

AN INSURANCE AMALGAMATION.

(A Fusion of Agents.)

In view of the tendency of the times towards combining the interests of many businesses under one management, and exemplifying the truism that in union may be found strength, it is not surprising to learn that a very strong partnership has been effected in the insurance field in Montreal. Messrs. Fred. W. Evans and C. R. G. Johnson have joined hands, and their combined forces will in future be known under the firm name of Evans & Johnson.

This will be one of the largest insurance agencies in Canada. They have taken very convenient and commodious rooms at the corner of Notre Dame and St. Francois Xavier Streets, which will give the firm an office area of 2,000 square feet. The partnership dates from the 1st inst.

Mr. Fred. W. Evans has had a long and extensive experience in the Canadian insurance field, and has been active in other walks of life, having been Mayor of Westmount, and now serving the Montreal Board of Trade as its Secretary.

He was formerly a member of the firm of Wood & Evans, which represented the Etna since its entrance into Canada. The new firm will have the representation of the following companies: the provincial agency of the Aetna and the London and Lancashire; the city agency of the British America; the Manchester; and the American Fire Insurance Co. of New York.

Mr. C. R. G. Johnson has for the past dozen of years been highly regarded as an energetic and careful underwriter; and his success in the management of the companies he represented augurs well for the strength he will bring to this amalgamation of interests. The firm is starting with good wishes from their many friends, in which THE CHRONICLE desires to join.

PERSONALS.

MR. M. F. SHERIDAN, of Bamford & Sheridan, Insurance and Real Estate Agents, of this city, left by the C. P. R., on Tuesday last, for Vancouver, en route for Dawson City, via Skagway and the Chilcoot Pass, in the interests of his firm who has large claims in the Yukon District. Previous to his departure, he was presented with a very flattering address on the part of his numerous friends, accompanied with many useful articles, such as are very necessary for a Klondyke trip.

MR. H. B. HIGENBOTHAM, who has been assisting his brother in representing the Sun Life in Philadelphia for several years is about to start for Egypt in the interests of the same company.

Correspondence.

We do not hold ourse'ves responsible for views expressed by Correspondents

THE OATS PROBLEM.

The Editor, THE CHRONICLE:—

Might I hazard a guess at the oats problem?

If the Company insured \$1,000 on 3,000 bushels of oats, and 3,000 bushels were burned, the Company would pay for 3,000 bushels, provided it did not take more than \$1,000.

The effect of limiting insurance to cover 3,000 bushels only is that the insurance is limited to 3,000 bushels. I may be wrong in this, but I am open to correction.

Perhaps a better illustration of the effect of the wording of the policy might be had were we to suppose that, instead of 3,000 bushels being destroyed, 4,000 had been, and the price declined to 25c per bushel. Here, we would have the Company insuring 3,000 bushels for \$1,000, with a loss of 4,000 bushels worth \$1,000. What should the Company pay? Unquestionably, \$750; or rather, that is all the Company would be liable for under its policy. If the assured didn't like that, the Company might go out into open market, invest \$750 in oats, and pay him back in bushels, bow gracefully and say: "It is in the bond."

Yours,

FARMER JONES.

ANOTHER SOLUTION.

The question is:—

"A. purchased a lot of oats, and insured as follows:— \$1,000 on 3,000 bushels of oats while contained in a certain framed warehouse.

He subsequently purchased another lot of 2,000 bushels, and mingled it with first lot. A fire occurred, and practically destroyed 3,000 bushels, leaving 2,000 uninjured. How many bushels should the insurance company pay for?

What is the effect of limiting the insurance to cover 3,000 bushels only?

Assuming that no co-insurance or other modifying clause existed in the Policy, and that no distinguishing marks or numbers were mentioned, the fact of an additional 2,000 bushels being added, and mingled with the original 3,000 bushels, could in no way reduce the liability of the insurers.

The Policy covered *any* oats belonging to the assured contained in the building at time of the fire to the extent of 3,000 bushels and not exceeding \$1,000.

3,000 bushels were destroyed by fire, and consequently the insurers cannot escape paying a total loss under their Policy.

"B. C."