

want they must have, if it will do them good or do them harm. The great public is very much like a child. It does not know when it is ill, and its medicine must be given it in disguise. The newspaper man must exercise judgment. A vast field passes daily before him. He cannot give attention to even all the legitimate news. He must learn to choose the best, and he must learn to choose quickly. He must learn to do things himself, must get initiative. It is true that a large part of his work will be done in the city within call of his office. But at times he will find himself at the other end of the province, at the other end of the country, perhaps. He must then give his own orders and act on them.

What of the qualifications necessary in a journalist? One of the greatest men in the profession in the last century was M. De Blowitz, who for thirty years represented the London Times in Paris. He used to tell those who came for his advice that "the man who would enter journalism should feel a positive call to this vocation, should have in him the unwearying vigilance which is an absolute condition of it, the love of danger, of civil danger, that is, and a real peril—a boundless curiosity and love for truth, and a special and marked facility of rapid assimilation and comprehension."

Sir Leslie Stephen laid more stress on the need for sound knowledge. "Know something really," he said, "at any rate, try to know something; be the slave of some genuine idea, or you will be the slave of a newspaper, a bit of mechanism instead of a man." Minute, detailed knowledge along some one line is almost a necessity, certainly an advantage. The newspaper has to speak on questions, often almost on the spur of the moment, and it must speak with authority. The aim must be steadfast, sure. There is no going back next day and revising the policy. Such a thing would be fatal.

Whitelaw Reid, United States ambassador in London and proprietor of the New York *Tribune*, one of the sanest of the great American dailies, gives advice somewhat along the same lines as Sir Leslie Stephen: "One must first know things," he says, "and where to find things; and in your reasoning about them, knowledge—real knowledge, not a smattering—of the history of your country is indispensable, and no historical knowledge will come amiss. Constitutional and international law, at least one must know. Modern languages will be most helpful. The literature of your own language should be studied until you learn to use the noble tongue to express to the best advantage and in the fewer words what you have to say. You should know your own country. You should know foreign countries, and thus chasten the notion that wisdom began with us and that liberty and intelligence hardly exist elsewhere. You should know the people, the plain, everyday, average man, the man in the street, his conditions, his needs, his ideas and his notions—and you should learn early that he is not likely to be overpowered by your condescension when you attempt to reason with him." There is a bill-of-fare beside which your broadest college course looks puny.

Bernard Shaw, too, has had his say: "Newspapers all over the world are always on the wrong side of every question. It is a true maxim that if a young