

degree to the expected large turn out of officers in khaki. The speech from the throne was long and chiefly about the war, coal, gold, fishing and farming. Lieut.-Gov. McKeen spoke the speech prepared for him by some member of the government, or by some one selected by it, who never had heard of, or if he had did not believe in, the axiom "Brevity is the soul of wit," in a voice clearly audible at the extreme corner of the chamber. The reference in the speech to Gold is to the effect that better days are in store for that industry. But readers should not become overelated at the announcement that gold production in 1915 was double that of 1914, for the total yield after all is trifling. I have heard it stated that the gold production this year may reach 20,000 ounces of a value of say \$400,000. In January alone of this year the value of the increased output of coal is in excess of the total gold production—predicted—for 1916. I mention this merely to prevent unthinking people from assuming that King Coal, in the near future, may have a rival for the throne. The object in writing this paragraph is not so much to relate what happened "at" the "opening" as to what was said "of" it. An esteemed Halifax daily expressed regret that the Lieut.-Governor had not discarded the traditional robe of royalty, with its much gold lace, and its feather cocked hat; in short that he had not abandoned the Windsor uniform, and clothed himself in every day attire as had a predecessor. The paper told us this is a democratic age, that we are a democratic people, and are not fond of frills and other fal de ralls. In saying such things the paper was talking nonsense—a thing not unusual with it—and failed to recognize the eternal fitness of things. The President of the United States, and the president of the French Republic may fittingly appear at all functions, state and otherwise, in civilian attire, as the U. S. and France are republican—democratic—in their form of government. While however much we may brag and chatter about our democratic ideas, institutions, etc., etc., we are neither, after all, democrats or republicans. We are nominally monarchists, if of a limited kind. And there cannot be a monarchy where there is no King. We have a King, they call him George, and though he may not have the powers of a Kaiser we all shout "God Save the King." The Lieut.-Governor is not the representative of democracy, but of monarchy, and so long as he is that he is bound to appear in kingly attire. If he appeared, at a state function, in civilian attire then a critic would have a right to say his so appearing was flouting the King. We are democratic are we,—as they are across the line? Well, if one wants to see gold lace, and cavalier hats, and all sorts of arresting attire let him cross the line, and if the Order of Eagles, or the Virginia Veterans, or the Knights of Pythias, or any of the uncountable Sons of Geegaws don't satisfy him that democracy is still in swaddling clothes nothing will. . . . And then the same paper, in the next breath, censures the Speaker for appearing in khaki, and not in the time honored emblem of office, a flowing wig. Why should the Governor be censured for being non-democratic and the Speaker for being too much so? The wig! Why it is a horrible affair and would make the handsomest face look hideous. Wigs were introduced long years ago so that those who were exalted to wear

them might look so fearsome that the poor wretches brought before their much bewigged lordships might fear and tremble. Why wigs should be worn today is beyond my comprehension. I think the wearing of them a silly, stupid, piece of foolery.

\*\*\*

The two chief arguments hitherto advanced against prohibition were that it would be an interference with the liberty of the subject, and that it would deprive thousands of persons out of their present mode of making a living, in short it would throw thousands on the community for sustenance. There was never much in the first argument, for thoughtful people realized that effective government meant nothing short of a continual interference with the liberty of the subject. The second argument, though it should not, carried weight with many hasty folks. The present war has not only deprived the argument of any force from an anti-prohibition standpoint but has actually turned the large numbers employed in the trade, as a reason why the distilling and brewing business should be wholly and effectually banned. In Britain there are over 400,000 persons engaged more or less directly in the production and sale of liquor. The contention today is that this army of labor is uselessly employed. The Chairman of the Cunard S. S. Coy. has recently called the attention of the nation to this fact, in language void of rancor. Sir Alex. Booth says:

The most glaring example of a form of consumption which we could perfectly well dispense with is the drink traffic. I am not thinking now of the temperance side of this question. Important though that is, we have got far beyond that now. I am thinking of the demand which this trade makes upon the services of our ships, our railways and carts, and of our labour. Thirty thousand tons a week of barley and other produce are brought into this country for the brewing and distilling trades. Think of the demand which this means on the depleted resources of our mercantile marine. Then all this stuff, together with the larger quantity which is grown at home, has to be carted and hauled by rail to the brewery or distillery. Then it all has to be brought back again and distributed to the consumer. In addition to this, 6,000 miners are kept permanently employed getting coal, and 36,000 tons of coal have to be sent every week to these breweries and distilleries. Taken in the aggregate, the services absorbed by this trade are on a gigantic scale, and the net result of it all is a decrease in national efficiency. I say in all seriousness that if we are to maintain our armies in the field we shall before very long have to choose between bread and beer.

Commenting on this The Manchester Guardian says:—

In addition to this army of workers, it must not be forgotten that there is an even larger army of workers engaged exclusively in the retail distribution of intoxicating liquors. In England and Wales alone in 1911 the Census records that at least 185,187 men and 112,886 women are so employed—or 298,073 in all. Of the men 130,426 were under 45 years of age. Of the women 60 per cent. were under 35 years of age and 55 per cent. were unmarried. Of course, a certain proportion of these men and women are not directly engaged in selling drink—for

(Continued on page 12.)