

The large number of deaths amongst policy-holders who had been insured only from one year to five years, is a convincing argument in favour of life assurance.

It is a very striking exhibit of the uncertainty of human life, as it is also an illustration of risk in all life policies.

The experience of the *Ætna Life* in 1903, as reported in the journal of the company, was as follows, showing the cause of death and number of deaths in each period:—

Cause of Death.	Ages.				Totals.
	Under 30	From 30 to 50.	From 50 to 70.	Over 70.	
Typhoid.....	12	25	15	3	55
Consumption.....	19	50	27	5	101
Cancer.....	1	12	52	22	87
Rheumatism.....	..	1	..	1	2
Diabetes.....	..	6	7	5	18
Apoplexy and paralysis.	1	27	111	80	219
Heart diseases.....	3	32	119	97	251
Pneumonia.....	5	23	37	30	95
Grippe, etc.....	1	6	26	36	69
Appendicitis.....	10	10	2	..	22
Digestive diseases.....	2	17	45	21	85
Bright's disease.....	2	8	64	34	108
Accidental.....	6	36	24	11	77
Suicide.....	2	12	3	..	17
Vario ^{us}	9	28	46	97	180
Totals.....	73	293	578	442	1,386

That out of 1,386 deaths in 1903 there were 470, or over one-third, attributable to diseases of the heart and nerves is significant. These diseases are caused by habits of the same class as those which develop digestive diseases, Bright's disease, and ailments of other bodily organs, which are apt to be unduly strained by the stress and strain and other conditions of modern life.

THE ADVANTAGE OF LIFE ASSURANCE TO MEN OF MODERATE WEALTH.

To which class in the community is life assurance most desirable and beneficial for themselves and their families, is a difficult question to answer. But that there are some differences in the extent of the benefits conferred by life assurance from a class point of view may be admitted. There is only one class of persons who have any reasonable claim to be regarded as entirely above the need for such advantages as life assurance confers. This class is composed of those who have wealth represented by properties of fixed value as producers of income, to such a large extent as will enable those by whom it is inherited, or devised by will, to maintain the social position they occupied before the testator's death.

There are, however, numerous wealthy men who will be able to leave some members of their family

in circumstances of affluence, or of such comfort, financially, as they enjoyed before being bereaved, but whose estate is not large enough to provide amply for the needs of all the family and connections without some sacrifice of the family's social status.

The ambition to found a family by leaving a large property to one son, or some chosen heir, is not so common amongst rich men on this continent as it is in England, but even here this desire for posthumous distinction is not unknown, as it is too near being a natural instinct to be confined within geographical limits.

To wealthy men life assurance opens up the opportunity of discriminating heavily in favour of some one heir or a small circle, without making such discrimination unjust, or cruel, as it sometimes is, towards others of the family. A rich man might justly leave his personal property to some one heir, or a few favoured ones, and by having life assurance proportionate to his means, he could leave a handsome sum to other members of the family, who, under ordinary circumstances, would suffer a severe financial reverse of fortune were no such special provision made for them as is possible by life assurance.

A case in point occurred last year, not in Canada, when a man of some wealth, chiefly in land, who lived in a family mansion, died and left his estate between his widow, his eldest son, three daughters and two sisters. The necessity of selling and dividing the property left them all in far less easy circumstances than those to which they had been accustomed for many years. Had he insured his life for such a sum as he could easily have afforded to do, the heirs all round might have kept the estate intact and maintained the family mansion as it had been for several generations. To the estate of many a wealthy man life assurance would be a very great benefit as a "cash reserve" against contingencies and a "cash resource" which would enable the conditions of a will to be carried out without sacrificing real estate, or breaking up a family home, or leaving some bereaved relative, or defendant, less adequately provided than was expected, and natural justice demanded.

The field for extending life assurance amongst men of property is a very extensive one, one which has been much neglected, one which would richly repay the most strenuous, skilful and persistent efforts to bring it under the beneficent influences of life assurance. Many a family reared in comparative affluence might have been saved the humiliation and acute distress of being thrown out of an ancestral home and deprived of their social standing had the owner of the estate had the foresight and the good judgment to protect his family by a life policy proportionate to his income and moral obligations.