

Hon. Mr. BLACK: If the honourable gentleman objects, I apologize to the House and to the chairman.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Anyway, under the rules of this House, when the vote is four to four the motion is lost.

Hon. Mr. BLACK: I will go further and say the chairman voted quite properly. I do not care whether the company is permitted to take the name Fidelity or any other name, but it seems to me the reasons given for the change are reasonable, and the Bill should be referred back to the committee for further consideration.

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY: Honourable senators, I do not wish to express any opinion as to the merits of the Bill. All I desire to do is to explain the position as I see it. This matter was considered before the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills yesterday, in the absence of the promoter of the Bill, and if the committee's report is adopted by the House the effect will be to kill the Bill. I have a good deal of sympathy with the view of the honourable member from Ottawa East (Hon. Mr. Coté) in regard to the names, but under the circumstances I think it would be very proper to refer the Bill back to the committee.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY: If that were done, nobody would feel that he had been unfairly dealt with.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. COPP: Honourable senators, I appreciate very much the remarks of my honourable friend opposite. I was about to say something along the same lines. It seems to me that the argument as to what the company should or should not do, and as to the name, while all very instructive, is not relevant to the question before the House.

If I rightly understood the motion of the honourable senator from East York (Hon. Mr. McGuire), it was simply to refer the Bill again to the committee for reconsideration. The honourable senator says an arrangement might be made and, if necessary, a new name selected which would be satisfactory to the company and to the country at large. It is not a question of whether the word "Fidelity" should or should not be used, but of whether or not the Bill should be reconsidered.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: We are getting a little daylight on what the trouble is. Since yesterday I have made some inquiries on my own, and I think I have ascertained what is the real difficulty. Apparently it lies in the fact that the name "Fidelity," which has been

Hon. Mr. TANNER.

chosen by The Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company as its new name, may lead to a certain amount of confusion. To my astonishment I found that no fewer than four or five companies in Canada already make use of that name. In the past, either by enactment of the Parliament of Canada or through the action of the department, the name "Fidelity" has been given to at least four companies operating in this country. Has anybody ever heard of any confusion?

Hon. Mr. EULER: Is there not some qualifying adjective that distinguishes them?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: As in this case, the names are not identical.

But more than that: there are operating in Canada at the present time a number of companies, I should say between twenty and thirty, in regard to which the same kind of confusion might exist. Have we heard about any such confusion? I have not, and I doubt if anybody else has.

Furthermore, I learned that when this company made its application to the Insurance Department or to those responsible for drafting the legislation it submitted no fewer than five names. It was not tied down to the one name "Fidelity." So far as I have heard, there has not been a suggestion of any ulterior motive; so I think we can banish that thought from our minds.

As I understand the law, before the name of an insurance company such as this is adopted it must be approved by the Government. That approval is given through the department, the Deputy Minister acting on behalf of his Minister and for the Government. In this case the company itself went to Mr. Finlayson and said, "We want a new name, and here is our suggestion." After consultation and full discussion, I understand, he approved the name "Fidelity." Well, what is the trouble now? Let us bear in mind the conditions I have mentioned, the past records of companies, and the additional information just given to us by the honourable senator from Westmorland (Hon. Mr. Black) as to the attitude of the Committee on Banking and Commerce with regard to this question. It seems to me that in these circumstances, and in view of the committee's vote, the revelation of which has been so strongly objected to by the honourable gentleman behind me (Hon. Mr. Tanner), and the fact that the promoter was not present when the Bill was being considered, the wise thing for the Senate to do would be to let the committee have another whack at the Bill.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.