

Aiger from the cabinet, and his appointment as ambassador to France, the "Daily States" of New Orleans refers to him as having "a grape-vine twist on the McKinley administration." After signifying a want of belief in the story, the same paper thus refers to the Secretary of War:—"The country would be glad, however, to see him leave the cabinet and sent to France or Dahomey or any other old place."

The Five Hundred.

The recent publication by the New York "World," of a list of 500 millionaires hitherto unheard of as rich men is, to say the least, surprising. But a Southern paper in commenting upon this revelation of riches remarks that in these days of rapidly accumulating wealth a man who is worth a million dollars is "a very small potato," and that it is only the multi-millionaires who "count for anything." We are not informed by what means the New York "World" was enabled to make this pretentious parade of mere millionaires, but active workers in the life insurance field will doubtless thank modern journalistic enterprise for introducing these desirable risks to their notice. It is written in the book of Proverbs:

"The rich hath many friends."

Possibly this ostentatious newspaper display of wealth will result in a large addition to the list of friends of the possessors of \$500,000,000.

Britain's Beer Bill.

In September last, during the taking of the plebiscite, we incurred the resentment of a respected reader of THE CHRONICLE for venturing to say that the only community in which prohibition can be successfully enforced is a community in which nobody wants to drink liquor. In the discussion provoked by him, we quoted the opinion of the Rev. Principal Grant that intemperance is a decaying vice and Canada a remarkably sober community, and this opinion was afterwards confirmed by statistics published by us, taken from the "Outlook," showing that Canada holds the British record for sobriety. That we are likely to maintain this exemplary record seems certain. Realizing that England is disgracefully over supplied with public-houses, the Royal Licensing Commission was appointed to enquire into the liquor trade with a view to restricting same. But the latest report of their labours states: "The commission bids fair to add one more to the host of abortive attempts at English temperance reform, and no one can suppose that the Government is sorry, for the question is traditionally full of danger for even the strongest ministry."

We are also informed that, despite the lessening drinking habits of the richer classes, the alcoholic expenditure per head of the population of the country has increased from \$14.50 in 1840 to \$19 in 1885, that is 30 per cent.

The failure of the Royal Licensing Commission to do anything is said to be due to the great power of the Beerage in English politics.

Altogether, Canadian workers for the regulation and suppression of the liquor traffic have little, if anything, to complain of, even if our Government declines to further interfere in a question "traditionally full of danger for even the strongest ministry." We are not blind to the moral and physical aspects of this question. But we again venture to assert that the strongest argument of the teetotalers may yet be found in tables showing their superiority as life insurance risks, and in proving the longevity of those who never seek in the wine cup

"A sweet forgetfulness of human care."

A Ferocious Reformer. *The old carle gae them a screed of doctrine; Ye might have heard him a mile down the wind.—Scott.*

The true and earnest worker in the cause of prohibition may well be excused if he declines to acknowledge the writer of the terrible tirades on temperance recently occupying so much space in our newspapers, as a very useful ally. There is nothing in the world more wholesome or more necessary for us to learn than the gracious lesson of moderation. But the sober dictates of reason and the mild suggestions of benevolence are drowned and lost in the storm which shakes and agitates the soul of this seemingly blood-thirsty opponent of the liquor traffic and incidentally the would-be destroyer of members of the Government. Surely, the fiery zeal of this ferocious reformer is carrying him too far beyond the bounds of moderation, when he recommends the execution of the Canadian cabinet ministers. Let us quote from the letter of this terrible fellow:—

It appears to me that the Government in dealing with the question of prohibition have acted from first to last on the great maxim of Charles I., which was, "to put something into his treaties which might give color to refuse all that was in other things granted and to make them signify nothing." To the credit of the English race, be it said, a scaffold darkening one of the chambers at Whitehall was the end of that kind of dealing with the nation, and may we, in the seventh generation here in Canada, prove ourselves worthy of our fathers by meting out to the present Government exactly the same fate.

Such an outburst as this is as profitless as the exchanges of pert pleasantries and sharp personalities between our members of Parliament during the late debate. However, the writer of the letters in question is not the ferocious reformer the discomposure of his mind and his apparent present purpose of revenge would lead one to picture him. He is really one of the most amiable and kindly of the citizens of hospitable Halifax, and we venture to assure the members of the Government that it will not be necessary to ask for special protection from this victim of "dreadful and hideous thought."