reduced by over 15 per cent. Even if only a third of this possible reduction were obtained, or only 5 per cent, the insured in the United States would be saved many millions annually.' He adds:

"The conclusion seems safe that here is a rich, unexploited field for saving money. And the beauty of it is that these gains bring with them gains far more precious to the nation than dollars—immeasurable gains of longevity, vitality, efficiency and happi-ness. Life insurance is not philanthropy, but it is beneficent business. Though at first glance it might seem that to prevent the polution of streams, to improve the milk supply, to obtain pure foods, and freedom from accident, is no part of the business of life insurance, yet it is easy enough to see the very vital connection. By far the larger part of the cost of the insurance business is not management, nor agents' fees, but the cost of mortality. It is the right, if, in fact, it is not the duty, of any business to reduce its cost. To pare down salaries might not save the policy-holders 1 per cent of his premium, but to reduce mortality cost might save him many per cent.'

There is here food for serious consideration. Prof. Fisher believes the very fact that life companies proposed to improve health conditions would convince millions that if there was not merit in it, life companies would not attempt it, and that the mere announcement would spur the various healtlh officials to reform. The success which fire companies met with in the effort to reduce fire risks is pointed out, in some cases reaching as high as 70 per cent.

In the Bill respecting life assurance before the House of Commons there is an attempt being made to limit the expenses of the business, but a consideration of the facts referred to will convince anyone that much greater good will result from freedom. The progress of life assurance should not be bounded by the enterprise of a government official. Life assurance companies have a direct interest in the health and welfare of the community. It is only desirable citizens that are insurable. Self-interest is sometimes a great help to reforms. One very notable example of this was when the railway companies determined to employ no man who drank, and to discharge any men who drank on or off duty. Philanthropy did not dictate this course. It was self-interest, but it gave the temperance cause a great forward movement. While the Bill introduced is intended to do good by limiting the expense, it is likely to do ten times more harm by limiting the efforts possible to be made to bring about an improved condition and length of life.

Other arguments against this limitation have already been pointed out, among others the absurdity in a country where the protective principle prevails of applying a restriction clause to life companies, and allowing every protected industry to tax the rest of the community. It would be more consistent to bonus life companies to encourage thrift and an observance of the laws of health among the people, until in time the whole people would become insurable.

The clause is neither right nor necessary. It belongs to the same class as the 99th clause, which seeks to force stock companies to give representation on the boards of directors to policy-holders, even though the policy-holders have never asked for it. The charters were granted and investment made without such representation. It should remain optional. Both clauses should be struck out.

MONTREAL, April 8, 1909.

To the Committee of Banking and Commerce,
Ottawa, Ont.

GENTLEMEN,—In reference to the new Insurance Bill now before you, we wish to say that the present Canadian Underwriters have combined into an association which has systematically raised the rates on insurance to such an extent that they have become prohibitive.

Before the Board of Trade fire we paid here a premium of 66½ per thousand, and this has gradually been raised, so that we have been paying up till now, $2.05 per