have all run out,' let the public join with the survivors, if any, in placing the business upon a substantial basis. In the meantime, will the public be satisfied with the value of the indemnity they are purchasing, if they bit, insurance for protection against loss when fires come?

To a careful observer it would seem that the time is nearly at hand, if not already with us, when merchants, manufacturers and the insuring public generally should seriously inquire of themselves, has not the war against the insurance companies gone far enough, and is it not time that something should be done for their protec-Fair rates for fair and strong insurance protection should be the cry now on the part of the public, and the same public should take a strong stand against obnoxious and adverse legislation against the com-This kind of legislation has never benefited the public one jot in any form. On the other hand, it has burdened the companies enormously in a great and forced increase of expenses, and indirectly, if not directly, has increased the losses to such a serious extent in those States where such legislation has been prominent, that the strength of indemnity has been seriously threatened, and a greater number of companies than the public has any conception of have been driven out of the business. If the public will realize that the withdrawal of so many companies from the insurance business presents to them a most serious question, namely, the possible difficulty of securing the requisite amount of sound insurance protection, and will also take into careful consideration the fact that probably the fire loss in the United States ouring this year, 1891, will exceed \$125,000,000, and possibly may be nearly \$150,000,000, and third and lastly, will understand that the aggregate loss payments this year of those companies that were sufferers in the Chicago fire of 1871, and survived the same, will probably exceed the amount paid by the same companies during the entire year 1871, including the amount paid for losse by the Chicago fire, they will fully appreciate that the call for an advance in rates is not a far cry by any means, but one that calls for the earnest support of every one.

Finarcial and Statistical.

OUR RIVAL GIANTS.

COMPARISON OF THE TRADE OF MONTREAL AND TORONTO.

Some years ago we made a careful comparison of the trade of Montreal and Toronto on the basis of the ratings given to their merchants and manufacturers by the Mercantile Agency. This brought out some curious results, and was so interesting that we have again taken up the matter, and can now present our readers with a fresh comparison brought down to date. The bases of our calculations are the figures given by the Bradstreet Company; and though these may not be absolutely correct, yet they are as likely to err in the case of one city as in the other, and may thus be taken as a fair ground on which to base a comparison. In order to lessen the work, it was necessary to ignore all firms not rated at least as high as "\$20,000 to \$35,000." This was done in both cities. The following are the results :--

| TRADE CAPITAL | IN | MONTREAL. | AND | TORONTO. |
|---------------|----|-----------|-----|----------|

| | MONTREM. | | Toronto. | |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|--|
| | No cf | Capital. | No tirms. | Capital, |
| WHOLESALE :- | i | | | |
| Dry Goods, Fancy Coods, etc:— | | | 1 1 | |
| Merchants | 47 | \$6,320,000 | | \$3,600,000 |
| Manufac arers | 12 | 3.682,000 | | 9.10,000 |
| Ciothing, hats, furs, etc | 13 | 2,140,000 | 8 | 540,000 |
| Hardware, metals and machiner, :— | l ¦ | | 1 | |
| Merchants | 32 | 7 142,000 | 12 | 1,443,000 |
| Manufacturers | 47 | .,894,000 | - 1 | 3,703,000 |
| Groceries, teas, provi- | " | | ! ! | |
| sions, fruits | 45 | 6,665,000 | | 3,087 000 |
| Drugs, oils, paints, etc Boots and shoes, leather, | 34 | 3,,162,000 | 19 | 1,305,000 |
| | -6 | 3 9 7 000 | ار. ا | 1,7.12,000 |
| rubber, etc | 36 | 3,811,000 1,374,000 | | 4,546,000 |
| Books, paper, print'g,etc Ship'g,and allied trades | 39 17 | 0,173,500 | ,, | 355,000 |
| Mining | 12 | 4,158,000 | " | 3,151 |
| Lumber, sawmills, etc | 25 | 2,175,000 | 26 | 3,643,000 |
| Brewers, vinegar rufrs | 1.1 | 2,042,000 | 10 | 1,949,000 |
| Distillers and liquor | | - | | |
| merchants | 3 | 210,000 | | ,252,000 |
| Grain, flour, biscuits, etc | 22 | 7,000 | 1 331 | 1,120,000 |
| Contractors | 12 | 2,020.000 | | 105,000 3,368,000 |
| Contractors | 33 | 1,397,000 | 17 | 292,000 |
| Furniture, coffins, etc | 6 | 447,900 | , ,, | 562,000 |
| Jewellery | 10 | 430,000 | | 570,000 |
| Wood and coal | S | 402,000 | | 1,547,000 |
| Saddlery and trunks | 6' | 277,000 | | 219,000 |
| Musical instruments | 4 | 270,000 | | 1,240,000 |
| Hotels | 5 20 | 567,000 | | 357,000 |
| Other manufacturers | 30 | 2,130,000 1,685,000 | | |
| Other merchants Electricity, gas, street | ا عدا | 1,005,000 | 1 '9 | 1,00,5,000 |
| cars and miscellaneous | 17 | 8,025,000 | 10 | 720,000 |
| Matala Canadalisala Marila | | 274 006 000 | | 5:2 212 000 |
| Totals for wholesale Trade. Retail not included above | 557 53 | \$76,996,000 2,245,700 | | |
| Retail not included above | -33 | 2,243, 700 | 37 | 2,000,000 |
| Trade Totals | 610 | \$79,241,000 | 411 | \$54,973,000 |
| Financial: | | | 1 1 | |
| Banks (head offices) capital | s | 20 210 000 | | 20,101,000 |
| and Rest Life Assurance Companies: | | 39,210,000 | 7 | 20,101,000 |
| Can. Companies—Assets. | | 2,474,000 | 4 | 4,855,000 |
| Chief offices for Canada of | 1 1 | 744 17 | i 'i | ., 50, |
| British and American Cos. | | | | |
| Canadian Investments | 15 | 16,705,000 | 6 | 5,253,000 |
| Fire and other Insur. Cos: | | | ا ا | - 0/ |
| Can. Companies—assets. | 7 | 2,249,000 | 5 | 2,860,000 |
| Chief offices for Canada of | | | 1 | ! |
| British and Amer. Cos., Canadian investments | | 9,313,000 | 12 | 1,340,000 |
| Loan and Mortgage Com- | | 2,5,5,000 | T | -,,,40,000 |
| panies—capital and rest. | | 1,240,000 | 1. | 16,377,000 |
| | [| - | · | |
| Grand Total | 670 | \$150,462,000 | 4 4 | \$105,759,000 |
| | Ι. | J | | <u>' </u> |

A comparison of these figures with those of five years ago reveals a most satisfactory expansion in nearly all departments. Both cities have during that time made immense strides in the path of commercial prosperity. In some lines, Montreal has the decided lead. Inothers Toronto leaves Montreal far behind. There are sufficient points of superior to in the record of each to satisfy the most ardent citizen of either place. For instance, Montreal leads in dry goods, hardware, groceries, shipping, mining and electricity, while Toronto leads in lumber, books and stationery, coal, musical instruments, and contracting, besides retail trade.

Turning from commerce to finance we see equally curious results. While the number of banks in Montreal is but one in excess of that in Toronto, yet the combined capital and rest of those whose head offices are in Montreal is just about double the figure for those