

Actuaries of the United States. So our professional definitions, where they occur—and in some statutes they do not occur at all—are all related to bodies incorporated outside this country. If this bill becomes law the corporation which it creates will provide the means for defining an actuary in terms of a Canadian organization.

There is the other fact that a federally incorporated organization in the circumstances of the actuarial profession probably provides the best means for professional representation and identification in the provinces where there is no qualified actuary, or not a sufficient number of such persons to make feasible the formation of a provincial organization, whether by incorporation or otherwise. This is the situation in all the provinces other than Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba. Only in those three provinces is there a sufficient concentration of actuaries to make any provincial association possible.

Hon. Mr. Bouffard: Are there such organizations in Quebec and Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: There were, senator. I think I have said that there were three actuarial associations or clubs, one in Montreal, one in Toronto and another in Winnipeg. In 1946 they merged to become the Canadian association, with branches which meet in those three localities.

To indicate what I mean I will mention that as at January 1, 1964, there were, including Fellows and Associates, 297 actuaries in Ontario, 103 in Quebec, 38 in Manitoba, and only 12 in the other Canadian provinces. Those figures indicate that a series of provincial incorporations is quite unrealistic.

Hon. Mr. Power: May I ask if the provincial organizations now in existence ever undertook to give recognition to persons wanting to use the title "actuary?" Did they assume any authority over persons using the title "actuary?"

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: No, they have assumed no authority. They have had no right to assume such authority. The only authority for the definition of an actuary, in my opinion, is found in certain statutes where the word "actuary" is defined.

Hon. Mr. Power: As I understand it, if that statute, which is a statute of Canada, prescribes that nobody shall be employed as an actuary unless he is a member of a British or American society, then our statutes do not recognize any Canadian, as such, as an actuary. Am I right in that? It recognizes them only in so far as they belong to some foreign association?

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: The statutes recognize Canadians as being actuaries, but the

actuaries must belong to a foreign organization. One of the purposes of this bill is to provide a Canadian recognition.

Hon. Mr. Power: But what prevents a man who lives in Winnipeg from calling himself an actuary now?

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: So far as I know, nothing. He would not be recognized, of course, by the Superintendent of Insurance if he purported to sign an actuarial report of a life insurance company. There are other circumstances in which he would not be recognized, but so far as I know there is nothing in law to prevent anybody calling himself an actuary.

Hon. Mr. Bouffard: Is there not a course for actuaries given at McGill and Laval universities? After a person has completed that course the university must give him some form of license to practise. Is such a person called an actuary?

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: He may be called an actuary, and without doubt Laval University, McGill, Queen's, Toronto, Manitoba, and Western Ontario, among others, are educational centres from which most of our actuaries come, but I know of no university which gives any degree in actuarial science. Such universities give a degree in pure mathematics and the various other branches of mathematics. Apart from the few statutes that provide that an actuary must certify a statement, and so on, and which then define an actuary as being a member of one of the three foreign bodies I have mentioned, there is nothing to prevent any person calling himself an actuary. Such a person would be under no liability and have no responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Croll: If section 5(2) of the bill means what I think it means, are you not setting up there a qualification or providing an opportunity to differentiate between people who belong to the organization and those who do not belong, by granting some sort of title or degree? Does not that subsection give that authority?

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: That is what is intended, senator. I am going to discuss briefly the sections of the bill. A Fellow of the Society of Actuaries—and most actuaries in Canada are Fellows of that society—is entitled to put after his name the letters F.S.A.; and an Associate, such as I am, is entitled to put the letters A.S.A.

Hon. Mr. Croll: Are we not giving them authority there to grant degrees? That is the point I am getting at. Is that what you want, and have we the right to do that?

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: What is proposed here is not the granting of a degree. No one