

The Week.

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, SOCIETY, AND LITERATURE.

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00. Subscriptions payable in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertion for a shorter period.

Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage pre paid, on terms following:—One year, 12s. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. Remittances by P. O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher.

All advertisements will be set up in such style as to insure THE WEEK's tasteful typographical appearance, and enhance the value of the advertising in its columns. No advertisement charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGHIER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto. C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

WE hope the declaration of a Collingwood farmer to the *Toronto Chronicle* of the *Mail* the other day is something more than idle chit-chat. The farmers of the country ought to be the aristocracy of the country, and they might be, if their young men after passing through school and college would go back to the farm instead of herding in towns and villages and overcrowding the professions. It is impossible that all the doctors of medicine and laws that are fledged every year can find sufficient employment to keep them going while travelling that road to eminence that they doubtless all deserve. In common with other callings, the medical and legal professions are subject to the laws of supply and demand; and as a result of general prosperity and of the spread of education, the supply of educated able men in these professions has for long outstripped the legitimate demand. Many of these, we have little doubt, would do much better in trade, and trade would be elevated through them. Any calling must be elevated by the spread of education and refinement among its practitioners, and by so much the country would gain. Farming, however, is a laborious life, and its pecuniary rewards are small; and any large diversion of people from city life to the farm must, we fear, overcrowd a business that would seem now to produce more than can find a ready market.

DR. MCGLYNN has blossomed, in the pages of the *North American Review*, into a full-blown Protestant. In an article in that magazine, entitled "The New Know-nothingism and the Old," he declares that the Roman Catholic Church in America is engaged in a vast political scheme to convert the Republic to its own uses; and, in support of this, he avers that in the West and North-west the Roman Catholic churches are being deliberately Germanised. "The ears of American boys," he says, "born of German parents, are boxed by the religious teacher in parochial schools in St. Louis for the heinous offence of speaking the common language of America—the English—and a clerical superintendent, to reproach an American boy of German parents for manliness and independence, can find no better words to do justice to his reprobation than to say, 'Du bist ein Amerikaner'—(You are an American!)" And he points out the significance of the establishment by the Church of separate schools in hostility to the public school system. With something similar to this we are pretty familiar in Canada; the encouraging of Separatism in national sentiment and in education is as un-Canadian as it is un-American, and should come to an end in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario as well as the Western and North-western States. But this was as true before Dr. McGlynn was excommunicated as it is to-day; yet he had not a word to say against the system till he had a personal quarrel with the Church.

WE are glad to believe with Mr. Goldwin Smith that the somewhat adverse looking results of the recent bye-elections in England indicate no gain to the Home Rule heresy. "The topic of Home Rule," the *Standard* points out, "is now worn threadbare; not indeed in the estimation of thinking men, but in the minds of such as are incapable of fixing their attention for any length of time on a single subject, and to whom change of thought is always a welcome relief. Ireland has formed the principal subject of exposition in all the political speeches which have been addressed to the people for the last twelve months; and it is not to be wondered at if it no longer makes the same impression as it did when it was comparatively fresh." This, indeed, is a phase of the danger which Mr. Goldwin Smith has several times dwelt upon, and which he refers to again to-day, in his letter elsewhere; political power has been transferred to hands unfit to wield it, to men whose minds, if they ever receive a clear idea of a great principle or a great duty, are too feeble to retain it for long; to whom a "hoary rhetorician" having talked himself into their confidence, notwithstanding the glaring unwisdom of his acts, is as a god, and a king that can do no wrong; and who would cheerfully surrender the destinies of their country in a perilous crisis to the guidance of the most erratic and untrustworthy Minister it ever had, because they have no wider horizon than their paltry parish interests, and the Minister is a good man. As though the ability to read the prayers in church, and to persuade first oneself and then other people that every side of a question is in turn the right one, argues an ability to

govern an empire and to transform successfully in a day, and on a mere benevolent whim, a Constitution that has taken thirty generations of wise and valiant men to build up. We are glad to know, we repeat, that this supreme act of folly is not likely to be done; the gods have not yet marked England for destruction by making the greater part of the nation mad. The apparent Gladstonian gains are accidental and temporary—relative, not absolute; the conservative forces have suffered, not from a more formidable attack, but from the supineness and lack of power incident to fighting under two flags. Unity is required from both Liberal and Tory Unionists. Most men cannot fight under an unaccustomed flag—in this case but a little while ago a hostile flag to one or the other camp—and a new emblem must be unfurled. What that should represent—what besides plainly shows the true value of the late pretended Gladstonian gains, is indicated by the fact that in all the recent bye-elections where a seat was fought on distinctively Tory lines, by a typical Tory candidate, the result was defeat, as at Coventry, or a reduced majority, as at Paddington; while whenever a Liberal-Unionist appeared on the scene, as at St. Ives, nobody durst oppose him; or, as at St. Austell, where a Gladstonian ventured to contest a strong Radical constituency against a Liberal-Unionist, the Liberal-Unionist immediately pulled down the previous Gladstonian majority.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Spectator* speaks with impressive force of a danger to which the British Constitution is exposed as a result of the Liberal advance of late years. Mr. Gladstone in his speech to his American sympathisers appeared to exult in the possibility of the Unionists being put in a minority of 80,000 votes at the next Election (instead of the majority, amounting to that number of votes, which gave them power at the last Election), which would enable him to carry his revolutionary proposals. But as the writer of the letter justly says, it is nothing less than terrifying and shocking that a great constitutional change such as that proposed should be dependent on the shifting of a bare majority from side to side. It is clear that with a nation so evenly divided no fundamental change ought to be made in its Constitution. A bare majority has a perfect moral right to keep things as they are—as the Unionists are doing—for there is evidently no overwhelming desire for change; but to justify a revolution such as that rashly proposed by Mr. Gladstone, very much more than a bare majority ought to be in its favour. There should exist such an universal consent to it, that the majority in its favour, while independent of parties, should be so great as to be absolutely overwhelming. "Hitherto," says the writer of the letter, "we have maintained our stability in two ways: by taking historical institutions for granted, and by keeping active political power in the hands of a class, the fundamental assumptions of whose members were identical, however important might be the practical differences among them. Neither of these safeguards any longer exists. Nothing is taken for granted, and there is no governing class. The Liberal leaders have taught their adherents to look upon the House of Lords as a contemptible assembly, existing only to be bullied and squeezed. The result is that that much despised thing, a paper Constitution, alterable only by something much bigger than a bare majority, would be a godsend. . . . A year or two ago Mr. Goldwin Smith warned us that our problem was to organise our democracy in this sense. The counsel has been greatly enforced by what has happened since." "Organise your democracy"—educate your masters—is the pressing thing to be done, while withstanding the onrush of revolution, gaining time by such assistance as the House of Lords can still afford. This is not inconsiderable, now the best of the Liberal leaders have rallied to the Conservative forces of the country; but all the strength of the nation will be required if it is not to be overturned by that return swing of the pendulum Mr. Gladstone so much desires. No country can continue to stand whose form of Government depends on so unstable a regulator as a pendulum.

A CONSPICUOUS and admirable characteristic of the Irish people is the purity of its women. No one can throw a shadow on this splendid fact, for which the Irish race deserves all honour; but to say, as the Irish and Mr. Gladstone are perpetually doing, that the Irish are otherwise also innocent is to claim too much. In a letter to the *Times* Mr. W. Ambrose shows, from official statistics, that while in England 71 per 10,000 persons are accused of indictable offences, the proportion in Ireland is 94 per 10,000, notwithstanding that in Ireland a great number of offences are dealt with summarily that in England are indictable. And another correspondent of the *Times*, who signs himself "Statistician," adds that in England and Wales, while 16,763 Irish men and women were committed out of 562,474 Irish inhabitants, only 134,750 English and Welsh persons were committed out of 25,974,000 inhabitants. The Commissioners of Prisons report that "The points which are most remarkable in the returns