

It has not been claimed there is anything inherently wrong in a company accepting a risk from a broker, whether that company has a proper system of inspection or not. No one said it was contrary to the law of Moses! All I claim is that the system is bad; that it is neither in the interest of the insured nor insurer, and the only person benefited is the ubiquitous broker—he's always ahead.

It would seem I went too far in my "profession of faith" to please "Nonchalance." I might explain to him now that the only reason I had for my belief with regard to the procedure in placing a risk without the assistance of a broker was because I thought that was his belief; and I formed my opinion from his first letter, wherein he states brokers have an existence to avoid annoyance and trouble caused by dealing with thirty or more agents. It is quite a relief to my mind to know "Nonchalance" meant something else when he used these words, because I must admit it was with difficulty I accepted that part of his teaching. If he will be kind enough to tell me what he really did mean, I am quite prepared to say beforehand—I believe.

I am not aware of anything in the system I advocate to prevent one man furnishing wordings for thirty policies; at the same time there is no objection to several men furnishing the same wording, while this advantage exists, the wording is more likely to be in accordance with their wishes. But I take the liberty of correcting "Nonchalance;" this was not the point. He asserted where a competent broker took over a line of insurance previously placed direct with companies, he was likely to find everything wrong; the point I wished to make was that this state of affairs is quite as likely to exist where the business is done through a broker.

Again does "Nonchalance" with a wave of his hand dispose of what seemed in my humble judgment very much to the point. It would be folly to criticize certain of my statements! Say rather it would be folly on your part to attempt to criticize them, and I am with you, "Nonchalance"! You must know that your assumption of superiority cannot be considered conclusive so far as relates to the point I fairly made, that the actual work performed by the broker might be otherwise just as efficiently attended to at one-tenth the cost.

As for my reference to the establishment of the brokerage system in Gibson, Fairville and Bucetouche, I think the inference drawn from "Nonchalance's" first letter that that was what was required at these points was just as fair as his suggestion that there was some connection between the experience in these villages during 1893 and the brokerage question. But bless his innocent little heart, he didn't imagine I was in earnest! I knew the proposition was absurd; but my aim was to answer absurdity with absurdity.

Now, then, since I have been unable hitherto to advance a "reasonable" proposition, no doubt owing to the fact that propositions possessing that quality emanate only from the mighty intellect of "Nonchalance," who seems to have a "corner" on reason, I will undertake the task once more, and with more hope of success this time, for my authority is one that even "Nonchalance" cannot well dispute, since it is none other than himself.

In his first letter "Nonchalance" asserts that the broker's usefulness lies in his ability to harmonize the divergent views of the several offices.

If I apprehend him, this means that a given risk offered direct to the companies, being open to question, causes the property owner trouble and annoyance; the same risk placed through a broker "goes"! If this is intended as an argument in favor of the brokers, I want to borrow "Nonchalance's" reason for a short time to be able to appreciate it. Prithce, Mr. "Nonchalance," explain how it comes that this risk presenting so many objectionable features, when offered direct to the companies, seems so acceptable when it comes through a broker; and let me know if you do not find in this an answer to your question: Why the independent and intelligent agent fears to refuse undesirable business from any source?

The cloven hoof is shewn when "Nonchalance" speaks of wagering a fat premium to a scaly loss. That is what these gentlemen are proverbial for, the odds frequently being largely in favor of the scaly loss. But while I am not prepared to accept his wager, I may point out that even if his surmise were correct it proves nothing. Would he pretend that because you cannot get food just in the way you want it, you should do without food?

I fear I have already made this letter too long, but I wish to say before closing, that if "Nonchalance" chooses to come again he need not bring his joke book with him. I say this out of pure kindness, for if the book is as heavy as the jokes, it must be quite a load for him to carry. Meanwhile I beg to assure him that his caseous-avuncular joke has been duly noted.

"ANTHEDILUVIAN."

MONTREAL, April 26th, 1894.

P.S.—I like "Nonchalance." He combines the playfulness of the kitten with the freshness of the newly plucked cabbage head.

## Notes and Items.

Insurance of Crops is contemplated by the Russian Government in consequence of the recent famines in that country.

The next convention of fire chiefs was decided at a business meeting at Boston to be held on the second Tuesday in August at Montreal.

The bill to establish the office of State fire marshal has been favorably reported on by the finance committee of the Massachusetts legislature.

A Bicycle Accident Insurance Company has obtained a charter in Virginia to insure bicyclists against money loss by the accidental breakage of wheels.

The Canada Life Assurance Co. is gradually extending its field of operations. It has already entered two of the States, and is now reported to have opened in Cincinnati.

The Arkansas Supreme Court recently decided that the law prohibiting life agents from soliciting assurance in the State without a license is unconstitutional.

Insurance of Vineyards from that pest, phylloxera, is suggested by the New South Wales Government; but the insurance companies do not seem disposed to entertain the business.

Mr. Charles C. Little, Secretary of the Phenix of Brooklyn, has been elected Vice-President of the Company, succeeding Mr. Arthur Graves; but he will continue to hold the secretaryship.

Fire losses in Missouri last year amounted to 90.02 per cent of the premiums, an increase of nearly 18 per cent. over that of 1892. No wonder several of the companies are withdrawing from the State.

English accident business.—The following are the ratios which the claims bore to the premiums received by 14 British companies in 1893: Crown, 49.6; Equitable, 74.9; General, 37.2; Globe, 4.24; Imperial Union, 61.4; Law, 7.5; Northern, 56.6; Ocean, 53.6; Palatine, 47.8; Railway Passengers, 59.2; Scottish Employers' 62.5; Scottish Alliance, 51.2; Sickness, 35.