

of re-insurance as required by law," leaving a balance including the paid-up capital, in favor of the Company of \$507,067.92. This year they had only \$133,105.01, from which must be deducted \$72,000 for re-insurance, leaving a balance in favor of the Company of only \$361,105.01. This showed that the Company lost not only the re-insurance fund of \$344,414.49, but a further amount of \$146,862.91. He had compared last year's statement with that now before them, had studied it for some time, and this was what he had found.

The Chairman, having passed around a few copies of last year's balance sheet, which happened to be at hand, said what they had just heard was an illustration of the manner in which figures could be distorted. But he would apologize for the absence of any mention of the Re-insurance Fund of \$72,000 in the statement. It was an oversight; he was absent when the balance sheet was prepared. After making this provision the Company still had a surplus of \$61,000. The surplus last year was \$207,000, showing that the Company had lost \$146,000 meantime; but we then had a liability of \$400,000 in the United States to get rid of which we had to pay \$176,648.66.

Hon. J. R. Thibaudeau said the liability in the United States was upon \$30,000,000 of risks, and now this was all got rid of.

The chairman continued.—The Company had wiped off 25 per cent. from the warehousing bonds, reducing them from \$24,333 last year to \$18,000 in the present statement. The Sincennes-McNaughton stock is valued at 40 cents in the dollar. As for the mortgages held by the Company, one of them for about \$20,000 is a first lien on property on which other parties held a second mortgage of \$40,000.

The amount opposite "Bills Receivable" was for marine premiums. In that department there is a large amount usually left over as credit must be given. The total assets last year was \$913,401.

Mr. Gilman.—The Chairman admits he has \$313,000 assets less than last year.

Mr. Stewart did not think they required to go into such detail.

Mr. Coghlin was of opinion that it must be satisfactory to know that the Directors had valued the affairs as they had.

The Chairman said they were now in a position to meet contingencies which they were not then. Mr. Gilman having again interrupted, the speaker asked to be allowed to continue as Mr. Gilman had been. Perhaps, before he had done, he might have to bring up a personal matter, and show that all Mr. Gilman had done was not as it ought to be. The Chairman continued, and said that if they had reinsured last year they would have saved the money they had lost in the United States, but in Canada they had made money. The business in the United States had entailed a great deal of trouble, but there were few companies which had done as well as they had in that country the past year. They had got back their money from California and Ohio, \$100,000 from each, but there was \$200,000 yet to get from the State of New York and \$10,000 from Virginia. There is interest accruing upon these deposits. After closing up in the States, measures were at once taken to reduce expenses at the head office. Great stress had been laid that this was not done last year, but then they were carrying on business with the United States and thought they were to improve business, and would require all their staff. Rent is now only about one-half, and other expenses have been cut down equally, or largely reduced. We are told that we have lost half a million dollars. In New York ten companies had found that for every dollar they received last year they had lost respectively \$3.21, \$2.55, \$2.30, \$2.13, \$2.06, \$1.99, \$1.69, \$1.61; \$1.55 and \$1.46 while the Royal Canadian lost only \$1.44; the English companies had fared no better, for in six months they lost on an average \$1.18 for every \$1. We left there simply because the business was so bad, and if they had less money now they knew they owned it. (Applause.) The speaker then read the following correspondence:—

MONTREAL, March 2, 1880.

Andrew Robertson, Esq., &c., Sr.:

DEAR SIR,—I was told by you and several of your Co-directors, Messrs. McIntyre, Archer and Hodgson, on the 5th July last, that any information which I wished to have regarding the number of meetings of Directors, the attendance of each at such meetings, the amount paid to each during the year, the amount paid to the President and other officers, in detail, would be furnished to me by your Secretary, Mr. Gagnon. I called several times, but did not get the information asked for. Mr. Gagnon has just now been with me, and stated that the Directors did not wish to give me that information. I am very much surprised, the more so as I hold nearly as much stock in the Company as all the Directors together, and, consequently, think I should know all there is to know about the Company and its working.

I am compelled, however, to await the meeting of shareholders, when I shall try and get the information you refused me.

I remain, yours, &c.,

F. E. GILMAN.

Montreal, 3rd March, 1880.

F. E. Gilman, Esq.

DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of your favor of the 2nd inst.

Mr. Gagnon informs me that he has given you any information you have asked, that you had access to any books you requested, and that the statements required have been submitted confidentially for your inspection.

These and the books of the Company are open at any time for your inspection, or any other shareholder can have the same privilege.

I am, &c., &c.,

A. ROBERTSON.

The Chairman begged to mention one word personal to himself.

Last year the shareholders decided that the remuneration of the President should not be brought up year after year for a vote; that course was objectionable to him, and he agreed to take a less amount rather than have the matter so discussed. On the 6th May the directors passed a resolution that they would pay him not to exceed \$3,000, but this was before they withdrew from the States. They would find by the By-laws that \$45 was allowed for each Board meeting, to be divided amongst those present, but he was of opinion that where persons did not attend, the company should have the benefit. He added he had himself drawn three quarters' salary and refused to take any more. If they did not sanction the by-law, he could only hand over the money.

Mr. Gilman—No, no.

Mr. H. Lyman thought that, under the circumstances, it must be very painful for Mr. Gilman to have asked for such explanations, as he said, in the interest of the Company. He himself was gratified that the explanations had been forthcoming. The board had done their best for the Company, and he was sure they ought to be very thankful to them.

Mr. Ogilvie paid a high tribute to the excellence of the President, and was sure, if they had not had their present board the Company would have been default. If ever a man did work hard for a Company, that man was Andrew Robertson, and he, the speaker, would not do the same work for \$5,000 a year. In fact he could not do the work. If that Company could not afford to pay a chairman like him \$3,000, it was not worth carrying on. He thought however the dividend should be truthfully advertised, 1½ instead of 5 per cent.

Mr. Clendinning asked what amount was at risk last year in the United States?

The Chairman replied \$30,000,000.

Mr. Clendinning said they had got rid of that, and it was a fact that the Canadian business paid. He asked as to the expenses in the United States?

The Chairman replied that they had to pay salaries for four months there, during which time they had no business, but the cost of the whole United States business was 41½ per cent.

Mr. Clendinning asked as to the percentage in Canada, and was answered 23½, and in answer to a further question he was told the Canadian risks were \$13,000,000; he then went on to say there was no gentleman who understood figures better than the man who had made the attack upon the Royal Canadian Company. They had now a balance of \$133,000, with \$13,000,000 of risks, while last year they had \$852,414, with risks of \$42,000,000, and yet it is stated they were in a worse position. Taking their responsibilities into account they were in a very much better position. This year they were doing business at home at a cost of 24 per cent., instead of 42 per cent., which was the average expense of the United States business. He felt they ought to congratulate themselves on having such a Board. It was not this Board which did it, but it was a wild-cat piece of business to try to do business all over the world. The Company had got over the worst, and he asked every Canadian present to stand by it. Each shareholder should give it a share of his business. The gentlemen who had unloaded them of \$30,000,000 of risks and brought them down to a paying business, were surely deserving of all thanks. He had great pleasure in seconding the report.

Mr. J. Stewart was very glad that Mr. Clendinning and the President had so clearly stated the position of the Company. Mr. Clendinning had given the facts most clearly, and he was happy to endorse his remarks and those of the President. While they had only a liability of \$13,000,000 against \$43,000,000 last year they have more than half the assets they had at that time to meet it. He was more than satisfied that they had been able to give such a report, all things considered. Now they had got rid of the elephant, as Mr. Clendinning had observed, he thought they would succeed.

The report was then adopted.

Mr. Coghlin proposed: "That the thanks of the shareholders are due and are hereby tendered to the Directors for their attention to the business of the Company during the past year."

Mr. Ogilvie seconded the motion which was carried.

The Chairman, in reply, said he was sorry the Company had not been so fortunate as they might have wished, but he assured them that, notwithstanding the best judgment, luck would tell on insurance companies. Expenses could be controlled, but unforeseen losses could not.

After some discussion, a resolution was adopted giving the Directors power to vote any sum, not exceeding \$2,000, to the President.

The shareholders then proceeded to the election of new Directors, which resulted as stated in our last issue, and the meeting then adjourned.

RECIPROcity WITH CANADA.—A memorial to Congress, urging the enactment of a new reciprocity treaty with the Dominion of Canada, is being circulated for signatures at the Produce and Maritime Exchanges, and is being quite generally signed. The memorial sets forth that the experience of the last several years has served to deepen the conviction in the minds of the business men in this country that important concessions might be made by both the United States and the Dominion of Canada, which would serve materially to increase the trade between them, and relieve it from many vexatious restrictions to which it is now subjected; and that as the treaty of 1854 between Great Britain and the United States was abrogated by a notice from the United States in 1865, it would be courteous and desirable that the first steps towards negotiating a new treaty should be taken by the United States. To that end, Congress is urged to take speedy action on the bill introduced early during the present session by Hon. Leopold Morse, providing for the appointment of three commissioners to confer with similar commissioners to be appointed by Great Britain, and ascertain on what basis a mutually beneficial treaty of commerce between the United States and Canada, including also the Colony of Newfoundland, can be negotiated. It is to be hoped the present session will