been made with the agitation for the extension of the State Fire Marshal departments. Commissioners and Superintendents of Insurance in several States have come out in advocacy of establishing a fire marshal department, notably in Missouri, Illinois and New York; and in the last two named States special commissions, appointed to make a study of the whole situation as regards insurance and especially insurance rates, have not only recommended fire marshal legislation, but advised that the law be so framed as to give the marshal ample powers to eliminate conditions which endanger the life and property of a community. During the past year fire marshal bills were introduced into the Legislatures of Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon and Pennsylvania, in five of which States—Iowa, Michigan, Montana, Oklahoma and Pennsylvania—the demand for the law was successful.

This Credit Men's committee is going on with its work, acting in concert with the National Fire Protection Association. With something already done, Credit Men have an excellent incentive to go further ahead in their efforts to reduce fire waste.

CANADIAN INSURANCE ACT: BRITISH ACTUARIES' VIEWS (II).

We continue below a summary of the recent discussion by the Institute of Actuaries, of Great Britain, of the paper prepared by Mr. Thomas Bradshaw on the Canadian Insurance Act. The first part of this discussion appeared four weeks ago. As we then said, while, possibly, some of the opinions expressed may not find agreement with them on this side, it is always interesting to observe familiar objects from new points of view, and, possibly, may be more than interesting.

INSURANCE, WHOLESALE AND RETAIL.

Mr. S. G. Dunn (Liverpool and London and Globe) found himself in opposition to the Author in connection with some of those provisions which that gentleman appeared to approve. The Author pointed out that one of the provisions of the Act was that there should be no distinction in the rate of premium charged to a large policyholder as compared with the small policyholder. If a company pub-lished a prospectus stating that its rates of premium were so much per cent., without qualification, he thought it was quite arguable there was some moral obliquity in charging a smaller rate per cent. to a particular policyholder or a particular class of policyholder; but if an office, in its prospectus, published separate tables of rates to show that it was prepared to issue large policies at a different rate of premium, it seemed to him it was perfectly justified in doing so. If it liked to publish a table for £100 policies and a table for £1,000 policies and a table for £10,000 policies, he did not see that any one could possibly com-Further, he thought that that provision of the Act was not only fundamentally wrong in principle, but very injurious in tendency . . . The general office expenses in ocnnection with a $\pounds 2,000$ policy were surely less than the expenses of twenty $\pounds 100$ policies, and the policyholder should have the benefit. Mr. Bradshaw laid it down that the intention of the Act was undoubtedly to secure to all policyholders equality of treatment. It was only equality of treatment to give the large policyholders the benefit that accrued to them from the cheaper rate at which their policies were transacted. The effect of imposing upon all policyholders, irrespective of the magnitude of the policies, the same rate of premium per cent. was that the companies would be able to pay a larger commission to the agents, the business being cheaper; and the Government by so enforcing that provision was encouraging the agent and increasing his remuneration at the ex-

pense of the policyholder. He thought it was an extremely novel economic principle that the interests of the distributary should be placed before those of the consumer, and it seemed to him the whole principle of the provision was absolutely wrong.

CANADIAN AND BRITISH ACTS NOT COMPARABLE.

Mr. A. McDougald (Phœnix Assurance Company), paid a high tribute to Mr. Bradshaw for his paper, and proceeded:

The Act may be regarded as (a) the outcome of an aroused public sentiment in Canada, and of native criticism of life insurance management in the Dominion; coupled with (b) a growing conviction in Canadian insurance circles that a healthy expansion of the business was becom-ing an increasingly difficult operation under the laws which the new Act supersedes. Not improbably, too, the genesis of the measure was influenced by a desire on the part of the Dominion Government to head off any contemplated attempt on the part of the Provincial Governments to arrogate to themselves the sole right to enact insurance legislation, each within its respective territory. thor does well to remind us more than once of the underlying principles, viz., Restriction and Supervision, on which the Act is based. It is not possible to institute any comparison of these principles with those on which our own Act is founded; we may place the Canadian and British Acts in juxtaposition, but they are not comparable. It is necessary that these facts, and the reasons therefor, be thoroughly recognized before we are justified in passing any judgment on the merits or demerits of the Act. The economic conditions, the social and commercial habits and requirements of the people, the fact that the country is in the making, the most impressive chapters of its history lying in the future rather than in the past, its insurance requirements and habits of thought and even its insurance glossary so largely influenced by the giant insurance instigiossary so largely induced by the giant insurance insti-tutions in the States, all these considerations, and more, if duly borne in mind, will serve to assist us in fairly estimating the degree of fitness and utility of the Canadian Act in the sphere of its operations.

PUBLICITY MORE IN EVIDENCE.

It is to be noted that whilst the Dominion Parliament, in its latest insurance law, has emphasized its policy of "Re-striction and Supervision" laid down in earlier enact-ments, the principle of publicity is more in evidence in the new Statute than ever before. At the same time we are struck with the fact that the periodical returns now required of the companies in Canada differ in important respects from those called for under the British Act. Indeed, the incidence of the publicity called for under the two Acts is remarkably dissimilar. For example, under the Canadian Statute, assets and their movements have to be shown in very great detail, but, desirable as this may be, what we regard as of vital importance, namely, periodical returns in such form as to enable the public through an actuarial reader to place an approximate check upon a company's estimate of its policy liabilities, are practically absent. Policy contracts are mentioned in bulk, and are compared with the corresponding statutory reserves certified by the companies, but for anything further than this reliance has to be placed on the element of Government On comparison of the supervision in terms of the Act. On comparison of the two systems there can be no doubt that the Canadian in-surance public are the losers of a healthy and valuable element of expert criticism. Time was when such criticism supervision in terms of the Act. was not available in Canada, but to-day that country enjoys a strong and growing body of actuarial opinion, thanks to the efforts during recent years both of this Institute and of the American Actuarial Society. Again, the annual returns of income and expenditure are shown on what is locally spoken of as a "Cash basis," and are in no sense returns of revenue drawn up according to modern principles of accounting. This feature is a reflection of United States legislation, and may be amended at a future date.

Those portions of the Act dealing with the Maximum and Minimum Valuation bases are collated by the Author from widely separated sections of the Statute, and are lucidly set forth, with certain modifications such as are not to be These classes are, from our point of view, unique, and are interesting alike for what they provide and on account of their omissions. For example, the vide and on account of their omissions. For example, the Act stipulates that no company may combine any form of insurance with life assurance, but by another and inde-pendent section permits Sickness Disability Insurance Benefits to be included in a life policy! This inconsistency