

policies, have very little respect for a Company that seeks deliberately to obtain business anywhere, in actual and wilful defiance of law, such courses being regarded as far from creditable to the Company authorizing it, and as being unjust to those more honorable offices which do comply with the law, and pay all licenses and taxes required by it. Moreover, companies which are guilty of transacting an illegal, underground business will not hesitate, as a rule, to dispute a claim if it chanced to be a large one. Quebec City has had some experience with cheap underground insurance companies. Unfortunately, our laws cannot be made sufficiently far reaching to follow these companies to their homes, and punish them there for misdeeds done in our midst; hence the Superintendent of Insurance being powerless, our only reliance for preventing, or at least minimizing, the evils of this outlawed traffic is upon the integrity and consistency of our citizens, for whose consideration we submit the foregoing thoughts and suggestions.

LA CANADIENNE AND THE FRANCOPHOBES.

What a terribly wicked man the editor of the *INSURANCE AND FINANCE CHRONICLE* is, to be sure! Our good friend Mr. Belcourt, of *La Canadienne*, says, and it must of course be true, that we are a "Francophobe," a "sectary," a "false prophet," a "mercenary," an "ignoramus," a "rascal," a "dodger," a "false alarmist," a "detractor," a "fanatic brain," a "knave," a "braggart," a "fanatic," a "boaster," and everything else that is bad. What a catalogue of names to hurl at our devoted head in one short article! We never knew our real character before. Is it not strange that we yet survive?

But what is it that has so wonderfully excited our worthy friend and drawn down on us the thunders of his wrath? Simply, that in our last issue we ventured to publish a literal and exact translation of his own report and financial accounts. It is true that we had to confess that the statements had not even the "clearness of mud," and that we therefore in addition to publishing the report, endeavored to group the items into the usual form of receipts and disbursements, that our readers might understand the true position of the matter.

He claims however that our translation of the report is incorrect; but no error can be shown. Our readers may rest assured that our version is literal and in fact much better English than the original is French.

Then, too, it is said that we left out of our summary five items of the receipts as shown in their report (which however we gave in full in the next column). These are the items which Mr. Belcourt thinks we should have included in the income.

Furniture....	\$ 368.46
Due by agents (advanced on commissions).....	1,775.74
Cash on hand and in bank	171.47
Bills receivable (apparently on account of capital). ..	5,600.00
Premiums due and to become due (not yet paid)...	3,762.61

\$11,678.28

What ignoramuses we all were! Mr. Belcourt has found out what no one else knew before about bookkeeping, and deserves a vote of thanks from the society of chartered

accountants for his valuable discovery. Who of us could have supposed, for instance, that money spent on furniture was an income? Or that money paid out to agents was a receipt? Or that cash received for premiums and deposited in the bank should be entered a second time as cash received? Or that bills receivable given on account of capital should be added in, not only as cash but as premiums and interest? Or that premiums not yet paid and not even due are a cash receipt? We confess to being the veriest novices in the art of preparing such accounts, but we are afraid our genial critic would find our Superintendent of Insurance no better educated to his standard than we are. But fortunately for him he does not come under the Ottawa department.

If Mr. Belcourt really wishes to give us some information and not merely call names, we would ask him to tell us the following:—

(1) Is it true that the *cash* income and disbursements, apart from capital, were as follows, according to his own accounts:—

Premiums and interest.....	\$18,750.79
Claims.....	\$10,533.62
Expenses.....	20,841.70
	<u>31,375.32</u>
Excess of disbursements over income.....	<u>\$12,624.53</u>

If this statement is not correct, we will be pleased to insert a corrected one.

(2) Is it true that on 31st December last *La Canadienne* had only \$171.47 of available cash assets with which to pay claims, outside of its government deposit, which cannot be touched?

(3) Is it true that the report only claims to have \$18,651.21 left out of a paid up capital of \$31,600, the difference being already lost by their own admission?

(4) By whom was the "statutory reserve" calculated, and on what basis?

(5) Is it true that the company gave notes in payment of its largest death claim?

Mr. Belcourt tells us that although an Englishman of pure blood was appointed to the charge of their English department, not even one Briton could be found who would join the Company. This is certainly strong proof of the wisdom of our countrymen, and we much fear that a comparatively short time, will make that wisdom clear to even our French Canadian friends.

We cannot close however without expressing our obligation to our critic for the diversion he has created both for ourselves and our readers. We will be delighted to insert any communication from him, and may even open a humorous column for his special benefit—national and religious jokes a specialty.

FIRES CAUSED BY NATURAL GAS.

The following table for which we are indebted to *The Chronicle*, N.Y., shows the number of risks burned and property losses caused by natural gas fires:—

	Number.	Loss.
1886.....	96	\$526,732
1887.....	78	535,895
1888.....	120	981,686

La Canadienne.—An esteemed French Canadian correspondent, after mentioning some facts with regard to the business of this Company, says, with much force, that it should not take long to convince intending assurers that it is better to take a policy in a well-tried company which has gone through the storm unscathed, than to put their money into a company whose assets seem to consist largely of patriotic sentiments and race-prejudice.