

As Imperial Federation would be a serious step, it is well that we are enabled in some measure to forecast its results by an experiment on a smaller scale. The language and bearing of our High Commissioners are always showing us what that of Canadian delegates domesticated in London society would be. Evidently we might as well consign our interests at once to the hands of the Lord Chamberlain or the First Lord in Waiting; indeed these functionaries might perhaps be more trustworthy and independent, inasmuch as they would be at ease in their own element, and would not be intoxicated by breathing their native air. Sir Charles Tupper has been earnestly assuring British society that no constituency in Canada would think of electing to Parliament a man who dared to cherish the seditious hope of Canadian nationality. He has, with equal earnestness, disclaimed on behalf of the Canadian Protectionists, any intention of seeking protection against British goods, vowing that it is only against American goods that protection is desired, and insinuating that the freer admission of British goods was in fact the main object of the Tariff. These statements and many other statements like these the British believe: perhaps in the moment of social rapture the speaker believes them himself; but we may be forgiven for deeming the Canadian press and the telegraph more faithful exponents of Canadian sentiment than any colonial member of a London club. It is proposed that Sir Charles Tupper should enter public life in England and lead the Tory Party. His oratory would be a great improvement in point of vigour on any of the present Tory speakers, though his style is a little full-bodied and might require tempering to the tastes of the House of Commons. But is not the suggestion pregnant with a warning that Canada may possibly be better governed when the highest aspirations of her public men centre in their own country?

WHAT is the High Commissioner? Is he an ambassador from Canada to England? If he is, we would humbly suggest that he should observe the rules of his office, and propose nothing without the authority of the Government and the community which he represents. He is now, of his own motion, but with the credentials of Canada in his hand, advising the British Government to expend a million annually in the deportation of its surplus population to our shores. It would be the pauperism and the incapacity that we should receive: England does not want to be relieved of valuable labour, nor would the British Parliament be so foolish as to spend a great sum of money for that purpose. At all events, before such a scheme is settled between Sir Charles Tupper and the Poor Law Board at Westminster, let the people of Canada be heard. We can hardly afford to allow a gentleman on the other side to carry this country in his pocket.

If no site can be found for the new Parliament Buildings except the Queen's Park we must bow to necessity; but the necessity is most unwelcome. The Park is being gradually devoured, and this new encroachment will eat deeply into what is left. Only one open space or ground for recreation has Toronto now left—the Horticultural Gardens. No other playground have our boys. They cannot go out by rail for ball or lacrosse at High Park. A playground for the boys of a city is more than a source of pleasure and health; it is almost a moral necessity. Amusement boys will have, and if they have no playground to afford it them, they will find it in worse ways. Whether the welfare of our rising generation in Toronto or the better accommodation of our Provincial Legislators is the more important object it would be impious to inquire. Why could not the site of Upper Canada College be taken, and Upper Canada College, if it is not to be abolished, moved to the neighbourhood of the University, where land is still to be had? If University Confederation goes into effect, Trinity College will move, and its site and buildings will become disposable and might be purchased for Upper Canada College. That the site in the Park is obtained for nothing may seem a great consideration now, but a not remote posterity will probably wish that an act of improvident parsimony could be rescinded, though it were at double the cost.

A MEETING, we learn from the *London Times*, was held at the War Office on the 3rd instant, and attended on one side by the Secretaries of State for War and the Colonies and the Commander-in-Chief, on the other side by the representatives of colonies, the object of which was "to obtain information as to the Colonial Contingents whose services have been offered to Her Majesty's Government, and to discuss the conditions under which they should be employed in the autumn operations in the Soudan." "Sir Charles Tupper, V.C.M.G.," proceeds the announcement, "who was unable to be present on the 3rd, has subsequently had an interview with the Secretary of State for War and His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge." Surely malingering is sorry work. Let those who love England here, show it by telling the honest truth.

MR. DAVIN on St. Patrick's Day at Montreal pointed to a certain English writer as intensely hostile to all Irishmen. It happened, curiously enough, that the very writer to whom he referred was, in connection with the same anniversary, the invited guest of a large gathering of Irishmen, and by them, when called upon to address them, was received not only as a friend but with a cordiality which in the opinion of one reporter deserved the name of an ovation. Nor did the Irishmen there assembled belong to an element of the Irish population unworthy to represent Erin; but on the contrary to that element in which a very large proportion of the vigour, the intelligence, the industrial energy resides, and which has produced almost all the illustrious men. Where Ireland is Protestant she is prosperous, she is contented, she is friendly to England and to Englishmen, she is loyal to the Union. This is the Irish question in a sentence. We call the attention of His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto and all other candid investigators of the problem to this fact, and to the inference which it appears to suggest. The government, laws and tribunals of Ulster, are the same as those of the rest of Ireland, and the administrative system of Dublin Castle, to which so malign an influence has been ascribed, is common to the whole island. To complete the basis for an induction, the discontented element and that hostile to the British connection, which ascribes all its weaknesses and all its misfortunes to the hateful institutions of Great Britain, has been transplanted on a large scale to this side of the Atlantic, where there is nothing British to blight its political virtues or to trammel its political progress, and the result of its emancipated development is Tammany. When will people learn that there are two Irelands? Nor is this all. Mr. Davin, with generous fervour, and apparently with the full assent of his audience, denounced the acts of the dynamiters as utterly alien to the Irish cause. Does he, and do those who applaud him, extend the condemnation to Land League outrage and assassination, to the butchery of men in cold blood before the eyes of their wives or mothers, and to the cruel maiming of helpless cattle? If they do they will find themselves at variance in sentiment with a very large number even of those Irish with whom politically they appear to be at one. They will find in short that the phrases, "Ireland," "Irish," "the Irish Cause," are used when "Parnellite" or "Fenian" is the proper term, and that a man may be set down as an enemy to Ireland when he is an enemy to nothing but Disunionist conspiracy and murder. They may perhaps be led on to the conclusion that it is possible for a man to have sympathetically studied Irish history and yet with perfect consistency to be opposed to the plots of a set of selfish demagogues, the foulness of whose language betrays the lowness of their natures, and who, with their train of assassins, are labouring to bring on a conflict between the two islands, and at the same time between the two sections of Ireland itself, which could end only in a fresh revolution of the whole cycle of Irish woes.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY brings up again the controversy as to the character of the Irish Saint's religion. To the historian who requires substantial evidence the figure of St. Patrick is almost mythical, and he leaves it to the pious care of the hagiologist with whom the religious tendency of a fact is an assurance of its authenticity. But history may with certainty pronounce that the church to which the Saint belonged, and which was a branch of Celtic Britain, can neither have been Roman Catholic nor Protestant. Protestant it cannot have been, since the liberty of private judgment, the cardinal tenet of Protestantism, was in those days unborn; of an open Bible there was just as little thought; and the doctrine of Justification by Faith had certainly not been developed as it was by the leaders of the Reformation in antagonism to Indulgences and Good Works. Roman Catholic it cannot have been since it three times came into decisive collision with Rome: once when in its Celtic fastness, amidst the hills of Wales, it rejected the authority and repelled the overtures of the Roman missionary, Augustine; a second time when the two Churches, contending for the possession of Northumbria, confronted each other at the Synod of Whitby in the persons of the Scoto-Irish Colman and Wilfrid, the great champion of Rome; a third time when the Pope granted Ireland to Henry II. on condition of his reducing to the Roman model and obedience the irregular and schismatical native church. Satisfied with these proofs of antagonism history need hardly involve herself in labyrinthine controversies about the reckoning of Easter, the tonsure, the relations of Bishops to Abbots, or the rule of the Culdees. It is enough that in points of discipline and ritual there were differences which to primitive minds seemed vital. The Ecclesiologist, deducing sacred institutions from the ordinances of Heaven, is apt to overlook the earthly medium in which they have been developed. The medium in which the Latin Church was developed was the Roman Empire, with its regular government, laws and civilization, with its great cities and its urban life, with its municipalities and confraternities, with its august capital and autocratic head. The