

vance sheets of the Missouri and Wisconsin reports as given out. It will be observed that the Connecticut Report separates the regular from the industrial companies, the former of which only we give in the following table:—

COMPANY.	Loading for Expenses.	Total Expenses.	Interest and Rents earned.	Int. Required to maintain reserve
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Anna.....	1,059,224	1,267,033	2,301,746	1,493,754
Berkshire.....	360,677	376,992	361,120	258,958
Conn. General.....	44,605	116,862	142,064	90,623
Conn. Mutual.....	1,180,522	1,173,207	2,997,195	2,217,430
Equitable.....	8,525,000	8,066,983	8,341,822	6,478,756
Germania.....	682,501	743,034	950,126	781,747
Home.....	324,865	564,011	478,935	317,006
Manhattan.....	481,559	659,261	717,089	531,535
Massachusetts.....	857,520	845,705	714,489	666,000
Mutual Benefit.....	1,741,621	1,494,657	2,836,877	2,183,000
Mutual, N. Y.....	8,688,844	10,264,523	10,387,804	7,776,921
National, Vt.....	559,361	736,389	571,926	439,447
New England.....	700,906	722,569	1,063,248	945,224
New York.....	8,052,330	7,947,539	8,722,934	6,209,588
Northwestern.....	3,448,087	2,821,255	4,697,146	2,754,155
Penn Mutual.....	1,202,795	1,117,516	1,130,373	999,810
Phoenix Mutual.....	279,617	523,867	576,836	393,212
Provident L. & T.....	807,413	783,373	1,352,754	1,059,711
Provident Savings.....	613,102	606,461	87,240	69,100
State Mutual.....	549,506	486,732	478,235	468,314
Travelers.....	269,561	668,917	885,273	655,819
Union Central.....	751,800	974,555	976,272	575,848
United States.....	212,721	445,687	311,134	270,430
Washington.....	416,597	557,409	632,460	526,976
Totals.....	41,810,736	43,959,538	51,715,099	38,116,364

It will be seen that, while the premium loading for expenses amounted to \$41,810,736, the expenses incurred amounted to \$43,959,538, or just \$2,148,802 in excess of the loading. Of course that means that the excess was taken from some source not contemplated in the legitimate conduct of the business, and that the surplus is less by just that amount than it would otherwise have been. Turning to the interest account we find a large difference between amount earned and the amount required to maintain the reserve. The former was \$51,715,099 and the latter \$38,116,364, a gain on interest account of the large sum of \$13,598,735. This we take it must be rather disquieting to the ardent advocates of the necessity for a higher standard than four per cent., for when the fiction, as some regard it, has been indulged of making a liberal deduction for "investment expense," there yet remains a pretty large margin between the legal requirements and the actual results.

A large gain, measured by the difference between the reserve belonging to and the portion paid out on lapsed and surrendered policies, is also shown in the exhibit. For example, the total reserve credited to these two classes of policies by the twenty-four companies above considered was \$37,205,744, and the amount paid out on account of these retiring policyholders was \$29,580,389, showing a gain from surrenders and lapses of \$7,625,355. As the amount paid was 79.5 per cent. of the total reserve involved the saving from this source was 20.5 per cent. Still further, a comparison of the "cost of the insurance," or the mortality assumed by the standard tables for

which credit was taken, shows that the death losses actually incurred amounted to \$42,174,706, while the losses assumed amounted to \$52,669,143, the actual death losses being \$10,494,437 less than the expected losses, or a fraction over 80 per cent. This experience is a most suggestive one, showing, as it does, that the average death-rate of the companies, including the oldest and largest, is about twenty per cent. less than is provided for in the construction of the current premium. The "Gain and Loss Exhibit" for 1895, taking the same companies here considered, showed a gain on mortality account nearly though not quite so large as in 1896.

From the three sources of gain above referred to, viz.—on interest account, on surrender and lapse account and on mortality account, we find a total gain amounting to \$31,718,527. Of this amount \$16,575,546 was paid in dividends to policy-holders and \$12,994,178 added to the surplus, bringing it up to a total of \$161,873,878. What became of the balance of the \$31,718,526 "gained" is accounted for in the \$2,148,802 absorbed for expenses in addition to the premium loading provided for that purpose. Two logical conclusions follow a study of the above exhibit. One is that either the new or the old business, or both, costs too much, for it exceeds the ample loading provided; and the other is that the current premium charged is a good deal too high or the dividends returned to policy-holders a good deal too low. If twenty-four companies can show a gain in a single year of more than \$31,700,000 it is perfectly plain, assuming 1896 to have been an average year, that either they should charge less for the insurance furnished or return to the policy-holders a good deal more than was returned. There are other lessons to be drawn from the "Gain and Loss Exhibit," assuming it to be reliable, or approximately so.

#### THE NEW PROVINCIAL CABINET.

The Honble. Mr. Marchand has doubtless had an anxious task in selecting his ministerial colleagues. The knotty question as to the Treasurership he has settled by taking this office himself. The Cabinet, for the present, is made up as follows:—

HON. F. G. MARCHAND,	Premier and Treasurer.
HON. HORACE ARCHAMBAULT,	Attorney General.
HON. H. T. DUFFY,	Commissioner of Public Works
HON. S. N. FARENT,	" Crown Lands.
HON. F. G. M. DECHEN,	" Agriculture.
HON. A. TURGEON,	" Mines and Fisheries.
HON. J. E. ROBIDOUX,	Provincial Secretary.

Hon. G. W. Stephens, Hon. J. Shehyn, Hon. J. J. Guerin, are members of the Cabinet without portfolios. Mr. Jules Tessier is named as Speaker of the Assembly. Some changes are probable in a few months, when the Premier will take Mr. Robidoux's portfolio on his elevation to the Bench, and Mr. Bickerdike is spoken of as the coming Treasurer.