lotteries. The liberty of the citizen to do as he likes so long as he does not interfere with the liberty of others to do the same, which has been a shibboleth for some well-known writers, is interfered with by school laws, by the Post Office, by every state or municipal institution which takes his money for purposes thought desirable, whether he likes it or not. The Fourteenth Amendment does not enact Mr. Herbert Spencer's Social Statistics. The other day we sustained the Massachusetts Vaccination Law: Jacobson vs. Massachusetts 197 U.S. United States statutes and State statutes and decisions cutting down the liberty to contract by way of combination are familiar to the court. Two years ago we upheld the prohibition of sales of stock on margins or for future delivery in the constitution of California. The decision sustaining an eight-hour law for miners is still recent. Some of these laws embody convictions or prejudices which judges are likely to share. Some may not. But a constitution is not intended to embody a particular economic theory, whether of paternalism and the organic relation of the citizen to the State or of *laissez-faire*. It is made for people of fundamentally differing views, and the accident of finding certain opinions natural and familiar, or novel and even shocking ought not to conclude our judgment upon the question whether statutes embodying them conflict with the Constitution of the United States."

Thus, then, if the decision in the case in question were to be considered on the grounds of precedent, there are too many conflicting precedents to allow it long to remain unchallenged. Public opinion, however, if not legal opinion, leans to the idea that labor unions must not be allowed to terrorize the community, nor yet be allowed to have either custom or law framed to meet the vagaries of members of such bodies.

* * *

ASSESSMENT INSURANCE.

(Continued.)

Cool-headed business men had all along predicted this result. But the societies took in new members so rapidly, that in spite of the utter insufficiency of the premiums charged, those who entered "on the ground-floor" actually received their endowments; and for some years, the great influx of new entrants enabled the societies to meet their claims.

Now it is far from being our purpose to classify the assessment organizations of the present day with the "wild-cat" concerns of which mention has been made above. The former are, we believe, honestly conducted; the purpose of the latter, from the very outset, was fraudulent. Nevertheless, while we give the managers of modern assessment organizations full credit for honest intentions, there is yet a certain similarity in the modus operandi of the two schemes. The defunct "wild-cat" concerns charged inadequate rates; so do the assessment societies. The promoters of the former trusted that the rapid influx of "new blood" would keep their schemes afloat; so do the apostles of assessmentism to-day. Both built their structures on an insecure foundation, and the ruin which overtook the one can hardly fail to overwhelm its modern counterpart.

The reason, therefore, that several of the assessment societies in Canada are still able (in spite of utterly insufficient rates) to carry on an apparently prosperous business, is simply this; they are taking in new members in such large numbers that their death-rate is kept very low—the new members being younger and healthier lives than the rest of the membership. But it is evident that the larger the society becomes, the larger must be the influx of new members in order to keep the death-rate stationary. Sooner or later, the time must come when it will be impossible to secure enough new entrants to balance the increasing death-rate among the old members. When that moment comes, the society is doomed.

Let us use a comparison which will be readily grasped by every member of a fraternal society. Suppose a merchant starts business in a retail trade. He purchases all his stock at three months' credit. His prices are so low that he speedily secures an enormous business. He does not require to meet any bills at all for three months, and when that time comes, he has abundant funds to meet his debts. We will suppose that the merchant continues on this basis, buying goods on credit, selling them below cost. It is evident that with a large, constantly-increasing trade he may be able to continue in business for a long time, before his debts overtake his assets. It is evident also that the merchant's business to an outsider will appear exceedingly flourishing, for he will be doing a large trade. But it is *just as evident* that sooner or later the time will come when he will be forced into bankruptcy, *because he is selling at a loss.*

Now the case we have cited is exactly analogous to that of the assessment societies. They are selling insurance at a loss, because their rates are inadequate. They are doing business on a credit basis, because they do not have to meet any claims until deaths occur. They may be able to continue in business for some years with apparent success, because new members are flocking to them. But, sooner or later, the time must and will come when the unsoundness of their financial standing will be made evident.

When that time comes, what will be the position of the members who remain? This is a question which should be seriously considered by every member of an assessment or of a fraternal society. If you, reader, belong to one of those ill-starred organizations, it may repay you to stop a moment and consider your own position. You have a family to protect, and it was for that reason that you insured your life. But are you really insured? Can there be any insurance where there is nothing sure?

The society is paying other men's death claims at the present time. If you were to die ten years from now, would it have sufficient funds to pay your death-claim?

The society is doing a flourishing business now. If it collapses within the next ten years, will you have anything to show for the premiums you have paid?

You are satisfied with the society now, and expect to remain in it. Would you remain in it, if you knew that the rates would be raised within the next few years?

You are in good health now, and can secure insurance in any company. Ten years from now, after the society has collapsed, will you still be in good enough health to secure insurance elsewhere, or will you be left in the lurch as thousands of others have been?

Do you believe that it is wise on your part to continue throwing money away on insurance that does not insure?