

It is worthy of note that in 1874 the rapid advance in volume of premiums was owing to the formation of new Canadian companies, the Royal Canadian making a start in that year of \$392,434, the Canada Agricultural of \$109,892, and the Stadacona (in a few months) of \$21,918, and this seemingly all came from cultivation of new business, as the older companies lost but little, or rather made up the risks captured from them by finding new ones to fill their place.

Again in 1882, the increase, mainly by new companies, his time British, viz., City of London, Fire Insurance Association, London and Lancashire and Scottish Union and National (their total *increase* being \$319,601), seemingly has not detracted from the business of their competitors, as most show a considerable gain, and but three lose anything, and they not to any great extent.

Evidently the influx of new companies causes cultivation of unexplored hunting grounds, and this, added to the natural growth of the Dominion, must far more than counterbalance the lowering of rates by excessive competition.

Turning to the Loss Column we can hardly speak with such accuracy, as presumably the three "non-concurrents" have withheld their figures because they were "very bad."

However, of the twenty-five companies reporting,

4	show losses under	40 per cent.
8	" ranging from	50 to 60 "
10	" "	60 to 70 "
2	" "	72 to 74 "
1	" "	87 "
The 16 British Companies average..... 64 "		
5	Canadian "	63 "
4	American "	51 "
The twenty five Companies " 63 "		

While considering the business of 1882 as not of such an unsatisfactory nature as some imagine, yet it is clear that no *Rest* has been earned for conflagration years;—that new coming companies, rejoicing in low ratio of losses, have not yet *earned* the premiums allotted thereto;—that many conservative managers have been badly caught by losses on first-class risks, these often being *adjoining*;—that reckless underwriting is not to blame so much as gradual senseless lowering of rates;—and that an extra 12½ per cent. all round must be obtained in equity to confiding shareholders.

CO-OPERATION.

At the annual meeting of the Fire Underwriters' Association of the Pacific Coast, held at San Francisco on Tuesday, Feb. 20th, a paper was read on the subject "Co-operation," prepared by Mr. C. C. Hine, editor of the *Insurance Monitor* of New York.

We should have liked to have presented to our readers this address in its entirety; but as (1) our policy is to treat of Canadian matters solely, for the present (2) our limited space is filled with home articles and news, (3), our readers all should (if they don't) subscribe to some reputable United States Insurance journals, of which the *Monitor* is the oldest and is undoubtedly among the best.

Therefore the paper can be read in the March number of the *Insurance Monitor*, a copy of which we shall be happy to forward to any of our readers that may express a wish to read it.

"Co-operation is a good thing under almost any circumstances and in almost any connection, because it means harmony, unity and prosperity, instead of discord, division and adversity," is an extract in which all members of Canadian "Insurance Society" will agree, and if they desire further reading on the subject we shall be glad to hear from them.

DISCRIMINATION IN QUEBEC.

Taking it for granted that it is the dog which wags the tail and not *vice versa*, we infer that it is the citizens of Quebec who have prompted their council to bring forward the Act to enable them to discriminate between Fire Insurance companies with regard to the tax to be levied on said companies for the privilege (*sic!*) of doing business in Quebec.

We all know that this means insurers do not like to pay the increased rates agreed upon by the Offices, and are seeking to break those rates down by offering to remit a portion of the tax to any company who will agree to accept business below the tariff, in other words (not to put too fine a point on it) they would bribe such as would gamble to serve them.

This is not only unjust but stupid as well. It is unjust, because the citizens of Quebec have only themselves to thank for the high rates forced upon them, inasmuch as it is their despicable parsimony in not providing their city with adequate fire protection which has caused disastrous conflagrations, with the consequent losses to the Insurance Companies, until the latter have simply declined to do an unprofitable business merely to oblige the citizens of Quebec.

It rests with Quebec to prove that present rates are too high as clearly as she has hitherto demonstrated that former rates were too low, but until she does so she cannot complain that she reaps as she has sown.

The "bribe" is also a stupid one, for we are confident that no reliable company will be caught by a bait in which the death hook is so plainly visible, and surely if the business is given to unstable institutions the last stage of that city will be worse than the first.

The City Council in their paternal wisdom may think they know more about underwriting and the value of a fire risk than the Insurance Companies, as this is a common delusion among insurers who are continually grumbling that the offices show no "discrimination."

Sometimes, alas, this charge is only too true, but not exactly in the manner meant by the insurers, and in the present instance we believe the companies will be able to "discriminate" quite as effectively as the City Council. Quebec citizens must be easily hoodwinked if they cannot see that taxing companies who insure them is an indirect tax upon themselves, and this argument applies equally well regarding insufficient water supply.

In conclusion we may remark that this "discrimination" game in Quebec reminds us of a poor deal at euchre; and we have no doubt that as each Company views its hand it will remark, "I pass," until Quebec is left to "go it alone."