

## Chamberlain on the Press.

Interesting Remarks on the Great Modern Power.

At London, Eng., at the annual dinner on behalf of the newspaper press fund, Hon. Joseph Chamberlain made the principal speech as chairman. Among other things he said:

Gentlemen, what strikes me is not that the facts with which we have to deal in the press are inaccurate, but that they are, as a rule, so extraordinarily correct. I am filled with wonder when I think of this great organization perpetually working, and so omniscient, so omnipresent, that nothing can occur of the slightest interest in any part of the world that it is not served up to you hot with your toast and eggs the next morning at your breakfast. Hitherto I have spoken only of the debt which the general reader owes to the newspaper press. But the class to which I belong—the profession, I will call it, of the politician—is peculiarly indebted. Without the press I do not really know where we should be. We owe everything to you. I tremble to think what would be the result if, following the course pursued by other trades and professions, the newspaper press were suddenly to strike for a living wage or for an eight hours' night. (Laughter.) I am really afraid that under those circumstances we should make no more speeches, and you will agree with me that imagination shrinks appalled from the thought of a speechless world. (Laughter.) But, gentlemen, you are good enough to continue to report our speeches. We do not always make a good return to you. There was a time when politicians were undoubtedly hostile to the press, when the House of Commons carefully guarded the secrecy of its debates, when it shrank from wholesome criticism, and when any editor or writer who dared to comment on the acts or speeches of a prominent statesman ran great risk of being committed to jail or being exposed in the pillory if he did not have his ears sliced off or his nose slit. (Laughter.) We have changed all that. Now the House of Commons courts your notice. Now the House of Commons implores free discussion on the part of the press, and only denies free discussion to its own members.

I have heard that Charles Dickens once had an interview with Mr. Disraeli, and after it was over Dickens went away regretfully and said to a friend, "What a pity it is. There is a man who might have done something in literature, and he has thrown himself away upon politics." (Laughter.) It is a curious speculation to think whether Sir W. Harcourt, for instance, if it had been his destiny to conduct a daily paper, would have found it a more genial task than leading the House of Commons—(laughter)—and whether even the Prime Minister might not in his heart prefer to edit a comic paper—(loud laughter and cheers)—rather than waste his delicate wit and gentle sarcasm upon a Birmingham audience. (Cheers and laughter.) In any case, I say that the journalist has nothing to envy in the politician. His power is as great, or greater, his work is not one whit more severe, and if he surrenders the public applause and the personal credit, which cannot follow him into his modest retirement, at all events he is relieved from the stress of personal strife which wears out many of us, and which, even when it does not wear us out, is apt to pervert our judgment and spoil our temper. Gentlemen, the power of the press is enormous, and I think that it is constantly increasing. I do say that, while the authority of the crown and the authority of the peers have been continually waning, and while the authority even of the House of Commons shows symptoms of decline, the authority and the power of the press are continually increasing. (Hear, hear.) In the main I believe that the press of this country is worthy of its high mission. I am not going to say that there are not still some belated survivals of the malignity of Wilkes and the scurrility of Grub street, but they are the exceptions, and, speaking generally, the press fulfills its high functions of teacher and guide and judge with wonderful ability, with signal independence, and with as much impartiality as is consistent with that controversial spirit which we like to see in party politics, and which gives to them a sauce and a flavor. The press of this country is incorruptible; it is pure; and so it has a high conception of public duty, and has always been animated by a lofty patriotism. (Cheers.) These at least are great virtues. They justify our pride in the British press, and justify our sympathy with every institution which can attend to or benefit by its advice. (Cheers.)

**Educate the Young.**  
The veteran general, O. O. Howard, insists that the great hope for the temperance cause in the future lies in the education of the young. He believes in fighting the enemy all along the line, but he thinks that the largest and most effective service can be performed through educational agencies. "My inclination and feeling," he says, is to begin with the systematic instruction of the young—the thorough education of the masses of the people through books, papers, the platform and the pulpit. The reason is this, that if we educate the children, we will

soon have the majority. We often count majorities when we really have not got them. Canada is ahead of the United States in Temperance. Now this work of education must precede the first challenge of the liquor department to political battlefields; for we must have majorities, and large ones, to make political action finally effective. I do not think anybody realizes, especially the masses of the temperance people, how thoroughly organized and strong the liquor interest is. It is enormous. A grand union of hearts and hands in this preparation for the great struggle that must sooner or later come to our people, is what we want now; and is, I am sure, what every true follower of Christ will earnestly advocate and support. Slavery is dead. Let this worse slavery of drunkenness and all drunk making disappear forever from America."

The Reign of Money.  
(Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, in a French Review.)

It may be said that money is, by natural right, the legitimate sovereign of democracies. Upon the ruins of royalty, nobility, the church, is founded the supremacy of wealth. It remains the sole superiority recognized by all. At other epochs, the power of money had some counterpoise. Of these nearly all have disappeared. Every form of society has its aristocracy, that is, a class which dominates by its social position. Now, what form of aristocracy can spring up in a democracy, that being a society of equality in which all other distinctions are effaced, save an aristocracy of money? Our fathers dreamed of an aristocracy of talent and intelligence. How can the people judge as to that? The great mass of humanity has not sufficient discernment to be able to form an opinion as to the talent of others. For the crowd, there is but one tangible and recognizable superiority, wealth. They are jealous of it, but they lust after it; they admire it almost in spite of themselves.

Democracy begets plutocracy. It is a law of nature, and a law of history. It has always been the case—in antiquity, in the middle ages, in modern times, in the east as well as in the west, in Semitic countries as well as in Aryan countries. Consider the United States. It is the country of mammon and mammonism. What is the sovereign of the great Republic, if not King Dollar? So with our old Europe: the more it is freed from the shackles of tradition, the more it is in the way of having the same sovereign as the United States. I have heard it said that Europe is being Judaized; it would be more apt to say that it is being Americanized. To speak exactly, however, plutocracy, if you choose to call it by that name, is neither American nor European, nor Anglo-Saxon, nor Semitic. It has nothing to do with race. Plutocracy is the result of a social condition. It springs, spontaneously, from the predominance of industry and commerce. In our democracies, what is there to counterbalance the weight of money? In fact, one thing only, the covetousness of the great mass of the people, who desire in their turn to enjoy the goods that money can purchase.

The intrusion of money into politics is one of the most alarming symptoms of our social distemper. Politics become a matter of traffic. Not that our time is more corrupt than those which preceded it. There was a time, in Christian Europe—witness the England of Charles II.—when even kings were for sale. The price of consciences in Germany, in Poland, in Sweden, even at Rome, in every place where assemblies sat, was well known at Versailles. Now, nevertheless, on both sides of the Atlantic, for money and by money seems to be the motto of the great herd of politicians.

The malady is in ourselves and cannot be cured by external remedies. It has not come to us from abroad; it is not a yellow fever or an Indian cholera imported from beyond sea with exotic products by merchants of a foreign race; it is a disease which has originated spontaneously among ourselves and become endemic in the West of Europe. To defend ourselves from it is of no use to establish quarantines at our frontiers or at the gates of our towns. The malady is in ourselves, an organic malady which is part of our social system, part of all the conditions of our existence; a malady which has reached all classes. Not that all are equally contaminated, but there is not one which is exempt.

Am I then to be understood to say that the malady of which I speak consists in there being wealthy people, a plutocracy, among us? Certainly not. Wealth, in itself, is neither good nor bad; it is neither beautiful nor ugly. Despite its detractors, wealth, even opulence, plays, in our modern culture, a part of great importance—a part which nothing but itself can play. Among the things perishable or durable, which gave value to life, more than one would perish without the existence of wealth. Without it, neither art nor science, to go no farther, would long exist. To suppress it, under the pretense that its elegancies are superfluous, would be to cut through the stalk which supports the flower of civilization. Wealth is one of the factors in what we call progress, and if wealth should disappear, it would not be the rich alone who would suffer.

The malady of which I have spoken cannot be cured by the abolition of wealth. Neither can it be cured by an equal distribution of well-being among

all classes of people, whether that distribution be effected by the brutal quackery of the Socialists or the sagacious hands of the economists. It is a moral malady, which can be cured by moral remedies only. The rule of wisdom was declared on the hills of Galilee 2,000 years ago. That rule is poverty of spirit. To be immoderately fond of wealth when one has it, to thirst for it in excess when one has it not, is the thing which is the curse of our modern society, and that curse will continue as long as there are people who preach war against the rich and declare that the most important object in life for the poor is to get money.

## Municipal Liquor Law Administration.

The Chicago Lever well says: "The saloon is the most active factor in modern politics. It rules or ruins and its rule is ruin. It dominates the councils of both political parties and neither dare oppose its demands." That is true regarding Chicago, New York and other of the great American cities to a much larger extent than in regard to Canada—Ontario especially. We owe a great deal in this Province to the fact that our present license and municipal laws disqualify liquor license holders from seats in our municipal councils and have otherwise separated the liquor business from municipal affairs.

In nearly every American city the liquor sellers are a controlling element in municipal politics, holding a large number of seats in the various city councils. We have no doubt but it would be so in our Ontario cities, too, but for the wholesome provisions of our existing laws. In this way the same interests would also dominate our Provincial and Dominion political affairs to a much larger extent than they now do.

It seems to us that it is a very serious mistake of Mr. Meredith and his party in the Legislature to strongly contend that the administration of liquor license affairs should be placed back again in the hands of the various municipal councils. That very change would inevitably bring about with it some of the very worst evils, such as have here been referred to, from which we are now happily free. The people should be careful about the indorsement of any such change of principle. The Ontario Opposition now stand pledged to such a change, if the opportunity is given to it. Seeing what its mischief is elsewhere and what it would likely be here ought to prompt us to much caution in this respect.

It is a well-known fact that during the years of the Scott Act adoption in this Province the failure of the experiment was largely because of the influence of our country councils. In county after county where large popular majorities were rolled up in favor of the adoption of the act the county councils showed such a decided hostility to any aid in its success as to turn the scale. It was in the power of these councils, and it was their duty, to make provision for a part of the expense of the enforcing of the law. Fully two-thirds of them refused to grant any such practical assistance, and for lack of that there were not the necessary funds at the disposal of the officers to carry on the necessary prosecutions. The Provincial Government amended some of our laws in the end, so as to meet the requirements of the case, but before that could be done the disappointment regarding enforcement became so great as to turn the tide of popular opinion. Let the temperance people be careful not to indorse any movement, or any men, who would place our liquor license administration back again in the hands of our municipal councils.

## Character and Profession.

The increasing reluctance with which men speak of their spiritual experiences has long been noticed, and is no doubt responsible, in a measure, for the difficulties which beset the prayer-meeting in recent times. However much some of the results of this reticence may be regretted, there is a very wholesome element in it. If men are more sensitive about making public the sacred things of their personal life, it is largely because they are more sensitive to the vital relation between profession and character. The man who has the keenest conscience with regard to conduct will be likely to be most modest in his public declarations of his intentions, and most eager to let men discover by his deeds the principles by which he is trying to live. This does not imply a shrinking from Public confession of one's faith; it does mean a growing emphasis upon conduct as the last and the authoritative disclosure of that faith. As conscience becomes more exacting, declarations of what one intends to do become more cautious and infrequent; the sensitive nature shrinks from promises in the proportion in which it craves the witness of deeds. This emphasis on character as the one authoritative disclosure of a man's creed may sometimes unduly weaken the emphasis on other forms of expression, but at bottom it is sound and wholesome; it is a great safeguard against those blasting revelations of moral hollowness and sham which are so destructive of public confidence, and it is a great stimulus to the kind of living which constantly advances its own ideals. Reticence of profession and publicity of conduct are far safer than publicity of profession and reticence of conduct.—[The Outlook.]

## Women as Public Speakers.

(Advice to Beginners, by Mrs. Phillips.)  
In the Young Women for May there is an interesting article containing an interview with Mrs. Phillips, who is one of England's brightest and most successful political speakers. At first, she tells us, she had a great prejudice against women on the platform, but after a time she found out her mistake. She says:

Now I am more than reconciled, and I fully appreciate the value of public speech. I consider that it is the revival of one of the noblest of all arts, and should take a place in education, and in recreation as well, alongside with writing books and reading them.

On being asked by her interviewer, "What would be your advice to the young beginner who suffers from nervousness?" she said:

Take trouble. I often say to women who feel it their duty to speak, but find it so difficult: "Do you take as much trouble in trying to make a speech as you would in learning French verbs or cooking an omelette? Why should you expect to make a speech without taking the trouble and going through the drudgery which would be absolutely essential to excellence in a very much easier department of work?"

Mrs. Phillips says that she was trained in elocution, and she strongly recommends would-be speakers to study voice-production rather than elocution. Here are Mrs. Phillips' hints to a girl who wishes to make an effective speech in public:

First, know all about the question with which she proposes to deal. Whatever arguments she intends to bring forward she should oppose in her own mind, or read the best opponents of them; she should do justice to the arguments of her opponents, and then try to meet them, not with easy rhetoric, but with logical refutation. Next, she should prepare a speech that would take about three hours to deliver, and then cut out everything but the very best parts that would take about twenty minutes. If it is her first speech, and she is troubled with nervousness—which, if she is going to be a great speaker, is exceedingly likely—she should not be ashamed of learning it by heart. She should make notes of her headings only, and then be ready, if the audience inspire her and she has gained self-command, to express any further thoughts that occur at the moment. What helps me most, perhaps, is that whenever I address an audience, however small, I feel that it is a great occasion. I say to myself: Even if I have done nothing of public worth till this moment, and though I may be prevented from doing anything of the kind again, this is a great moment for me, and it is for me to make it a great moment to those who listen."

There are to my mind three women who in their own way are in their greatest speeches near to perfection in their art—Annie Besant, Lady Carlisle, and Lady Henry Somerset. But quite apart from their gifts as public speakers, there are some women whose whole work and character have such an influence on the many women they come in contact with, that they have an extraordinary eloquence of their own; for when they speak the goodness of their lives shines through all they say.

"Before you go," said Mrs. Phillips, "I should like to take the opportunity of giving a message to the many women who will read this. Let them remember that we live in heroic days. The overwhelming majority of women might be doing far more than they are now doing, in their own spheres, without changing their line of life, if they would but link themselves together and put themselves under the inspiring influences which are bringing forth every day so many workers in the fields of philanthropy and reform. Once women come forward to work, remembering this essential truth, which I have often expressed before, that a workless life is a worthless life, they are perfectly certain to join those who want to do away with all disabilities that restrain women, and devote themselves to discovering and using their highest abilities."

## The Shoelace Test.

A clever woman laces her low shoes with narrow, flat, black elastic, sewing the ends securely.

This method enables the wearer to slip the shoe on and off with ease, and a bow of black satin ribbon tied at the top covers the place of joining.

The difficulty of keeping the ordinary shoe-string tied is generally admitted, and of late the fisherman's "salmon knot" has been adopted with much comfort. This is easily tied, and consists in putting the second loop of the bow twice through the knot, instead of once, as in the usual way. It may be untied without trouble, but will not slip nor come undone, no matter what the strain.

## DEAFNESS COMPLETELY CURED.

Any person suffering from Deafness, Noise in the Head, etc., may learn of a new, simple treatment, which is proving very successful in completely curing cases of all kinds. Full particulars, including many unsolicited testimonials and newspaper press notices, will be sent post free on application. The system is without doubt the most successful ever brought before the public. Address, Aural Specialist, Albany Buildings, 39, Victoria street, Westminster, London, S. W. 14 u.

## The Pulpit in Politics.

It is a healthy sign of the times that our pulpits—the best of them at least—are beginning to make their influence felt more and more from year to year on the great public questions that tend to the peace, prosperity and moral advancement of the whole community. The mere discussion of dogma has too largely confined the attention of the pulpit and it is one of the great reasons why so many people have not the interest in it that they otherwise would have. The politics and the business affairs of our country ought to be influenced more by our pulpits than they have been.

One reason why the prohibition movement of to-day is assuming the importance that it does and is making such splendid advancement is that our pulpits, to a very considerable extent at least, have spoken out clearly and boldly in its behalf. The moral cowardice that is driving some occupants of the pulpit out of the bold advocacy of this great reform, now that it is becoming a burning issue in politics, is something pitiable to witness. The pulpit occupied this ground first and now that the politicians have been compelled to come up to it is no reason at all why it should take flight.

There are now a number of important political reforms looming up in Canada in which our pulpits ought to be heard most distinctly. Rev. Principal Grant well said before the General Presbyterian Assembly a year or two ago that the church that could not grapple with the labor question is not one in which laborers need feel much interest, or words to that effect. The single tax reform is another question, in our opinion, in the discussion of which the pulpit should take a leading part. So with the woman franchise question. So with a number of others that we might enumerate.

Less of study and discussion of mere creeds and dogma and more of the important principles that ought to guide and govern us in every day affairs, seems now the popular demand. Our theological students of to-day ought to have a fair training in regard to the laws of health, of popular science, of sanitary matters, of the general principles of political economy that should underlie good legislation and proper government, even if these have to be obtained by the sacrifice of a good deal of obtrusive theological instructions. The pulpit ought to give good wholesome teaching, of an everyday practical bearing regarding the affairs of this life as well as of that which is to come. Leadings of this kind would do much to elevate our politics above the mere party wrangles into which it too often degenerates.

Rev. Dr. McCabe has been well saying: "The pulpit must now abrogate its right to discuss any question which has a bearing upon the advancement of the kingdom of Christ in the earth. It would not be popular to discuss such a question as the tariff in the pulpit, but when such questions as the Sabbath, the liquor traffic, lottery abominations and other kinds of gambling get into politics, then the pulpit should speak out in the name of the Lord."

## Strategy.

If we would get on peacefully and successfully, we must have an eye to the peculiarities of temper and disposition of those with whom we have to do. Such was the lesson which one husband lately tried to teach another, according to a story in the Brooklyn Life.

"It's strange I can't get my wife to mend my clothes," remarked Mr. Bridie, in a tone of disgust. "I asked her to sew a button on this vest this morning and she hasn't touched it."

"You asked her?" said Mr. Norris, with a slight shrug of his shoulders. "Yes. What else should I do?"

"You haven't been married very long, and perhaps you'll take a pointer from me," answered Mr. Norris with a fatherly air. "Never ask a woman to mend anything. That's fatal."

"Why, what do you mean?" "Do as I do. When I want a shirt mended, for instance, I take it in my hand and hunt up my wife. 'Where's that ragbag, Mrs. Norris?' I demand, in a stern voice."

"What do you want the ragbag for?" she asks suspiciously.

"I want to throw this shirt away. It's all worn out," I reply.

"Let me see," she demands.

"But I put the garment behind my back."

"No, my dear," I answer. "There is no use of your attempting to do anything with it. It needs—"

"Let me see it," she reiterates.

"But it's all worn out, I tell you."

"Now, John, you give me that shirt!" she says in her most peremptory tone.

"I hand over the garment."

"Why, John Norris," she cries with womanly triumph, "this is a perfectly good shirt. All it needs is— And then she mends it."

## "Brandy Drops."

The Board of Health of New York deserves commendation for its action in forbidding the sale of "brandy drops" and chocolates containing brandy to school children. An analysis of these candies shows how well and cunningly they are designed to create an appetite for strong drink among children and thus recruit the army of saloon patrons in the future. Samples of the candy when analyzed were found to contain 157.69 grains of alcohol to one pound of the chocolate drops, and

each drop held about 11.2 grains. The brandy drops, mentioned as most popular among the children, contained still more alcohol. Each drop had 12.3 grains of alcohol, and there were 210.60 to the pound, equal to about seven drops of brandy to each piece of candy. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children very properly took the lead in the investigation which led to the action of the Board of Health.

## The Spirit of Exploration.

There seems to be a marked revival just now in the spirit of exploration, which, for some reason or other, had cooled off recently. Movements of this kind seem to go by cycles as it were. One expedition to Central Africa brings forth a dozen others. Livingstone sets out to cross the continent; Stanley follows "to discover" him, and somebody marches in Stanley's footsteps to look him up. The interest grows with each new party, and as a result of one expedition Africa is soon swarming with professional and amateur explorers, so many, in fact, that they get in the way and trip over each other. It is the same with the North pole, which even above Africa has a charm for explorers. When Sir John Barrow declared that "the North Pole is the only thing on this earth of which we know nothing whatever," he laid down the principal which has stimulated hundreds of explorers to seek to solve this mystery and to lose their lives perhaps among the bergs and flocks of the desolate north. There has been a wonderful impetus given to polar expeditions the present year, and scarcely a week passes without a new one being announced. Peary is already well in Greenland by this time and has begun his march which is being carried on in a most sensible and systematic manner. His expedition will be entirely by land, by which means he will try to reach the pole. Even if he does not succeed in getting there the geological, meteorological and other investigations he is conducting will make the trip a valuable one.

Dr. Nansen, who has already made several expeditions to the Arctic circle, and who accomplished the difficult feat of crossing Greenland from its east to its west coast, over very high altitudes and across innumerable glaciers, will this time try to reach the pole by water, and in a very peculiar way. His vessel, which he has had specially constructed for the occasion, is very queerly shaped, mainly with a view to strength, and he believes that it is so built that it cannot be crushed in the ice. He will sail as far north as he can when the seas are open in the fall, allow his vessel to be caught and frozen in the ice, and in this way hopes to drift to the pole with the floating bergs, pass it and be released a couple of years afterwards by the melting of the iceberg into which his ship has been frozen. It is the maddest of all schemes ever proposed, to sail to the North Pole on an iceberg, but such mad schemes have occasionally been favored with success, and its very originality recommends it as worth trying. Frederick G. Jackson, member of the Royal Geographical Society of London, will make Franz Josef's land his base of operations. Lieut. Melville, of the United States navy, has planned a similar expedition, and Lieut. Ryder, of the Danish navy, who is at present making a tour of Eastern Greenland, has organized another expedition, which will aim not to reach the North Pole itself, but to find the magnetic pole. Finally, there is Robert Stein, who will devote himself to the unknown portion of Grinnell's land.—[New Orleans Times, Democrat.]

## Aversions of Noted Persons.

Amatus Lesitanus relates the case of a monk who would faint on seeing a rose, and who never quitted his cell at the monastery while that flower was blooming. Orfila, a less questionable authority, tells us of how Vincent, the great painter, would swoon upon going suddenly into a room in which roses were blooming, even though he did not see them. Valtair tells of an army officer who was frequently thrown into violent convulsions by coming in contact with the little flower known as the pink. Orfila, our authority on the case of Vincent, the painter, above related, also tells of the case of a lady 46 years of age, hale and hearty, who, if present when linseed was being boiled for any purpose, would be seized with violent fits of coughing, swelling of the face and partial loss of reason for the ensuing 24 hours. Writing of these peculiar antipathies and aversions, Montague remarks that he has known men of undoubted courage who would much rather face a shower of cannon balls than to look at an apple! In Zimmerman's writings there is an account of a lady who could not bear to touch either silk or satin and would almost faint if by accident she should happen to touch the velvety skin of a peach. Boyle records the case of a man who would faint upon hearing the "swish" of a broom across the floor, and of another with a natural abhorrence of honey. Hippocrates of old tell of one Nicænor who would always swoon at hearing the sound of a flute. Bacon, the great Englishman, could not bear to see a lunar eclipse and always completely collapsed upon such occasions, and Vaughan, who had killed hundreds of wild boars, would faint if he but got a glimpse of a roasted pig.—[San Francisco Examiner.]