

Private Bills

created by others who see fit to make that sort of contribution to our country.

• (6:40 p.m.)

At the moment there is a shortage of funds in Canada with which to carry out those measures we believe are important to the social aspects of this country. The incorporation of another insurance company would drain from our capital market funds with which the company would probably put up a 50 storey office building in the city of Toronto. The money expended on this air conditioned skyscraper could be used to build 10,000 houses for those people who see fit to produce the wealth, but who cannot get their hands on the material or money to enable them to obtain decent housing.

The building of more insurance company offices would not only be unwise, but it would detract from those projects we feel the country most sorely needs.

There is another threat in Canada today. The popular theme is that we cannot improve our standard of living until we increase our productivity. For the past eight or nine years, our productivity has risen from 3 per cent to 7 per cent. These people urge that if we are to increase our standard of living we must increase our output of goods. If we use this as a yardstick, then we must say that the more of us who contribute our time to production the more our productivity level will rise. Perhaps this is one of the reasons our productivity level has not risen as we think it should have, or as the economic council has recommended.

We see that there are some sectors of our society who are certainly doing their best to increase productivity. The steel workers, for example, are working hard to hold up these productivity figures. In fact they are working to such a degree that the productivity increase effected by steel workers in Canada is higher than for steel workers in the United States. This brings us back to a consideration of the question of wage parity. Why should not those who make steel in Canada get higher wages than those who make it in the United States, since the Canadian workers are producing more? As I say, therefore, the question of wage parity comes into this problem. When a man produces, certainly he should receive his just reward for that production.

By pulling all these insurance salesmen out of the production side of our society and putting them on the parasitic side, we are going to reduce our productivity. This would

be bad for the entire population. Not only does it throw a heavier burden on those who have to try to hold up the productivity level, but I think everyone has to accept a certain degree of responsibility for the production of wealth in this country of ours.

During the last 31 years I have been on the production side of our society, and then six months ago I joined the parasitic side. I sit here tonight and feast on those who go down in the mines, in the mills or smelters, or wherever they are. Certainly, I did not want to come here to join this non-productive group of people. I think the main reason for my coming here was to help the ones who are carrying the load—and I am referring to the individuals who would have to go out and buy insurance at inflated prices. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we have to look further than merely creating another insurance company; we have to think how this will affect Canada.

This company seeks to conduct business in many fields, one of which is fire insurance, one of the most important aspects of the insurance industry. Regardless of how poor a man is, he has to have a dwelling wherein he may find shelter. Certainly if this building, regardless of its value, is devastated by fire, he is out in the cold. He has to protect himself; so he has to go out and buy this type of insurance, regardless of price. I believe he has to pay a price which bears no relationship to the protection he receives.

The hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Martin) cited some of the excessive costs, including television programs, which insurance companies have incurred. We all know the cost of these things, and we all know who ultimately bears the cost. It is the person who has to go to the marketplace and buy insurance. When these people are watching television at night, they do not realize they have paid for the program ten times over, and could probably go down to the corner theatre and see the same show for less. This is an expensive advertising medium. The insurance companies show no restraint, in the knowledge that, regardless of what they spend on programs—\$30,000 or \$40,000 their salesmen will be out on the street tomorrow recouping that loss from the poor, innocent, unwashed victims who are on the productive side of society.

There is one other aspect of insurance with which this company proposes to deal, and that is insurance on motor vehicles. In Ontario alone there are approximately 400