

Now, at that time the Ancient Order of Foresters were assessing their members at the rate of \$10.92 per annum, whereas this present society assesses its members only \$8.04. At another age they assessed their members at \$15.24, where the Sons of England only assess theirs at \$9.60. At the age of 40, they assessed at \$18.24, where the Sons of England only assess their members at \$11.28. At the age of 44 the Ancient Order of Foresters assessed their members at \$21 a year, where the Sons of England only assessed their members at \$11 a year. The result of that is that at the end of a man's expectation of life the Ancient Order of Foresters would, at the age of 25, have a sum of \$1.124 for the security of that individual; at the age of 35, they would have \$1.031; at the age of 40, \$1.011; at the age of 44, \$982, subject to the expenses of management. These high figures did not, however, cause the Government to feel justified in conceding to their request, and before they could get the Government's assent they had to consent to have the rates materially raised. Now if we compare the conditions that exist in this society that now seeks incorporation with those that exist in the Ancient Order of Foresters, we find that at the age of 25, at the end of a man's expectation of life, there are \$828 waiting for him; at the age of 35, \$649; at the age of 40, \$631; at the age of 44, \$525, when the obligation is that they are to pay this man \$1,000. These figures are also subject, I presume, to working expenses. It is also true that the Sons of England can make three additional assessments: they are not compelled to do so, but they may do so, and if they do that, they will have, for a man aged 44, at the end of his expectations, \$636, where they promised to pay him \$1,000. And yet it is said that we are arbitrary if we do not consent to give them a Dominion charter in order that it may be used in the outlying provinces to further the aims of their institutions. Now, I am a sympathizer with benevolent institutions, I recognize the good they have done in the past and that they will do in the future, if they confine themselves within proper and safe lines. But when any benevolent institution starts out with the assumption that they can pay a man \$1,000 at the end of his expectations of life, and only collect \$636 from him, they are bound ultimately to fail in their objects. Therefore, I look with considerable alarm at the attempt made to get Dominion incorporation to continue such a state of things as I have enumerated. It has been said that the benevolent societies cannot successfully carry on a life insurance business. I do not think that is true. I do not see why, under a proper and economical management, they could not successfully compete with the ordinary life insurance societies of the day, because their expenses are so much smaller than those of the ordinary

life companies that they are able to reduce materially the rates they charge. The last speaker gathered from the remarks of the Minister of Finance that the Government will compel these societies to raise such a sum as to equal that of life insurance companies. That is not at all necessary, because the expenses of life insurance companies are so immeasurably larger, that a benevolent society can carry on its work of life insurance under their ordinary management at a much cheaper rate, and, therefore, they can successfully carry on the business of life insurance. I have looked over the returns of the various Canadian life insurance companies doing business in Canada, and I find that out of ten companies there are only two that do not expend more than 20 per cent of their entire premium incomes, one spends 25 per cent, two spend 30 per cent, one spends 33 per cent, two spend 40 per cent, one 42 per cent, one 43 per cent, and one 48 per cent of their entire premium income in the management of their business. Now, if a benevolent society can conduct its affairs in a more economical way, they can come up to the requirements of the Government without at all levying such a large annual assessment upon their members as is levied by the ordinary insurance company. I think that the Sons of England are engaged in a good work, a patriotic work, but it is doubtful whether they are justified in asking us to incorporate their society in order to do business in the various provinces of the country when we know, and they know, that they are not securing from its members an adequate sum of money to enable them successfully to carry out their objects. How a society can honestly and consistently induce members to join it and promise to pay them \$1,000, when they only have \$500 to do it with, is something I cannot comprehend. Because the Ancient Order of Foresters were willing and consented to have their annual premiums raised in order that they may be absolutely safe, I vigorously supported their Bill. They consented to accept the amendment suggested by the actuaries of the department, and having done that, they put their society upon a safe basis in so far, at least, as all their future business is concerned. Is it safe for us now, when we have taken the first step forward in the right direction, to go back to the old principle that we know is wrong, though it has obtained for the past few years? It has been urged here to-night that because the Government has given a Dominion charter to several institutions, therefore, it is right that it should be extended to this one. The question, I fancy, for us to consider is, was it right for the Government in days gone by to give charters to institutions that could not implement their promises? And if it was not right, is it right for us to continue that custom to-day? If they have engaged