THE SECURITY to Policy Holders is no greater in the "Proprietary" than in the MUTUAL Companies, and practically the Mutual is safer. A proof of this is furnished by the failure lately of a dozen or more American Companies, not one of which was Mutual!

So safe and popular have the MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES of the world become, that many Stock Companies incorporate Mutual in their names, and nearly all the Stock Companies have a participating system hung on to popularize them.

The Insurance Year Book (corrected to August, 1877) shows that nine American Stock Companies are self-styled Mutual; that forty-eight American Stock Companies own \$168,228,180.00 of Assets, while the Policy Holders of the Four leading Mutuals own \$194,740,336.00. The sixteen American Mutuals own \$258,193,964.00 Assets, as against forty-eight Proprietary Companies owning \$90,000,000.00 less.

THE TESTIMONY TAKEN

by the English Parliamentary Committee of A. D. 1853, leaves no room to doubt that the only use of Stock Capital in a Life Assurance Company is to start it, and the fact that the most successful companies have not even required it for that purpose, proves that it is of no benefit to Policy Holders at all, but the reverse.

PROF. WRIGHT,

the eminent actuary of Boston, in one of his reports (as Insurance Commissioner) to the Legislature of Massachusetts says:—

THE MUTUAL SYSTEM, with redundantly large premiums and an equitable method of dividing the surplus, seems greatly preferable to the non-participating plan.

In the same reports, Prof. Wright says, "It does not seem wise for any Legislature to farm out

al

rporeiver ained Do-

ucted ining liable

Policy s, and Direc-

mally ing in The ceduc-ce of Policy serve, for the central serve.

e who ection But no URELY most uch as

uch as f New f Brit-