

made? No amount of ingenuity can convert the Philippines into personal property; the territory belongs, or, as soon as the treaty is signed, will belong, to the United States. Definitions, we fancy, will count for little when the power of Congress comes to be exercised over the islands. The essential thing for other nations is the assurance that the open door will be maintained. This is a point on which we have no doubt Europe would have insisted; and it is satisfactory to see it conceded without friction.

LONGEVITY OF TOTAL ABSTAINERS.

It has sometimes been sought to be shown of late, though we have never been convinced by the arguments to that end, that it was a mistake to suppose total abstainers lived longer than people who drank malt and spirituous liquors, either moderately or to excess. In the face of experience such as that of the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution, which for years has demonstrated the advantage in longevity maintained by the Temperance Section of its insurants over the General Section. In the face of the declaration of Emory McClintock, the American actuary, that his enquiry extending over many years and including many thousands of policy-holders showed the ratio of death losses among abstainers to be much lower than among non-abstainers. And in the face of similar testimony from other sources in Canada and Great Britain there seems to be no room to doubt the superior longevity, as a rule, of those who abstain from intoxicating liquors as proved by the records of life insurance authorities for a quarter of a century.

There have lately appeared some interesting statistics, the compilation of an English actuary, James Meikle, showing the actual longevity among policy-holders known to be total abstainers. In his observations, extending over fourteen years, Mr. Meikle finds that between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-four among policy-holders aggregating 12,363 years, only forty-eight deaths occurred, as against 92.7 per cent. (actuaries' tables healthy males), a ratio of actual to expected deaths of 51.7. According to Mr. McClintock's paper before the Actuarial Society of America it was found by United States actuaries that in the first year of insurance between the abstainer and non-abstainer there was a difference of 27 per cent.; from the second to the fourth a difference of 26 per cent.; and after the fourth year only 10 per cent. Also that, taking persons born in United States by themselves, the percentage of the maximum expected loss was eighty-four for abstainers and ninety-two for non-abstainers, a difference of 8 per cent. These results do not, of course, show, says the *Travelers' Record*, that moderate drinking is very injurious, or that rather immoderate drinking condemns the drinker to premature death. "It does show, however, that there is sufficient harm done among a large number of individuals to make the death-rate appreciably higher on the average. At any rate the teetotaler is a better risk for an insurance company than the moderate drinker."

To this testimony should be added the experience of a Canadian life company, the Temperance and General, which has maintained for some twelve years a separation of its policy-holders into two classes—those who drink intoxicants and those who do not. We learn from the statistics of this company, which has 1,400 insurants in its General Section and 6,000 in its Temperance Section that its average ratio of death losses for the past twelve years "has been 8.84 lives per 1,000 in number, and \$3.77 per \$1,000 in amount in our Temperance Section, and it has been 4.02 lives per 1,000 in number, and \$4.91 per \$1,000

of the annual average of our total business for the same period." This is a very low general ratio, and the company takes pride in the still lower ratio of its teetotal policies, as they may be called. Here, surely, is in all sufficient testimony to make it clear that abstainers, as an average, are better life risks than those who are not.

TAKE CARE WHOM YOU TRUST.

The following lesson in granting credit may possibly deter some people from being too ready to trust strangers and travelers: One I. Grossman carried on business for years in a small way at Ailsa Craig and neighborhood. About a year ago he started a small general store there, which was followed up by the starting of a small business by his brother-in-law, one H. Kauffman, at St. Paul's, near St. Marys.

Things went on well enough until the autumn of 1898, when the usual tactics were employed—ordering goods from everybody on short terms of credit, making the bills mature about 4th November. In the meantime Kauffman and Grossman both set to work to get the start of their creditors by shipping the goods, largely in original cases, to Toronto, some being sent to the address of one Tob. Cooper, others to L. Clain and others again to Messrs. Simonsky & Levinsky and A. Raffleman. Messrs. Simonsky & Levinsky also professed to have bought the balance of the stock at Ailsa Craig, some \$2,500, together with certain consignments to them in Toronto, amounting in value to \$1,300, all for \$1,225. They, of course, claimed to be innocent purchasers and to have been deceived by Grossman.

The London creditors brought action against them to set aside this sale, through Messrs. Gibbons, Mulkern & Harper, and the matter was settled by their handing over to the estate the goods at Ailsa Craig, amounting to \$2,500, the goods in Toronto amounting to some \$1,300, and paying the sum of \$1,500 in respect of the goods which they had already disposed of. Suit is still pending against Mr. Raffleman.

It may be that Messrs. Simonsky & Levinsky paid, as they claim to have done, for the goods in question, and if so, their misfortune in dealing with such gentry as Grossman and Kauffman is the greater that they have now had to pay for the goods again.

It ought to be a salutary warning to people buying out stocks from debtors without taking pains to see that they are acting in good faith and that they have made some arrangement for the payment of their debts. The creditors have rights which must be respected.

A DISASTROUS STORM.

The storm of Sunday last on the Atlantic shores of New York, Massachusetts, Maine and our Maritime Provinces, has caused a distressing loss of life and a great loss of property. In New York on Sunday there was a regular blizzard, with snow, which blocked traffic in the city and kept many sea-going vessels in harbor. In Boston and Hartford the gale was even more violent and the snow very thick. The storm swept over the greater portion of New England, demoralizing traffic of every description and interrupting telegraphic and telephonic communication, while the northeast gale, coming on a high course of tides, drove the sea far beyond its usual limits and made a mark along shore only exceeded by the memorable hurricane of 1851.

Even up to yesterday tidings of more wrecks were being received and evidences of wreckage discovered till the number of vessels of all kinds lost approaches one hundred and the loss of lives two hundred. The most appalling wreck was that of the passenger steamer "City of Portland," 1,500 tons, a wooden boat plying from Boston to Portland. Her captain had been instructed by the owners not to leave Boston before nine o'clock, on that Sunday night, because of the bad weather forecasts. But the captain ventured in defiance of orders, and paid for his temerity with his life. But, alas! not his own life only, for every living person on board, some 118 in all, perished. The steamer was driven some sixty miles out of her course and went to pieces near Highland Light, on the Cape Cod shore of Massachusetts. For days