

reports published up to date may be accepted as reliable, the Monarchy has been abolished and a Republic proclaimed with very little tumult and no conflict. The people who can peacefully effect such a revolution must be either far advanced in the knowledge and use of constitutional methods, or singularly apathetic in political matters. The case, so far as at present known, seems to be one in which the people have been led to depose a mild and somewhat popular Emperor, in order to forestall coming events and prevent the accession of an unpopular successor. There can be little doubt, we suppose, that the change, if not a direct outgrowth of the recent abolition of slavery, is, at least, closely connected with that event. While the action of the Government in emancipating the slaves not only commanded the approval of the civilized world, but was probably endorsed by the sentiment of a majority of the Brazilians themselves, it is quite probable that the mode in which the change was brought about may not have been very wise or statesmanlike. Complaint is made that the Government gave the land-owners insufficient time in which to adapt themselves to the new order of things, and that, as a consequence of their inability to procure free labour, they, in many cases, lost their crops of the past season, and were impoverished in consequence. The refusal of the Government to even consider the question of indemnification no doubt more deeply embittered the former slave-holders, and led them to join the Republican ranks. This may seem, in itself, an illogical sequence, but it is, in part, explained by the statement that the Crown Princess, Dom Pedro's heir-apparent, took credit for having been the chief agent in bringing about the sudden manumission. Señor Castelar, whose opinion is worth something on such a point, is said to scout the idea that the emancipation had anything to do with the revolution, since, he asserts, the promoters of the one were the chief agents in effecting the other. As to the future, it is quite too soon to attempt any broad generalizations, or even to assume the stability of the new form of government. It is probable, however, that another has been added permanently, whether for good or for ill, to the list of American republics.

THE movement in Central America above referred to is of a different, and perhaps more auspicious, or at least less ambiguous, kind. Every one is more or less familiar with the history of the frequent quarrels which have marked and marred the history of the petty republics of Central America. It is pleasing to learn that a movement is now in progress for the federation of all these feeble but belligerent bodies under one central authority. The Central American Diet, a body composed of delegates from the different States, has been sitting at San Salvador for the purpose of devising means to bring about a community of mercantile and political interests between the republics. Considerable progress seems to have been made. A plan submitted by Señor Lainfiesta, the delegate from Guatemala, met with the hearty approval of the other delegates. The scheme proposed is, as sketched by the New York *Examiner*, "a unification of Central America in the eyes of the outside world," under the name of "The Republic of Central America." The headship of the government will be vested in a president, whose term of office shall continue for one year, and who will be selected in successive years from the five contracting republics in turn; the order of succession to be determined by lot. Each republic will send to the seat of government one representative. The whole number will constitute the president's council. The duties and powers of the executive will be essentially those of the United States system, the chief difference being that his appointments must gain the consent of the Council, whereas with the United States the appointments are ratified by the Senate. That difference, it will be observed, goes a good way in the direction of responsible government, the Council referred to being representative. The five republics will be given unrestricted freedom in all matters relating to their individual welfare, questions relating to foreign affairs alone being adjusted by the president of the greater republic. There will be freedom of trade and navigation between the States. Señor Lainfiesta does not, however, propose that the amalgamating process shall stop with the confederation thus outlined. He looks forward to a "federal," or, as we should say, legislative, union, as the final goal. So much is this a part of the scheme that the Diet has provided in the provisional plan for a constituent assembly, to meet in 1890, and sooner if possible, whose duty it shall be to draft a constitution and set up a federal government. Should even the first of these statesman-like proposals be carried into effect, it can scarcely

fail to inaugurate an era of prosperity and peaceful progress among these hitherto turbulent communities.

THE question of the federation of the Australian colonies has been brought once more to the surface by the proposal of Sir Henry Parkes, Premier of New South Wales, that a convention of delegates from the different colonies be called to consider the matter. The prospects of success for the movement are, perhaps, better than ever before, because the motives which make for union are becoming more imperative with the lapse of time. The necessity for demolishing the tariff barriers which the colonies, with the exception of New South Wales, have erected against each other; the desirability of some uniform militia system, with provision for centralization of authority for defensive purposes; and the great advantages to intercolonial trade that would accrue from harmony of purpose and action in the construction and management of railways are among the economical considerations which render a federal union almost a *sine qua non* to Australian growth and greatness. There must be, moreover, in the case of contiguous colonies whose populations are of the same Anglo-Saxon stock, with the same institutions, traditions and modes of thought, very strong impulses of a sentimental character tending towards union. On the other hand, very serious difficulties, both practical and theoretical, will have to be overcome before the end is attained. Where colonists have lived for a length of time as distinct communities, pursuing selfish and divergent policies, the task of harmonizing conflicting views and interests, to such an extent as to make even a federal union possible, is no slight one. It is well known, too, that there are amongst the Australians sharp differences of opinion as to the ultimate destiny of the country. It is possible, however, that these questions may not be seriously involved in the present proposal. Whether Imperial Federation, Independence, or the perpetuation of the Colonial system is regarded as the goal to be kept in view, all may perhaps agree that federation is a desirable first step. The progress of the movement will be watched with interest from all parts of the Empire, and Canadians will not be the least earnest in wishing for their fellow-colonists an harmonious arrangement and a prosperous issue.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

WE are glad to find that our comments on the recent appointments to the Chairs of Philosophy in the University of Toronto have received somewhat more of attention than is generally accorded to criticisms of that kind. We want, in particular, to draw attention to the letter of a correspondent which appeared in the last number of *THE WEEK*. We are pleased to see that our correspondent expresses a general agreement with our own remarks; and we, on our part, can sympathize largely with his sentiments. At the same time we are not sure that we can go the whole way with our correspondent, and this is a matter of so great public importance that we have no hesitancy in returning to the subject.

Two things we must premise, both of which, however, were noted in our previous article. One is, that we have no kind of interest or prejudice in this question. We are simply desirous that the best possible appointments should be made to the professorial chairs in our universities, and that no difficulties should be thrown in the way of those who have the responsibility of making such appointments. The second thing we should hardly have referred to, but for the fact that our correspondent emphasizes his own opinion "that Mr. Hume's being a Canadian should not militate against his appointment." We are not only in agreement on this point with our correspondent: we have insisted that, other things being equal, a Canadian ought to be preferred. There is no reason whatever for supposing that the ministers did not accept this principle. It is, therefore, totally unnecessary to insist upon it.

But we are now coming to something more serious. Our correspondent says, "We held, second, that philosophy should be taught for its own sake, and not because it falls in more or less readily with this or that system of theology. Now it is notorious that a good deal of the opposition to Mr. Hume came from theological professors who wished a philosophy taught that would readily adapt itself to their theological principles." This is a very serious accusation, and it certainly should not be made unless it can be sustained by "infallible proof." Indeed, we can hardly bring ourselves to accept the statement in all its length and breadth.

At the same time we cannot conceal our own opinion that theological considerations are not to be disregarded. It is quite true that the University of Toronto is a secular institution, and that no religious or theological qualifications are required in those who are candidates for any teaching office. But he must also remember that this is a Christian country. There is a sense, we are told, in which Christianity is the law of the land. And we doubt whether any Minister could stand who should appoint an avowed atheist even to a professorship of Natural Science. Is it then a matter absolutely unimportant whether the professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy is a Christian, or a theist or an atheist?

We know absolutely nothing of the religious opinions of the two gentlemen who have been appointed to the two chairs. We are merely dealing with the argument and position of a respected correspondent, as that position is described by himself. We are doing so because it appears that he is the representative of many others who share his opinions, and we believe that we are expressing the sentiment of an overwhelming majority in this Province when we say that the appointment of an infidel professor of philosophy would be regarded by the public as an unpardonable outrage.

Our correspondent will probably declare that it was very far from his meaning that no regard should be paid to the religious opinions of a candidate. But he will probably admit that his language naturally bore this meaning. We need hardly add that we are animated by no sectarian bias in offering these remarks. We wish no more than our correspondent that a theological test should be applied to the candidate for any professorship; but this is quite compatible with an unwillingness to appoint anyone to a post of such importance as that of a teacher of the sciences of knowledge and of duty who might use his position for the purpose of overthrowing the foundations of Christianity or even of Theism.

We do not propose to argue with our correspondent the orthodoxy of the late Professor Young or the heterodoxy of President McCosh. Dr. Young is but little known to the general public, however highly he may have been valued by his own pupils. When his lectures are given to the world we feel perfectly certain that they will add to his reputation. Dr. McCosh, however, is already a man of world-wide fame. His writings would do discredit to no living author; and, when we hear his philosophical system spoken of as having a dogmatic basis, we wonder whether such a notion is derived from what he has written.

On one point we are constrained to say that we feel very deeply the force of what our correspondent has urged, when he speaks of "the vice inherent in a system of political appointments." He says it is "written on the face of the appointments that they were made to escape the difficulty of offending the friends of either candidate;" and he adds, "That is surely not a defensible principle of appointing." This is putting the matter very mildly. It would be a monstrous thing, if it were true, that ministers should be coerced by political considerations into appointing to a professorship a candidate whom they thought unworthy of the office.

But we fear that our correspondent here has given expression rather to the outcome of his own disappointment and surprise than proceeded upon any sure ground of knowledge. We should be slow to believe that the Attorney-General or the Minister of Education had done anything to incur so grievous a reproach.

At the same time, it is clear that our correspondent has hit a blot in our Provincial University. We do not believe that there are many men who would be thought worthy to govern this province, who would appoint unfit persons to office merely because they belonged to their own political party; but it is quite possible and very far from unlikely that persons in authority should be unconsciously biassed, and even consciously influenced, by such considerations. But what is the remedy? Really we should say that, in such a case, it would almost be better to pass a "self-denying ordinance" that all the professors should be chosen from some locality outside the Dominion, where party politics could not be taken into consideration; but we fear that such a "desperate remedy" would find little favour with the objectors on the present occasion. What, then, is to be done? In the denominational universities of the Province—Queen's, Trinity, and Victoria—the professors are chosen by the governing bodies. Is there any chance of such a system being adopted for the University of Toronto? Is it desirable that it should be adopted? We hesitate to answer.