

Insurance and Finance CHRONICLE.

No. 5.

VOL. XI.

Office:
1724 Notre Dame Street.

MONTREAL, MARCH 1, 1891.

Subscription:
\$2.00 per ANNUM.

THE Insurance and Finance Chronicle.

Published on the 1st and 15th of each month.

AT 1724 NOTRE DAME ST., MONTREAL.

R. WILSON SMITH, Editor and Proprietor.

A. H. HULING, Associate Editor.

Annual Subscription (in Advance) \$2.00
Prices for Advertisements on application.

All Communications intended for THE CHRONICLE must be in hand not later than the 10th and 25th of the month to secure insertion.

THE EXTORTION PRACTICED in the name of taxation upon the insurance companies, which we deal with at some length on another page, finds a significant illustration in a law which requires companies doing business in New York city to pay annually a tax into the treasury of the "Exempt Firemen's Benevolent Fund," of that city, although that fund now amounts to considerably more than a quarter of a million dollars. Of course there is no more reason why insurance companies should be forced to contribute to the support of retired firemen than that they should be taxed to maintain hospitals or orphan asylums or retired policemen, and yet, during 1890 the fire insurance companies of other States and of foreign countries paid to this New York firemen's fund nearly \$72,000. This is of a piece with the absurdity that is responsible for the law of the Province of Quebec, which exacts, in addition to general Government taxes, a tribute of from \$900 to \$1,500 from each insurance company, for the privilege of doing a general business in the Province, while Quebec city, and perhaps other municipalities, pile on an extra tax to help to pay its local expenses. Why not tax insurance to buy uniforms for the police force?

IN OUR ISSUE for December 15 last, we made a full statement in our legal department of the interesting case of the South Staffordshire Tramway Company against the Sickness and Accident Assurance Association, tried in the Queen's Bench Divisional Court in London, and from whose decision the plaintiff appealed. The issue on the appeal was as to whether the accident, in which some forty persons were injured,

should be construed as one accident under the language of the policy insuring against "any one accident," or as forty accidents, that number of persons sustaining injury by the one accident, applying the term to the vehicle itself. In the former case the liability was limited to £250, but in the latter event the claims for injuries aggregated £833 4s. 9d. The Court of Appeal, the three judges concurring, held that the tramway company was liable to each of the forty persons injured, and that the insurance association was liable to that company for the sum of the injuries resulting from this one accidental occurrence which involved several accidents to individuals. This decision is doubtless good law, and is most certainly good common sense.

A RELIABLE AGENT in Ontario sends us a circular letter and printed matter, received recently from "F. P. Elwes & Co., Insurance Agents & Brokers," Chicago, soliciting business in mutual companies, at non-board rates in "lines of any size, regardless of hazard," etc. From the printed leaflet sent out it would appear that the above parties deal with such weak mutual concerns as the "Fairmount Insurance Association" of Pennsylvania, which in 1889 collected in cash the enormous amount of \$3,353 and paid out \$5,345. The "Inman Insurance Co. of Chicago" seems to be another of their companies carrying "large lines, regardless of hazard," though the last Illinois Insurance Report has no knowledge of the existence of such a company. Good agents and brokers in Canada fight shy of undergrounders, even with some standing, and we predict that "F. P. Elwes & Co." will waste their postage and stationery on most Canadian brokers.

OUR INGENIOUS CONTEMPORARY, *Insurance*, is not a success as an apologist for the Mutual Reserve Fund Life whose failure to add fully 50 per cent. of its new issues in 1890 to assurance in force (41 per cent. being all that would stick), we showed in our last issue. *Insurance* uses the "you're-another" argument, by saying that the Mutual Life carried to assurance in force only 44 per cent. of its new issues. Our contemporary is not green, and very well knows that such a comparison is absurd, for the reason that the Mutual Reserve's vanished assurance all consists of pure "back-outs," excepting the amount paid for death