

So I managed to fix
A place for six
Of my sons at a big salary;
Then things went well
For a limited spell,
"Till the first year's business matured;
Then the losses increased
And the profits all ceased,
And the company re-insured;
But I went to the re-
Insurance company
As part of the assets, you see;
And don't you forget,
I am flourishing yet
As president of the Re.

RECEIVED FROM AND PAID TO POLICY-HOLDERS.

According to an interesting table compiled by the Hartford *Insurance Journal* the twenty-four American Life Insurance Companies received from policy-holders in premiums from their organization up to January 1, 1886, the enormous sum of \$1,293,102,561, and paid to policy-holders during the same period \$943,555,537, besides having invested assets for policy-holders \$504,385,825. The account accordingly stands thus:

Dr.	Cr.
To premiums rec'd \$1,293,102,561	By payments..... \$943,555,537
-----	Assets..... 504,385,825
\$1,293,102,561	\$1,447,941,462

THE CO-INSURANCE CLAUSE DEFINED.

An ingenious attempt to pervert the meaning of the co-insurance clause was made by the lawyers of the assured in the case of Chesbrough & Carlton v. the Home Insurance Company, recently decided by the Michigan Supreme Court. The Home had a \$5,000 risk on a stock of lumber valued at \$37,148.23, and there was other insurance, making the total \$19,000. The policy stipulated that "the assured shall maintain insurance on the property hereby insured by this policy to the extent of four-fifths of the actual cash value thereof, and that, failing to do so, the assured shall be a co-insurer to the extent of such deficit, and in that event shall bear his, her, or their proportion of any loss." The deficit in the amount of insurance stipulated was \$10,718.56, being the difference between \$19,000 and four-fifths of the cash value. Extraordinary as it may seem, the claim was advanced that the co-insurance clause increased the risk of the Home instead of reducing it, and made that company a co-insurer with the insured to the extent of the deficit—in other words, made the company the writer of a \$10,000 instead of a \$5,000 policy. More remarkable still, the lower court sustained this contention, but it was set aside on appeal as "unnatural and unreasonable." The court said: It seems to us the meaning of the clause in the policy is very clear, and holds plaintiffs bound either to procure from others or carry themselves insurance to the extent with defendant's policy of four-fifths of the value of the insured property. The undertaking is positive and unequivocal that they shall keep the property insured to that extent, and that they shall themselves be treated as insurers for all that others do not insure."—*Chronicle N.Y.*

The British America Assurance Company of Toronto seems to have got into another muddle over its New York agency. The management of this company appears to be very brilliant in this respect. The company's treatment of John M. Whi on, two years ago, has not yet been forgotten.—*The Chronicle, N.Y.*

RUSSIAN FINANCES.

We were much impressed on reading lately in one of our leading English contemporaries, the "*Statist*," an article on the policy of Russia, to note how, almost unconsciously apparently, the writer spoke of the policy of Russia as the policy of its Czar. "The Czar is or is not likely to do this;" "he is not ready to declare war for such a reason;" "he has done this or that;" Such a forcible manner of presenting matters brings us face to face with the fact which we in democratic countries are too apt to forget or fail to grasp the importance of, that Russia is absolutely governed by one man who can direct all the powers of that mighty empire in any direction the whim of the day may suggest to him. When we remember this, and look at the vastness of the resources at his command, it is no wonder that there are many "Russo-phobes" who are constantly in dread that the ambition or necessity of this man may plunge all Europe into a terrible war.

The Russian Empire covers one-seventh of the land surface of the Globe, or about 8,644,000 square miles, and having a population of about 103,000,000, of whom 87,000,000 are in European Russia. The army, when on a peace footing, consists of 757,000 men, while on a war footing it is 1,918,000 men. In addition to the above there are nearly 27,000 men employed on its 38 war vessels. The total war equipment of Russia may thus be said to be roughly 2,000,000 men. We agree with those who believe that this enormous mass of half civilized humanity which it is in the power of one man to hurl against any of his neighbors, is a menace to the world which prudent statesmen cannot overlook. The aggressiveness of Russian monarchs in the past moreover gives force to the worst suspicions as to the present aims against her weaker neighbors.

These facts, however, belong more to the domain of the statesman than the financier, and we would not have referred to them but to show the importance of another aspect of the case, the very unsatisfactory condition of Russian finances at the present time. This is in fact the bright side of the cloud, so far as the rest of Europe is concerned, for as it is not possible to carry on a great war without large resources in money or credit, it is evident that the more deeply Russia plunges into debt, the greater are the chances of European peace not being broken. There are in fact many who believe that but for this Russia would have seized the opportunity presented by the late troubles in Bulgaria to have seized a large slice of Turkey. Under such circumstances a little further knowledge of how Russia stands financially is acceptable.

The Imperial Revenue and Expenditure are given as follows, roughly:

Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Surplus or Deficiency.
1875....	\$288,000,000	\$270,000,000	+ \$18,000,000
1876....	280,000,000	312,000,000	— 32,000,000
1877....	275,000,000	508,000,000	— 233,000,000
1878....	313,000,000	504,000,000	— 191,000,000
1879....	331,000,000	388,000,000	— 57,000,000
1880....	326,000,000	375,000,000	— 49,000,000
1881....	326,000,000	376,000,000	— 50,000,000
1882....	352,000,000	360,000,000	— 8,000,000
1883....	350,000,000	362,000,000	— 12,000,000
1884....	358,000,000	364,000,000	— 6,000,000

The expenditure for some years, especially 1877 and 1878, was greatly swelled by the expenses of the war with Turkey, but the fact remains that the country is getting and has been getting, almost since the commencement of the century, deeper and deeper into debt with each passing year, and is in reality paying its interest by fresh borrowings. Her army and navy cost her alone about \$125,000,000 in time of peace. We can see the matter more clearly, perhaps,