

much, more than can be properly performed; others because they think it does not go quite far enough. Some parties think that this project would burden the state unduly; others have told me they consider the state would make unreasonable provision of the transaction. Some allege that there is no need for it. With that objection I shall deal presently, and at a little more length. Some say the annuity limit is fixed too high, some that it is not fixed high enough, and so on. Some allege that the government has too much latitude given to it, some that it does not take discretion enough. Some parties think that there is a sinister design concealed behind this project, and that the government take power to interfere with companies which are now doing good work in the country. Some, as I have said, consider that it may possibly interfere with insurance companies, and others object that it does not provide insurance which they would like to see furnished by the state. Now the question of state insurance, like the question of old-age pensions, is a question which may, under certain conditions, and in certain places, be fairly discussed. I do not propose to discuss that now, I merely mention it in order to clear the ground, and to point out that this is neither an old-age pension Bill nor yet a provision for state insurance. Then there are parties who object to the provision, which I may observe has already been recognized fully by our law, and is recognized in all old-age pension Bills introduced in other countries, that an annuity granted by the state under these conditions should be inalienable, should be free from seizure for debt and should remain the property of the person who obtains it until the day of his death. Then there are others