

MONTREAL LIFE.

18-19 Board of Trade . . . Montreal.
28 Front Street West . . . Toronto.
109 Fleet Street, E.C. . . London, Eng.

MONTREAL AND TORONTO, DECEMBER 1, 1899.

TELEPHONES:
Montreal . . . Main 1255
Toronto . . . 2149

LIFE IN A LOOKING-GLASS.

MOST of us have noticed that those born in the same month in any year have the same general characteristics; but when we study the lives of those born on the same day and year the resemblance is most striking, not only in character, but in good and bad fortune. The ancients reduced this subject to a science by the comparison of thousands of lives. They found that mankind generally was affected by the movement of the heavenly bodies. Good or bad times always occurred when certain planets were in the same position with regard to each other and to the sun.

There are many in business who will not engage a man for an important position without first studying his character as shown by the modern astrological chart. Two leading life insurance companies use it constantly. MONTREAL LIFE has added this subject to its other attractive features, and, beginning with this week's issue, three forecasts will be given for each day in the week. The first applies to the world at large; the second shows how persons, born on this day in any year, will fare during the coming year; the third indicates how children, born on this day in the present year, are likely to fare during life.

The department will be edited by Mr. James Hingston, B.A., an Oxford University graduate, and for many years the literary critic of one of the big New York dailies. He has made a special study of astrology, and, in fact, he now devotes all his leisure to it. He is looked upon as one of the greatest authorities on this subject.

TO read the twaddle about the mayoralty that appears from time to time, in both the editorial and news columns of the daily papers, one would conclude that Montreal was a third or fourth-rate town or small village, instead of the metropolitan city of Canada. It seems that a sort of *modus operandi* was adopted some years ago, and has remained in force to date, under which each of the more numerous sections of Montreal's population has had in turn the honor of the chief magistracy. This unwritten convention may have worked very well in its day. But, like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, is it to be binding forever?—no matter what conditions may arise, or what the requirements of this growing centre may become. If the English Protestants, the French Catholics and the Irish Catholics, have severally a heaven-appointed right to elect a mayor once in so many years, why should not the Hebrews have the same right? And by the same process of reasoning, as the city grows larger, may not the Italians, the Armenians, and even the Chinese in time, participate in the privileges and benefits of an arrangement which, being based on a supposed principle of equal rights, should be elastic enough to embrace every important and respectable element of the population.

OBVIOUSLY, it would be absurd to carry such an agreement to its logical conclusion. No great city could be properly governed under a system the chief and avowed object of which was merely to hand around, to this section and that, the post of highest honor and trust, like the presidency of a baseball club or the sinecure of a poundkeepership under some village Pooh-bah. I am not discussing Mayor Prefontaine's qualifications for his high office, nor yet his claims for the honor of a

third term, but I simply want to point out that a city of the size and importance to which Montreal has now attained should elect its chief magistrate because of his ability and fitness, without regard to any extraneous and non-essential consideration, such as race, religion or language. Surely we have had enough of village politics in the past. This is one of the great commercial cities of America, and we should at last attempt to look at municipal matters through larger glasses than we have hitherto been doing—that is, if we expect to set our city in order, and to give it the place it is entitled to.

WHAT a wonderful thing the British Empire is becoming—nay, what a wonderful thing it has already become! The enthusiasm of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, and of the present war, were required in order to bring out in all their marvellousness, the striking characteristics of the great federation (I think one may now use the term) that has come into existence under the British flag. It was easy enough to say that the Queen had more Mahometan than Christian subjects; that there were more brown men than white men under her sway. But, until the Jubilee and the events of the past year or two made clear the meaning of such statements, they were mere empty intangibilities, void of significance to the average Britisher. To-day, we see the troops of a half-dozen widely separated colonies hurrying to South Africa to fight for Imperial interests. The men of five continents—Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia and America—will make up the British forces under General Buller. There has been nothing like this in the history of the world. The nearest approach to it was in the time of world-wide Rome, and, again, the days of the Emperor Charles V., who had the greater part of Western, Central and Southern Europe under his sway.

IN this connection, I notice that a striking event, illustrative of the breadth of British institutions, has just taken place in Ontario. Dr. Acland Oronhyatekha, son of the well-known head of the Independent Order of Foresters, made application for a commission in the Kingston Field Battery, and it was approved and forwarded to the Militia Department for confirmation. Young Oronhyatekha's application is unique, as he will be the first full-blooded Indian in Canada to receive a commission in the Royal Canadian militia. An empire that has room for the ambitions and talents of all its citizens, of whatever origin or color, is not in much danger of falling to pieces through disloyalty, which is bred most surely and quickly where men's opportunities of serving the State are not equal.

THE milkmen of Toronto are credited with having formed a trust, and at the same time the public are informed of an effort on the part of the wholesale hardwaremen of the Dominion to organize with the object of cutting down unnecessary expense and preventing needless competition. It is hard to say how far combinations of this kind may justifiably go. A trust is not necessarily an evil, by any means. If, by effecting large savings in some directions, it is able to reduce the price of the article it handles and at the same time to make increased profits—as appears to have been done in the case of some combinations—the trust is truly working in the interests of the public, though it may be seeking only its own interests. The