and in Office B for $600, covering both ranges by a "blanket" policy. A loss occurs of $800, say $400 on each range, and by the existing practice the apportionment (which we will call No. 1) would be thus (we omit fractions):

Example 1.

I.	II.
Loss $400	$400 = $800 Total loss.

Apportionment No. 1.

| B 6-11ths | $217 | 6-11ths | $217 | = $434 B policy pays |
| A 5-11ths | 183 | 5-11ths | 183 | = 366 A " |

$400	$400 = $800

Now the absurdity of the foregoing must be palpable to any one who will give the matter a moment's thought, for either the apportionment is made as though Office B covered each range to the extent of $600, or else that Office A's policy was simply a "blanket" for $500 on the two ranges, neither of which is the case. According to the rule we uphold, Office B's policy of $600 covers $800, and, the loss on the ranges being equal, is liable for $300 on each range. Office A's policy for $1,000 is practically only an insurance for $800, viz., $400 on each range, for were it the sole office interested it would only be liable and contribute to that extent, and an additional insurance can certainly not increase the policy's liability. Thus the apportionment would be as follows:

Apportionment No. 2.

I.	II.
B's Liab. $300 = 3-7ths $171	$171 = $342 B pays
A's " 400 = 4-7ths 229	229 = 458 A "

$400	$400 = $800

Example 2.

I.	II.
Loss $800	$800 = $1,600 Total loss.

Apportionment No. 1.

B 6-11ths	$436	left	$164	= $600	B pays
A 5-11ths	364	5-11ths	364	= 728	A "
			272	= 272 insured loses

$800	$800 = $1,600

Apportionment No. 2.

(Both policies are liable to their full extent.)

| B 3-8ths | $300 | 3-8ths | $300 | = $ 600 B policy pays |
| A 5-8ths | 500 | 5-8ths | 500 | = 1,000 A " " |

$800	$800 = $1,600

By apportionment No. 1 the insured loses $272, notwithstanding its being clear he has sufficient insurance to meet the loss, which we maintain is not only an outrage against common sense but also common justice, which asserts that insurance is indemnity. The next two examples show the respective results of each

method of apportionment when the loss on the ranges is unequally divided.

Example 3.

I.	II.
Loss $300	$900 = $1,200 Total loss.

Apportionment No. 1.

B 6-11ths	$163	left	$437	= $600	B pays
A 5-11ths	137	5-11ths	409	= 546	A "
			54	= 54 insured loses

$300	$900 = $1,200

Apportionment No. 2.

(B liability is $150 and $450 on Ranges I and II, respectively, while A, as shown above, is liable for $300 on I and $500 on II.)

Liab.		Liab.			
B $150 = ¼	$100	$450 = 9-19ths	$426	= $526	B pays
A 300 = ⅔	200	500 = 10-19ths	474	= 674	A "

$300	$900 = $1,200

Example 4.

I.	II.
Loss $400	$1,200 = $1,600 Total loss.

Apportionment No. 1.

B 6-11ths	$217	left	$383	= $ 600	B pays
A 5-11ths	183		500	= 683	A "
			317	= 317 insured loses

$400	$1,200 = $1,600

(Or adjusting Range II. first.)

B	....	$600	= $600	B pays
A	$400	500	= 900	A "
		100	= 100 insured loses

$400	$1,200 = $1,600

Apportionment No. 2.

Liab.		Liab.			
B $150 = 3-11ths	$109	$450 = 1.	$450	= $ 559	B pays
A 400 = 8-11ths	291	500 = 1.	500	= 791	A "
		250	=	250 ins.loss

$400	$1,200 = $1,600

In example 3 we again perceive that, with obviously abundance of insurance applicable to the loss, apportionment No. 1 makes the insured lose $54, while in example 4 two totally different results are arrived at under the same method of apportionment, according to which range is adjusted first, one of which results is manifestly unjust to the insured, and the other as plainly makes Office A pay more than it is entitled to do, inasmuch as Office B has undoubtedly a certain proportion of liability attaching to the loss on Range I, and should contribute that proportion Our apportionment No. 2 some may think is unjust to the insured, but a little consideration will show that, while $100 of Office A's policy is useless—for, were there no other policy, said office would only pay $100—there is still $150 over insurance on Range I, making together $250, the amount clearly short on Range II, and for which

the insured has only himself to blame, and must suffer accordingly, for had he been more correct in his calculations he could have had Office B's policy endorsed over to apply to II exclusively, and $100 of the policy A covering I transferred to II, also when he would have been paid in full, but he should not expect the offices to be answerable for his own bad arithmetic.

In the foregoing we have assumed the measure of the loss to be the measure of the value, but our rule will apply equally correctly when the value is also given, for the "ratio of a policy's liability to the total loss covered is also its ratio of liability to any item of such loss," the definition of Mr. Hore in his book already referred to by us, and which our readers will find we have adopted throughout the examples offered, and which will never give either inequitable or absurd results, such as is too often the case with the present system of apportioning fire losses.

INSOLVENCY STATISTICS.

One of the mercantile agencies has just published a statement of the number of failures which occurred during the first quarter of this year in the United States as well as in Canada. To give this quite suggestive statement more value, we add to it the number of failures and the amount of liabilities during the same period of the three preceding years.

Number of failures and liabilities during the 1st quarter of the year:

Number of failures.		Liabilities.
CANADA.		
1876	447	$7,417,238
1877	572	7,576,511
1878	555	9,100,929
1879	634	11,648,697
UNITED STATES.		
1876	2,806	$64,644,156
1877	2,859	54,538,070
1878	3,355	82,078,826
1879	2,524	43,112,665

The statement for the first quarter of this year, compared with the same quarter of 1878, shows for Canada an increase of 14 per cent. in the number of failures, and of 28 per cent. in amount of liabilities, with an average amount of $18,375 per failure. For the United States the exhibit is quite different. The comparison between the two years shows for the 1st quarter of 1879 a decrease of 24¾ per cent. in number of failures, and of about 52¼ per cent. in amount of liabilities, with an average amount of $17,081 per failure. This, if reliable, is not a very encouraging exhibit for us in Canada, but it is to be hoped that under the new order of things, with greater and more judicious enterprise and more self-reliance, the next statement may prove more satisfactory.