



SOCIETY OF ACTUARIES

Article from:

The Actuary

December 1981 – Volume 15, No. 10

Canada Product Innovation

(Continued from page 6)

social right. By transferring so much risk to the policyholder, do we increase the danger of government interference? This question must be faced by all actuaries and all companies, not just those who have introduced these modern products. For if the consumer complains, and the government listens, it will be the entire industry that will suffer.

Discussion at the Meeting

There was a full and wide spectrum of opinion. At one extreme—the buyer wants an inexpensive product, and is willing to risk future premium increases or face amount decreases to get it. And he's willing to accept lower cash value. The old guarantees have had their day; if we don't respond, we'll lose even more savings dollars to other financial institutions. At the other extreme—the buyer doesn't know the risks he's assuming; his satisfaction will last only till costs turn adversely.

Most opinions were in-between, but perhaps closer to the first than to the second extreme. The annual premium flexible products seem quite accepted in Canada, but less so the single premium variety. Nor is there universal acceptance of products devoid of cash value guarantees. □

Universal Life in U.K.?

(Continued from page 1)

It is quite possible that regulatory changes in both our countries may lead to convergence in product design. We know there is pressure on U.S. regulators to broaden the scope for unit-linking, and the U.K. industry is lobbying for relaxation of the constraints on product design.

Ed. Note: We welcome this account from a member in Great Britain. □

PART 5 CHANGES IN 1982

The E & E Committee has decided to continue offering Part 5A and Part 5B as separate examinations for the foreseeable future, rather than to combine them into one exam as originally scheduled for 1982. Thus, any credit that students have for either Part 5A or 5B will be retained indefinitely.

Two modifications are being made for Part 5 in 1982: (1) Part 5A will become a 4-hour exam, and (2) Risk Theory will be moved from Part 5B to 5A. Thus, Part 5A (4 hours) will cover Advanced Life Contingency Theory and Risk Theory; Part 5B (3 hours) will embrace Mathematics of Demography, Principles of Construction of Mortality and Other Tables, and Mathematics of Graduation.

Please see Alastair Longley-Cook's article, "New Risk Theory Study Note Signals Change," in this issue, for particulars of a new Risk Theory study note which is being circulated to Part 5 students and can be ordered by others who want it.

*James J. Murphy,
Vice-General Chairman,
E & E Committee*

Seminar On Actuarial Career Development

The University of Nebraska Actuarial Club cordially invites anyone interested to attend their Sixth Annual Educational Seminar at the City Campus Union in Lincoln on January 23, 1982, 8:45 a.m. to 1 p.m. The major career development subjects include Actuarial Recruiting and Student Development in Companies. Admission charge is \$2.00. Enquire to Prof. Warren R. Luckner at his Year Book phone or address.

LETTERS

Election Matters

Sir:

This letter is in strong support of Recommendation III (cutting back on Board renominations) of the Special Committee on Election Procedures (October issue). The Society cannot afford to become in-bred; we have many talented younger members on our committees who have earned places on the Board; and adequate continuity is amply assured by our constitutional provisions.

Here are the figures for the eighteen non-officer members of the current Board, divided between "repeaters" (those who have previously served in any capacity) and new blood:

<i>Year Elected</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>	<i>Repeaters</i>	<i>New Blood</i>
1979	1982	2	4
1980	1983	4	2
1981	1984	4	2
Totals		10	8

Four of these ten repeaters are now in their *third* term; two are former Vice-Presidents.

Examination of the preceding six years shows how new this phenomenon is. Apart from 1978 (in which three of the six were repeaters) we elected at most a single repeater annually; in 1977 there were none. The reason, I believe, was that Committees on Elections before 1978 operated under unwritten guidelines that effectively forestalled multiple terms.

Mr. Jackson's committee report was given to the Board (and hence to the 1981 Committee on Elections) in time for this problem to be dealt with. Chairman E. Paul Barnhart tells me that his committee did not knowingly ignore Recommendation III; through communication failure they simply didn't "hear".

A remedial guideline needs to be promptly drafted and communicated to the membership. It should permit occasional exceptions, but only for good and clear reasons.

C. L. Trowbridge

(Continued on page 8)

IT'S LOWRIE (NOT LAWRIE) !

The man who'll be glad to hear from readers who have ideas about the curriculum for Numerical Analysis and Graduation is Walter B. LOWRIE. We apologize to those who were sidetracked

by our misspelling of Walter's name on page 4 of our November issue.

Prof. Lowrie is at University of Nebraska-Lincoln. See p. A-90 of Year Book.

E.J.M.