

FIRE AT TORONTO.

A fire took place on the night of 12th inst. on the premises of the Toronto Biscuit Company in that city. The building is in a block of warehouses on Front street. As the next one is occupied by a firm of wholesale druggists, whose next neighbour is a dealer in liquors, there was great risk of the whole block being destroyed if the fire spread. The fire brigade, however, succeeded in confining the flames to the Biscuit Company's building which was damaged to extent of \$5,000. The stock valued at \$40,000 was totally destroyed and the machinery valued at the same sum was damaged to extent of \$20,000. The insurance is so widely distributed that no company will lose over \$5,000.

The following companies are interested in above fire:—

ON BUILDING.	
British America	\$5,000
Western	1,500
Hartford	3,000
London Mutual	1,000
Globe	1,000
	\$11,000

Loss about \$3,000.

ON CONTENTS.	
Phoenix of London.....	\$5,000
Sun	5,000
Lloyds	5,000
Western	5,000
Anglo American	5,000
L. & L. & Globe	2,500
Caledonian	2,500
York Mutual	2,500
Economical Mutual	2,500
Union	\$2,500
Traders	2,500
Imperial	2,500
Scottish Union	1,500
North British & Mer	1,500
London Mutual	1,500
Waterloo	1,250
Gore	1,250
Equity	1,250
	\$50,250

CONSTABLE TRUDEAU'S EXPLOIT.

EVERYBODY SATISFIED BUT THE TAX-PAYER.

The police authorities are reported as having agreed that there is no necessity for any further investigation into the accidental shooting of Mrs. Prieur by Constable Trudeau. They consider that the police officer was justified in attempting any form of intimidation to effect the arrest of the man he was pursuing. They admit however that the city is responsible for damages. The worst feature of the affair is, that the police authorities are so perfectly satisfied about it. Everybody is happy all round. The fugitive escaped the bullet, and escaped arrest; the constable escaped censure; the lady is to be compensated, and the tax-payers—well the tax-payers are going to pay. The opinions expressed by the powers that be are a direct encouragement to every policeman on the force to imitate Constable Trudeau's exploit. Seeing that he has incurred no blame, it is to be presumed that he was acting according to general instructions. The police however are not authorized to fire revolvers in the

streets for other than defensive purposes. It is doubtless less trouble to shoot at a man than chase him; but to run away from a policeman is not an offence worthy of the death penalty. Had the lady or fugitive been killed, the magistrate's judgment might not have been so lenient as that of the Chairman of the Police Committee.

The question of compensating Mrs. Prieur will have to be dealt with by the City Council. While there can be no doubt about the city's responsibility, there can be no object in opposing in the courts a favourable settlement of the lady's claims for damages. The opportunity for further investigation should not be allowed to pass. It is all very well to pay legitimate claims with a light heart, but there is no use in putting a premium on blundering. If Constable Trudeau were acting within his instructions when he fired his revolver, then the instructions given to the police need revising. Revolvers were supplied to the police at a time when the city was infested with burglars, who fired freely at constables. No citizen objects to the officers of the law firing in self-defence under those circumstances. The aldermen did not purpose authorizing the police to shoot at any flying fugitives they chase. In Trudeau's case it appears that he was not firing at the man he was chasing, he was only trying to frighten him. In this he succeeded so well that the man has not yet been caught. If the City has to pay for these little "accidents" the City Council ought to know exactly what responsibility it is incurring through the instructions given by the Police Committee. It is also important to know whether these instructions are legal. The Committee is not superior to the criminal law, and the indictment of a constable for manslaughter might place the Committee in a very embarrassing position.

FIRE AT LAPOINTE'S FURNITURE STORE, MONTREAL.

The following Companies are interested in the fire which took place in above premises on 12th inst. —

Guardian Assurance Company.....	On building.
Loss	\$500 or \$600
	\$10,000
London Assurance Corporation	On Lapointe's stock.
Atlas	3,000
	\$6,000
Loss nearly total.....	Gentleman's clothing, stock in same building.
	\$8,000
Liverpool & London & Globe	5,000
National	4,000
Caledonian	3,500
Atlas	3,500
North British & Mercantile	
	\$24,000
Loss about	\$2,500
Queen Insurance Company	Slater Shoe Co., in same building.
Loss nearly total	\$6,000