*STATE MONOPOLY OF COMPENSATION INSURANCE, LABORATORY TEST OF GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

PART II

ANALYSIS OF THE RECENT ACTUARIAL AUDIT OF THE OHIO STATE INSURANCE FUND

BY

WINFIELD W. GREENE

The general subject of this paper was dealt with in November 1936 before this Society in an address of which the gist was as follows:

> In modern times there have evolved three distinctive schools of thought as to the relation which should exist between government and economic activity, namely:—
>
> 1. *The laissez-faire,* or classical school, which holds that "economic law" should be given free play, i.e., that government should not interfere with private enterprise, as the greatest good for the greatest number is achieved through what someone has referred to as "the sum total of little greeds."
> 2. The school which favors private enterprise *fostered* but *controlled* by government.
> 3. Socialism (theoretic socialism, not necessarily identical with any existing political regime), which holds that private enterprise will destroy itself, and be supplanted by state ownership and operation of the productive mechanism.
>
> Private enterprise *without some governmental restriction* has never existed, and evidently is not presently wanted in this country; so that the practical choice before our people is between friendly governmental regulation of private enterprise and a regime which is essentially socialistic in its objectives (whether admitting such a goal or not).
>
> Workmen's compensation insurance affords our electorate a unique large scale laboratory test of government in business in the form of the Ohio State Insurance Fund, one of the largest carriers of workmen's compensation insurance in the country, in business for more than a quarter of a century.
>
> Various public committees and commissions have reported grave lack of efficiency in the operation of this Fund. Nevertheless, it has been contended by its advocates, and particularly by the spokesmen of organized labor, that the "Ohio Plan" is the only one which gives the workman "a break."

* This paper is a sequel to one of identical title delivered as a presidential address to the Casualty Actuarial Society, November 13th, 1936. See also written discussions in this issue, page 187.

> Further, it has been claimed that the Ohio Fund furnishes compensation insurance at a lower cost than does any other plan, thereby benefiting not only the employer but also the employee, since this saving in insurance cost is alleged to be potentially available for the benefit of the employees in the form of more liberal wage scales and other benefits.
>
> On November 26, 1934, Woodward & Fondiller, Inc., consulting actuaries of New York, addressed to the Governor's Investigating Committee on the Workmen's Compensation Law, an "Actuarial Survey" of the Fund. This survey included an exhibit of the experience of the Fund for the years 1929-33 by industry group. Comparison of this experience with that for practically the same period in New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts (where private compensation insurance prevails with the sole exception of the competitive New York Fund) indicated that, with due allowance for difference in benefit scale, the pure compensation cost in Ohio under the monopolistic system was approximately 38% greater than was that in the three Eastern states. The gravest aspect of this abnormally high benefit cost is not the monetary loss to employers. Rather, it is the loss of life, health, income and happiness upon the part of workmen and their families.
>
> On the evidence available, the Ohio Fund, largest of the state compensation monopolies, has failed to render efficient and equitable service to employer and employee. It has been and still may be in precarious financial condition. Directly and indirectly, it has cost the people of Ohio dearly in money, life, health and good-will. There can be no justification for any state's initiating or continuing such an experiment in the workmen's compensation field, the automobile liability field, or any other field which can be served by private insurance.

That is what I said in November, 1936.

Under date of December 22, 1938, Woodward & Fondiller, Inc. again made a report, referred to as an "Actuarial Audit," upon the Ohio Fund, addressed in this case to the Industrial Commission of Ohio. Naturally I have felt it incumbent on me to study this report carefully and present my conclusions thereon to this Society, the more so when I discovered that in his transmittal letter to the Industrial Commission, Mr. Richard Fondiller said, *inter alia,* "The formulæ used by the Actuary of the Fund to establish the reserves for payment of claims were reviewed and found to be correct. Based upon our examination of the claims and analysis of the loss experience we find that the Actuary's formulæ have been correctly applied and the reserves, in our opinion, are adequate. . . . *The solvency of the Fund is unquestionable: the margin of safety of the Statutory Surplus is 6.4%; that of the General Surplus is 2.1%; and thus the total margin of safety is 8.5%.* . . . The Fund has been successfully operated for over a quarter of a century and is the only state insurance fund where *all* injured employees covered by the Law receive the full benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Law, regardless of whether or not the employer is insured. Ohio was one of the few large States where, during the years of depression, all claimants and employers were fully protected through the ability of the Fund to meet all of its obligations."

The new report contains no direct refutation of this writer's demonstration that for the period 1929-33 the pure premium cost of the Ohio Fund was 38% higher than that for the corresponding period of New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts upon the Ohio benefit level, although Table 18 of the new report captioned, "Experience of All 40 Groups—Private Fund Based on 5-Year Experience Period 1933-37, Inclusive" invites such a comparison, being similar in arrangement to Table 13 of the old report,* upon which my previous study was based. A superficial comparison of the new Ohio experience by industry group with the old shows an amazing improvement. The pure premium for all groups combined has dropped from $1.20 to $.91. Furthermore, whereas the pure premiums for 39 of the 40 groups have dropped anywhere from a few cents to several dollars, only 3 groups show an increase in pure premium, and these increases are trifling in amount. This tremendous improvement is the more surprising when it is realized that each of the two five-year periods observed includes the calendar year 1933, i.e., the periods overlap to the extent of one year.

The tremendous reduction in pure premium indicated by Table 18 of the new report would, on the face of it, strongly suggest that all or the greater part of the previously demonstrated abnormal excess of the Ohio benefit cost over that of the three Eastern states has now been suddenly and miraculously wiped out.

* I shall herein refer to the "Actuarial Survey", dated November 26, 1934, as the "old report", and to the "Actuarial Audit", dated December 22, 1938, as the "new report"; and to figures appearing in the earlier report as "old", and those in the latter report as "new".

In order that we may determine whether, in fact, such an improvement has occurred, it is necessary to make a close comparison of new Table 18 with old Table 13. Accordingly, exact copies of these two tables are attached hereto as exhibits. (See Tables VI and VII.)

It will be noted that the captions of several columns in new Table 18 differ markedly from the corresponding column headings of the old Table 13. Confining our attention to the only item with differing caption which affects the determination of pure premiums, we find that new column 5 is captioned, "Claims Less Interest," whereas the old Column 5 was captioned merely, "Claims." On page 44 of the new report it is explained that "The figures for gross premium (Column 4) exclude the 2% of premiums which are credited to surplus for catastrophe losses, and also exclude Occupational Disease premiums, Self-insurers' premiums, and disbursements for State Auditors and Safety Division." Presumably, corresponding exclusions have been made as respects claims, so the implication is that "Claims Less Interest" as shown in new Table 18 exclude not only interest, but also catastrophe losses and occupational disease losses. It is clear that before Table 18 will be comparable with the experience of other states, adjustments must be made to restore these items; and when we look further through the new report it becomes apparent that still further adjustments are necessary.

A fairly concrete idea of the complexity of the problem confronting us will be formed when I point out that the new report contains no less than five different figures relating to claims incurred for the period 1933-37 for the "Private Fund," as follows:

Amount	Table No.	Page No.	Caption and Remarks
$52,014,000	18	43	"Claims Less Interest."
$52,124,000	8	23	"Development of Incurred Losses by Successive Valuations." This particular figure is the sum of the incurred losses as shown in Table 8 as of December 31, 1937 for "Years of Accident Occurrence" 1933-1937. All figures in this table are after deduction of the "Accumulated Interest Credited to the Reserves."

Amount	Table No.	Page No.	Caption and Remarks
$58,144,000	8	23	Previous figure plus increase in incurred as per Table 8 from December 31, 1932 to December 31, 1937 as respects "Years of Accident Occurrence" 1928-1932.
$73,817,882	9	26	"Loss From Claims Incurred" from "Gain and Loss Exhibit for the 5 years ended December 31, 1937—Private Fund."
$74,825,215	19	45	"Claims Incurred" from "Trends in Loss Ratio—Summary of Experience of All 40 Groups—Private Fund 1933-1937, Inclusive."

It must be admitted that the above figures represent a wide area of choice, ranging from the figure of $52,014,000 appearing in Table 18, to that of $74,825,215, which appears in the very next table, namely, Table 19. This multiplicity of varying figures apparently relating to the same item, is characteristic not only of the new report but of the old report as well. However, it is comforting to note that the figure of $73,817,882, which appears in Table 9 of the Gain and Loss Exhibit for the Private Fund actually is repeated elsewhere in the report, namely, in Table 22 on Page 48, captioned, "Private Fund—Comparative Statement of Gain and Loss for the Five Years ended December 31, 1937"; and I am going to lean very heavily on this last figure not merely because Mr. Fondiller gives it two votes instead of one, but also because I am sure it is reasonable to assume that the figure for "Loss from Claims Incurred" appearing in the Gain and Loss account, that most sacred of all accounting exhibits, represents the exact amount of claims which the Private Fund incurred during the calendar period 1933-37. (Incidentally, I am not going to succumb to the temptation to use the highest figure as to "claims incurred" appearing in the new report, namely, that in Table 19, even though it exceeds the amount shown in the Gain and Loss Exhibit by more than $1,000,000!)

The figure shown in the Gain and Loss Account exceeds that in the experience table by almost $22,000,000. On the face of it, it does not appear likely that interest, catastrophe losses and occupational disease losses can possibly make up this difference, and upon investigation we will find that they do not.

The first impression created by this situation is that the incurred losses shown in the industry group experience (Table 18) are understated, i.e., they reflect inadequate reserves in respect of the accidents which have occurred in the period 1933-37. If an insurance institution is at all times setting up correct claim reserves then, according to its figures as of a given date, the incurred claims relating to the accidents of any recent five-year period will be approximately equal in amount to its losses incurred on the calendar year basis for the same five years. In fact, an excess of incurred losses on the calendar year basis over that on the "accident year" basis can be due only to the fact that at the beginning of the five-year period loss reserves were understated; and if such was the case a strong presumption is created that inadequate reserves have also been set up for the accidents occurring in the latest five years.

We can find plenty of sustantiation for this impression in the new report. Indeed, it is stated on Page 45, referring to "Trends in Loss Ratio" in 1933-37, "in each of these years, while the experience on current claims was favorable, it was necessary to strengthen the reserves on claims of *prior* years."

We find not only that this reserve deficiency is substantial, but that it has manifested itself in each of the latest five years, and in increasing degree. (See Table I attached hereto.) The new report includes an exhibit showing the development of incurred losses *by year of accident* as valued on successive year-end dates, as well as figures (Table 22, Page 48) for incurred claims for each calendar year, which latter figures balance out with the Gain and Loss Exhibit for the five-year period. Making appropriate adjustment in the accident year figures to eliminate the deduction of interest and to include claims due to catastrophe, occupational disease, self-insurers, uninsured employers, and safety violations, we find that as respects each of the latest five accident years, the first estimate of claims incurred fell far short of the calendar year "claims incurred" figure. This deficiency, which, as the new report shows, arose because "it was necessary to strengthen the reserves on claims of *prior* years," ranges in amount from $1,537,063 in 1933 to $5,519,784 in 1937.

There is every indication, then, that the reserve situation is getting worse rather than better.

In a situation such as this, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the claim cost relating to accidents occurring in the period 1933-37 will eventually prove to be at least as great as the total of claims incurred appearing in the Gain and Loss Exhibit. However, there is evidence supporting another approach to our problem; and, in all fairness, let us see what that evidence indicates before attempting definite conclusions. (This evidence is presented in Tables II, III and IV attached hereto.)

Table 8, Page 23, of the new report shows that as of December 31, 1937, the incurred losses relating to accident years 1933-37 amounted to $52,124,000. However, upon analysis of the changes in reserves shown in this table to have occurred from December 31, 1932 to the close of 1937 on accident years 1928 and subsequent (see Table III), we find that if we take the happenings of this five-year period as a guide to future reserve developments, the reserves on the last five accident years are still deficient to the extent of $7,685,000; which brings our incurred loss figure for accident years 1933-37 to $59,809,000. (We have still taken no account of reserve developments beyond the "tenth valuation," i.e., beyond a date nine years after December 31st of the year of accident occurrence, because data for that purpose are unavailable).

The new report casts no light whatever on the difference between incurred claims less accumulated interest and such incurred claims before interest deduction. However, as explained in line 4 of Table II, such evidence is contained in the old report in respect of accident years 1929-33, and, making due allowance for this difference, the incurred loss for the latest five accident years becomes $65,072,192.

We are still shy of any allowance for catastrophe and occupational disease claims, and once more the new report reveals no evidence on this point. However, using figures from the old report, as explained in Line 6 of Table II, we are able to make an adjustment for these items which brings the claims incurred for accident years 1933-37 to $67,084,734.

Now we are not through with this matter of reserve deficiency, for, as just stated, we have made no allowance for unfavorable developments after the tenth valuation. Line 6 of Table IV, which table accounts for the difference between the calendar year figures and the accident year figures as closely as we can with the evidence at hand, indicates that in the period 1933-37 there was sustained an incurred loss, gross as to interest, due to reserve deficiency on accident years prior to 1928 of $6,450,176. This figure cannot all be attributed to deficiencies occurring after the tenth valuation date, since accident years 1924 to 1927 had not, at the beginning of 1933, reached the tenth valuation. However, the size of this figure strongly supports the probability that a substantial part of it was due to reserve deficiencies emerging after the tenth valuation.

We have, therefore, two figures to consider as a measure of the claim cost due to the accidents of 1933-37.

1. That of $67,084,734 built up from the accident year figures appearing in the new report, upon evidence contained in the old and the new reports as to (a) adjustment for the deduction of interest and (b) reserve deficiency through the tenth valuation. This figure, which as we have just observed, is *probably too low,* indicates that the pure premiums in Table 18 of the new report should be increased 29.0%.
2. That of $73,079,703, which is the calendar year figure from the Gain and Loss Exhibit, reduced, as shown in Lines (11) and (12) of Table II, to eliminate certain claims not chargeable to the experience of the insured employers. This figure, which represents the amount of claim cost which the private assured of the Fund *had to pay for* in 1933-37, indicates that the pure premiums in Table 18 should be increased 40.5%.

Evidently we cannot be wide of the mark if we adjust the pure premiums and the figures for "Claims Less Interest" in the Ohio industry group experience by the mean of these factors, i.e., if we increase them 34.7%. This procedure will enable us to make an appropriate comparison between the Ohio experience and that of other states.

In Table V (attached hereto) is shown a comparison of the combined experience of New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts, all on the Ohio benefit level, with the Ohio experience, with the necessary adjustment made in the latter, namely, with "Claims Less Interest" and pure premiums increased the said 34.7%. This adjustment, by the way, puts the total Ohio experience for 1933-37 upon a cost level slightly higher than that of 1929-33, as shown in the old report. (The Ohio pure premium for all industry groups combined on the adjusted basis for 1933-37 is $1.23, as compared with $1.20 for 1929-33.) Furthermore, when, for industry groups which can be identified as comparable with industry schedules in use in the other states, the pure premiums of the three Eastern States combined (on the Ohio benefit level) are applied to the Ohio payrolls, we again find, as I did in my previous study, that the Ohio losses are 38% higher than the level indicated by the Eastern experience!

This latest Ohio experience, therefore, still indicates an abnormally high benefit cost, occasioning undue monetary loss to employers and undue loss of life, health, income and happiness upon the part of workmen and their families!

The tremendous reserve inadequacies revealed in the new report reflect gravely indeed upon the present financial position of the Ohio Fund.

At December 31, 1937, the surplus of the Private Fund, according to the new report, was $4,340,435. (Of this amount $4,300,255, all but $40,180, has been derived from contributions by self-insurers!) Study of the changes which have occurred in reserves since December 31, 1932 indicates that the reserves at the end of 1937 for accident years 1928-37 were deficient to the extent of $10,765,000. (See Table III.) Our evidence here, as already stated, gives no indication of what may happen after the first ten years of development. (The figure just named is net of interest credited to reserves, as is entirely proper from the standpoint of financial condition, though not from that of a comparison of pure premium cost.) As Table I clearly indicates, there is no evidence that the Ohio Fund is catching up with this reserve situation. It seems, therefore, a reasonable assumption that on December 31, 1937 there existed in the total claim reserve of the Private Fund a deficiency not less than the sum last named, which would imply that the assets of the Fund as carried in its balance sheet at the end of 1937 were insufficient to cover its reserves, had the latter been set up on an adequate basis, to the extent of $6,424,565. In other words, if the Private Fund were to liquidate, somebody, the employers or the taxpayers, presumably, would have to make a contribution of more than $6,000,000! Perhaps it is superfluous to state that this indicated deficit would be, save for the contribution of self-insurers, $10,724,820!

I now ask, as I did three years ago,—what justification can there be for any state's initiating or continuing an experiment of this kind in the workmen's compensation field, the automobile liability field, or any other field which can be served by private insurance?

I, for one, do not know the answer, and yet during the legislative sessions in 1939 there were introduced in the Legislatures of twelve states monopolistic state fund bills for workmen's compensation; and during the same legislative period, bills for monopolistic state funds covering compulsory automobile liability insurance were also introduced in twelve states! And, under date of June 30, 1939, Mr. Verne A. Zimmer, Director, Division of Labor Standards, transmitted to Hon. Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, a report entitled, "Progress of State Insurance Funds Under Workmen's Compensation—A Quarter Century of American Experience," by John B. Andrews. This pamphlet is the frankest sort of propaganda for state monopoly of compensation insurance. In Chapter VIII of this brochure, entitled, "The Case for State Funds," a "condensation of the principal reasons commonly advanced for the adoption of State compensation funds" is "briefly presented," covering the following captions:

"Public Responsibility"
"Complete Security"
"Social Service"
"Administrative Economy"
"Lower Cost to Employers"

Under the last heading appears the following:

"(1) The economy of workmen's compensation through State Funds, by elimination of unnecessary expense, is indicated by comparison of the average expense ratios (the proportion of collected premiums taken for expenses and profits):

1. For stock companies (selected risks) it is now about 40%.
2. For mutual companies (selected risks) it is now from 20 to 25%.
3. From competitive State Funds (all risks) it is from 10 to 20%.
4. For exclusive State Funds (all risks) it is from 5 to 10%.

"In simple terms, therefore, the cost to employers under exclusive State Funds is more than 30% less than under stock companies."

This last statement, as we have seen, simply is not true as far as the largest State Fund in the country is concerned.

I am loathe to believe that the responsible representatives of labor, or of the Federal Government, are so blindly committed to state monopoly as to ignore the facts concerning it, once they are acquainted with them. On the other hand, it is, as I see it, distinctly the job of the casualty business, if it is at all interested in its own survival, to collate these facts conscientiously, and display them widely, and persistently. In this task, which is quite as urgently important to the public as it is to our business, this paper, in the nature of things, can be "only the beginning."

TABLE I

Incurred Losses Divided Between Amount Relating to Accidents of Current Year and Deficiency in Reserves for Accidents of Prior Years

Year or Period	"Year of Accident" Incurred Losses, 1st Valuation, Net of Interest	Same Adjusted to Include Interest, and Claims Due to Catastrophe, Occupational Disease, Self-Insurers, Uninsured Employers and Safety Violations (1) × 1.077 (b)	"Claims Incurred" — Private Fund as per Gain and Loss Exhibit	Difference (3) — (2)	% Ratio (4)/(2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1933	$ 6,982,000 (a)	$ 7,520,000	$ 9,057,063 (c)	$1,537,063	20.4
1934	8,234,000 (a)	8,868,000	13,947,276 (c)	5,079,276	57.3
1935	8,537,000 (a)	9,194,000	12,588,890 (c)	3,394,890	36.9
1936	12,140,000 (a)	13,075,000	16,873,869 (c)	3,798,869	29.0
1937	14,699,000 (a)	15,831,000	21,350,784 (c)	5,519,784	34.9
1933-37	50,592,000	54,488,000	73,817,882	19,329,882	35.5

(a) From Column 1, Table 8, Page 23, New Report.

(b) This factor is product of interest factor (1.034), factor for inclusion of catastrophe and occupational disease claims (1/.97) and factor for inclusion of claims due to Self-Insurers, Uninsured Employers, and Safety Violation (1/.99). The two latter factors are explained in Table II of this paper. The interest factor (1.034) is the ratio of Incurred Claims before interest deduction, Accident Years 1929-33, from Table 17, p. 48, Old Report ($66,059,565) to Incurred Claims after interest deduction from same Table ($63,902,653).

(c) From Table 22, p. 48, New Report, "Private Fund — Comparative Statement of Gain and Loss for the Five Years Ended December 31, 1937."

TABLE II

DERIVATION OF FACTOR TO ADJUST LOSSES AND PURE PREMIUMS FOR ACCIDENT YEARS 1933-37, SHOWN IN TABLE 18, P. 43, NEW REPORT, TO BASIS COMPARABLE WITH EXPERIENCE ON NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY AND MASSACHUSETTS

Item	Source or Explanation	Amount
(1) Incurred Losses	Table 8, p. 23, New Report. This figure is after "The accumulated interest credited to reserves" has been deducted.	$52,124,000
(2) Indicated Reserve Deficiency through tenth valuation	Indicated by changes in incurred loss between 12/31/32 and 12/31/37 on accident years 1928 and subsequent (See Table III, this paper).	$ 7,685,000
(3) Sum	Line (1) plus Line (2)	$59,809,000
(4) Factor to eliminate Interest Deduction	Ratio of Incurred Claims before interest deduction for Accident Years 1929-33 as at 12/31/33 (Table 17, p. 48, Old Report) ($69,393,272); to same after interest deduction (from same source) ($63,769,941) (The New Report contains no similar table.)	1.088
(5) Product	Line (3) × Line (4)	$65,072,192
(6) Factor to include catastrophe and occupational disease claims	No figures on this in New Report; but Old Report (for 1929-33) shows the following: Table 14, p. 40 Total Claims (ex-catastrophe) .... $69,168,520 Table 19, p. 52 Incurred Claims, catastrophes 1929-33........... 1,268,009 TOTAL .... $70,436,529 Ratio of "Catastrophe" to "Total," 1.8%. Table 10, p. 34 Private Employees Disease Division—Claim Vouchers 1929-33 .... $ 824,936 Table 6, p. 29 Employees Accident Division—Claim Vouchers 1929-33 72,199,699 TOTAL .... $73,024,635 Ratio of "Disease" to "Total" 1.1%. From the above we conclude that catastrophes and disease combined constitute about 3% of Total Claims.	1/.97
(7) Product	Line (5) × Line (6)	$67,084,734
(8) Claims Less Interest	Table 18, p. 43, New Report. (This is the figure upon which the pure premiums shown in said Table are based.)	$52,014,000

TABLE II (*Continued*)

Item	Source or Explanation	Amount
(9) Factor (I)	To adjust "Claims Less Interest" and pure premiums shown in Table 18, p. 43, New Report to basis comparable with experience of other states. Line (7) divided by Line (8).	1.290
(10) Claims Incurred	From Table 9, p. 26, New Report (Gain & Loss Exhibit).	$73,817,882
(11) Factor to Eliminate Claims Due to Self-Insurers, Uninsured Employers and Safety Violation	Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, p. 29, 30, 31, 33, 34 Old Report show the following for years 1929-33: *Claim Vouchers* Self-Insurers Accident .... $ 47,184 Non-Compliance .... 552,255 Safety Violations .... 158,663 Self-Insurers Disease .... —o— TOTAL .... $758,102 (a) Total—Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.........$73,782,737 (b) Ratio (a) to (b) — 1.03%. From the above we conclude that Claims Due to Self-Insurers, Uninsured Employers, and Safety Violation constitute about 1% of Total Claims.	.99
(12) Product	Line (12) × Line (13)	$73,079,703
(13) Factor (II)	For purpose stated in Line (9), but based on assumption that Incurred Claims for Accident Years 1933-37 would, if adequately reserved for at least equal in amount of the Incurred Claims for Calendar Years 1933-37. Line (12) divided by Line (8).	1.405
(14) Factor (III)	Mean of lines (9) and (13) (This is the factor used in Table V, as explained in the text of this paper.)	1.347

RESERVE DEFICIENCY INDICATED BY DEVELOPMENT OF INCURRED LOSSES DURING FIVE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1937 (BASED ON TABLE 8, P. 23, NEW REPORT)

Yr. of Accident Occurrence	Incurred Losses (in Thousands) for Each Accident Year as of Successive Valuation Dates (a)									
	1st Val.	2nd Val.	3rd Val.	4th Val.	5th Val.	6th Val.	7th Val.	8th Val.	9th Val.	10th Val.
1928					$14,603	$15,046	$15,293	$15,232	$15,653	$15,917
									Total $15,653	$15,917
									Ratio—1.017	
1929				$17,769	18,082	18,680	18,418	18,834	19,590	
								Total $34,066	$35,243	
								Ratio—1.035		
1930			$15,874	16,296	16,989	16,359	16,747	17,339		
							Total $50,458	$51,405		
							Ratio—1.019			
1931		$13,045	13,288	13,756	13,253	13,450	13,832			
						Total $63,535	$64,290			
						Ratio—1.012				
1932	$8,884	9,119	9,296	9,096	9,464	9,517				
					Total $72,391	$73,052				
					Ratio—1.009					
1933	6,982	6,920	6,830	7,202	7,401					
			5 yr.	Total $64,119	$65,189					
				Ratio—1.017						
1934	8,234	7,915	8,553	8,910						
		5 yr.	Total $53,841	$55,260						
			Ratio—1.026							
1935	8,537	8,961	9,516							
	5 yr.	Total $45,960	$47,483							
		Ratio—1.033								
1936	12,140	11,598								
	5 yr. Total $44,777	$44,513								
	Ratio — .944									
1937	$14,699									

Year of Accident Occurrence	(1) Incurred Loss (in Light of Valuation to 12/31/37)	(2) Deficiency Factor	(3) Deficiency as of Dec. 31, 1937 (1) × (2)
1928	$ 15,917,000	.000	$ —o—
1929	19,590,000	1.017 — 1.000 = .017	333,000
1930	17,339,000	(1.017 × 1.035) — 1.000 = .053	919,000
1931	13,832,000	(1.053 × 1.019) — 1.000 = .073	1,010,000
1932	9,517,000	(1.073 × 1.012) — 1.000 = .086	818,000
1933	7,401,000	(1.086 × 1.009) — 1.000 = .094	696,000
1934	8,910,000	(1.094 × 1.017) — 1.000 = .113	1,007,000
1935	9,516,000	(1.113 × 1.026) — 1.000 = .142	1,351,000
1936	11,598,000	(1.142 × 1.033) — 1.000 = .180	2,088,000
1937	14,699,000	(1.180 × .994) — 1.000 = .173	2,543,000
Total Latest 5 Yrs.	$ 52,124,000		7,685,000
Total 10 Yrs......	$128,319,000		$10,765,000

NOTE: (a) "First Valuation" is at end of Calendar Year in which accident occurred; successive valuations annually thereafter.

TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF INCURRED LOSSES FOR CALENDAR PERIOD 1933-37 BY YEAR OF ACCIDENT OCCURRENCE "PRIVATE FUND" ONLY

	Years of Accident Occurrence	(1) Incurred Loss After Deduction of Interest	Adjustment for Inclusion of Catastrophe and Occupational Disease Claims		(4) Earned Interest	(5) Adjusted Incurred Loss Without Interest Deduction (3) + (4)
			(2) Factor	(3) Adjusted Incurred Loss, Net of Interest (1) × (2)		
(1) Columns (4) & (5) from Table 9, p. 26 — "Gain and Loss Exhibits," etc.— "Private Fund"	all	($65,499,751)	XX	XX	($8,318,131)	($73,817,882)
(2) Line (1) less 1% to exclude claims due to Self-Insurers, Uninsured Employers, and Safety Violation	all	$64,844,753	1.00	$64,844,753	$8,234,950	$73,079,703
(3) Column (1) from Table 8	1928-32	$ 6,020,000	1/.97	$ 6,206,000	(b) $1,958,759	$ 8,164,759
(4) p. 23, "Development of In-	1933-37	$52,124,000	1/.97	$53,736,000	(a) $4,728,768	$58,464,768
(5) curred Losses by Successive Valuations"	1928-37	$58,144,000	1/.97	$59,942,000	$6,687,527	$66,629,527
(6) Column (3) obtained by subtracting line (5) from line (2)	all prior to 1928	XX	XX	$4,902,753	(b) $1,547,423	$ 6,450,176

NOTE: (a) Column (3) × .088. Table 17, p. 48, Old Report, indicates that at the end of 1933, this was the ratio of "accumulated interest" to "net claims" for years of accident 1929-33.

(b) Difference between lines (2) and (4) divided in proportion to lines (3) and (6) of column (3).

TABLE V

Pure Premium Cost by Industry Group for Workmen's Compensation Insurance
Ohio compared with New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts Combined

Ohio Experience—Accident Years 1933-37 inclusive							New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts Exp. Combined—Ohio level—P. Y. 1933-36 inclusive					Difference in Pure Premiums		
			Basis I (a)		Basis II (b)									
Group Nos.	Description	Payrolls (Hundreds of $)	Incurred Losses	Pure Pre-miums (2)÷(1)	Incurred Losses (2)×1.347	Pure Pre-miums (4)÷(1)	Sched. Nos.	Description	Payrolls (Hundreds of $)	Incurred Losses Ohio Law Level	Pure Pre-miums (7)÷(6)	Basis I (3)−(8)	Basis II (5)−(8)	Projected Losses on Ohio Payrolls (1)×(8)
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
1A	Food & Beverages	$109,296,0	$1,178,000	$	$1,586,766	$	05	Food and Tobacco	$734,507,1	$9,183,675	$	$	$	$
1B	" " "	79,970,0	1,323,000		1,782,081									
	Total	189,266,0	2,501,000	1.32	3,368,847	1.78		Total	734,507,1	9,183,675	1.25	.07	.53	2,365,825
2A	Chemicals & Drugs	47,094,0	409,000		550,923		24	Chemicals	267,710,2	3,017,485				
2B	" " "	19,034,0	218,000		293,646									
9	Oils and Grease	88,137,0	1,020,000		1,373,940									
	Total	154,265,0	1,647,000	1.07	2,218,509	1.44		Total	267,710,2	3,017,485	1.13	−.06	.31	1,743,195
4	Mines and Quarries	130,714,0	5,705,000		7,684,635		02	Mining	9,623,8	334,881				
							04	Quarrying & Stone Crushing	19,597,3	767,791				
	Total	130,714,0	5,705,000	4.36	7,684,635	5.80		Total	29,221,1	1,102,672	3.77	.59	2.03	4,927,918
5A	Construction	74,861,0	1,701,000		2,291,247		26	Contracting—Not Erection	211,212,6	7,902,189				
5B	"	65,339,0	2,394,000		3,224,718		27	Erection	651,843,9	21,568,209				
5C	"	61,044,0	2,800,000		3,771,600									
5D	"	10,063,0	996,000		1,341,612									
	Total	211,307,0	7,891,000	3.73	10,629,177	5.03		Total	863,056,5	29,470,398	3.41	.32	1.62	7,205,569
7A	Leather & Rubber	130,153,0	827,000		1,113,969		09	Leather	500,159,6	2,843,579				
7B	" " "	5,612,0	74,000		99,678		10	Rubber Composition, Bone Goods, etc.	183,881,3	1,661,835				
	Total	135,765,0	901,000	.66	1,213,647	.89		Total	684,040,9	4,505,414	.66	—0—	.23	896,049
12A	Stone	7,828,0	130,000		175,110		21	Stone Products	55,513,7	985,011				
12B	"	13,029,0	184,000		247,848									
	Total	20,857,0	314,000	1.51	422,958	2.03		Total	55,513,7	985,011	1.76	−.25	.27	367,083

TABLE V—*Continued*

Pure Premium Cost by Industry Group for Workmen's Compensation Insurance
Ohio compared with New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts Combined

Ohio Experience—Accident Years 1933-37 inclusive							New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts Exp. Combined—Ohio level—P. Y. 1933-36 inclusive					Difference in Pure Premiums		
			Basis I (a)		Basis II (b)									
Group Nos.	Description	Payrolls (Hundreds of $)	Incurred Losses	Pure Premiums (2)÷(1)	Incurred Losses (2)×1.347	Pure Premiums (4)÷(1)	Sched. Nos.	Description	Payrolls (Hundreds of $)	Incurred Losses Ohio Law Level	Pure Premiums (7)÷(6)	Basis I (3)−(8)	Basis II (5)−(8)	Projected Losses on Ohio Payrolls (1)×(8)
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
14A	Textiles	$172,324,0	$437,000	$	$588,639	$	06	Textiles	$943,137,2	$5,537,139	$	$	$	$
14B	"	94,938,0	740,000		996,780		07	Clothing and Other Cloth Goods	1,436,642,5	4,781,448				
	Total	267,262,0	1,177,000	.44	1,585,419	.59		Total	2,379,779,7	10,318,587	.43	.01	.16	1,149,227
15	Ore Reduction & Concentration	11,693,0	153,000	1.31	206,091	1.76	16	Metallurgy Total	40,901,9	583,989	1.43	−.12	.33	167,210
16A	Paper	297,436,0	1,020,000		1,373,940		12	Paper & Pulp, Paper Goods and Printing	895,610,5	5,971,611				
16B	"	50,861,0	620,000		835,140									
	Total	348,297,0	1,640,000	.47	2,209,080	.63		Total	895,610,5	5,971,611	.67	−.20	−.04	2,333,590
17A	Pottery & Glass	94,458,0	618,000		832,446		22	Clay Products	38,181,1	397,422				
17B	" " "	69,918,0	686,000		924,042		23	Glass & Glass Products	64,124,7	414,360				
	Total	164,376,0	1,304,000	.79	1,756,488	1.07		Total	102,305,8	811,782	.79	—0—	.28	1,298,570
18A	Stores (c)	1,970,960,0	4,322,000		5,821,734		34	Commercial Enterprises	2,489,114,0	23,282,016				
18B	"	116,947,0	2,006,000		2,702,082		35	Clerical & Professional	7,708,473,3	8,195,447				
	Total	2,087,907,0	6,328,000	.30	8,523,816	.41		Total	10,197,601,3	31,477,463	.31	−.01	.10	6,472,512
	Sub Total	$3,721,709,0	$29,561,000	.79	$39,818,667	1.07		Sub Total	$16,250,248,7	$97,428,087	.60	.19	.47	$28,926,748
	All Other Groups	1,977,539,0	22,453,000		30,244,191			All Other Groups	5,205,658,3	58,954,808				
	Grand Total	$5,699,248,0	$52,014,000	.91	$70,062,858	1.23		Grand Total (d)	$21,455,907,5	$155,382,895	.72	.19	.51	

(a) Incurred Loss and Pure Premium as shown in Table 18, P.43 New Report.
(b) Incurred Loss and Pure Premium adjusted by factor 1.347 (see line (14), Table II).
(c) Includes clerical classifications.
(d) Excluding Per Capita, Flying Hours and Cabs.

N.B. For the three eastern states the experience of the *policy* years 1933-36 was employed for comparison with the Ohio experience for *accident* years 1933-37. This is an appropriate comparison, since the central point in time of these respective periods is identical viz., June 30, 1935.

TABLE VI

FROM REPORT ON OHIO STATE INSURANCE FUND TO GOVERNOR'S INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE, DATED NOV. 26, 1934

TABLE 13

EXPERIENCE OF ALL 40 GROUPS — PRIVATE ACCIDENT

Based on 5 Year Experience Period 1929-1933 Inclusive

Group No. (1)	Description (2)	Payroll (00's omitted) (3)	Gross Premium (98% + Interest) (4)	Claims (5)
1 A	Foods and Beverages	$ 106,750,0	$ 1,011,395	$ 1,206,639
1 B	Foods and Beverages	54,750,0	792,192	1,105,014
2 A	Chemicals and Drugs	50,650,0	526,328	508,727
2 B	Chemicals and Drugs	12,620,0	249,854	250,483
3	Wood and Metal....	69,800,0	643,577	1,102,088
4	Mines and Quarries.	98,870,0	5,493,268	7,183,864
5 A	Construction	117,910,0	1,551,304	2,867,057
5 B	Construction	139,270,0	4,055,438	6,409,466
5 C	Construction	52,960,0	2,092,432	3,347,752
5 D	Construction	19,190,0	1,602,980	2,848,221
6 A	Utilities, Railroads and Electrical....	32,870,0	466,503	589,657
6 B	Utilities, Railroads and Electrical....	28,780,0	1,050,433	1,191,849
7 A	Leather and Rubber	126,200,0	775,078	1,065,651
7 B	Leather and Rubber	6,000,0	56,849	85,294
8 A	Wood	26,730,0	194,909	285,874
8 B	Wood	80,470,0	1,069,049	1,571,177
8 C	Wood	8,750,0	437,563	546,441
9	Oils and Grease....	83,610,0	1,157,322	1,371,071
10 A	Metal	117,010,0	833,538	1,080,971
10 B	Metal	484,040,0	4,788,933	5,900,842
10 C	Metal	201,140,0	2,513,656	3,363,526
10 D	Metal	55,440,0	1,214,346	1,328,959
11	Transportation and Public Utilities ..	184,150,0	2,410,750	3,467,047
12 A	Stone	10,760,0	128,311	177,690
12 B	Stone	11,150,0	197,803	232,056
13 A	Miscellaneous	57,560,0	273,529	320,406
13 B	Miscellaneous	107,470,0	1,702,479	2,098,161
13 C	Miscellaneous	6,840,0	407,588	551,986
13 D	Miscellaneous	5.180,0	419,168	796,078
14 A	Textile	161,340,0	321,115	489,574
14 B	Textile	103,520,0	674,095	950,032
15	Ore Reduction and Concentration ...	15,880,0	237,096	222,580
16 A	Paper	345,770,0	1,003,029	1,127,351
16 B	Paper	49,500,0	650,453	696,827
17 A	Pottery and Glass..	87,930,0	822,494	821,983
17 B	Pottery and Glass..	71,420,0	966,281	1,070,851
18 A	Stores	2,045,780,0	3,724,219	5,559,342
18 B	Stores	116,670,0	1,826,307	2,354,394
19 A	Service	226,960,0	1,142,620	1,384,284
19 B	Service	188,400,0	1,465,485	1,637,273
	TOTALS........	$5,770,090,0	$50,949,669	$69,168,538

TABLE VI (*Continued*)

FROM REPORT ON OHIO STATE INSURANCE FUND TO GOVERNOR'S INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE, DATED NOV. 26, 1934

TABLE 13 (*Continued*)

EXPERIENCE OF ALL 40 GROUPS — PRIVATE ACCIDENT
Based on 5 Year Experience Period 1929-1933 Inclusive

(4) — (5) Gain (6)	(5) — (4) Deficit (7)	Average Premium Rate as per Actuary Excluding Interest (100% Prem. ÷ (3)) (8)	(4) ÷ (3) Average Collected Premium Rate (Incl. Interest) (9)	(5) ÷ (3) Average Loss Cost (10)
	$ 195,245	$ .82	$ .95	$1.13
	312,822	1.25	1.45	2.02
$17,599		.90	1.04	1.00
	630	1.71	1.98	1.98
	458,510	.80	.92	1.58
	1,690,597	4.80	5.56	7.27
	1,315,754	1.14	1.32	2.43
	2,354,027	2.52	2.91	4.60
	1,255,319	3.41	3.95	6.32
	1,245,241	7.22	8.35	14.84
	123,154	1.23	1.42	1.79
	141,415	3.15	3.65	4.14
	290,575	.53	.61	.84
	28,446	.82	.95	1.42
	90,966	.63	.73	1.07
	502,128	1.15	1.33	1.95
	108,879	4.32	5.00	6.24
	213,748	1.20	1.38	1.64
	247,385	.62	.71	.92
	1,111,907	.86	.99	1.22
	849,867	1.08	1.25	1.67
	114,612	1.89	2.19	2.40
	1,056,297	1.13	1.31	1.88
	49,379	1.03	1.19	1.65
	34,252	1.53	1.72	2.08
	46,876	.41	.48	.56
	395,684	1.37	1.58	1.95
	144,398	5.15	5.96	8.06
	376,909	7.00	8.09	15.38
	168,458	.17	.20	.30
	275,937	.56	.65	.92
14,517		1.29	1.49	1.40
	124,322	.25	.29	.33
	46,374	1.14	1.31	1.41
512		.81	.94	.93
	104,569	1.17	1.35	1.50
	1,835,123	.16	.18	.27
	528,087	1.35	1.57	2.02
	241,665	.43	.50	.61
	171,790	.67	.78	.87
(Net)	$18,218,719	$ .76	$ .88	$1.20

TABLE 18

EXPERIENCE OF ALL 40 GROUPS — PRIVATE FUND BASED ON 5-YEAR EXPERIENCE PERIOD 1933-1937 INCLUSIVE

In Thousands (000. omitted)

Group No. (1)	Description (2)	Payroll (3)	Gross Premium (4)	Claims Less Interest (5)	+ Gain − Deficit (6)	Experience Prior to Jan. 1, 1933 + Gain − Deficit (7)	As of Dec. 31, 1937 + Gain − Deficit (8)	Average Premium Rate Excluding Catastrophe (4) ÷ (3) (9)	Average Loss Cost Excluding Catastrophe (5) ÷ (3) (10)
1A	Foods and Beverages	$ 109,296,	$ 1,179,	$ 1,178,	$+ 1,	$+ 26,	$+ 27,	$1.08	$1.08
1B	Foods and Beverages	79,970,	1,334,	1,323,	+ 11,	− 71,	− 60,	1.67	1.65
2A	Chemicals and Drugs	47,094,	419,	409,	+ 10,	+ 128,	+ 138,	.89	.87
2B	Chemicals and Drugs	19,034,	280,	218,	+ 62,	+ 133,	+ 195,	1.47	1.15
3	Wood and Metal	69,190,	848,	711,	+ 137,	+ 111,	+ 248,	1.23	1.03
4	Mines and Quarries	130,714,	8,271,	5,705,	+ 2,566,	− 4,267,	−1,701,	6.32	4.36
5A	Construction	74,861,	2,294,	1,701,	+ 593,	− 836,	− 243,	3.06	2.27
5B	Construction	65,339,	3,728,	2,394,	+ 1,334,	− 2,235,	− 901,	5.71	3.66
5C	Construction	61,044,	4,160,	2,800,	+ 1,360,	− 1,597,	− 237,	6.82	4.59
5D	Construction	10,063,	1,625,	996,	+ 629,	− 1,759,	−1,130,	16.15	9.91
6A	Utilities—Railroads and Electrical	23,469,	518,	436,	+ 82,	− 268,	− 186,	2.21	1.86
6B	Utilities—Railroads and Electrical	26,492,	778,	521,	+ 257,	− 92,	+ 165,	2.94	1.97
7A	Leather and Rubber	130,153,	857,	827,	+ 30,	+ 237,	+ 267,	.66	.64
7B	Leather and Rubber	5,612,	51,	74,	− 23,	+ 98,	+ 75,	.91	1.32
8A	Wood	25,722,	202,	183,	+ 19,	+ 30,	+ 49,	.78	.71
8B	Wood	67,785,	1,288,	1,025,	+ 263,	− 104,	+ 159,	1.90	1.51
8C	Wood	6,144,	391,	334,	+ 57,	− 298,	− 241,	6.36	5.45
9	Oils and Grease	88,137,	1,405,	1,020,	+ 385,	− 475,	− 90,	1.59	1.15
10A	Metal	144,393,	1,196,	1,006,	+ 190,	+ 39,	+ 229,	.83	.70
10B	Metal	585,348,	6,151	5,666,	+ 485,	+ 450,	+ 935,	1.05	.97
10C	Metal	209,533,	2,965,	2,831,	+ 134,	+ 1,251,	+1,385,	1.42	1.35
10D	Metal	56,295,	1,158,	1,141,	+ 17,	+ 416,	+ 433,	2.06	2.03
11	Transportation and Public Utilities	185,498,	4,430,	2,909,	+ 1,521,	− 883,	+ 638,	2.39	1.57
12A	Stone	7,828,	125,	130,	− 5,	− 26,	− 31,	1.60	1.66
12B	Stone	13,029,	196,	184,	+ 12,	− 16,	− 4,	1.50	1.41
13A	Miscellaneous	43,373,	281,	225,	+ 56,	− 101,	− 45,	.65	.52
13B	Miscellaneous	102,608,	2,148,	1,828,	+ 320,	− 528,	− 208,	2.09	1.78
13C	Miscellaneous	8,124,	649,	433,	+ 216,	+ 9,	+ 225,	7.99	5.33
13D	Miscellaneous	5,187	566,	439,	+ 127,	− 480,	− 353,	10.91	8.46
14A	Textile	172,324	458,	437,	+ 21,	− 53,	− 32,	.27	.25
14B	Textile	94,938,	725,	740,	− 15,	+ 8,	− 7,	.76	.78
15	Ore Reduction and Concentration	11,693,	133,	153,	− 20,	+ 332,	+ 312,	1.14	1.31
16A	Paper	297,436,	1,158,	1,020,	+ 138,	− 56,	+ 82,	.39	.34
16B	Paper	50,861,	559,	620,	− 61,	+ 255,	+ 194,	1.10	1.22
17A	Pottery and Glass	94,458,	950,	618,	+ 332,	− 270,	+ 62,	1.01	.65
17B	Pottery and Glass	69,918,	863,	686,	+ 177,	+ 133,	+ 310,	1.23	.98
18A	Stores	1,970,960,	5,470,	4,322,	+ 1,148,	− 1,154,	− 6,	.27	.22
18B	Stores	116,947,	2,596,	2,006,	+ 590,	− 594,	− 4,	2.22	1.72
19A	Service	225,225,	1,526,	1,279,	+ 247,	− 235,	+ 12,	.68	.57
19B	Service	193,153,	1,596,	1,486,	+ 110,	− 100,	+ 10,	.83	.77
	Totals	$5,699,248,	$65,527,	$52,014,	$+13,513,	$−12,842,	$+ 671,	$1.15	$0.91

TABLE VIII

*EXPERIENCE OF NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY AND MASSACHUSETTS, POLICY YEARS 1933-36 (AS FURNISHED BY THE OFFICIAL RATING BUREAUS OF THESE STATES)

INDUSTRY SCHEDULE		NEW YORK		NEW JERSEY		MASSACHUSETTS	
Description	No.	Payroll (to nearest $100)	Incurred Losses	Payroll (to nearest $100)	Incurred Losses	Payroll (to nearest $100)	Incurred Losses
Agriculture	01	$ 75,739,4	$ 1,362,799	$ 43,910,9	$ 670,358	$ 31,006,4	$ 394,512
Mining	02	9,445,3	384,186	178,5	15,847	..	..
Quarrying, Stone Crushing, etc.	04	9,747,9	539,439	5,443,6	156,445	4,405,8	144,686
Food and Tobacco	05	427,060,8	7,269,875	165,386,9	1,627,574	142,059,4	1,344,490
Textiles	06	259,489,0	1,601,066	233,090,5	1,374,196	450,557,7	2,518,139
Cloth Products	07	1,172,609,4	4,627,359	170,667,7	587,700	93,365,5	309,967
Laundries	08	144,063,6	1,547,790	43,821,2	274,852	36,666,8	247,900
Leather	09	200,711,5	1,245,683	48,290,5	311,188	251,157,6	1,335,145
Rubber, Composition, Bone Goods, etc.	10	47,823,5	563,625	55,826,5	598,247	80,231,3	526,604
Paper and Pulp	12	588,287,3	4,598,784	106,133,7	849,453	201,189,5	1,157,743
Wood	14	118,373,5	2,379,767	27,949,7	357,588	48,481,4	607,291
Metallurgy	16	32,715,3	530,454	6,748,4	121,505	1,438,2	18,743
Metal Forming	17	274,610,8	4,857,254	124,767,5	1,606,452	137,543,2	1,431,509
Machine Shops	18	367,458,5	3,180,640	148,000,0	1,156,717	263,444,6	1,140,355
Vehicles	20	50,477,5	675,980	5,699,4	138,668	19,731,9	312,957
Stone Products	21	30,303,1	590,685	9,221,7	143,893	15,988,9	311,974
Clay Products	22	13,003,7	241,195	23,725,9	176,104	1,451,5	17,290
Glass Products	23	18,419,3	281,423	33,060,5	147,371	12,644,9	28,513
Chemicals	24	130,214,9	1,714,908	88,598,7	1,121,152	48,896,6	412,275
Miscellaneous Manufacturing	25	104,767,5	862,106	26,085,4	190,326	20,707,5	103,346
Miscellaneous Construction	26	137,126,4	6,127,152	33,489,8	1,175,133	40,596,4	1,455,151
Erection	27	417,307,4	17,003,339	113,811,3	4,073,070	120,725,2	2,983,604
Shipbuilding	28	38,325,4	954,001	11,783,9	266,386	4,497,0	104,397
Vessel Operations	29	30,886,5	889,543	7,798,3	159,058	3,217,0	79,605
Stevedoring & Freight Handling	30	41,066,1	2,127,059	14,005,8	822,056	7,586,2	438,233
Railroad Operation	31	17,181,3	373,620	1,636,6	19,164	45,812,5	268,788
Cartage & Trucking	32	303,066,8	6,536,072	81,911,2	1,366,175	101,049,0	1,193,682
Public Utilties	33	117,760,0	1,983,627	24,037,9	317,877	88,441,1	728,689
Commercial Enterprises	34	1,660,359,5	19,198,423	341,819,9	3,286,423	486,934,6	3,596,463
Clerical & Professional Occup.	35	5,515,541,0	7,736,993	963,073,7	1,062,947	1,229,872,6	625,149
Operation & Maintenance	36	1,507,827,4	16,755,044	190,173,5	1,738,767	220,056,9	1,523,639
Miscellaneous Occupations	37	146,989,1	1,551,103	63,719,8	705,860	23,024,3	222,747
Code 7777						498,4	2,694
TOTALS (a)		$14,008,758,7	$120,290,994	$3,213,868,9	$26,618,552	$4,233,279,9	$25,586,280

(a) Data for risks on per capita basis, as basis of number of flying hours, or cabs, are not included.

* This experience was converted to the Ohio benefit level (as shown in Table V) by use of the following law differentials, based on calculations by the National Council on Compensation Insurance: Ratio of Ohio Law to New York .83

Ratio of Ohio Law to New Jersey 1.01