

in evangelical fervour? Has there been any decrease in these items because of the godless institutions through which they passed? No, no decrease, but an increase in all of them. I now ask the readers of the JOURNAL to say whether a man who writes in such a strain and makes such statements is a reliable witness as to the effects of Parnell Home Rule on education in that country?

We are told that of the population of Ireland the Roman Catholics are the most self-reliant, the Episcopalians Protestants the least so, while the Presbyterians occupy an intermediate position. The writer, I doubt not, laughed in his sleeve as he penned this bit of information for the native greenhorns of Canada. *Judaus credat.* The only shadow of a ground for such a statement is in the fact that previous to 1886 one of the bodies above named was endowed by the State, another was partially endowed, while the third, that which is declared to be self-reliant, was not. Even that is hardly true when it is remembered that the College of Maynooth got as much from the State as all that the Regium Domini amounted to. Supposing, however, Maynooth were out of the question, there is another side to the case. Had the state emoluments been voluntarily renounced some three centuries ago, then the boast of self-reliance would have been something to be proud of, but such was not the case. Moreover, there are other aspects in which that noble trait of self-reliance may be viewed. The funds of the campaign in favor of the so-called national cause come largely from this side of the Atlantic. Is that characteristic of self-reliance? Is that in accord with a pure and lofty patriotism? The pockets of the sons and daughters of toil in the United States and elsewhere are depleted to enable men that pose as patriots to live in luxury, and to provide for moonlighters and assassins. While these words are being written a newspaper has come to hand showing that during the latter half of 1886, for every dollar of the kind referred to given to the poor misguided farmers that were evicted, sixteen dollars were given to maintain the members of parliament. I am not saying that it is wrong in members of parliament to take money for their services, but the less said about self-reliance the better. There is still another phase. We know of cities and communities on this side of the Atlantic that are all the time clamoring for state aid to build elevators, to construct docks and wharves, to deepen harbours and rivers and so on; while there are other cities that do these things for themselves in whole or in part, and so broaden out the channels of commerce. We need not ask which of these lines of action is the self-reliant one. There are contrasts such as these in Ireland. Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Waterford and Galway are examples of the one; Belfast is a conspicuous example of the other. Look at what they were 50 years ago, and consider what they are to-day. Those that had the start as to age, and had all natural advantages, have declined and are declining; that which was utterly insignificant, whose harbor was literally a mud bank, and whose surrounding coun-

try was the poorest, has overcome all obstacles, and is to-day a great port and a great manufacturing centre as well, Liverpool and Manchester combined. It is true one of the four divisions of Belfast returns a Home Ruler, but the self-reliant men of Belfast, the men that made Belfast what it is, are not in favor of Home Rule. They dread the result of it; they believe that were the Parnell party at the head of affairs the prosperity of the city would be doomed.

PHILOSOPHY IN UNDRRESS.

No. I.

"PHILOSOPHY in Undress!" Is that irony, or a brand new instance of the Hegelian "union of contradictories?" Is your philosopher ever divested of his official robes? Is he capable of speaking in language that may be "understood of the people," and of condescending to lay aside the uncouth jargon in which his soul delighteth?

Perhaps not, gentle reader (as dear old Elia would have said); perhaps the *ex cathedra* philosopher is as wedded to his barbaric terminology as the mathematician to his "tangents, co-tangents, co-secants, co-sines"—if we may adopt the pleasant jingle of our good old College song—or the chemist to his troop of verbal skeletons, Ca, Cl, Au, and the rest of the alphabet, or the physicist to his "mass" and "energy," his "kinematics" and "kinetics." But then we are not all philosophers, but only humble individuals interested in philosophy, and perhaps we may succeed where the masters would fail. We mean to try at any rate. One of our medical correspondents has suggested that the Royal College should "resolve to confer, and hereby does confer" upon itself the glory of being *facile princeps* in Anatomy; and we don't see why Queen's should not decide—and then, of course, the thing is done, for Queen's has a way of getting her own way, being a lady—that she will be distinguished for her philosophy in the future even more than in the past. We do not know whether the Royal has hitherto shown any special brilliancy in Anatomy—not that that is any objection, for her light will be all the more dazzling when it leaps from the surrounding blackness—but we do know that Queen's has turned out not only students of philosophy, but even authors and professors. Witness Dr. Jardine and the dear fellow who sits in the chair of Philosophy in the University of New Brunswick, and who is already known by his articles in the old world as well as the new. Well, to come back to our muttons. We think that a corner in the JOURNAL may as well be occupied with stray ideas about philosophy and books on philosophy as by anything else. True, there are students who hate the name of philosophy; but then there are students, and it may be the very same students, who hate the name of Mathematics, and Classics, and Physics; in fact they are men after Dr. Johnson's own heart—we mean the Big Dictionary man—they are "good haters." But we don't