

Insurance and Finance CHRONICLE.

OFFICE:
1724 Notre Dame Street.

MONTREAL, NOVEMBER 15, 1894

SUBSCRIPTION:
\$2.00 per ANNUM.

THE Insurance and Finance Chronicle.

Published on the 1st and 15th of each month.

AT 1724 NOTRE DAME ST., MONTREAL.

R. WILSON SMITH, Editor and Proprietor.

Annual Subscription (in Advance) \$2.00

Prices for Advertisements on application.

All Communications intended for THE CHRONICLE must be in hand not later than the 10th and 25th of the month to secure insertion.

Who held
the
Mortgages?

ONE of the most fertile farming districts in Canada between here and Toronto is comprised in two townships that run alongside two that are very stony, difficult to cultivate, and, apparently, hardly worth the trouble. A visitor in this city who knows every family in those parts informs us that in one section most of the farms are under mortgage, while in the other very few are incumbered, and the money advanced to the farmers in the other section has nearly all been supplied from their neighbors. He asked us, "In which of these districts were the mortgages held?" The natural reply came, "in the fertile section which is so famous for its rich grazing lands and dairy products." This, however, turned out to be a wrong guess, for the farmers owning the good lands owed the money, while those on the rocky ground were the creditors. The explanation was this, the farmers who are in debt live near to a city, they and their families are ambitious of keeping up a style of living and of dressing after city fashions; their houses are large, substantially built and expensively furnished; they have domestic servants; they have a stylish carriage with a good team; they give entertainments, and compete with each other in making a display on their tables of silver ware and costly services. On the other hand, the farmers on the poor land have to work very hard, and to utilize every member of the family as a worker. They are not tempted to copy city style, as they have no time for anything but work, they live in houses by their own labor; hence they set their whole minds on making and saving money, which they do so successfully that they have put their stylish neighbors under obligations to them for borrowed money. Our informant says that anyone who sits in the churches attended by people from both these sections can easily pick out the families who are in debt from those who are money lenders,

the distinction being, as he puts it, that the former "wear Montreal dry goods," and the others are not so expensively attired. The debt-burthened drive to church in a costly buggy, behind a fast team, while their creditors come in the farm wagon. The clergy inform him also, that the stylish families give meanly to church objects, and grudgingly, while the more modest ones give more liberally, and in a cheerful spirit.

The contrast between these two classes of farmers conveys an obvious moral, which those who comment upon farm life and its conditions need to heed—as do others. While no one desires to keep farmers from enjoying the elegancies of life, they certainly are not objects of pity, as they are often represented to be, if, in order to procure luxuries, and to keep up "style," they plunge into debt. In far too many cases, a farm mortgage has resulted from a lack of economy.

Interest of Agents
in business
they secure.

A DECISION has been given by the Supreme Court of Alabama, confirming that of the Court below, which is of high importance in regard to the interest of an agent in the business he has secured for an insurance company. One 'Dangaix,' agent of the Scottish Union & National, transferred his services to another company. After making the change, he induced some seventy-three policy holders, whom he had secured, to seek cancellations of their policies in the company he had left, and assignments of their claims for return premiums, in order to substitute policies in other companies he had become interested in. The original company declined to return the premiums, on the ground that Dangaix having taken this business as their agent, and received commission thereon, his interest in the policies ceased, and that, "after he ceased to be their agent, he procured said policies of insurance to be cancelled for the purpose of depriving the defendant company of the benefits thereof, and bought the unearned premiums in violation of the right of the company, which he had no lawful right to do." The judgment of the Supreme Court sets out that while an agent's connection with a company continues, he must not act in any adverse way to his principal. But when his engagement has ended, the law has laid down that, he may, "if he act in good faith and without fraud, engage in business in competition with and even to the