

staff: "It delights me to have the opportunity of saying how much I admire and esteem your work, and still more important, how much I admire and esteem the spirit in which you carry it on, and the reports I hear on all sides, from often unexpected quarters, of your high and honourable character and reputation," etc., etc. It was pleasant indeed to work under such men, and I owe more than I can say to their friendship and help.

EVENING PAPER "LEADERS."—Professor Stuart occasionally wrote the leading articles for the *Morning Leader*, and for a period regularly wrote the "leader" for the *Star*. The latter work involved getting to the office at seven o'clock in the morning, reading the morning papers, and then writing the leader at the last moment. He told me the prospect of writing an article against time terrified him, but that his subsequent experience was that it was easier on the whole to write at high pressure. He added that as he generally went to the House of Commons in the afternoon until midnight, the time at his disposal for sleep was very limited.

It seems to me now that one of the most striking differences between what I may call the "old" journalism and the new, is the restlessness which characterises the journalist of to-day. The giants of the 'nineties, and earlier, and even the smaller men, worked for the same paper much as a man goes into the Bank of England with never a thought of changing into, let us say, Lloyds. Even to-day the world at large associates the names of Sala with the *Telegraph*, Russell with *The Times*, and Archibald Forbes with the *Daily News*.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR JOURNALISM.—Another difference, which the War to some extent has modified, was that the "fine writing" of the old high-priced dailies gave way to plainer English more suited to the masses, to whom the newspapers with great circulations appealed. As an illustration of what I mean, it was said years ago that no