

There is, however, an English flavor in the number as a whole, very pronounced and not to be commended; a considerable portion of the contents look to the foreign market, as is naturally to be expected, perhaps, with an assistant English editor. At present all our three leading magazines occasionally issue a number that reads as if some sheets of the *Cornhill* or *Macmillan's* had got bound up by mistake with the product. It is evident already that the two popular audiences to which our publishers appeal are by no means homogeneous.

When one sees how legitimate the *Nation's* comment is and how utterly unwarranted the *Week's* remark, one is tempted to ask what can have stirred up the wrath of our English contemporary in Toronto. It is not necessary to go back more than a few months to find the explanation. Mr. Goldwin Smith, moved by an insane hatred of the Home Rule Irish party, regards as "Fenian" in its sympathies every journal which takes the part of the Nationalists, even to the extent of fair comment on the bad features of Dublin Castle administration. Mr. Godkin, editor of the *New York Nation*, on account of his sensible views of Irish affairs has been repeatedly abused by Mr. Smith and his organ, the *Week*. Mr. Godkin wrote to Mr. Smith privately, calling attention to misstatements about him in the *Bystander* papers and asking a correction. Failing to get this, he wrote to the *New York Tribune* a full account of the whole affair. The above is Mr. Goldwin Smith's way of getting even with a man who will not submit to be wronged. The *Nation*, I need hardly say, has for twenty years ranked amongst the best weekly journals in the world, and splenetic remarks by the *Week* are not likely to injure it.

In the same issue of the last-named paper occurs the following suggestive sentences. Speaking of the recently published memoirs of John Wilson Croker, former editor of the *London Quarterly Review*, the *Week* says:—

Croker has been identified in the imagination of most people with the "Rigby" of Disraeli's "Coningsby." It now appears that Disraeli had a personal grudge against Croker. His mode of assailing the object of his hatred was that which he frequently adopted, and of which Mrs. Manley of unsavory fame had set him the example. He libelled Croker under the cover of fiction, giving real traits enough to identify the person libelled as effectually as if the name had been printed, but mixing with them calumnies in the fabrication of which he used the boundless license of the novelist.

Mr. Goldwin Smith has himself been identified in the imagination of most people with one of Disraeli's characters, the Oxford professor in "Lothair," who is described as "quite a young man, of advanced opinions on all subjects, religious, social, and political;" as "clever, extremely well-informed, so far as books can make a man knowing, but unable to profit even by that limited experience of life from a restless vanity and overflowing conceit which prevented him from ever observing or thinking of anything but himself;" as "gifted with a great command of words, which took the form of endless exposition, varied by sarcasm and passages of ornate jargon;" as "the last person one would have expected to recognize in an Oxford professor;" as one "who was not satisfied with his home career, and, like many men of his order of mind, had dreams of wild vanity which the new world, they think, can alone realise," as "a social parasite" who finding himself on one occasion unexpectedly about to dine with a peer, was content to dazzle and amuse him instead of indulging in his usual invectives against peers and princes.

Mr. Goldwin Smith seems to think that Croker did himself a wrong in persistently refusing to take any notice of the attacks made on him by Disraeli and others. It may fairly be questioned whether Mr. Smith did not do himself an injury by trying "to brand the falsehood" of which he complained, and which he inconsistently described as "the stingless insult of a coward." Whatever endurance the "social parasite" has in the public memory is due more to Mr. Smith's putting the cap on than to Disraeli's making it for him, and the victim has foolishly kept the "insult" alive by his malignant and repeated attacks on his torturer while he was alive and on his memory since his death. An "insult" which has rankled for fifteen years with ever increasing virulence, whatever else it may be, cannot be described as "stingless." Disraeli was a Jew by descent, and, whether correct or not, the popular impression is that Mr. Smith's absurd and persistent attacks on the Jews and his immoral defence of their European persecutors are the result of his intense antipathy towards his Jewish

tormentor, who never, however, took the slightest notice of him except to limn his portrait as above, in "Lothair."

The Minister of Education has done wisely in making an earnest effort to solve the University problem in Ontario by bringing into harmony interests which have hitherto been rather antagonistic to each other. That the time has come for making such an effort is proved by the fact that the heads of Colleges were willing to meet with him in conference, and assist in framing a plan of consolidation, co-operation, or confederation, whichever term most correctly describes the lately promulgated scheme. On its underlying principle and important details I may have more to say hereafter, but even at this stage it is manifest that if the friends of such denominational institutions as are located in Toronto, or can be removed hither, are wise, they will fall in with the project and assist in making it a success. The plan may not be the best in theory, but it is probably the best attainable, and a few years' experience of its working would probably show how it could be greatly improved.

I have not heard of the newly enfranchised women voting in many municipalities at the late elections, but in some towns they did turn out in considerable numbers. In Fergus and Belleville, if not in other places, they decided the election of mayor, the issue in each case being largely a temperance one. For this result the liquor sellers had themselves to blame. By their active support of one candidate they roused the temperance organizations against him, and secured his defeat. If the temperance societies of Toronto will during the current year ascertain what women will be able to vote at the next election, and take steps to have their votes polled, I have no doubt of their being able to elect a thorough-going temperance man in spite of all opposition. The work cannot be commenced too soon, and I throw out this suggestion now for the benefit of Mr. Withrow, or any other temperance man who has the mayoralty in view.

The unanimous decision of the Supreme Court that the McCarthy Act is, in respect of all but wholesale and vessel licenses, invalid helps to simplify the situation. The choice must now be between the Scott Act and the Crooks Act, and the temperance people should be just as zealous in securing improvements in the latter as they are in opposing amendments calculated to make the former less effective. The McCarthy Act served one good purpose during its brief existence. It was in several respects a distinct advance on the Crooks Act, and this fact enabled the temperance people last session of the Ontario Legislature to secure some amendments to our Provincial license law which they would otherwise have been able to carry. The contention that the decision of the Supreme Court makes uncertain the validity of the Scott Act is absurd. The latter draws its authority from a judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and no decision of the Supreme Court of the Dominion can affect it.

Mr. Blake's late speech in Shaftesbury Hall makes one regret that the people of Toronto have so few opportunities of hearing such expositions of political science. The "Parliament-out-of-session" speeches are a feature of English politics, and they should be of our own. If the new departure inaugurated by the Young Liberal Club is only persisted in we may hereafter be able to listen to our best political speakers without attending Parliament, or wasting time at a banquet, or taking part in an exciting election contest. The meeting in Shaftesbury Hall was worthy of the orator of the evening. It was enthusiastic, intelligent, and most orderly. If the Young Conservatives are wise they will provide for the public a similar entertainment as soon as possible. A marked feature of the evening was the presence of a large number of women who appeared to thoroughly enjoy the speech, and sat it out though it took over two hours in delivering. There is no reason why women should hold aloof from politics, which Mr. Blake well designated the highest occupation of every citizen. There is every reason why they should take an active interest in matters of government, and every political meeting would be the better for their presence, which has a wonderfully civilizing effect. The Young Liberals made a mistake, however, in reserving any place for them. The reserved space was insufficient and there was more embarrassment caused than there would have been if the women had been allowed to choose their seats anywhere in the Hall.