

But Bishop Potter cannot surely complain if some poor wandering members of his flock find, in the speech from which we have ventured to quote, their pastor's justification for the abandonment of home for the republic of festivity to be found at the nearest tavern.

Home holds so much, that few mothers will forgive Bishop Potter his unfortunate defence of weak and selfish men, his unnecessary reference to crying children and untidy wives.

Bishop Potter may not be a Pharisee, but he is certainly likely to be regarded as a friend of the publican.

---

**Loose and Mischievous Legislation.** The desire of the new school of politicians and legislators in Great Britain, as elsewhere, to ponder to the wishes of the masses, and thereby obtain their support at elections, has resulted in much loose and mischievous legislation, some of which is already bearing fruit. The Workmen's Compensation Act has developed so many difficulties that already wise and thoughtful men are questioning if Mr. Chamberlain's measure will have effected good or evil when a balance sheet is struck. The Act has produced a regular epidemic of perjury; has brought about a change in the social conditions of the labour market already, demanding serious consideration; is proving a legal puzzle to learned judges; and is a perplexing problem to clever actuaries—despite the positiveness of Mr. Chamberlain as to the cost of compensation.

And now, another bit of loose and mischievous paternal legislation has again illustrated the folly of so much law-making. Simply as a bid for popularity by the fathers and framers of the measure, and yielding to the outcry of a few faddists, an act of Parliament provides that parents troubled with "conscientious objections" to vaccination can apply to a magistrate for a certificate of exemption for their children. The magistrate has no option in the matter, but must issue said certificate if the parents are willing to swear they are actuated by conscience. Forgetful of the fearful ravages of a loathsome disease; glad to be relieved of the trouble incidental to compulsory vaccination; and with some vague and shadowy fear of impure lymph; the conscience of the British parents has developed such an unexpected elasticity that half a million "conscientious objectors" have appeared before the magistrates. However, there is good reason to hope that this latest mistake of modern legislation will be speedily remedied. The public health authorities have been aroused to a knowledge of the danger of the situation; intelligent men are moving to repair the mischief and evil done by act of Parliament; school boards are up in arms; householders are declining the services of domestics unless the latter have been vaccinated; insurance societies, benefit societies, and model tenement trustees are

piling up evidence of the sin and folly of such loose and mischievous legislation; and in all probability the common sense of Great Britain will triumph over the framers of unnecessary laws, and administer a deserved castigation to members of parliament whose desire for the happiness and welfare of their constituents is continually leading them to introduce some bill having for its object the unnecessary coddling of the masses.

---

**A Grievance.** An esteemed subscriber to THE CHRONICLE, who has been labouring in the insurance field for the past twenty

years, has favoured us with a long and highly interesting letter, complaining that the companies do not appear to appreciate or encourage the efforts of their "legitimate agents." The principal grievance of this thoughtful and observant representative of fire insurance companies finds expression in strong objections to the constant diminution of the business belonging to "legitimate agents," owing to the ever-growing practice of appointing extra agents because of the risks they are able to control. Our correspondent questions if the business obtained by some of these special agents is desirable. Against this and other deviations from the beaten path of employing only trained insurance men, the gentleman referred to flings his thoughts into words having in them a ring of righteous indignation, and, on behalf of sufferers, he says:—"I consider it the rankest sort of hypocrisy on the part of these gentlemen who declaim against the struggling agent for dividing commissions, etc. (which I also condemn, and do not practice), but who are guilty of such sins as I allude to. The greatest sinners in this respect are frequently the greatest sticklers (at banquets and board meetings) for a high standard of morality on the part of their agents. I wish some of these gentlemen would honour me with an invitation to some of their "assemblies." I think I could give several of them a rather painful half hour." Pursuing the subject of his grievance, he then becomes almost too outspoken for the columns of an ordinary journal, charging many of these special appointees of companies with being "sublimely innocent of the most rudimentary principles, practices, or even the methods of the business, subscribing to no journals, and reading nothing more edifying than the application form and the tariff."

Our correspondent regards "all this as being very humiliating," and asserts that this "let her go" policy in pursuit of business is demoralizing, ruinous and disheartening. This indignant agent further remarks that, when reading the speeches and letters of some managers who are thus unjust in their treatment of legitimate agents, he "feels like invoking the spirit of a Virgil or a Homer" to score managerial sins.

We cannot publish our old friend's eloquent letter in extenso, but we gladly outline the burden of his woes, and we hope his grievances may be redressed.

If he wrote direct to the offending managers in the same vein as he addresses this paper, they could not turn a deaf ear to his complaint.