

In my judgment there should be no change in the plan of annuities, although I know government annuities are sold to applicants in a measure cheaper than are annuities sold by a private company. That has been the subject of debate ever since the Annuities Act was introduced in 1908; reasons and very sound ones were given at that time and have been reiterated since, but the idea of the Annuities Act was to present to those who wanted to take care of themselves in their old age something perhaps a little easier to maintain through governmental assistance by way of taking care of administrative charges than what was made available by private corporations for those who are perhaps inspired to buy annuities away and beyond that class of people to which annuities were presented in the first instance.

Mr. RALSTON: I take it from the minister's statement that there is not under consideration any idea of reducing the basis of interest yield on annuities or reducing the interest basis on which annuities are sold below four per cent?

Mr. GORDON: The question of reducing the interest yield has been the subject of very careful consideration, and at the present time the government has not in mind reducing it.

Mr. RALSTON: Or increasing the price of annuities, basing that price on a lower interest yield?

Mr. GORDON: It would be difficult indeed to forecast what the future may have in store for us, and I would not like to commit the government or any succeeding administration, if I could, to any hard and fast rule. The question of these annuities must very greatly depend upon the cost of money, the cost of annuities and all the factors that enter into the infinite complexities of insurance against old age. But at the present time the matter cannot be stated other than that the government does not intend to make any changes.

Item agreed to.

Combines Investigation Act, \$22,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Could the minister give us by years the number of prosecutions and the fines that have been levied as a result of prosecutions under this act during the last ten years?

Mr. GORDON: I take it that the question asked by the hon. gentleman has to do with fines that have been imposed and recovered following investigations under the act?

Mr. ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr. GORDON: The information before me discloses that the first fines were as the result of prosecutions in 1926 and that \$200,000 was recovered. The figures for other years are as follows:

Year:	Fines recovered
1930.. . . . .	\$10,000 3,000 4,000 8,000 1,000 500
1931.. . . . .	\$ 8,000 1,600 1,100 8,000
1932.. . . . .	\$17,500 8,700
1933.. . . . .	\$ 1,500 5,000 7,000 5,000 7,000 6,000
1935.. . . . .	\$ 5,000 5,000 2,000 1,000 500

Those were the fines collected in the years indicated.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The total for 1926 was about \$200,000?

Mr. GORDON: Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: And nothing for 1927 or 1928?

Mr. GORDON: No. After the fines were imposed and recovered in 1926 there were no fines, as the result of proceedings, until 1930.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I notice that among the bills introduced by the minister is one to amend the Combines Investigation Act, which will remove the act from the administration of the minister and, as I understand it, put it under the president of the privy council as the responsible minister, the act to be administered by a commission. In these circumstances will the minister require this year the appropriation for which he asked last year?

Mr. GORDON: As I understand it the legislation to which the right hon. gentleman refers has not been introduced as yet, or at all events has not been passed, and in the interval I think we are quite justified in presenting this estimate. We may never use it, but at the same time it will be there if the occasion should require it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is just as well to have this pointed out at once. I assume the legislation will pass and that the