## Fire Insurance Business in Canada for the Year 1913—*continued*

| COMPANIES | Per cent. of Losses incurred to Premiums | | | | | | Business of 1912 | | Business of 1913 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1907 | 1908 | 1909 | 1910 | 1911 | 1912 | Net Cash received for Premiums | Net Losses Incurred | Net Cash received for Premiums | Net Losses Incurred | P.C. losses incurred to Premiums |
| **British—** | p. c. | p. c. | p. c. | p. c. | p. c. | p. c. | $ | $ | $ | $ | p. c. |
| Alliance | 64.1 | 58.5 | 31.7 | 45.80 | 55.85 | 47.67 | 206,684 | 98,528 | 224,905 | 83,946 | 37.33 |
| Atlas | 52.6 | 64.5 | 46.0 | 63.34 | 67.14 | 56.27 | 497,116 | 279,412 | 541,479 | 269,984 | 49.86 |
| Caledonian | 52.1 | 78.8 | 41.6 | 58.90 | 51.98 | 49.39 | 431,217 | 212,988 | 436,726 | 247,125 | 56.59 |
| Commercial Union | 46.6 | 49.6 | 46.1 | 55.65 | 53.97 | 51.18 | 792,177 | 405,406 | 843,850 | 393,681 | 46.65 |
| Employers' Liability | .... | .... | .... | .... | 31.33 | 31.88 | 174,606 | 55,678 | 259,958 | 111,872 | 43.03 |
| General | .... | 6.9 | 37.6 | 66.51 | 77.12 | 46.09 | 264,818 | 122,051 | 279,748 | 166,786 | 59.62 |
| Guardian | 54.6 | 64.0 | 52.7 | 57.76 | 63.88 | 61.74 | 827,130 | 510,638 | 891,802 | 553,131 | 62.02 |
| Law, Union & Rock | 50.3 | 59.7 | 44.5 | 53.57 | 51.74 | 52.04 | 212,748 | 110,703 | 236,795 | 124,278 | *52.49 |
| Liverpool & L. & G | 66.2 | 59.1 | 56.3 | 59.64 | 53.70 | 57.78 | 1,297,207 | 719,609 | †1,300,000 | †715,000 | †55.00 |
| London & Lancashire | 38.2 | 62.6 | 47.6 | 54.36 | 64.21 | 40.71 | 614,269 | 250,065 | 373,804 | 316,718 | 47.00 |
| London Assurance | 52.7 | 54.0 | 27.9 | 40.43 | 35.75 | 42.59 | 252,008 | 107,333 | *296,240 | 134,727 | 45.48 |
| North British & Mer | 60.4 | 56.8 | 54.5 | 62.67 | 57.80 | 48.63 | 940,87[illegible] | 457,510 | 961,354 | 561,164 | 58.37 |
| Northern | 62.9 | 76.3 | 50.2 | 52.93 | 47.49 | 48.86 | 636,980 | 311,264 | 718,600 | 375,829 | 52.30 |
| Norwich Union | 45.7 | 63.8 | 44.2 | 54.96 | 47.23 | 54.50 | 770,887 | 420,121 | 805,204 | 462,937 | 57.49 |
| Palatine | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 6.67 | 73,594 | 4,910 | 187,594 | 90,902 | 48.46 |
| Phœnix | 50.3 | 54.5 | 54.6 | 62.20 | 44.66 | 52.45 | 996,925 | 522,885 | 1,028,527 | 567,144 | 55.14 |
| Provincial | .... | .... | .... | .... | 9.13 | 10.08 | 29,382 | 2,964 | ....... | ....... | .... |
| Royal | 63.0 | 50.6 | 52.5 | 56.41 | 53.37 | 57.35 | 1,267,798 | 727,149 | 1,291,623 | 773,844 | 59.91 |
| Royal Exchange | .... | .... | .... | 2.35 | 40.23 | 39.71 | 322,085 | 127,897 | 406,218 | 160,622 | 39.54 |
| Scottish Union & National | 36.3 | 67.2 | 40.0 | 42.85 | 48.83 | 38.86 | 349,315 | 135,758 | 361,126 | 182,222 | 50.46 |
| Sun | 58.2 | 54.0 | 58.0 | 51.71 | 60.18 | 54.07 | 422,328 | 228,375 | 475,555 | 274,451 | 57.71 |
| Union | 56.3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 44.05 | 438,649 | 193,230 | 503,125 | 257,741 | 51.22 |
| Yorkshire | 45.8 | 36.8 | 51.4 | 61.64 | 51.11 | 46.38 | 273.327 | 126,769 | 341,614 | 223,760 | 66.67 |
| Totals and Averages | 55.5 | 58.1 | 49.7 | 57.02 | 53.83 | 50.95 | 12,092,125 | 6,161,243 | ...... | ...... | .... |

*Net Premiums †Approximately

## GROUP INSURANCE: A CRITICISM

From time to time within the last few months there have appeared in THE CHRONICLE references to group insurance, which had its origin in the United States, and will shortly be permissible in Canada by the amendments to the Insurance Act introduced this week at Ottawa. In this matter THE CHRONICLE has no other interests to serve than the dissemination of information in regard to a subject which is of interest to the whole insurance fraternity. For that reason there is herewith reproduced a criticism of the plan appearing in the current number of the Canada Life's Agents' journal:—

"If any life company were to accept applicants indiscriminately, without medical examination, merely rejecting those who were obviously in impaired health, it would undoubtedly do a very large business, but it is beyond question that it would rapidly acquire an undue proportion of unsound risks. A company which writes Group Insurance accepts, under that plan, a large number of men in a body without medical examination. True, the claim is made that these men were sound lives when originally engaged by their employer; otherwise he would not have taken them. The fact remains, however, that they were not medically examined, and there is not a shadow of a doubt but that amongst them must be a number who would never have been accepted by a qualified medical examiner for a life company.

A claim made in defense of Group Insurance is that an employer will naturally drop from his service those whose health is impaired, so that there is in this way a constant selection in favor of the company.

No doubt this practice is followed in a general way by employers, but if a man were on the pay-roll, whose expectation of life was short, it is quite unreasonable to suppose that his employers would drop him when, by keeping him for a little while longer, his wife and children would come in for the life insurance which would mean for them removal from absolute want. By reducing his pay the employer would be sacrificing very little, and he would be relieved from the obligation of providing for the family of his employee.

There is another danger in connection with this plan. It is known to every Life man that many who are apparently in sound health, and who are able to do their full share of work, are yet unable, either through family or personal history or because of some incipient malady, to obtain Life Insurance. A man of this sort, who has been rejected by a Life company, becomes particularly keen and anxious for Life Insurance. Being still an efficient workman, he would naturally seek employment with a corporation which provided Group Insurance for its employees, and he could thus slip in and obtain protection, where, with medical examination, he would inevitably be rejected.

From a company point of view, it is claimed that Group Insurance eliminates lapses and that, therefore, this class of business is desirable owing to its permanency, but that argument is more than offset by the chances of a firm or corporation failing or winding up business, in which event the whole group of policies would immediately cease.

A further criticism of the plan from a company point of view is that it is term business, and this class of business is neither desirable for the company nor for the thrifty workman who wishes to secure permanent protection for his dependents. As a matter of fact, if there be a place for Group Insurance, it is in the industrial companies."