

irrefragable. First, there is the high ground that the exposure of such conduct in a penal way is of good moral example. Then you have the important public question of how the hotel is conducted, and whether any undue facility for evil has been afforded. Then there is the fact brought duly to the attention of the public, if the accusation is made out, that such things do occur from chance acquaintance made in the street; from which parents, employers, and seniors of all sorts may deduce reasons for impressing upon young women the necessity of punctilious conduct. Moreover, the case may give a hint to passers-by occasionally to render a good service by watching, or even interposing, when suspicious incidents are observed. But the offence may not be proved. It may have been trumped up, in which case it becomes self-evident how valuable publicity is in securing that no man's character can be taken away as many a man's would be upon false accusations if the Press were not vigilant in noting and regular in publishing whatever is of public interest. Here we have a few, and a very few, of the reasons assignable for the publication of such a case, unpleasant and nauseous as it may be. Often as the question has been before us—impartially as we have regarded it—and much as we have always sympathized with those who have complained of newspapers in this particular, we have never been convinced that the Press behaves either pruriently or carelessly or unwisely in this matter. Society would lose rather than gain if the newspapers more generally excluded intelligence which springs out of its proved and punishable corruptions.—*Liverpool Daily Post.*

THE EDITORIAL IDEA.

The modern newspaper, like the modern office of Premier in British institutions, has grown by degrees to its present importance—by sheer force of social usefulness—although legislatively it must be classed as an anomaly. With all its merits, it has greatly tended to weaken the thinking function of a people by taking it into its own irresponsible hands to such an extent that action almost ceases to be the outcome of thought, to the immense loss of the social order.

A newspaper does not commonly profess individuality in its opinions, although a person or a firm is made legally responsible for attacks appearing in its columns. We may look upon the use of the "I" as indicating individual opinion; the "we," the opinion of party, great or small. Even "I" himself would have no objection to use the expression "we may say," or "do," and editorial writing is ordinarily more subjunctive than indicative; and if "I" can speak, often with vigour, he cannot do much in the way of action without the people, or some section of them. Those having anything to put forth against a public man should formulate their charges at their own risk. Newspapers having striven to drop the responsibility of men and citizens, often delight in insinuation, and earn the contempt that is deserved by such a course. With his customary playfulness our editor made personal reference to this anonymous correspondent in a note following the first letter over his present signature. He did not know "whose Disciple he was." Quiet citizen he may be, the Volunteer will suggest occasionally, but, as the editor knows, there are men at Ottawa who govern—the theory of a limited monarchy further modified by new democratic elements, being, that men be only brought into prominence in proportion to their recognized usefulness to the State. The King, or Vice-King, under shield of the Empire, or however the chief ruler may be styled—and all States must have a chief ruler—the Triumvirate being proved a failure—such ruler and his consort are to be honoured with an affectionate regard and respect—about which there is no difficulty amongst our loyal Canadians. We are not to suppose the office a sinecure, for in social exertions few have to work harder or with more deliberate precision. There are also distinctly deliberative duties connected with the office. Our Scribes and Pharisees—to pursue the playful vein—some of them very good men—fill the chair of Moses the Lawgiver and Tribune in a sort of collective way—and they have chiefly to avoid the course of the particular Priest and Levite who troubled the Samaritan by shewing "how not to do it." The people being so befriended in many things, the question arises, "Is there room outside and in communication with this august body for the work of the Reformer?" His work—that of the social reformer—is very much like that of the philosopher of old, who begged to a statue in order to increase his own patience by perpetual disappointment. He, poor man, must curb and woo for leave to do the people good.

The too listless world, instinctively recognizing certain established forces of wealth and power,—as it should do within proper limits—is not prepared to give up the control of its affairs to the merely able or well-informed or zealous brother or citizen; and why should it? The zealous brother has probably never desired it. An ignorantly enthusiastic section may sometimes raise a sort of cry in his favour, if he be foolish enough to make himself too prominent; but unless he be desirous of senatorial honours, and in a position to take them, it will result in nothing. If he be clerical, he needs no "anonymous," having always his cloth for protection and comparative immunity. Some writers for newspapers are only professional, and write as they are paid and instructed to do, being more or less able and well informed in their own

department of life. They may have rather a horror of zeal, a social advancement in the inconvenient sense. They may sometimes wish that greater freedom was theirs. And so in either alternative the "anonymous" must be held to work well in a mixed community. Either in depriving of prominence a name having no particular significance, or in keeping in obscurity one that, as it has no political office attached to it, the world feels, if it can be said to feel, that it need not be burdened with, and whose owner has no desire to assume the burden of the direction of its affairs. That equality without the temporary assertions of which there can be no human friendship, is but a dream in the political life,—amongst our Republican neighbours an injurious dream, often enough. To attempt then, to draw aside the veil that obscures the personality of a writer, and clothe the voice with all virtual attributes, under such conditions, is an indecorum rather too common amongst us; for our people in Canada, are, in many things, rather too much like school-boys, and, in feeling, have hardly yet cast the shell of tutelage and home dictation which used to lead, of old, to discontent and disorganized folly on the part of the colonists. An anonymous writer may be personally taxed upon occasions, and he may be free to give, as he would be free to withhold, the expressions of his pen. He might address editor and readers as follows: "The Editor wishes to know more about his correspondents, and asks whose Disciple he is. We may trust he will discover, in the end. He does not believe in the anonymous form, while the writer regards it as a convenience in a mixed community, but one not to be abused. To the personal reference, the writer merely says, that he believes his conversion from the principles of this world took place thirty-six (36) years ago—that he has been married thirty-two (32) years, nearly—that self and wife have tried to bring up their family in health, and in the truth of Christ, having lost two dear children in infancy, with all their care—that he has been an occasional writer in the public press for thirty (30) years—that he is loyal to the crown in this Dominion and Empire—and that he believes it is not out of conformity with these facts for him to sign himself

Disciple."

ELECTIONEERING.

The walls of newspaper offices are not commonly adorned with Scripture texts, but there is one text which ought just now to be written up, large, in most of the newspaper offices in England, certainly in the office of every journal which supported the Beaconsfield Government. It is the text which speaks of blind leaders of the blind. For the last three years, to go no further back, those public instructors have been steadily singing one unvarying chorus, that there never was a stronger Government, that there never was a policy more in favour with the country, that never the constituencies more heartily supported any Minister than they did Lord Beaconsfield.

The Liberals were told that their information was wrong, that their conclusions were blundering, that their assurances were hollow, and that their predictions were laughable. All such statements they put aside as ideas, mere Radical nonsense. Was not the great Conservative party firm in its loyalty and magnificent in its strength?

The great heart of the people, cried the special organ of wind and bluster, is bent upon asserting the Imperial rank and influence of England before the world. The lesser lights followed the lead of the greater ones. "Don't talk to us," they said, "of reaction in public opinion. We know better. The Government is stronger than it ever was. The Liberals have neither power nor persuasiveness. The best thing for them is to put off an election as long as possible, for when it happens, they are in danger of being effaced." This is no imaginary sketch. After the dissolution, and on the very eve of the elections, the *Times* actually predicted the utter discomfiture of the Liberal party. On March 10th it said:—"Lord Beaconsfield has become of late a singularly powerful Prime Minister. Assaults against him, whether within Parliament or without it, have been so signally defeated that his personal authority has been continuously augmented. He has had little occasion to reply to his opponents. He has been able to leave that to themselves and the constituencies. But what would be his position if the coming election were made a repetition of the disputes of the last three years—if it were fought on the same ground, and led to the same result? The immediate effect would necessarily be to augment incalculably Lord Beaconsfield's personal influence, and to render him, perhaps, the most powerful Minister we have seen in our generation." Lord Beaconsfield is a man with a taste for cynical humour. I should like to know what he thinks now of the apologist who knew so little, and had such a miserable faculty of discernment, as to write rubbish like this on the very eve, not of a defeat, but of a collapse.

The same sham was kept up day after day; on March 15th the "leading journal" was as blind, and therefore as confident as ever. "Without the votes of English Radical and Home Rulers," it exclaimed, "no Liberal majority is to be hoped for." On the 19th it was still blundering in the same strain—"The edge of speculation is sharpened by uncertainty." The roar of battle was in its ears, but the smoke was in its eyes, so that it could see nothing. Indeed, it would not accept information within the reach of all who had