

it has been and is being amply demonstrated that there are, to say the least, many marked exceptions among the young nobility of England. On the other hand, it is evident that the Upper House would soon be impoverished beyond hope by the desertion of its ablest men in order to make careers for themselves in the popular chamber. But when the hereditary Chamber is not only assailed by the Radicals, but deserted by prospective Lords, it is evident that serious changes of some kind in respect to it are near at hand.

If it be true, as reported, that of about one hundred candidates who wrote at the recent civil service examinations in Montreal, not less than one-third were personators, hired to represent members of the Ottawa civil service writing for promotion, the fact is humiliating in the extreme to every honest Canadian. Dismissal from the service, as well as the full penalty of the law, should be firmly visited upon the culprit in every case in which the attempted fraud can be proved. The man who could be deliberately guilty of such an attempt is unfit for any position of trust. Whether the fraudulent design is the result of want of moral principle, or merely of want of moral training, the guilty persons are quite unfit to be trusted in the public service. And what shall be said of the students and others who could, for a paltry money bribe, make themselves parties to such a transaction? Where was the high sense of honour which ought to be a religion in the breast of every college student? The crime of the personator is not a whit less gross and culpable than that of his employer, unless some allowance should be made for the fact that the one is the tempter, the other the tempted. But the latter must be held responsible for a higher intelligence and a better moral training, if the colleges are doing their proper work. A vigorous effort should be made to stamp out this tendency to dishonest trickery, before it saps the foundations of the national character, and makes the name Canadian a by-word. We can hardly blame foreigners if they take members of the civil service and students of colleges as at least fair representatives of the best types of Canadian character. We are glad to believe that those implicated in this case are very far from being such.

Is it the legitimate function of the newspaper simply to cater to the tastes of the majority of its readers, supplying what is found, by the crucial test of the subscription list, to be in largest demand, or has it a responsibility in the matter of educating and elevating the popular taste? The reply to such a question should be easy. It may be perfectly allowable for the purveyor of journalistic literature to meet to the best of his ability the popular demand, so long as in supplying that demand he is not called on to furnish anything hurtful to

mind or character. But it cannot be morally lawful for the journalist, any more than for any other citizen, to furnish for gain any commodity that is pernicious in its effects. The question is pressed upon our attention just now by the receipt of a circular from a Committee of "Baltimore Yearly Meeting of Friends," containing a report of the doings of this committee during the last year, in the interests of a purer literature for the home, which is the special object for which the committee exists. There is good reason to hope that a gradual change for the better is taking place in the leading journals of both the United States and Canada, though when we remember that most of the great dailies, on both sides of the line, will still give columns to an account of a brutal prize fight, it is obvious that there is yet too much room for improvement. The object of this influential committee of lady Friends is a most worthy one, and we wish them great success in their efforts to induce the journalists to throw aside "advertisements which point to gilded crime, details of most unholy acts, personal and pictorial notices which are incentives to the violation of the higher law" and to give their space to better things, thus producing a "pure, unadorned sheet for every home." The influence of such journals in forming the character of the people is incalculable, and the responsibility of those who produce them correspondingly great.

The new leaders of British Liberalism are no doubt politically wise in determining to separate their one-man-one-vote measure from their registration and simultaneous-polling bills. Both the latter reforms have so much to recommend them, and are open to so little objection on general principles, that the Opposition, especially the Liberal-Unionists, will probably hesitate to give them a very determined opposition. To so oppose them would be but to play into the hands of the Government, by giving them an additional grievance to carry before the national tribunal. The same consideration can scarcely fail to have a good deal of weight with the Lords also. On the other hand, the direct abolition of plural voting, however just in itself, is so closely connected with the other and equally necessary reform known in political parlance as the "one-vote-one-value" measure, that the attempt to accomplish the one would be sure to lead to the introduction of the other. It is not easy to see how any honest Liberal could support the one and refuse to support the other. If it is contrary to the spirit of modern popular self-government that one citizen should have several votes while his neighbor has only one, simply because the former happens to have property in several constituencies, while the other has none save in the one place, it is equally contrary to that spirit that a few thousand citizens in one place

should have the same influence in parliament as twice or four times their number in another. Of course the simultaneous polling, if adopted, will have the effect of reducing the plural voting to the minimum, even should the one-man-one-vote bill fail to be carried through. But it seems none the less true that it would redound to the honour of the Government and its party, if they would resolve to do the right regardless of consequences, and place side by side with the last named bill, one for a fair and, so far as practicable, equal re-distribution of the constituencies.

Mr. Charlton is again to the fore with his bills for promoting public morality in different directions. With that designed to enforce a better observance of the Sabbath we may deal hereafter, when we have learned its exact provisions, and the grounds upon which their passage is advocated. While we have strong convictions with regard to the value and necessity of a hebdomadal rest-day, as a means of promoting the physical and social, as well as the moral, well-being of the nation, we are quite unable to regard it as any part of the duty of the State to enforce the observance of such a day on religious grounds. But it has always seemed to us a pity and a shame that either artists and their patrons, or churches of any denomination, should claim exemption from the operation of a law designed to prevent the vice of gambling, or the formation of the gambling habit. True art should be the handmaid of a lofty morality and should in its own sphere, as the Church in its, aim at helping in the formation of the highest types of individual and national character. They dishonour themselves, or rather they are dishonoured by their representatives, when they claim permission to do that which is forbidden to others. We, therefore, earnestly hope for Mr. Charlton's success in his renewed effort to have these most indefensible exceptions to the application of a good law done away with, and this standing reproach wiped away from these two classes of citizens. No end can sanctify a wrong means, either in art or in religion.

It is a hackneyed saying, often uttered as if it were a truism, that men cannot be made moral by Act of Parliament. As we have more than once had occasion to point out, if the saw were indeed a self-evident or demonstrable truth, the occupation of parliaments would be to a large extent gone, for much of their time is spent in enacting laws designed to make men moral, or to deter them from the commission of immoral acts, which amounts to exactly the same thing. Not only so, but parliaments find it necessary to pass very stringent laws to promote morality among their own members, as witness the Canadian Act for preserving the Independence of Parliament. It is, indeed, a sad reflection upon the