

than by quoting, for the information of any of our readers who may not have seen that paper, the words in which it settles and dismisses the question :

The fact is that a newspaper is a class unto itself, and that any attempt, either from within the profession or from without, to regulate its conduct, is condemned from the beginning to failure. The only conceivable bounds that could be set to its field of publication would be the tastes and requirements of its readers and the well defined limitations of the Statute book. And from that Statute Book to Holy Writ, every publication that has had for its object the lasting betterment of the morals and fortunes of mankind sets the press an example, or rather confirms it in its right and duty to tell its readers everything that may have happened and transpired. No code of ethics could withdraw this right or absolve the press from this duty. As to the manner in which it may do its work, it may be called to account, as has been suggested, by its readers, or by the law. But those are the only limitations which can be set to the observance of what is plainly its only right to existence :

Whether this paragraph is a model of the clearness and definiteness required we do not stay to ask. But we venture to commend to the attention of any who may still doubt whether there is not room for further discussion, the crucial question which seems to be suggested, viz. : Whether the newspaper is to be included in the category of those publications which have for their object "the lasting betterment of the morals and fortunes of mankind," or whether it is indeed so completely "a class by itself" that it is free from all obligation to consult anything but "the tastes and requirements of its readers and the well defined limitations of the statute book." If the statute book is infallible, or if the journalist is morally free from any responsibility for his influence in forming the tastes, etc., of his readers, then, of course, no ethical standard is needed, and there is nothing left for discussion.

Women in Public Life.

English society is generally supposed to be more conservative and less democratic than American society, and yet there is some reason to suppose that the very reverse is the case. One evidence of this is the willingness of English voters to elect women to public positions. Under the English School Act of 1870 the election of school boards occurs every third year, and at every triennial election of the London School Board during the quarter of a century a considerable proportion of the members have been women. Since the establishment of the County Council System, within the past few years, women have been elected members of these bodies, and a recent cable despatch announces that the Marchioness of Londonderry and the Countess of Warwick have just been elected members of the still more recently established point councils. At the last general election Miss Helen Taylor, who had served for many years on the London School Board, was nominated by the workingmen as their candidate in Chelsea. Her candidature was declared to be illegal, but at the present rate of progress it may not require many years to open the door of the House of Commons to women. So much can hardly be said of either Canada or the United States.

The Anti-Lynching Agitation.

The Anti-Lynching Association formed in England, as a result of the visit of Miss Ida Wells, not only seems to be gaining ground in Great Britain, through the adhesion of influential members, but there is reason to hope that its influence is making itself increasingly felt in the United States. The fact is that, notwithstanding the strong tendency of a great many of the citizens of the great Republic to assume, in their pride of country, that "whatever is, is right," so far as it is concerned, there is in its citizenship a large number of thoughtful and

high-minded men and women who need only to have their attention seriously directed to a great national iniquity of this kind to be aroused to combat it. Such an arousing of attention is, it is believed, one result of the movement originated by Miss Wells in England. Some powerful journals are entering into the crusade with energy. One of the most widely circulated and influential of the New York weeklies announces its intention of informing itself as well as it can with regard to all alleged acts of lawlessness, and keeping its readers informed. As a first result of its inquiry it finds that the papers reported four cases of lynching within the week last preceding its announcement, in one of which seven negroes were lynched for the killing of one white man, while the real murderer escaped. According to Miss Ida Wells, who claims to have definite information as to name and date in every case, there was an average, in the Southern States alone, during the last year, of four lynchings a week. In only one-third of these was the offence of rape—the standing, though insufficient, excuse for these brutalities—even charged. Now that the light is being thus turned upon these deeds of primitive savagery, in one of the foremost Christian nations of the closing nineteenth century, we cannot but believe that the beginning of the end has come.

Anti-toxine for Diphtheria.

Not only the medical profession but the world of newspaperdom seems to be going out after the new treatment for diphtheria. So pronounced is public opinion, so apparently unanswerable are the published statistics, that no little courage is required to insinuate even a doubt as to the genuineness and permanence of the remedy, or, in other words, the truth of the supposed scientific principle which underlies it. Yet there are, no doubt, many who are still sceptics in spite of themselves. The causes of the scepticism are various. First, and by no means least, is the instinctive revulsion, or repulsion, which seizes one at the very idea of having introduced into the circulation a foreign matter derived by so unpleasing—to use no stronger word—a process from one of the lower animals. Then there is the recollection of the ephemeral fame and quick failure of other remedies of a somewhat similar kind, which have been heralded from time to time with a great flourish of trumpets, only to be found, on fuller trial, delusive and worthless. The *Empire*, the other day, reminded us of two of these, to wit: the Brown-Sequard Elixir and the Koch lymph for the cure of consumption. But the fact is that the whole history of medical science is full of somewhat similar records. It is, of course, true that the failure of nineteen famous remedies does not prove, by any means, that the twentieth may not be found genuinely successful. But it does justify a reasonable scepticism and is a fair warning against jumping to conclusions. Then, as to the statistics, we are informed that while in Paris only sixty-five deaths from the disease were recorded for October and November, in the smaller city of New York, in the same period, 374 persons died from diphtheria. Apart from reliable information as to the whole number of cases treated in the two cities, the general sanitary conditions, the comparative skill in regard to other treatment, etc., the figures prove nothing. On the other hand, medical authorities, for some of these are on the side of the unbelievers, tell us that the ratio of fatal cases to the whole number under treatment is not larger in London hospitals without the Anti-toxine treatment than in those of Paris with it.

The Remoter Effects.

"What is needed," as the *Empire* well says, "is something which will slay the microbe while it nestles in the sewer or waste-pipe, or when it takes a flight through the air." There