

Brooklyn .....	155	New Orleans.....	287
Charleston .....	37	New York .....	321
Columbus.....	41	Peoria .....	55
Dayton.....	43	Philadelphia .....	102
Denver.....	50	Portland.....	32
Detroit.....	92	Rochester .....	130
Galveston.....	67	St. Louis .....	224
Hoboken.....	42	San Antonio.....	43
Houston .....	40	San Francisco.....	147
Little Rock .....	34	San Jose .....	30
Long Island.....	30	Toledo.....	90
Minneapolis.....	99	Washington .....	238
Mobile.....	44		

In Toronto the number of one-horse cars is 73 and two-horse cars 38, the former running over twenty-eight and one-quarter miles of railway in districts where the population is comparatively sparse, and over nineteen and five eighths miles where it is dense; while the latter or two horse cars, run over twelve and three-eighths miles of road in the less, and eleven and three-quarters miles of road in the more populous part of the city.

The accidents that have happened since 1882, when Mr. Franklin the present superintendent first assumed control of the road, from which time only any record has been kept, are best divided into those caused by collisions and those happening to persons getting on and off the front and rear platforms of the cars. The following table shows the comparative numbers of such accidents on the different kinds of cars as elicited in evidence:

## FROM COLLISIONS.

	Front of Car.	Rear of Car.
Single horse car.....	54	5
Double horse car.....	132	18

## WHILE GETTING ON AND OFF.

	Front of Car.	Rear of Car.
Single horse car.....	3	25
Double horse car.....	11	60

The total number of fatal accidents to persons run down or over by the different kinds of cars is exactly the same, that is seven in each case. The number of fatal accidents occasioned by other vehicles in the streets of Toronto during the same time was 22. The consensus of opinion of witnesses was in favor of the more frequent service if only to be secured by retaining the one horse cars.

Mr. Shepley further argued that it was highly unreasonable to hold the company to the by-law, because it was not necessary for the protection of the persons or property of the citizens, nor was it reasonable to put them to the immediate cost of \$56,000 to make the necessary changes. Besides, by the change they would lose \$50,000 a year. Such a by-law was against the custom all over America, and would interfere seriously with the convenience of the public, if the frequency of the service was reduced as it would have to be. And also that the city has acquiesced so long in the one horse system, that it is too late now to object to it. The Chancellor, without calling on Mr. Robinson, Q. C., counsel for the city, gave judgment against the company. He admitted that the original agreement should bind, that the rights of the parties should be determined by it, and held that under it reasonable regulations could be made by the city council, but that the original agreement provided for conductors and they must be supplied.

The charter of the Street Railway Company of Brooklyn in the city of that name entitles the common council of the city to make by-laws for the regulation of traffic on the road, and, under it, the council passed a by-law identical with the one here, and the Supreme Court of the State of New York held this by-law to be invalid, for that it enacts that conductors shall be put on all cars, an unreasonable enactment under the circumstances. The Company has not yet decided on taking the case to a higher court.

## INSURANCE NOTES.

The Reserve Mutual Life, a Grand Rapids Mich., co-operative, is no more, according to the *Index*. Liabilities, \$23,000; assets, none.

"When all insurance companies shall insist upon a thorough examination of flues and grates and upon cancellation of policies as a penalty whatever they are found defective," says the *Cincinnati Price Current*, "then we may look for a marked improvement in the ratio of loss to insurance, particularly upon residence property and manufacturing risks."

In the matter of the Canada Agricultural Insurance Company, Judge Mathieu rendered an important judgment, Saturday last. The case in question was *Ross et al., vs. Locke, Mayrand, Foucher and Fontaine*. The plaintiffs, liquidators of the company, were suing the defendants for calls due by them, and the Court ordered that all proceedings be stopped until such liquidators have rendered an account of their administration since 1878 to a public meeting of the company's shareholders and creditors.

A marine insurance law suit which is of interest to many business men is now on trial in the Supreme Court, says the *Halifax Chronicle*. It is the action of O'Connor versus the Merchants' Marine Insurance Company, on a policy for \$1,250, issued to Henry Cook as owner of the schooner "Smiling Water." The vessel was lost, it is alleged by scuttling, and P. F. O'Connor, who held a mortgage on her, seeks to recover the amount of the policy. Among the provisions of the policy, that of insurance against "barratry" was not included, and one of the claims set forth for the defence is that the company did not insure against the wilful act of the vessel's master or crew. The question whether an insurance policy holds good in a case of scuttling or other wilful act whereby a vessel is lost is sought to be settled by this action, and the result is awaited with interest by those connected with marine insurance companies.

"Life insurance," says the *New York Commercial Bulletin*, "costs more than mere unguaranteed promises, because its contracts must be fulfilled to the letter. There is no known scheme wherein the entire number of entrants can honestly draw out more than they put in. Legitimate life insurance is no such Ferdinand Ward confidence game. Assessment companies seem anxious, however, to offer this deceptive inducement; but their constantly occurring failures furnish proof positive of their fallacy."

INSTITUTE OF ACCOUNTANTS,  
ONTARIO.

In compliance with the request of several correspondents, we give below two of the successful replies to the examination questions, re "Accounts of Executors and Partnerships." The questions we have already published in our issue of 12th inst.:

1.—BALANCE SHEET.	
Dr.	Cr.
Cash.....	\$ 1,300
Bank.....	17,400
Gen. Expense.....	64,330
Int. and Disc'ts.....	3,132
Rent and Taxes.....	7,746
Bills Receivable.....	23,325
Gen. Debtors.....	52,016
Properties.....	4,320
	\$168,619
2.—ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.	
Bills Payable.....	\$27,334
Gen. Creditors.....	77,640
Balance.....	69,946
	\$174,920
3.—PROFIT AND LOSS.	
Expense.....	\$64,330 00
Int. and Disc'ts.....	3,132 00
Rent and Taxes.....	7,746 00
Gen. Debtors.....	7,336 00
Property.....	575 00
Interest to C.....	900 00
Profit to C.....	5,713 80
" A.....	6,666 10
" B.....	6,666 10
	\$98,065 00
Merchandise.....	\$98,065 00
" A.....	Cr. \$16,666 10
" B.....	Cr. 16,666 10
" C.....	Cr. 16,613 80
RESOURCES.	
Merchandise, goods on hand as per inventory.....	\$84,320
Cash.....	1,300
Bank.....	17,450
Bills receivable.....	23,325
General debtors, considered good.....	44,680
Property.....	\$4,320
less depreciation.....	575
	3,745
	\$174,920
LIABILITIES.	
Bills payable.....	\$27,334
General creditors.....	77,640
Capital of firm.....	69,946
	174,920
STATEMENT OF PROFIT AND LOSS.	
Dr.	
General expense.....	\$64,330 00
Interest and discount.....	3,132 00
Rent and taxes.....	7,746 00
General debtors—BAD.....	7,336 00
Fixtures—amount written off.....	575 00
C's 3 per cent. of net profit.....	5,983 80
B's share of net profit.....	6,981 10
A's ".....	6,981 10
	\$98,065 00
Cr.	
Merchandise.....	98,065 00
PARTNERS' STATEMENT.	
C's net investment.....	30,000 00
C's share of profit.....	5,981 80
C's interest in the concern.....	\$35,981 80
B's net investment.....	10,000
B's share of profit.....	6,981
Amount of B's and A's interest each.....	\$16,981
*If A and B are to pay C 3% interest for investing his capital, then A's and B's share would each be \$450 less, and C's interest \$300.	

The second reply, though somewhat differently arranged, does not differ greatly in the result arrived at:

3.—PROFIT AND LOSS.	
Expense.....	\$64,330 00
Int. and Disc'ts.....	3,132 00
Rent and Taxes.....	7,746 00
Gen. Debtors.....	7,336 00
Property.....	575 00
Interest to C.....	900 00
Profit to C.....	5,713 80
" A.....	6,666 10
" B.....	6,666 10
	\$98,065 00
Merchandise.....	\$98,065 00
" A.....	Cr. \$16,666 10
" B.....	Cr. 16,666 10
" C.....	Cr. 16,613 80
RESOURCES.	
Merchandise, goods on hand as per inventory.....	\$84,320
Cash.....	1,300
Bank.....	17,450
Bills receivable.....	23,325
General debtors, considered good.....	44,680
Property.....	\$4,320
less depreciation.....	575
	3,745
	\$174,920
LIABILITIES.	
Bills payable.....	\$27,334
General creditors.....	77,640
Capital of firm.....	69,946
	174,920
STATEMENT OF PROFIT AND LOSS.	
Dr.	
General expense.....	\$64,330 00
Interest and discount.....	3,132 00
Rent and taxes.....	7,746 00
General debtors—BAD.....	7,336 00
Fixtures—amount written off.....	575 00
C's 3 per cent. of net profit.....	5,983 80
B's share of net profit.....	6,981 10
A's ".....	6,981 10
	\$98,065 00
Cr.	
Merchandise.....	98,065 00
PARTNERS' STATEMENT.	
C's net investment.....	30,000 00
C's share of profit.....	5,981 80
C's interest in the concern.....	\$35,981 80
B's net investment.....	10,000
B's share of profit.....	6,981
Amount of B's and A's interest each.....	\$16,981
*If A and B are to pay C 3% interest for investing his capital, then A's and B's share would each be \$450 less, and C's interest \$300.	

Merchandise..... 98,065 00

PARTNERS' STATEMENT.	
C's net investment.....	30,000 00
C's share of profit.....	5,981 80
C's interest in the concern.....	\$35,981 80
B's net investment.....	10,000
B's share of profit.....	6,981
Amount of B's and A's interest each.....	\$16,981
*If A and B are to pay C 3% interest for investing his capital, then A's and B's share would each be \$450 less, and C's interest \$300.	

—A claim is made against Ottawa mill-owners under somewhat novel and peculiar circumstances, in connection with the saw-dust nuisance. The sufferers in this case is a well-known boatman named Antoine Ratte, who bought property on the Ottawa some 22 years ago with a view to making a profitable living out of the renting of boats, &c. Had the river remained in the same condition he claims that he would have more than doubled the value of his property and capital. The saw mill industry, however, has killed off boating, polluted the water and turned the beautiful stream into a stretch of sawdust, slabs, lath, etc. Ratte declares that his business has been ruined thereby, and claims \$74,300 as compensation. He threatens that unless this sum is paid he will enter a suit for damages against the mill-owners.

—Some statistics concerning the wine industry of France appear in the *Paris Figaro* from which it appears that in 1873 the total yield of the vintage was 35 millions of hectolitres, and in 1874 nearly double that amount; in 1881 the figure had sunk to 34 millions, and in 1882 to 31 millions. In the next year the next year the figure had risen again to 36 millions, in 1884 it was 35, and last year barely 28½ millions. This year the yield is expected to prove still smaller, and the vine growers, we are told, are almost destitute. "The phylloxera," concludes the *Figaro*, "has already cost France far more than the war indemnity to Prussia."

—A dividend at the annual rate of eight per cent. is declared for the half-year by the Canada Landed Credit Co.

—The Union Bank of Canada declares a half-yearly dividend of three per cent.