

# LONDON THE GREAT

INTERESTING FACTS ABOUT THE  
WORLD'S METROPOLIS.

Residents in London who are interested in their place of residence, its complicated social problems, and its vast population, to which so many foreign nations make contributions, find the latest Blue Book relative to last year's census a fascinating study. It is a most intimate document, although its tables may have a forbidding appearance. It tells of every Londoner's place of birth, age, occupation, and condition, and even records the number of husbands, on the one hand, and the wives, on the other, whose spouses were absent on the night on which the return was made, though the Registrar-General, in noting that there were 47,310 husbands wifeless, and 63,035 wives husbandless, does not suggest that all these cases represented domestic tragedies.

Nearly two hundred pages of facts for Londoners are set forth in effective contrast, and he who will, may from these pages learn much of the bustling city. It is no mean city, or rather administrative county. It comprises—

Seventy-four thousand, eight hundred and thirty-nine statute acres.

Fifty-eight Parliamentary constituencies.

Twenty-eight metropolitan boroughs, excluding, of course, the City.

Fifteen petty sessional divisions.

Six hundred and eleven ecclesiastical parishes, in the diocese of London, Rochester, or St. Albans.

Four million five hundred and thirty-six thousand five hundred and forty-one persons, or nearly five times as many as a century ago.

It may interest the curious to learn that the smallest parish is St. Alphage, London Wall, with 29 inhabitants, while Lambeth Palace, with its 37 residents, is in the diocese of Canterbury, so that Dr. Temple is still in his own ecclesiastical area when residing in London.

London is not growing as rapidly as it was, because near the centre private houses are becoming shops, other residential buildings are giving place to offices, and the population is being driven ever outward into the more distant suburbs.

**GROWTH OF GREATER LONDON.**

In recent years London has been most energetically pushing its borders outward, covering fields with bricks and mortar and transforming rural lanes into formal, well-macadamized roads, lined with villas. Consequently "Greater London" now includes many parishes which are still counted for local government purposes as belonging to the counties of Surrey, Kent, Essex and Hertford. This area of 443,419 acres, has a population of 6,581,372 persons, an increase of nearly a million—947,000, to be exact—in the previous ten years, roughly one-third coming from within, and two-thirds from outside districts. As is pointed out—

"In the city of London and six of the central metropolitan boroughs the enumerated population showed an actual decline of over 67,000 in the ten years, notwithstanding that the recorded excess of births over deaths in that period amounted approximately to 70,000. In these central boroughs, with one exception, a decrease of population has regularly occurred during the last four intercensal periods, and has been due in great measure to the transformation of dwelling houses into warehouses, offices and business premises. This centrifugal dispersion of town population is, however, shared by all great, old and prosperous cities."

**THE SUPERABUNDANT FEMALE.**

On an average each of the 1,019,546 families in the county of London—not "Greater London" to which the figures do not apply—number rather over 4.4 persons each, while the females are shown to exceed the males by over a quarter of a million, and this disproportion is on the increase, for whereas ten years ago there were 1,116 to every 1,000 males, there are now 1,118. Excluding hotels and lodging houses, these households employ 15,425 male and 234,398 female servants, or one and a half to every hundred families of the former and twenty-three of the latter. These figures suggest that if every house were to have its proper proportion of service a painful, if not fatal, system of decimation would have to be practised. Hampstead and Kensington give most employment to servants.

Included in these million-odd households are rather less than a similar number of children of from three to fourteen years of age—968,007, of whom 481,060 are boys, and 486,946 girls. Moreover, in spite of all the disadvantages to health of "mean streets" London is again shown not to be a bad place in which to live if one would live long, if not merrily. The number of persons seventy-five years old and upward is 52,679 and of these 18,776 are males and 33,903 females. At the extreme ages the excess of females is still more marked, and of those who claim to be aged one hundred years and upward nineteen are females and five males. London should be proud of its twenty-four centenarians. As to the place of births of London's millions, the Registrar-General records—

Of the 4,536,541 persons enumerated

in the county of London, 3,016,580 were natives of London; 35,421 were born in Wales and Monmouth, being an increase of 4,129 since 1891; 56,605 in Scotland, an increase of 3,215; 60,211 in Ireland, a decrease of 6,254, and 33,350 in British Colonies or dependencies. Persons of foreign birth numbered 161,222, and of these 20,224 were British subjects, 5,621 were naturalized British subjects, and 135,377 were foreigners, an increase in the case of the last named of 40,324 since 1891."

**HOW LONDON LIVES.**

These census figures suggest the question—"How does London live?" And the official reply is not without interest in view of the increasing demand for houses for the working classes, and is reassuring, since there is a decline in the huddling together of poor people in single rooms. It is stated—

"The total number of separate tenements, which had been 937,606 in 1891, rose to 1,019,546, the increase being equal to 8.7 per cent. Of this total the tenements containing five or more rooms increased from 307,037 to 347,516 equal to 13.2 per cent., while the increase of those with less than five rooms was from 630,569 to 672,030, and did not exceed 6.6 per cent. The rate of increase in the larger tenements was, therefore, exactly double that shown in the smaller tenements. Stated in another way, the tenements with five or more rooms were equal to 32.7 per cent. of the total tenements in 1891 and to 34.1 per cent. at the recent census, while the percentage of the tenements with less than five rooms declined from 67.3 to 65.9. The reduction in the number of the latter class of tenements was most strongly marked in the tenements of one room, which declined from 172,502 in 1891 to 149,524—that is, from 18.4 per cent. of the total tenements to 14.7 per cent. It may further be pointed out that the number of single room tenements in which more than two persons were enumerated declined from 56,622 to 40,762, while the number of one-roomed tenements with six or more inmates on the census night declined from 4,097 to 1,802. The tenements of two rooms showed a slight decrease and those of three and four rooms a marked increase upon the numbers returned in 1891."

**MINORS AS WIDOWS AND WIDOWERS.**

The Registrar-General has the satisfaction of recording that there were 730,062 households on the night of the census with both their heads, while he prints some interesting figures as to the marriage state of London's population:—

"Of the males, 1,292,594 are unmarried, 777,363 are married, and 72,128 are widowed. Of the females, 1,403,842 are unmarried, 793,097 are married and 197,517 are widowed.

"The proportions of the married to the population, at all ages is now higher than it was in 1891, owing to the decrease in the proportion of children through the decline in the birth rate. The proportion of the married, however, if calculated on the population aged upward of twenty years, is distinctly lower than it was ten years ago, both among males and females.

"The number of males under twenty returned as married is 2,809, and the number of females 10,529. There are also twenty-one widowers and seventy-three widows under twenty-one years of age."

**LONDON'S AFFLICTED.**

London has its due proportion of those who are crippled by loss of sight or hearing. Of the former there are 3,556, which marks a slight decrease since 1891, a tendency which is more marked in the case of the deaf—and, therefore, dumb—who number 2,057. About a quarter of the former, so great have been the strides made in the instruction of persons thus afflicted, are able to engage in some occupation, while half of the deaf are in a similar fortunate position.

Of the blind 122 were workers in willow, cane or rush, 90 were musicians, 76 costermongers, 49 brush or broom makers, and 45 musical instrument makers or tuners.

Of the deaf and dumb, 91 were tailors, 72 boot and shoe makers, and 71 dress makers; 55 were engaged in laundry and washing service, 44 were domestic indoor servants and 40 bookbinders.

**INCREASE OF WOMEN WORKERS**

Details of the methods by which the people of London make—or do not make—their living are of interest, and it appears that 82.8 per cent. of the males over ten years old attempt to earn a subsistence, and no less than 38.4 of the females; in the latter case there is an increase of 1 per cent. which is hardly surprising in view of the invasion of the business world by women. 76.3 per cent. of whom are unmarried. Some figures are given—

"Of the 719,331 females over ten years of age engaged in occupations, 548,721, or 76.3 per cent., are unmarried, and 170,610, or 23.7 per cent. are married. Among the occupations in which married or widowed

females are principally engaged are laundry and washing service, with 27,204—of whom 7,604 work 'at home'—against 20,158 unmarried; charwomen with 21,624 married, against 4,327 unmarried; dressmakers, milliners, stay-makers, shirt makers, and seamstresses with 24,818 married—of whom 14,605 work 'at home'—against 80,700 unmarried, and 11,567 tailors married—of whom 4,572 work 'at home'—against 21,547 unmarried; 2,381 girls between ten and fourteen years, and 5,876 boys of the same ages work for their livings."

## THE CIGARETTE.

How Its Use Affects Boys.—An Anti-Cigarette War.

"Open your mouth, my little man" said a Toronto doctor, bending over a seven-year-old patient.

Thus adjured the lad obeyed, and disclosed a flabby, discolored throat with a chronically diseased look. A prolonged examination terminated in this question to the mother: "Has your boy ever smoked? The appearances suggest nicotine poisoning."

"No; nothing but cigarettes."

"Cigarettes!"

"Yes—there's no harm in them, is there? The child is so fond of them."

We need not chronicle the remarks that followed. The doctor put it strong.

In the sitting room, off the bedroom, two sallow faced boys of 12 and 14 were lounging about. The fond mother thought the doctor had better prescribe for them, too. They were also home from school with sore throats. Here again the darkened, inflamed tonsils told the same story. The doctor's stern words of reproof were evidently an amazement to the mother, who explained that "Her children's nerves were so unstrung (!) they seemed to need the stimulus of the cigarette. Indeed they could not get through a night without a smoke, so she always left a light burning low, to accommodate them."

You did not suppose there were any such silly mothers?

But there are. They are not so numerous as those who account the cigarette a low, vile thing, quite too common and vulgar to tempt their well-brought-up sensible boys, and while they rest in this fancied security, the well-bred boys are rempted, secretly yield, and form the habit that ruins them.

## THE STREET CHILD.

The street child is the readiest victim. In the recent press records of Magistrate Jeff's court, Hamilton, we find an account of the conviction of a bar-tender for selling to little Tommy Toner, a lad so small he came into court holding his father's hand, and he and the bevy of associates called as witnesses (all smokers) were said by the Herald to look like a section of a S.S. infant class. The hotel-keeper paid the bar-tender's \$50 fine, and that ended the matter, so far as they were concerned. The question for the public is, what will be the end of it for the boys?

B. Broughton, M.D., physician in charge of opium and other drug patients, at the Leslie E. Keeley Gold Cure Co., says:—

"More young men are led to the opium habit by cigarette smoking than by patent and proprietary medicines. Sixty per cent. of all males under forty years of age, treated at Dwight for opium, morphine, or cocaine using, in 1896, had been smokers of cigarettes, and sixty per cent. of these had no other excuse than that they needed some stimulant more than the cigarette furnished them."

## THE MOTHERLAND.

We shall soon have the company of our own nationality in the anti-cigarette war now waging.

The Birmingham Age-Herald (England) says:—"The British public is fighting an invader that is almost irresistible. It possesses neither heart nor conscience. It allows nothing to stand in its way. The American Tobacco Trust derives its revenue from every thin-faced child in America. It draws into its swelling purse the pennies of children who suck poison out of their baleful paper rolls. They have grown fat on the corpses of immature children, poisoned to death by the product of their factories."

From Scotland comes the news that in Dundee calculations show the weekly consumption of cigarettes not less than half a million, and that the Commissioner appointed by the Sunday School Chronicle has gathered the evidence of the most eminent men, heads of colleges, head masters of grammar schools, employers of labor, etc., and finds it the unanimous opinion that the "paper pipe" is a menace to intellectual, physical and moral character.

The officers of the Boys' Brigades of Dundee meditate an attempt to legislate the cigarette into oblivion.

Everywhere the battle rages. As the Arkansas "Traveller" says:—"The anti-cigarette forces show no disposition to smoke the pipe of peace."

If the world is going wrong,  
Forget it!  
Sorrow never lingers long,  
Forget it!  
If your neighbor bears ill-will,  
If your conscience won't be still,  
If you owe an ancient bill,  
Forget it!



## DOES FARMING PAY.

We are being continually told that notwithstanding the growing prosperity of our country, notwithstanding our increasing wealth, labor-saving machinery, comforts and even luxuries there is less real enjoyment of life than there was in the days of the sickle and the hoe, the scythe and the pitchfork. We are told, too, that notwithstanding the increased value of farm product consequent upon larger yield and better prices the actual net profit of the farm is no greater than it was fifty years ago. That there is considerable foundation for the contention we admit, but we are not inclined to take it at its face value. What was real enjoyment to our forefathers might, under the conditions of to-day be abject misery, and in arriving at the net profit of the farm to-day we have many an item of comfort and luxury on the expenditure side of the account which found no place there fifty years ago. While we cannot properly compare any two periods of our history—separated by years and by changed conditions—it is quite evident that

## THE GOOD OLD TIMES

of which we read and hear so much, while they served their day and generation well, would be extremely distasteful to us of to-day. Conditions are constantly changing although human nature appears to present the same surface through succeeding generations. The good old days were not the cloudless days which the fond historian, looking backward through the mists of memory, would have us believe. He sees only the rainbow—not the thunder cloud behind it; only the sunny slopes on the distant hills—not the frowning precipice nor the dismal swamp. There were in those days the same comparisons with a former better age that are made to-day, the same enjoyment of life, the same sorrow, the same heartache. Wealth and poverty, profit and loss, contentment and discontent, life and death rolled along then as now. The race was not to the swift nor the battle to the strong then any more than it is to-day, and when the whole matter is summed up it must be admitted that man bears the same relation to his surroundings to-day that he did in any other age; that he who cannot make a profit out of living to-day could not in the golden days of the forest primeval, of the sickle and the hoe or the scythe and the pitchfork.

## ROOTS AS PIG FEED.

Popular opinion is beginning to realize the importance of feeding more succulent feeds to all sorts of domestic stock.

In dairying silage has become such a recognized factor that no dairyman who is familiar with its benefits attempts to get along without it.

Roots are generally considered rather expensive for cattle feed, but most swine men regard them as unequaled as a succulent feed for hogs. Silage, though exceptionally good in the dairy barn, is entirely out of place in the hog-house.

The great virtue in feeding roots to swine is not so much the real intrinsic value of the mangal as a feed for pigs, by itself, but its importance in affording a variety to the feed.

Again, roots exert another strong influence over the animal, and this is in maintaining a free and healthy condition of the whole digestive system.

We have yet to meet the first experienced swine-raiser, who was also an advocate of the root crop as a feed for pigs, who did not urge that care be exercised in not overfeeding during the winter season.

The root in nature is essentially a summer feed, and if fed in abundance it also requires summer conditions. Provide warm shelters and feed succulently in moderation.

In our observations of experiments carried along the lines of feeding roots to hogs and determining results, the Drovers' Journal has noted two things quite invariably, viz: First—Feeding of roots in addition to grain and other feed quite infrequently produces a better gain than is the case where the roots are omitted.

Second—If the addition of roots does not actually produce a gain in flesh, it prevents the possible falling behind by producing 100 pounds of flesh at a less cost of feed.

Mangels serve the best purpose when they are used as an auxiliary rather than as a staple feed, such experiments indicate that excessive use retards fattening.

Experiments conducted at Ottawa, Utah and Ohio stations indicate that 400 pounds of mangels equal about 65 pounds of grain, or one pound of mangels will equal 615 pounds of grain.

According to experiments conducted in Denmark it was found that one pound of barley equaled from six to eight pounds of mangels.

## CHARCOAL FOR POULTRY.

Pure charcoal, or the charred wood from the stove, when fresh, is an excellent aid in arresting bowel complaint, and is both simple and harmless. Where the hens have not had a

variety, parched grain, partly burnt, affords an agreeable change, and serves nearly the same purpose as charcoal. Oats, wheat, or even bran, will be readily eaten by hens when they have been regularly fed on a sameness of diet, and such food will greatly aid in arresting diarrhoea or other bowel disorders. In experiments made to determine the benefits of charcoal feeding, if any, four turkeys were confined in a pen and fed on meal, boiled potatoes and oats, and four others of the same brood were at the same time confined in another pen and fed daily on the same articles, but with one pint of finely pulverized charcoal mixed with their food. These had also a plentiful supply of broken charcoal in their pen. The eight were killed, and there was a difference of one and one-half pounds each in favor of those supplied with charcoal. They were the fattest, and the meat was superior in point of tenderness and flavor.

## CARTING AN EMPEROR.

The Emperor of Austria, Francis Joseph, is a sporting individual, and as fond of a good joke as any of his subjects.

A short time back he was out for a long walk, and at nightfall he found himself some considerable distance from the house he was staying at. Tired and weary, he trudged along, wondering how long it would take him to get back, when he heard in the distance a peasant's cart approaching. He waited until it came up to him, and then, hailing the driver, asked if he might ride in his cart. The yokel bluntly answered in the affirmative, and the Emperor scrambled up by the wheel.

"Do you know who I am?" queried Francis Joseph, when in the cart.

"Well, upon my word, I don't—and neither do I care," gruffly answered the jehu.

"I am the Emperor Francis Joseph," said his Majesty, in Imperial tones.

The peasant then thought a practical joke was being played on him, and replied, with magnificent indifference:

"And do you know who I am?"

"No; I have not that honor," answered the Emperor.

"Well, I'm the shah of Persia," said the yokel, and continued his journey, while the shaky vehicle nearly paralyzed the Emperor. His Majesty was heartily amused at the joke.

## ENGLISH BOOKS.

The following stand in England as literary records: The largest circulation of any English novel in copyright is that of "East Lynne," of which the public have bought nearly half a million. The earliest published work still in copyright is Tennyson's "Poems by Two Brothers," which dates from 1837. The largest amount ever given for serial rights in England is £7,000 (\$35,000), paid by Cornhill for George Eliot's "Romola." The largest cheque ever given to an English author is £20,000 (\$100,000), received by Lord Macaulay for his history. The most expensive single volume lately issued is Morris' "Chaucer," published at £20 (\$100). The thickest single volume in print is the "Catalogue of Current Literature," which measures 10½ inches across the back. The highest price given for a first edition is 545 guineas (\$2,860) for an uncut copy of the Kilmarnock "Burns."

## THE LONGEST WORD.

"Rob," said Tom, "which is the most dangerous word to pronounce in the English language?"

"Don't know," said Tom, "unless it's a swearing word."

"Pooh!" said Tom, "it's stumbled because you are sure to get a tumble between the first and last letter."

"Ha, ha!" said Rob. "Now, I've got one for you. I found it one day in the paper. Which is the longest word in the English language?"

"Incomprehensibility," said Tom, promptly.

"No, sir; smiles, because there's a whole mile between the first and last letter!"

"Ho, ho!" cried Tom, "that's nothing. I know a word that has over three miles between its beginning and ending."

"What's that?" asked Rob, faintly.

"Beleaguered," said Tom.

## AS A SUGGESTION.

A young married lady is often criticized by her friends because of the freedom with which she accepts little attentions from friends of the other sex.

At a recent gathering which she attended she drew from her pocket her lace handkerchief, in which a knot had been tied in order to call to her mind some trivial duty.

"Dear me," said the popular young married lady to several gallants about her, "why is that knot in my handkerchief? I tied it there to remind me of something. What could it be?"

"My child," said an old lady, who overheard her, and who is noted for the acrid wit of her repartee, "it was probably tied in order to remind you that you are married."

He came from his daily grind at the office and, falling into a chair, said: "What have you to read? I'm just in the mood for reading something sensational and startling—something that will make my hair stand on end." "Here's the bill for my new dresses, darling."