WHEN WAR LORDS FIGHT

LITTLE TIFFS THAT LED TO GREAT DISASTERS.

Different Ending of Battles Might Have Resulted Had the Generals Agreed.

Some people think it very funny when great admirals and generals quarrel like schoolboys among themselves. But it is'nt always funny for the nations whom the admirals and generals are supposed to serve. Some of the greatest naval and military disasters in history have been owing wholely and solely to the fact that the leaders of the defeated fleets or armies have been on such bad terms that they have hampered one another, instead of working cordially together against the enemy.

Two of the most famous generals of ancient times were Belisarius and Narses. Apart from each other neither of them had a rival in the art of war. In the year 538 they were both sent by the Emperor Justinian to drive the Gothic invaders out of Italy. Had they helped each other the task would have been simple. But they "were not on speaking terms," and the result of this was that the great city of Milan, which was besieged by the enemy, was not relived in time.

William the Conqueror had reason to be thankful that King Harold's generals were not united. Two of them, Edwin and Markere, quarrelled with the others. They refused to patch up their differences and join whole-heartedly to expel the invader when he landed at Pevense, in 1066. Instead, they drew off in dudgeon from the Saxon army, taking with them thousands of their followers.

Nobody wishes to deprive the Scots of the glory of Bannockburn. All the same, it is just possible that Robert Bruce would not have won his great victory had the English barons been united.

UNDER THE BOLD BENBOW.

It was the same sort of jealousy among the French nobles which led the King of France to be defeated by the Black Prince at Poitiers; and our Henry V., fighting five against one at Agincourt, might have lost instead of won if the generals opposed to him had not hated and distrusted one another.

England has lost several times both on sea and land through "little differences" between her admirals and generals. William III. was terribly hampered at the great battle of Steinkirk, in 1692, because his generals, Dutch and English, could not "hit it off together." The worse naval defeat we ever suffered was off Beachy Head in 1691, when a French fleet thrashed an English and Dutch fleet very thoroughly. The fight was lost mainly because there was no confidence between the leaders on the losing side. The British admiral, Russell, openly accused some of his chief captains of being traitors to the country before the first cannon shot was fired, and they returned the compliment by informing him that he was another.

In 1702 Admiral Benbow was cruising with his squadron in the West Indies, and off Santa Martha gave chase to a French fleet under Du Casse. But many of his captains, for no other reason than that they were on bad terms with him personally, absolutely declined to join in the fight, and sheered off with their ships. Benbow was left to fight alone with the handful of ships which stood by him. He fought desperately, and even after his leg had been shot off by a chain shot, insisted on remaining on the quarter-deck until he was forced to give up the action and sail away baffled. Benbow died of his wound, and several of the sulky captains were tried by court-martial and shot.

WHY PRINCE CHARLIE LOST.

There might have been another and different result to the battle of Culloden, which shattered the hopes of "Bonnie Prince Charlie," had not dissensions and rivalries crept into the Highland army. Two of the generals, Lord Elcho and Lord George Murray, were far more anxious to get up a duel with each other than to fight the Duke of Cumberland.

The Duke of Wellington was at first greatly hampered in Spain by the conduct of General Picton, the leader of his cavalry. The two disliked each other bitterly, and for this reason Picton was always criticising and even disobeying the orders of his leader.

The "Iron Duke" himself might have come to grief in the Peninsular War, instead of covering himself with glory, had his opponents thought of nothing but how to beat him. He was opposed by three of Napoleon's greatest marshals, Massena, Ney, and Soult. At one time they had a good chance of destroying him had they worked together; but Ney and Soult were personal enemies of Massena, and, though he was in chief command, they refused to carry out his plans and wasted time in futile wranglings.

Napoleon declared that he lost Waterloo through the generals under him hating each other too much to fight well together. There was some truth in it. Grouchy distrusted Soult, Soult was envious of Ney, and Ney hated both of them. How could they be expected to do their best when they were, so to say, continually hurling defiance at each other?—Pearson's Weekly.

"I can truthfully say that I believe that, but for the use of your Emulsion I would long since have been in my grave. I was past work—could not walk up-hill without coughing very hard."

THIS, and much more was written by Mr. G. W. Howerton, Clark's Gap, W. Va. We would like to send you a full copy of his letter, or you might write him direct. His case was really marvelous, but is only one of the many proofs that

Scott's Emulsion

is the most strengthening and re-vitalizing preparation in the world. Even in that most stubborn of all diseases (consumption) it does wonders, and in less serious troubles, such as anemia, bronchitis, asthma, catarrh, or loss of flesh from any cause the effect is much quicker.

Do not delay. Get a bottle of SCOTT'S EMULSION—be sure it's SCOTT'S and try it.

ALL DRUGGISTS

Let us send you Mr. Howerton's letter and some literature on Consumption. Just send us a Post Card and mention this paper.

SCOTT & BOWNE
126 Wellington St., W. Toronto

* * *

LENGTH OF DREAMS.

May Dream An Unlived Life Within a Minute.

It is not unusual to hear one say that he has been dreaming about something all night, when possibly his dream occupied only a very short time. Many attempts have been made to measure the time occupied in a dream, and records appear from time to time in the papers, showing that often elaborate ones occupy but a few seconds. The following incident is told by a gentleman, who vouches for its accuracy:

He was engaged one afternoon with a clerk in verifying some long columns of figures that had been copied from one book to another. The numbers ,representing amounts in dollars and cents, were composed of six or seven figures. The clerk would read, for instance, "Fourteen, one forty-two, twelve, making the amount of $14,142.12, and the gentleman would answer, "Check," to indicate that the copy was correct. Page after page had been read as rapidly as the words could be uttered, each number receiving the "check." The work was drowsy, and it was with difficulty he could keep his eyes open.

Finally sleep overcame him, and he dreamed—dreamed of an old horse he had been accustomed to drive twentyfive or thirty years ago. He could not recall any special incident connected with the dream except the locality and the distinct sight of the horse, and of the buggy to which he had driven him. He awoke suddenly, and as a number was ended called, "Check." He was conscious of having slept and of having dreamed, and said to the clerk, "Charlie, I have been asleep. How many of those numbers have I missed?" "None," he replied. "You have checked every one." Close questioning developed the fact that of the figures 14,142.12 he had heard the fourteen and the twelve, but had slept and dreamed during the time occupied in rapidly uttering the words "one forty-two." He tried, by reading other numbers, to measure the time, and thinks it could not have been more than a second.

Another story is told of a man who sat before his fire in a drowsy condition. A draft, blowing across the room, set a large photograph on the mantel to swaying. A slender vase was in front of it, and the man remembers wondering, in a mood of whimsical indifference, whether the picture would blow forward and send the vase to the floor.

Finally a gust of wind did topple the picture, and it struck the vase. The man remembers having been curiously relieved in his state of drowsiness that at last the "old thing was going to fall and be done with it."

Presently he was in the midst of a complicated business transaction in a Western city, miles away. All the details of a new and unheard-of scheme were coming forth from his lips, and a board of directors was listening. The scheme prospered. He moved his family West. Fragments of the journey thither and glimpses of the fine house he bought came before his vision.

A crash woke him. The vase had struck the floor. He had dreamed an unlived life covering years, and all in the time it took for the vase, which he had seen toppling before he fell asleep, to fall five feet and break.

* * *

RAISING THE WIND.

How the Old Sea Captain Wrecked His Vessel.

Stranger—"I resume a man who has followed the sea so many years must have been in some wrecks?"

Old Sea Captain—"Wrecks? Well a few. The wust wreck I ever had was on the Jersey coast."

"Long ago?"

"Some'at. You see, I got becalmed off the coast of Ireland."

"Becalmed?"

"Yes. Well, I tried every way to start a wind, but it was no go. Not a breath stirrin'. At last I got desperate."

"I presume so."

"Yes, I got so desperate I made up my mind I'd try a plan I'd often heard of, if it took the last dollar I had. Can't raise the wind without money."

"It's a good deal the same way on shore."

"Jesso. Well, then, I took a big silver piece, kissed it thre times, swung it nine times round my head and then flung it as far as I could into the sea, in the direction I wanted the wind to come, you know."

"I see."

"Well, it came."

"It did?"

"Did it? Well, you just ought to seen it. The fust blast took every stitch o' sail clean off the yards, an' in three minutes more we was scudding under bare poles a thousand miles an hour."

"Cricky!"

"I sh'd say so. Well, the nex' thing I knew, bump went 'er bow, an' there we was bein' dashed all to bits square up agin Jersey. Why, sir, we struck with such force we bounded way up the beach an' walked dry-shod right into a hotel."

"I never hear of that."

"N—o; the season was over an' the hotels was closed. Well, sir, after that I never tried no more five cent pieces when I wanted win'."

"I suppose not."

"No, sir. After that I never flung anything bigger'n a cent."

* * *

TO SPARE.

The Angry Mother—You've got an awful nerve to ask me to give you back your ball when you nearly killed one of my children with it.

The Boy—Well, ma'am, you've got ten children and we've got only one ball.

"Don't you occasionally have company that bores you?" "Often; but we have a remedy. We always let our little Johnny recite."

SAMPLE COPY FREE

Would you like to have a sample copy of The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine?

THE BEST AGRICULTURAL AND HOME PAPER

on the American Continent. No progressive farmer can afford to be without it. Published weekly. Only $1.50 per year. Drop post-card for free sample copy. Agents Wanted. Address:

"THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE"

Mention this paper. London Ont.

1261

EXTRAVAGANCES OF OLD

VERY MUCH GREATER THEN THAN NOW.

Modern Household and Dress Bills Compared With Those of Our Ancestors.

We hear it said everywhere—at the beginning and at the end of each season—that modern extravagance is appalling, that women overdress, that they spend more for a single hat than their grand mothers did for their whole trosseau, says the London Daily Mail.

Like many other often recurring general statements, this is far from being accurate. The well known French writer M. Henry de Gallier contributes to the current issue of La Revue a remarkable study on "Spending Money in Days of Yore."

From statistics carefully compiled, from private documents of one or two centuries ago, from letters and bills dating from those distant days, it appears that extravagance was far worse then.

The greatest change in the matter of expenditure is that during the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries men spent quite as much —if not more—as women for their own attire.

To-day the average man spends considerably less than the average woman on clothes, and in the wealthy classes the difference is more marked still, since it was recently stated by a queen of fashion that while a man could be quite "elegant" by spending $2,000 a year on himself a woman needed $2,000 a month to dress stylishly.

IN THE MIDDLE CLASS,

as in the aristocracy, 150 years ago more things were required by a man. He wore night cuffs of lace, his black suit cost $20 (of our money), his hats—he needed half a dozen—$5 each. He required silk stockings, woolen stockings and "skin" stockings and five or six different kinds of boots.

He had to spend several dollars a year at the barber and wigmaker's. The middle class woman of those days managed to dress in a cheaper way, though dress was the main expense.

Diaries and memoirs establish the curious fact the upbringing of three children cost a third less than the clothes required by their mother, a modest woman! Men wore ribbons, lace, embroideries, and jewelry in as large quantities as women.

Certain gentlemen's suits cost as much as $3,000 and three of these were required by each guest for great wedding festivals. These were exceptions, however. An elegant man could "manage" with six summer and six winter suits, at $500 apiece. This, needless to add, does not include the gold or silver buttons or the lace! Let us turn to women. In 1720 Mlle. de Tournon married in Paris. It was an elegant marriage, but by no means a great affair. Her aunt offered her $3,500 for "fans, bags, and garters." The bride herself bought several gowns at prices varying from $750 to $2,000.

These were "ordinary things." For the court she required a long gown of white velvet, elaborately embroidered: cost $4,000, and the same dress could be worn on

A FEW OCCASIONS ONLY.

But gowns are not everything. Underwear and other "trifles" have to be considered. Mme. de Choiseul, the wife of a Minister of Louis XV., wore several thousand dollars worth of lace on her evening dresses.

The inventory after her death of Mme. de Verrue's properties revealed the fact that she possessed 500 dozen cambric handkerchiefs, 430 shirts and 60 pairs of stays.

As for jewels, men formerly wore diamonds and pearls on their clothes, shoes and hands, while today a man of refined taste is satisfied with a modest ring, simple links, a little pearl as a shirt stud and a large stone as a scarfpin.

Hospitality then was on a far greater scale than it is now. It would be difficult even for the wealthy owner of a great mansion to place all the year round 700 beds at the disposal of his friends, as did M. he Rohan at his castle of Saverne. One hundred and eighty horses were always ready to be saddled for his guests and 600 beaters were used daily by him during the shooting season.

People of moderate means had three days out of six from twelve to twenty guests at a time. People who called on business were invited to stay to dinner and given a room.

The "bills" of Mme. de Choiseul prove that thirty sheep a month and 5,000 chickens per annum were required to feed her guests. Three hundred pounds of bread was necessary daily. These receptions were elaborate, yet the guests enjoyed

THE GREATEST FREEDOM.

They called with as many servants, horses and dogs as they pleased. They were at liberty to take their meals in the rooms placed at their disposal or in the main dining hall.

Domestics—which so many people believe were very cheap in those days—were, as a matter of fact, more expensive than they are now. During the seventeenth century a kitchen woman was paid $15 or $20 a month, "not including wine and lard."

Gambling went on in most houses. There were games of "lansquenet" and "pharaoh" even in the salons of embassies! Servants asked their masters to stake their wages for them. Fortunes were lost and won in a few minutes. People staked their horses, their houses, their estates. The Duke de Rohan once staked his diamond order. He had not one sou left.

Lawsuits deserve a special mention. They were another craze of those days. Suits were everlasting; the son took up cases where his father had left them and transmitted them to his heir later on. It was the fashion; it was a luxury. The costs were colossal. A gentleman was able to say at the beginning of the nineteenth century: "My grandfather had thirty-three suits; he won every one of them and it cost him several thousands."

The amounts mentioned in the article are not of course the amounts appearing in ancient documents, but their equivalents in our money.

* * *

BABY'S OWN TABLETS A LITTLE LIFE SAVER.

Baby's Own Tablets have saved many a precious little life. There is no other medicine for children so safe and sure in its effects. The Tablets cure stomach and bowel troubles, teething troubles, destroy worms, break up colds and prevent deadly croup. And you have the guarantee of a government analyst that this medicine does not contain a particle of opiate or narcotic. Mrs. J. Laroque, Log Valley, Sask., says:—"I am a great believer in Baby's Own Tablets. I have used them on many occasions and know of no medicine equal to them in curing the common ailments of babies and young children." Sold by medicine dealers or by mail at 25 cents a box from The Dr. Williams' Medicine Co., Brockville, Ont.

* * *

OPEN AIR SCHOOLS.

Experiment in London Has Proved a Great Success.

London is experimenting with open air schools. They are for for poor children, their session is from June 1 to October 31, and they are proving a success.

The beginning was made last summer and was purely experimental. The authorities made a grant of $2,000 to see how the thing worked. They have increased the appropriation for next summer to $10,000 and three schools will be established.

Each school will accommodate seventy-five children, divided into three classes of twenty-five each. The staff will consist of one head teacher, three assistant teachers, a nurse, cook and helper and a janitor.

Of course there are buildings which are occupied a part of each day, as well in pleasant as in unpleasant weather; but unless the weather is hopelessly bad almost all the time is spent in the open air. A blackboard on an easel is set up on the grass and the chairs of the pupils are grouped before it.

The children are small and the course of study is light. There are games too, calisthenics, nature study in the open, and the results of all these in physical improvement are said to be very gratifying. The children have their meals on the premises and spend the entire day there

CELERY KING

Are You Thin

Pale, weak and nervous people need a tonic that will build them up and make them well and strong. Celery King is the tonic that will do these things. Large package 25 cents, at dealers or by mail. S. C. Wells & Co., Toronto.