

## THE ELECTION OF DEPUTIES AT GUERNSEY, 1924.

Excitement at election time had never been so acute nor vacancies so keenly contested, as at the election of eighteen deputies in January of this year for seats in the States of Guernsey, as the local Parliament is called. This election takes place every three years, and all members are eligible for re-election. I was fully convinced when asked to stand that a local reporter would come and interview me as he did others three years ago—in my own home, and by my own fireside. But no! the electors this January were far more searching in their demands. First and foremost, all candidates who really wanted to be successful had to publish a "manifesto" in the local papers, and then—much more terrifying—hire a hall and face the music. Three of us—I the only lady—hired the Masonic Hall, expecting just a few, but we were crowded out, and had to hold an overflow meeting, and submit to bombardments by anxious supporters and otherwise. One inquisitive old gentleman asked me, "What about the Divorce Laws?" We have none here, and not wishing to implicate myself either side, I responded: "That, Sir, I leave to the married people to decide," and made my exit, amidst a roar of laughter.

We have not yet arrived at the time when a house-to-house visitation is necessary; most probably because the districts are small, and practically every one who has resided here for a few years knows all about the candidate—age, parentage, social position, qualifications and views. I felt that after my Masonic meeting my fate was sealed, and it was useless to worry, so thoroughly enjoyed myself at the other meetings I attended. By January 1st, the day of the poll, I was excited, but resigned, and you may well imagine the huge surprise I had when the Bailiff (the President of the States) appeared on the steps of the Court House just after four o'clock on February 1st, and announced the result. I was second on the list of eighteen candidates, with 1,042 votes to my credit—and the only lady elected.

MARIE RANDALL,

In Juo Suffragil.

## VISCOUNT ASTOR WANTS TO KNOW.

### Asks Some Pertinent Questions Relative to the Carlisle System of Liquor Control.

According to a London special dispatch to the "Christian Science Monitor," the British Government is now drafting the terms of reference for inquiry into the system of control of the drink traffic in force in Carlisle.

Referring to the matter in a recent debate in the House of Lords, Viscount Astor quoted instances of warm approval of the Carlisle system expressed to him by representatives of local authorities. At the same time he dwelt upon the evils of a trade which, in the words of the Prime Minister, "had become a menace to the life of the community and corrupted politics." In this connection, Viscount Astor asked a number of very pertinent questions. He said:

"First of all, is any money made in Carlisle out of the sale of drink going to political organisations for the return to Parliament of candidates favourable to the financial interests of this trade? Again, does any money made in Carlisle out of drink go to political organisations for the purpose of keeping out of Parliament candidates who support the temperance programme of the churches? Does any of the money made in Carlisle from the sale of drink go to societies which conduct propaganda against the Temperance Council of the Churches to influence electors in favour of these specific financial interests? To what, if any, extent do the salaried staff of the Control Board or whatever the government body at Carlisle may be to-day, organise themselves politically on behalf of their industry? Finally, does the committee, or the body which runs the drink trade in Carlisle, bring pressure to bear upon publicans in Carlisle at election times as to whom they should support?"

In commenting upon the above statement by Viscount Astor, the "Christian Science Monitor" says:—

"These are all questions which will have to be answered before the Carlisle or any other experiment which does not go the whole length of Prohibition can be held to have justified itself.

"That the British Government should be committed to inquire into the matter

is a sign of the times. Its gropings may still be in the dark. To search industriously, however, may yet be to find."—Exchange.

## OPINIONS UPON PRAYER BY A SCIENTIST AND A DIVINE.

In a recent magazine article, says the "New Orleans Christian Advocate," one of the most distinguished nerve specialists in this country declared that he recommends prayer to those who are threatened with a nervous breakdown. He was speaking primarily as a man of science, and not as a theologian; his words, therefore, are specially significant to those who demand a scientific basis for their religion. His striking words are: "Prayer in the sense of communion with the infinite is a universal need. The question of whether or not you are a firm believer in some particular creed is not involved in this. One might hope you are a professing Christian, and that you can pray with the Christian's faith; but whether or not this be so, I must tell you that both the man with strong nerves and the man with weak ones find new resources and strength in prayer."

### THE MYSTERY OF PRAYER.

It is sometimes urged that prayer is mysterious. So is everything else if we stop to think about it. Matter is a mystery. Nobody knows what matter is. Force is a mystery. Nobody knows what force is. Gravitation is a mystery. Nobody knows what takes place when we drop a lump of sugar into a cup of coffee. Whether the change is mechanical or chemical, the very wisest men are not able to say. We know just one thing, that by dropping sugar into the coffee the coffee is sweetened. For most of us that is enough. We know that by dropping a prayer into a day we sweeten the day. How this is brought about we do not know. Who has sight so keen and strong that it can follow the flight of song or flight of prayer? Why should we not be as reasonable and practical in our religion as we are at our dinner tables?—Charles E. Jefferson, D.D.

By a vote of 45 to 28, the Bombay Legislative Council adopted a resolution in favour of Prohibition.—Bombay, 2/8/24.