I am the seconder of the amendment, that if the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate had directed his request to hold it off to me as seconder, then I would be in a position to comment on that request. But I will assume that he did, inasmuch as he directed it to the mover.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. gentleman that I had not the slightest intention of overlooking him in any way. I would never be so foolish.

**Mr. Howard:** I would only say in reply that to my way of looking at it, the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate is never foolish.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

**Mr. Jones:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. member a question while he is devoting himself to remarks on this bill. What would be the effect of accepting the principle outlined by the hon. member for Danforth on the business that the Saskatchewan government insurance office does in North Dakota, which I understand is carried on at the present time by the government of the province of Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member does not know the answer to that question then perhaps I can make the same comments about him as I did about the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate, except that I would reverse them.

**Mr. Jones:** I asked a question. The hon. member says, "Don't let them do this". What about that Saskatchewan company?

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Speaker, would you protect me from these inane interruptions?

The answer to the question, if one is really required, is that the adoption of this amendment would in no way affect the situation which the hon. member for Saskatchewan so ably posed to us. I would say this, though, getting back to the question of whether or not this amendment should be deferred or held off until some other time, and in the interim we would have the opportunity to hear representations before the committee, that at least the hon. member for Danforth is able to read and took advantage of reading the evidence taken before the committee of the other place, which was afterwards printed. It was from that evidence that he got the information which he used prior to moving the amendment. In fact, it was not just—

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a question at this point. Does he think we should use a committee of the other place to deal with all the private bills that come before this house?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Speaker, if you would permit me to invade that particular field I would be glad to talk about the subject of other types of private bills.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Heaven forbid.

**Mr. Howard:** I presume the hon. member was talking about those bills which are preceded by the letters SD, of which there are some 600 or 700 in this particular divorce mill. Frankly, I would like somebody else to deal with them. We have made, as the hon. member knows, a number of alternate suggestions for dealing with those particular