

# The Chronicle

Insurance & Finance.

R. WILSON SMITH,  
Proprietor.

ESTABLISHED JANUARY, 1881

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

VOL. XXI. No. 34.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 23, 1901.

SINGLE COPY - - .10  
ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION - \$2.00

Chief Justice Simmons, of Atlanta, Georgia, has entered suit to recover **Legal Limit to \$2,000** from the Mutual Reserve **Assessments?** Fund Life Association. He maintains that the assessments levied upon him in regard to a policy of \$5,000 issued by that Company were so excessive and unjust that he was compelled to decline making any more payments. The policy, consequently, was forfeited, and the Chief Justice claims that he is entitled to damages to extent of \$2,000. Whether he will secure a favorable verdict is exceedingly doubtful. It is desirable for this case to be pursued until a final judgment is delivered. This question having been raised so recently by a Chief Justice of an American Supreme Court, seems to show that the commonly received opinion is not correct that an assessment life insurance company has power to levy whatever assessments are deemed necessary by the managers.

**Redmond and Kruger.** "Whom the gods would destroy they first drive mad," or, deprive of their judgment, is an old saying. The leader of the Home Rule movement must be in the hands of the gods for the treatment indicated. He has made an ostentatious visit to Mr. Kruger in Holland to carry the sympathies of his followers to the fugitive Boer. Considering that giving such open "comfort" to the arch enemy of Great Britain is a flagrant insult to the whole British nation, and, considering also that Mr. Redmond's scheme is a wild impossibility without the good-will of the English constituencies which his conduct alienates, he must be so devoid of judgment as a tactician as to be open to the suspicion of being on the way to destruction by "the gods." While in Holland Mr. Redmond may have seen Dutch troops on their way

to Holland's colony of Atchin, where, for some 18 years, that country has been carrying on a war of subjugation against the natives. Before then the Dutch rebuke England for suppressing the Transvaal rebels it would be in order for them to take the beam out of their own eye, as this operation would enable them to see more clearly and put them in a more consistent attitude as censors of England.

**A Doubtful Assertion Commonly Made.** Were persons, who make some assertions with absolute confidence, put in the witness-box and questioned in regard

to their reason for believing such statements to be truthful, they would present a sorry sight. They would be compelled to confess that they had no reason for such belief. One current statement just now is that the Census of 1891 was "stuffed," as one writer says; or, as runs the general term, "is notoriously unreliable." Numbers of journals use a phrase similar to this in regard to the Census of 1891. Any comparison between the population of Canada in 1901 and ten years ago is confidently stated to be statistically worthless owing to the Census of 1891 being incorrect. What grounds are there for this sweeping assertion? Those who pronounce the Census of 1891 to be unreliable, either have evidence in their possession to justify this judgment, or they are talking at random. If they possess such evidence why do they not publish it? If they have it not why do they so boldly attack the 1891 Census? It would be very interesting to have the real extent of the population in 1891 revealed. Of course, it is known to some of those who speak of it as incorrect, or else how could they draw such a conclusion? For to pronounce a thing incorrect necessarily implies a knowledge of what is correct.