

**Twenty-two Years' Premiums Received and Losses Incurred
by Fire Companies with Dominion Licenses**
(Compiled by The Chronicle)

Years	Received Premiums	Losses Incurred.	% Losses to Premiums	Years	Premiums Received.	Losses Incurred.	% Losses to Premiums
1898	\$ 7,350,131	\$ 5,395,898	74.37	1909	17,049,464	8,604,477	50.47
1899	7,910,492	4,552,161	57.75	1910	18,725,531	10,931,918	58.38
1900	8,331,948	8,078,931	97.00	1911	20,575,255	10,810,929	52.54
1901	9,650,348	6,783,617	70.29	1912	23,194,518	11,855,704	51.11
1902	10,577,084	4,288,562	40.54	1913	25,745,947	14,601,148	56.71
1903	11,384,762	5,799,279	50.94	1914	27,499,158	15,899,218	57.82
1904	13,169,882	14,191,847	107.76	1915	26,474,833	13,654,463	51.57
1905	14,285,671	6,185,612	43.30	1916	27,783,852	16,308,270	58.69
1906	14,687,963	6,863,829	46.73	1917	31,246,530	17,734,444	56.76
1907	16,122,922	8,742,994	54.23	1918	35,954,405	18,204,160	50.63
1908	17,572,113	10,347,567	58.88	1919	39,912,398	16,766,371	42.01

WHO BENEFITS BY CO-INSURANCE?

One of the most discussed questions of the present day, insurance-wise, is coinsurance and who really benefits under its provisions—the insurer or the insured. The Pacific Underwriter quite frankly states that it does not know.

Many risks, and this applies specially to mercantile stocks, buildings and manufacturing plants, which were formerly protected by policies carrying the coinsurance feature are now being committed under policies in which it is intentionally omitted. This is taken to be largely the result of the rapid increase in prices of labor and materials and consequent uncertainty as to values, and the realization that this instability in values will continue just as long as the economic condition of the country remains in its present chaotic state.

The banks are giving the matter careful consideration and in many instances are refusing loans on mortgages covered by coinsurance, for the reason that recent experience has demonstrated most forcibly that while the insurance carried may be sufficient to cover the mortgage, it is entirely inadequate on account of increased values to cover an 80 or 90 per cent. coinsurance.

Of two or more companies binding the same risk, some under coinsurance and others without, there remains today but little choice for the company writing the straight policy but to incorporate the coinsurance clause or cancel its contracts.

While the insurer on the one hand may, under the provisions of the coinsurance clause, obtain a greater amount of insurance than he otherwise could, at a correspondingly decreasing rate, on the other hand the company assumes a greater liability without a proportionate income return.

Every effort is being made by the companies to educate their clients in regard to the liabilities assumed by both parties under the coinsurance contract, but sad to relate it is too often true that the insurer fails to take a sufficient interest to even make a cursory study of the subject and can

see no further than the greater amount of dollars on the face of his policy. Some of the companies have even gone so far as to prepare a thorough discussion of the subject for distribution among their policyholders, for in justice be it said, that the aim of the companies is, and always has been, fair and just treatment and a strict compliance with their policy agreements.

The greater protection offered by coinsurance at the lower rate makes a strong appeal, but when the risk becomes a loss and the insurer finds himself forced to submit to the fulfillment of his coinsurance contract, he does so most ungraciously and, in general, feels that in some way he has been subjected to a grave injustice.

It is a strange paradox that a loss claimant protected under a policy without the coinsurance clause, is naturally interested in increasing the estimate of his values to the greatest possible extent, while the claimant whose policy carries the clause, seeks to minimize them in the same proportion.

Had values remained at their level of a few years ago, the discussion would very probably never have arisen, but with the mounting prices of labor and materials, what affords adequate protection today may be entirely inadequate tomorrow. A striking illustration of this is the loss on one of New York's city churches which occurred during the latter part of 1919. On adjustment of the loss, it was found that the sound value was \$204,000 while the loss amounted to \$52,512. The insurance carried by the church was \$90,000, whereas under the 80 per cent. coinsurance clause it should have been \$163,000. As the result the companies paid \$28,962.13 and the church contributed \$23,549.87.

GENERAL ACCIDENT OF PERTH INCREASES CAPITAL

The General Accident Insurance Co. of Perth is increasing its capital from \$2,500,000 to \$8,750,000 in \$25 shares with \$6.25 paid.