

SOME DISEASES OF CIVILIZATION.

A writer in the "Standard," after describing some modern diseases, quotes some cases to prove the excessive sensitiveness of some persons of nervous organization. We cull for our readers a few facts from this very interesting article, and commence by describing yet another new disease, called by the not very agreeable name of "telephonic tintinitus" and attributed to the use of Mr. Edison's useful invention. The malady consists in irritation of the ear drum, accompanied with nervous excitability, intolerance of sound, giddiness, and neuralgic pains, and is owing to "aural over pressure," caused by a severe strain on the auditory apparatus, just as weak eyesight is due to the delicate membranes concerned in vision being used too much and rested too little. The telephone has, however, now been in steady employment for a number of years, and we imagine that if "tintinitus" followed its use with anything like the same certainty as dyspepsia follows pork chops, or gout a steady devotion to "vintage" port, we should have heard a great deal more about it than we have done. Indeed, M. Gellé, who claims to have discovered the new malady, admits that it is only found in people of a decidedly nervous organization, and that even in these cases it disappears by giving the auditory apparatus "a physiological rest." Persons of extremely highly strung constitutions are apt, however, to be affected by almost anything out of the ordinary track of their experience. There are plenty of individuals who sicken at the smell of cheese, and others who, like Erasmus, experience febrile symptoms at the sight of fish. Scalliger turned pale when water cresses met his eye, and Sir David Brewster always felt an electric shock when a cat entered the room. The famous Boyle swooned when he heard the splashing of water, and he knew a young man who fainted when his room was swept. The Duke of Epernay fell into a syncope on seeing a leveret, though a hare did not produce the same effect; and Tycho Brohe could not endure the sight of a fox, or Marshal d'Albret the face of a pig. History records how James I. felt "all in a quiver" at the sight of a naked ape, and Hippocrates tells us that "one Niconor" suffered dreadful agonies whenever he heard a flute—a circumstance not, however, so unusual as the Greek physician appears to have imagined. Vincent, the French painter, was always seized with vertigo if roses were in the same room with him, and Amatus Lusitanus asks us to believe that a monk of his acquaintance so regularly fainted at the sight of this flower that he never quitted his cell whilst it was in bloom, while a military friend of Volpi was thrown into convulsions in consequence of pinks being placed in the same chamber with him.

The foregoing examples are of persons sound in health and who were in no instance of feeble intellectual powers. On the contrary, many of them were great scholars, soldiers, artists, and statesmen. How they would have been affected by the strain of modern civilization, and by the novel agencies it brings to bear on mind and body, can only be imagined by the effect they have on those of less distinguished individuals. Insanity, which in various continental towns seems to be taking an almost epidemic form, is attributed to this worry and excitement, and, unquestionably, in times of great commercial depression or inflation, war, political fervour, or the like, many forms of brain disease increase. Railway travelling sometimes has on people of much more solid temperament a remarkable restlessness, and even faintness, which, however, pass away when the train is in motion, but returns when it stops. Some people are giddy, or half unconscious, while seated, and the late Charles Dickens, after being in the Staplehurst accident, was seriously annoyed at these and similar effects which railway travel produced upon his nervous system. The jolting movement is not known to have prejudicial influence, and in certain cases is suspected of leading to paralysis.

Another deduction from the advantages which scientific discovery and invention are conferring upon us is that special form of ophthalmia which the use of electric light has created. Men following peculiar callings have, of course, always been subject to the appropriate diseases. Painters are notoriously prone to lead poisoning, owing to the carelessness with which

they allow the material on which they are working to touch their food, and not many years ago a famous Scandinavian artist died of a disease which was confidentially attributed to a habit he had got into of holding his spare brushes in his mouth, and in this way conveying into his system some of the poisonous ingredients entering into composition of the colors used. A still more remarkable form of the same kind occurred some time ago under circumstances which entitle it to be called a malady of civilization. It was noticed that many of the women employed in counting "green-backs" in the Treasury Department in Washington looked ill, and had sores up in their hands and heads. The symptoms were those of arsenic poisoning and were ultimately attributed to the fact that the clerks wetted their thumbs and sore fingers to assist in turning over their notes, the green color of which was due to the mineral mentioned, and then touched their faces or lips with the poisoned fingers. Players on wind instruments are often troubled with emphysema, consequent on the air-vessels of their overtaxed lungs giving way. Similar cases in point are the clergyman's sore throat, the housemaid's knee, the "hummy" on the back of the deal porter's neck, the callus on the pitman's thumb and forefinger, and the corns which are so frequent on the feet of persons using tight shoes.

The coal miner inhales the fine particles of carbon, the knife grinder the steel dust, the cigar and the snuff-maker the powdery "shirts," the sand-piper make the minute particles of glass or sand which he spreads on the seat before him, the trimming manufacturer the dust of silk or cotton, the fur dyer the fumes of nitric acid and the dust of copperas, and the bleacher the chlorine or sulphurous acid vapours, while, as everyone knows, match-makers are—were, for with care this terrible disease can be avoided—prone to caries of the jaw bone from inhaling the fumes of phosphorus.

Even our amusements are bringing on new diseases. The "lawn tennis arm" is far from uncommon, and it is certain that the bent position which certain forms of bicycle exercise entail partly neutralize the good effects derived from spinning through the fresh country air. The decline of the passion for rowing is, we think, not to be traced to any excess of prudence on the part of our useful athletes, but rather to encroachment on it by more popular pastimes. Yet not so many years ago serious derangements of the circulation were confidently attributed to overindulgence in this exercise by boys unfitted for such violent exercise. It is, at all events, certain that the "athletic craze" which possesses certain English schools is not in every case to the benefit of the boys, either intellectually or physically. A lad who is in good health will always take enough of exertion without being driven to it. If he does not, there is something in his health which requires investigation, and this not infrequently will be found a weakness of the heart, quite incompatible with the furious joys of football and the cricket field.

Dr. Benjamin Richardson—himself an eminent cyclist—even goes so far as to declare that there is no sign, no evidence anywhere, that the deliberate culture of physical strength favors the longevity of an individual or the vital capacities of a race. The observation made by Greek, Roman, Arabian, and Italians admit of but one interpretation—namely, that such exercises often ensure premature decay. The facts elicited in more modern times tend in the same direction, and it is notorious that the longest lived and healthiest people on the face of the earth are the Jews. Yet, if there is one characteristic of this wonderful race more marked than another, it is that at no period of their history have they aimed at the development of their physical capacity, while, in the countries through which they are scattered, the pursuits which they favor are not those demanding much muscular toil. The sleeplessness, the nervous excitement, and the frequent softening of the brain, by reason of which busy men so suddenly disappear from their accustomed haunts, are all concomitants or consequences of the "storm of stress" of civilization, like the habit of taking cocaine, morphine, opium, chloroform, chlorine, and petroleum, which is found so often in people who have no craving for the coarser joys of drunkenness.—Dublin Nation.

RELIGION AND POLITICS.

The name of Rev. Father Kavanagh, the eloquent Franciscan friar, has figured prominently during the present year in connection with some of the '98 celebrations and his vigorous speeches in reference to the hero deeds of the men who in the dark and evil days of a century ago "rose to right their native land," have met a wise and deserving acceptance amongst Irishmen at home and abroad. The note of ardent and uncompromising Nationality which Father Kavanagh sounded in his various eloquent and forcible addresses awoke a respon-

maligned the priests of the Catholic Church, because they dared to exercise the most elementary rights of citizenship.

We hope these anti-clericalists who seized with avidity on certain phrases of Father Kavanagh and twisted and tortured them to their own base and ungenerous purposes, will read, learn, and inwardly digest the address which Father Kavanagh delivered to the members of the Catholic Literary Institute at Clonmel on Thursday evening on the subject of "Religion and Politics." In the course of his lecture Father Kavanagh dealt with several questions of the moment, and all of deep interest to Catholic Nationalists. On the subject of the selection of candidates for County and District Councils, the reverend gentleman gave some advice of which we highly approve, and which we would like to see taken to heart by the people generally.

He tells us that—"Some rather Quixotic people say that Irish Nationalists should show their generosity and lofty-mindedness by heaping coals of fire upon the heads of Irish Unionists, giving them their votes and helping them and their friends to positions of trust and honor in the new Councils. But my humble advice to my fellow-Nationalists is not to try the but coal experiment, but rather subject these gentlemen to the action of a system similar to the cold water one of Kneip. Let them try this system in dealing with the Unionist candidates for election and they will see what a beneficial effect it will have on the moral constitutions of these gentlemen, undermined by a long course of Government coddling and pampering. Keep them out in the cold—give them plenty of cold water douches—and you will find when the next elections comes round that a wonderful change has been wrought in them, and from being cold-blooded Irishmen or West Britons, you will see them transformed into hot and fiery patriots—embryo Emmets and Wolfe Tones."

This wonderful new affection for popular interests, and popular rights which has been developed in certain circles since the passing of the Local Government Act has, of course, its origin in the hunger for the loaves and fishes of office, of which the people's representatives will now be the sole dispensers. The gratitude of the people for services rendered to their cause in the past being a negligible quantity, the landlords and ex-Grand Jurymen believe, no doubt, that in the welter of contending interests and political controversies which will attend the forthcoming elections, there is a probability of representatives of their class stealing in in sufficient numbers to give them a weighty if not a preponderating influence in the Councils. Our advice to Nationalists in regard to the elections would be much the same as that given by Father Kavanagh to the people of Clonmel.

"Serve your friends first—decorate tried veterans in the people's battles, and let new-fledged patriots wait till they have won their spurs by honest service to their country. But if a man is a good Irishman, true to his country, do not let his creed stand between him and your favor. Such a man, though he differs from you in creed is rarely a bigot, for it is a fact that few, if any, Protestant patriots were bigots. The more distinguished we have known certainly were not. Neither let the politics of a man who seeks your favor prejudice you against him, provided he be a Nationalist, and a true one, although his view of how to serve his country differ from your own. In a word, choose honest and tried men to represent you on these Councils."

It should not be forgotten that the appointments to the various offices under the County and District Councils are to be made in the coming year, and if by a fatuous policy of misplaced toleration the people stuff the County Councils with men who have hitherto sympathized with the policy of tyrannizing over the people, and driving them relentlessly from their homes, the people need not murmur if the appointments that follow should be as exclusive in their character as those which have characterized the policy pursued by the Grand Jury and similar bodies. The expenditure of three millions of money will shortly be placed in the hands of local bodies, and the advantages which such expenditure entails should not be heedlessly thrown away. Sather Kavanagh whilst he has no love for the anti-Irish Irishman, at the same time does not believe in the anti-clerical demagogue who vilifies his Church and her ministers. He believes that such a man has no principle, no honesty of a purpose. A man of principle, a man of honesty, would not seek to undermine the system he professes to believe in. The anti-clerical demagogue lives and thrives on calumny, vituperation, and misrepresentation of all that Catholics hold most in reverence. The landlords are an indifferent lot, but the demagogue is a thousand times worse; and the "farmers, laborers and artisans," to whom he is continually avowing fidelity, would be wise to consign him to the fate he dreads so much—compulsory and permanent obscurity.—Munster News.

It is related by Mr. F. Marlon Crawford, the well known author, says the New York Times, that when he was making a tour of this country, and was travelling through a rich agricultural

region to fill an appointment at a large town, a brisk looking young man, with his hat on the back of his head, came into a car in which the novelist was sitting, held out his hand, and said, in a most affable and companionable way: "I presume this is the celebrated Mr. Crawford?" "My name is Crawford," replied the novelist. "The conductor told me you were aboard," rejoined the other. "Allow me to introduce myself. My name is Higgs. I am somewhat in the book line myself, and I know how it goes." "You are an author?" said Mr. Crawford. "I am glad to meet you." "Yes, I have published a book every year since 1890." "May I ask the name of your latest book?" asked Mr. Crawford. "It's the Premium List of the Jones County Agricultural Fair," cordially responded Mr. Higgs, taking a small pamphlet from his pocket and handing it to him. "Allow me to present you with a copy of it. I am secretary of the Jones county agricultural board. We are going to have the best fair this year we ever had. Ballroom ascension, Roman chariot races, baseball games, and trials of speed on track till you can't rest. Come and spend a day with us and it shan't cost you a cent. Well, this is where I get off. Good by, Mr. Crawford. Glad to have met you." Wringing Mr. Crawford's hand again, the genial secretary of the Jones county agricultural board pushed his hat a little farther back on his head, strode down the aisle and got off the car, leaving the astonished author of "Mr. Isaacs" gasping for breath.

BLAKE SPEAKS FOR IRELAND.

The annual dinner of the Oxford University Colonial Club was held two weeks ago under the presidency of the Rev. J. Larter, the guest of the evening being Hon. E. Blake, M.P., who, in responding to the toast of "The Empire," proposed by Mr. F. R. Ingle, made reference to the remark of Lord Curzon of Kedleston the other day that India had always appeared to him to be the Imperial centre of their political system. He disagreed with that. In his opinion that centre was in these two islands, and just so long as the resources, the spirit, the unity, the comprehension, determination and resolution of these islands should be what it had been, so long might it be hoped that the ends of those who endeavored to sustain the great fabric of the Empire might be strengthened and maintained in that gigantic task, and no longer. They never must forget that these two islands formed the core and centre of the Imperial system, and the foundation must rest on the principles of freedom and justice. But he did not say the image of freedom and of justice which they set before themselves was always realized. It was not so, but it was upon these two ideals that the foundation of Europe depended. The greatest blot and blemish, the greatest weakness and sting, upon their conditions was within these islands, and he for his part as a member of the House of Commons, as an old colonist, as a representative of a constituency in one of these two islands, had felt it difficult to understand how it was that the people of these islands should have regarded so lightly what occurred last year in reference to the sister island.

Was it not something which should give them cause to remember that the year of the Jubilee of that Queen, deservedly celebrated with enthusiasm on this island, was not celebrated in the sister island. The people of that island were not unmindful of the great position of the Queen as an exemplar of all the virtues proper to her sex and to her station; but because they were justly celebrating here the wonderful development of prosperity, of liberty, of freedom, and advancement, of which they did not find signs and tokens in the sister island, it was impossible for them to praise and give thanks for a situation which presented such an unhappy contrast.

Let them look again at the events of this year. He was not making a political speech in the ordinary sense; but was it not enough to make one reflect that through the whole of the sister island there had been, without any fitful exertions or agitation, enormous assemblages and celebrations of the great rebellion of a hundred years ago. That the memories of that great tragic insurrection should be preserved in the minds of the people, and had resulted in these immense gatherings, was to his mind a striking and significant circumstance deserving of the calm attention of those who governed the country and deserving of an answer to the question whether there was not something that could be done to remedy that state of things, whether it was not possible to produce that unity and concord which he from his soul desired should be created between the people of the two islands.

He believed they must proceed upon the lines largely dependent upon the general recognition of the importance of maintaining the union between the various parts of the Empire, upon the amelioration of all grievances, the redress of all wrongs, the granting of all local liberties according to the general British system in parts in which they were wanting, upon the hope, which he trusted would not be a hope doomed to failure, that the great dependencies of the Empire as they grew in power and strength would do their part in defence.

ATTITUDE OF LIBERALS ON HOME RULE.

Mr. Michael Davitt, M.P., writing to the London Daily Chronicle recently, discusses the new policy of the Liberals in shelving their Home Rule promises as follows:—

In commenting upon and approving of Sir Henry Fowler's most recent exposition of the new Liberal policy of shelving Liberal pledges on Home Rule you see some justification for this course "in the present divided condition of Irish politics." Will you allow me to say that this plea might find something of a substantial base to rest upon if the question between Irish Nationalist members and the party you speak for was one of alliance, and not one of solemn, reiterated, unequivocal pledges—pledges given again and again by Liberal leaders and organizations since the time when the shadowy alliance between the late Mr. Parnell and the Gladstonian party was ruptured in 1890. Whether Irish politics are divided or united, these pledges remain. They are by no means affected by the local Government Act of last Session; unless the pledge-making Liberals are prepared to declare that they have abandoned the principles and the position which they held under Mr. Gladstone, to find refuge and salvation now in the anti-Home Rule programme of Mr. Chamberlain.

Upon the subject of an "alliance" you stand on firmer ground, because there is no such alliance. There has not been an alliance of any kind since 1890, and it is not desirable, from either an Irish or an English party point of view, that there should be one. It is better for all concerned that there should be plain speaking on this matter. Nothing can be gained, either by an Irish or a Liberal party, in allowing a fiction to pass current as a fact. When, therefore, in your search for a new Liberal programme, you make the first article of your creed, "We declare ourselves independent of the Irish alliance," you are simply freeing yourself from what has no existence, and what no single Irish Nationalist member desires should exist. As the party have again and again asserted, by declarations and by acts, their absolute independence of all English parties, it would be absurd as unreasonable for Irish members to expect English Liberals to feel less independent in their standing towards parties in Ireland. We expect no such attitude or position. This state of things disposes, therefore, of your imaginary trouble about the "alliance." The other question is far more grave, and cannot be so easily solved as you seem to think.

The pledges made on Home Rule by all Liberals in 1892-1895, were not made to Irish members but to Ireland, as a response to the pleas of justice, and as an imperial obligation to the majority of the Irish people. These pledges were not conditional upon the reunion of National sections. These sections existed in 1892 and in 1895 in a more marked degree than they do to-day. Neither were these pledges qualified by the prospect of fulfilment by the Unionist party of their pledges to give Ireland a measure of county government. You cannot therefore be permitted without protest to contend that Liberal party can and should find a virtual release from pledges on Home Rule on the ground that the Unionist party have carried out their promise in the passing of the sham Local Government Bill which enables them to subsidize their Irish landlord supporters out of the public purse.

You seem to adopt Sir Henry Fowler's shuffling argument as a back door retreat from Home Rule, when you say:

"He thinks the constitutions of Great Britain will wish to watch the working of the new experiment—which in spite of its glaring defects, is the first instalment of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill—and to see it fully, fairly, and completely tried before they reconsider the question of any further change in the Government of Ireland. That is no doubt the case—in fact, it has been the view we have ex-

pressedly stated—and we hope that our friends in Ireland will see that it must needs be so."

We know by bitter experience what the meaning of "fully, fairly, and completely trying" a piece of English legislation for Ireland amounts to. We see it to-day in the effects of the worst education system of Europe; in the non-fulfilment of promises of complete religious equality, given so far back as 1829. We are still seeing the Land Laws of 1881, "fully and fairly" tried, in a muddle of amending Acts, and in a manner which bids fair to reopen again the whole Irish land question in order that redress may be found against the glaring partiality of tribunals purposely manned by the enemies of the Irish tenant. This is what you ask us to agree to in the matter of the latest instalment of English "justice." We are to wait and watch for 20 or 30 years until the English constitutions, and constitutions "Home Rulers" like Sir Henry Fowler, are satisfied that the measure which gives the Irish £1,000,000 a year (in first instalment) and the Irish people the privilege of repairing their roads and bridges, has failed to confer untold blessings upon the country for which the House of Commons endorsed a self-governing constitution in 1898. And you are so convinced of the reasonableness of this prospect so conveniently opened up for us by Sir Henry Fowler, that you express the hope that the Irish Home Rulers "will see that it must needs be so."

Well, we shall see about that. But has it occurred to you at all in this disposing of Home Rule for a generation what Irish Nationalist members are to do in Westminster, or upon what issue Irish electors in Great Britain are to be invited to record their votes in the meantime? These are two little matters which may possibly be worth considering by whoever is to be the future leader of the Liberal party to be Mr. Perks, Sir William Harcourt, or Lord Aosebery. To help you in your task of finding both a programme and a leader for the Liberals, let me say that Irish Home Rulers are not likely to assist Mr. Perks in his crusade against "Irish Papists," or Sir William Harcourt in his application of Liberal principles in the coercion of Ritualistic consciences, or Lord Rosebery in his ultra Jingoism in Africa or in China.

These are Liberal aims and principles, and your party is at liberty to spend its energies upon them. They are your concern. They are matters which may interest Englishmen, but they are not likely to appeal very strongly to Irish feeling or support.

The pledges of the Liberal party to Home Rule for Ireland remain unaffected in any way by the events of the past few years. These pledges were not given for any consideration of Irish support for Liberal measures for Great Britain. Mr. Gladstone never took that low plane of argument or contention. He looked upon the concession of National self-government to Ireland as a measure of simple justice, a debt due to the Irish people; as a restitution of a defrauded right; as an affair of Imperial honor and obligation; and, likewise, as an enlightened policy to secure the protection of interests of transcendent importance to the future welfare of great Britain, in her relations with rival powers. The Liberal Party accepted Home Rule in the same sense and for similar reasons, and so late as 1895, small majority of the electorate of England, Scotland and Wales in an effort to redeem their solemn pledge to Ireland.

This pledge may be broken. My own conviction now is that it will be. It will be no new experience by the Irish people of English broken faith. But you may safely rely upon it that Irish Home Rulers will not accept your own and Sir Henry Fowler's advice to provide the Liberal Party with an easy and convenient pathway over which to retire from Mr. Gladstone's position and later Liberal pledges on the Irish question to Mr. Chamberlain's more consistent retreat.

FATHER O'CONNELL DENOUNCES SLEIGHRIDING.

The news comes from Harrison, N. Y., that at the Church of the Holy Cross recently, the pastor, Rev. Maurice H. O'Connor, caused consternation among some of the young people by forcibly denouncing those who participated in a sleigh ride party on Monday night. The ride was enjoyed by many sons and daughters of prominent citizens and members of Father O'Connor's church.

They started from the home of a young woman, and went to a hotel in an adjoining district. After supper there was dancing, singing and a general social time, the party returning early Tuesday morning.

Father O'Connor declared that such affairs, whether sleigh ride parties or anything else, lasting until after midnight are against the rules of the Roman Catholic Church and that as long as he is able he will denounce them as dangerous to young people. While talking the priest held a newspaper clipping describing the sleigh ride and

giving the names of those who participated. They are all respectable young men and women, he said, but as they had violated the rules by their conduct he could not spare them from denunciation.

If the persons who took part in the ride are members of any society connected with the church, he said they should resign at once. He knew, he said, that some of them belong to the Junior Choir, the Junior Holy Name Society and the Children of Mary. He then referred to rehearsals which the young people are having for an entertainment to be given in aid of the Junior Holy Name Society. "That entertainment is off," he declared, "and the rehearsals must stop."

Father O'Connor concluded by commending the Police Committee of the Common Council and Chief Callaghan for recently driving a cheap carriage show out of town, and for taking stringent measures to compel children to attend the day and night schools.

Several of the young people who were in the Monday night sleigh ride party visited Father O'Connor during the day and declared they did not know they had violated any rule of the Church.