

LONDON MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.—Mr. H. Waddington, manager of the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company, has resigned his position, and is succeeded by Mr. D. Weismiller, for many years, inspector of the company.

PERSONALS.

MR. DOUGLAS K. RIDOUT, Toronto, spent a few days in Montreal this week. Mr. Ridout is a member of the firm of Ridout & Strickland insurance brokers, and represents the Law Union & Crown, Phoenix of London, and the London & Lancashire Life.

MR. J. H. LABELLE, assistant manager Royal and Queen Insurance Companies, has returned to the city, after spending two weeks visiting the agencies of above companies in Ontario.

MR. E. MARSHALL, manager of the Excelsior Life Insurance Company, is in the city, where he will remain a few days arranging for the appointment of a provincial manager for Quebec.

MR. W. H. HALL, general agent of American Surety Company of New York, was in the city this week. He reports the business of his company increasing.

MR. J. C. NORSWORTHY, favoured this office with a visit this week.

MR. SAMUEL I. PIPKIN, general manager Atlas Assurance Company, has been elected president of the Federation of Insurance Institutes of Great Britain for year 1905-6.

WANTED BY

THE EXCELSIOR LIFE INSURANCE Co., a Manager for the Province of Quebec. Apply in Confidence to

E. Marshall, 170 St. James Street,
Montreal.

Correspondence.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for views expressed by correspondents.

THE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION.

The Editor,
"Insurance & Finance Chronicle,"
Montreal, Que.

DEAR SIR:—The Canadian Manufacturers' Association suggests a New Departure in Fire Insurance.

In your issue of Nov. 10, a leading editorial under the above headline criticizes a letter addressed by the Insurance Committee of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to the Managers of the Companies forming the Canadian Fire Underwriters' Association.

As the editorial misrepresents to some extent the position taken by the Association, and clearly set forth in the

letter referred to, we desire through the columns of your paper to correct certain misapprehensions which apparently exist in your mind and which might be left in the minds of your readers.

In referring to increased rates after the Toronto fire, you state that "The Manufacturers formed an Association with the avowed purpose of opposing the advance and threatening to do their own insurance or to get up a Company themselves." This statement is absolutely without foundation.

So far as the inspection of risks is concerned, your statement that "Manufacturers as well as the public generally are in duty bound to supervise their risks with a view to minimizing as far as possible the danger from fire" is quite correct, but it is not true that there is anything in our letter to the Managers of the Companies which would lead one to "expect the Insurance Companies to accept reports from inspectors not employed by them nor under their control." On this point our letter leaves no room for misunderstanding. What we said was "It is the intention of the Department to employ a staff of inspectors whose business it will be to inspect the risks of those members who wish to have us do so, from their own standpoint suggest improvements, etc., all with a view to reducing the fire waste to which reference is made at the commencement of this letter."

Neither in this extract nor in the whole letter is there a word respecting the acceptance by Insurance Companies of reports made by inspectors other than their own.

What we did suggest was a supplemental inspection, believing that co-operation in this direction would tend to bring about corresponding improvements in the present unsatisfactory conditions. The suggestion has met with the hearty endorsement of many of the best business men of Canada. We had hoped, and still hope, for the sake of the important results to be achieved, that it will be equally approved by the Insurance Companies.

Our suggestion in this regard should, so it occurs to us, be additionally appreciated, as we understand the Inspectors employed by the Canadian Fire Underwriters' Association are not allowed to suggest to the insured improvements in physical construction or protection, but merely to report on risks as they find them.

Your editorial states in dealing with the "Agency" phase of the question that the present is not "exactly the season to claim interference with the internal arrangements of offices, etc." We cannot understand how such an idea has been either understood or implied from our letter, as it contains neither thought nor suggestion of "interference." What was asked for is simply what the Companies are freely according to-day to individuals, banks, loan companies, building societies, and other incorporated companies.

It was plainly set forth in our letter that as a national business organization, we approached the whole subject from a broad standpoint, and with the sole desire of improving the conditions. The criticisms offered in your letter have neither questioned the facts nor shaken the wisdom of the request contained in the letter. The issue is sufficiently important and far-reaching to demand fair discussion, based upon the facts and free from misrepresentation.

Yours truly,

P. H. BURTON,
Chairman Insurance Committee.

R. J. YOUNGE,
Secretary.