

resemblance between Dominion and Provincial politics, and yet all the forces of governments in the one are brought to bear to help the party operating under the same name in the other during their elections.

We must all recognize that there is vast room for improvement. Are we, however, going to wait and gravitate back into better methods or shall we try and stimulate a movement for some immediate improvement? To me it seems we must start with the people. Let us try and create a reasonably decent atmosphere for public men. Altogether we seem to have been proceeding along wrong lines. It is useless to look to the Mother of Parliaments. The situation there in recent years has been none too good. Where then will we look?

The matter, I believe, is largely in the hands of the press. No one realizes more than I do that the press of this country—a commercial institution—has been doing great service, especially during the present war. Can we, however, say as positively that the press is doing what is possible on its part to assuage or mitigate the bitterness of party strife? Is there not ground for the view that our newspapers are prone rather to accept as inevitable this evil of our national life, to justify it and even in a measure to profit by it (and revel in it)? Is it necessary that the partisan zeal of a newspaper should overflow from its editorial columns into all its pages? Is it desirable that reports of proceedings in parliament, or of any sort of gathering at which politics come up, by chance or design, should be blacksmithed into a supposed consistency with the party policy espoused by the newspaper? Is it not true that the reporter frequently maintains, as he writes, a running fire of comment and criticism, friendly or adverse, as occasion may require, of the statements he is crediting to the man who is for the moment at his mercy, so that the reader receives frequently, not so much a careful synopsis of the views expressed by this or that public man on that or this public question, as a curiously garbled version in which looms large the personality of the editor as interpreted by his representative?

Of course the reporter in such matters is blameless, and the editor must not be too severely condemned; it is difficult for individual institutions or men to break away from what is the common practice, though fortunately, here and there vigorous attempts are being made in the right direction. Is there not, however, much to be said for the development of a newspaper practice which would permit the reader to feel reasonably sure that in any respectable journal which deals with public affairs he will find that, though its editorial page may be frankly partisan, statements as to matters of fact are clear of partisan bias, and not to be distinguished in their general character from those found in a journal attached to the opposite political party? In short, would it not be a public advantage if our