

Amounts of Annuities.				Values of Annuities.			
<i>n.</i>	<i>r</i> =·03.	<i>r</i> =·04.	<i>r</i> =·05.	<i>n.</i>	<i>r</i> =·03.	<i>r</i> =·04.	<i>r</i> =·05.
5	·0300	·0400	·0499	5	·0299	·0398	·0497
20	·0309	·0414	·0518	20	·0302	·0402	·0500
35	·0314	·0419	·0519	35	·0302	·0399	·0492
50	·0315	·0414	·0502	50	·0299	·0391	·0475

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,  
M.

London, 17th August, 1855.

### DECIMAL COINAGE.

To the Editor of the Assurance Magazine.

SIR,—In Mr. Jellicoe's paper recently read before the Institute of Actuaries and printed in your Number for this month, it is stated (page 299) that I have adduced a certain multiplication, there referred to, as "an argument against the Committee's plan." Such is not the fact.

In my short paper read before the Society of Arts in February last, to which reference is made, it will be seen that the figures quoted by Mr. Jellicoe form an example offered, *not by me*, but by Mr. Henry Taylor, in his published work on this subject, in which he has used  $\cdot 11 \times 3 + 2$  to obtain the product of £57. 17s. 10d. by 35, thereby increasing the number of figures in the working—a mode of procedure which I *protested against*, as exhibiting an unfair contrast between the ordinary method and that by decimals. How, then, it could be brought forward as an argument of mine "to show that such operations can be performed in the ordinary way by means of a less number of figures than by making the computation decimally," I am at a loss to discover. I hold no such opinion.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

Islington, July 24th, 1855.

FREDERIC JAMES MINASI.

NOTE.—On referring to Mr. Minasi's paper, we observe that he adduces the calculation in question as an illustration of the following remark:—"I am not willing to leave this part of the subject without noticing the attempts of certain exponents of the millesimal division of the sovereign to exhibit unfair contrasts between that system and the one in present use." He then shows that  $58\cdot 856$  (not  $57\cdot 891$ )  $\times 35$  takes 26 figures, and that  $58. 17. 1\frac{1}{2} \times 5 \times 7$  takes 22 only, and says—"So much for prepared examples, than which there can be hardly anything more specious," &c.

Mr. Jellicoe admits the truth of the illustration, but argues that the decimal process is notwithstanding the preferable one, on the score of the less time and labour (of thought) taken by it. The calculation quoted by Mr. Jellicoe is Mr. Minasi's, or Mr. Minasi's "sharp little friend's," not Mr. Taylor's.—ED. A. M.