Custom House made vacant for him by the removal of his predecessor. Corruption, embodied in Tammany, responds by a peal of defiance, and nominates at the Democratic Convention for the State of New York, almost by acclamation, Mr. Hill, the proclaimed favourite of all the enemies of reform. The Republicans, on the other hand, schooled by adversity, appear to have made very good nominations. To them will, no doubt, be transferred the support of the Independents or "Mugwumps," who, in voting for Cleveland, voted not for the Democratic candidate but for Reform. The fact is that the President and the Mugwumps alike are now fairly outside party. The President is a National President, appealing to all who desire purity of administration and hated by none so much as by the opponents of reform in the party by which he was elected. The Mugwumps still, we suppose, profess to be Republicans in spite of all the abuse and kicks which they have received from the orthodox representatives of that party; but though they may vote the Republican ticket when they think it the best they will never get back permanently into the Republican lines. Nor does it seem possible that the respectable Conservatives who form one wing of the Democratic Party should continue to act with so strange a confederate as Tammany against that which every respectable citizen must desire. The artificial combination which owed its origin to Slavery, in support of which a wealthy class was united with the Irishry, can hardly last much longer now that Slavery is dead and gone. The dissolution of the Party system in the United States seems fairly to have set in. Purity and Corruption may divide the nation, but they are not Parties, nor do they at all coincide with the existing party lines. The interest at all events now centres not in a battle of parties but in a battle of the brave and upright chief of the nation with the forces of corruption. On one side Hercules, the Deliverer, grasps his club; on the other the mighty monster opens its foul maw. May the arm of the Deliverer be strong!

VERY notable are the "labour planks" in the platform of the Republican Party in the State of New York to which our Washington correspondent called attention. The platform, in effect, promises the "workingman" (1) that the employer shall not be allowed to reject men from his employment on account of connection with Trade Unions; in other words, that he shall be compelled to employ Unionists even though he may deem it ruinous to his trade; (2) that in cities the State shall see that the artisan has a comfortable and healthy dwelling; (3) that importation of labour shall be more strictly prohibited; (4) that the products of convict labour shall be entirely excluded from the market; (5) that taxation shall be "equalized," that is, we presume, that it shall be regulated on more socialistic principles than at present. These propositions are the more remarkable as they emanate from the Party to which still belongs the greater part of the wealth, intelligence and public morality of the nation. They point—the second of them especially—to the advent of a proletariat, which will look to the State for bread, and perhaps in course of time learn, like the Roman proletariat, to subsist not by industry but by the use of its vote. A strange and sad renunciation of the faith in liberty and selfhelp which has hitherto specially characterized Americans! So rapidly have the United States run through the course of social and economic change which it has taken the old world ten centuries to traverse. We are less surprised to find, as we do, Mr. Chamberlain in England promulgating a policy identical in principle with that of the New York Republican platform. It is doubtful, however, in both cases, but especially in the case of the United States, how far the supposed needs are real, and even how far the proposals are the spontaneous demands of the workingclass. Party must have planks wherewith to build its platforms, demagogism must have material for its trade; and while party strives to outbid party and demagogue to outstrip demagogue in the race, they may not only teach the industrial class to become a proletariat, but in the end bring on

The result of the French elections has corresponded to our anticipations in all respects. In the first place, not one of the Parties has obtained a majority sufficient to form the basis of a stable government; so that, if the Party system is to be retained, France will enter on another, and apparently interminable, course of cabal, intrigue, parliamentary anarchy, shifting combinations and ephemeral Ministries. In the second place, there has been a strong re-action, and the Monarchists, or, at least, the opponents of Revolution, have gained largely. For this different causes are assigned; but we are persuaded that the principal cause is the revulsion produced by the violent attacks of the revolutionists on the national religion. It is singular that these men, to whom the annals of the First Revolution are a political bible, which they con day and night, should never have laid to heart the lesson which its failure so signally teaches

and learned the fatal folly of an attempt to act in defiance of the fundamental beliefs of the people. Their blindness is the more surprising because the same Party in Belgium had just committed the same error and met, in consequence, with a disastrous overthrow. The Republican proper, or Opportunist, section, on which the present Ministry rests, appears to have suffered most, and it would seem that the Brisson Government can now stand only by a coalition with M. Clemenceau, who, in reference to his strategical position, as the holder of the balance of power, is compared to Mr. Parnell, but who, in his policy, is an advanced counterpart of Mr. Chamberlain. His programme, besides the abolition of the Senate, the abolition of State payments to the Church, gratuitous education and female suffrage, includes the detestable proposal of an elective magistracy. He wants also to make the Ministry absolutely subordinate to the Chamber. He wants, in short, a reign of demagogism pure and simple, without check or limit; and he is now supposed to be master of the situation. Of this, however, we are not so sure.

Among the various perils of society, great and small, nobody, we believe, has hitherto noted the private spy system, to which the letter of "Civis" calls attention. A public detective service, as "Civis" admits, there must be; but he is also justified in thinking that even this is a dangerous instrument and requires vigilance on the part of those who use it. It is sometimes necessary to employ doubtful characters, and temptations are sometimes strong. Many years ago a case of murder occurred in which a large reward was offered for the conviction of the murderer. The wadding of the gun from which the shot had been fired was picked up and was found to be a leaf torn from a National school-book. Suspicion fell upon a person in the neighbourhood who had such books in his possession. A detective went down, disguised as-a book-peddler, obtained access to the house, and on his return reported that he had found the book and that the leaf was missing. The book itself was then seized. But the first act of the legal authorities when it came into their hands was to send it to the publisher for identification; and the publisher's report was that, though it was the same book as that from which the leaf had been torn, it was not the same edition. The detective, therefore, had himself taken the book with the leaf torn out to the house of the suspected murderer and deposited it there, hoping that upon this evidence there would be a conviction and that he would pocket the reward. Still there is no reason for misgiving as to the general trustworthiness of the public detective service. But there is not a little reason for misgiving as to the use that may be made of a private detective service always at the command of inquisitiveness and malice. We have had a taste of the tendencies of such a system in the affair of the Pall Mall Gazette; and we are likely to have further experiences, if we bow our necks to the yoke of Prohibition. In fact, a riot was caused the other day at Barrie by a Scott Act spy, who, it appears, had been following the example of Noah Claypole. Even a man whose walk in life is pretty clean, and whose character is pretty sound, may feel a reasonable objection to being "shadowed." If the eye which tracked our movements were that of pure and disinterested morality, though we might wince, we could perhaps hardly dare to complain. it may be that of a rogue in the service of a blackmailer or of the editor of a sensational journal.

In the Nineteenth Century there is a touching paper on the question. Why Men will not be Clergymen, by one who has himself struggled with the difficulty which, in these days, confronts a man anxious to enter the spiritual calling, but also anxious to keep the truth, when he is brought face to face with ecclesiastical tests. The trouble began at Oxford and Cambridge, as soon as Puseyism had broken up the long torpor of the Church and unsettled that tranquil belief in the infallibility of her tests and the perfect wisdom of her system which, before that time, had made candidature for Orders as simple a matter as eating your dinner. Newman's secession, while it carried comparatively few with it, scattered dismay and perplexity among those who remained behind, and made almost as many converts to scepticism as it made to Rome. Soon it was noticed that where there had a where there had been half-a-dozen candidates for a Clerical Fellowship before there was now only one; only one at least of the right sort; for the dull and worldly continued mechanically, as before, to tread the beaten path which led to what was too aptly termed "a living." It became evident that unless the requirement of Holy Orders as a condition of holding a Fellowship was relaxed, almost all the active-minded and distinguished at 1 distinguished students would be excluded from Fellowships and from College offices at the same time. But what were the doubts and misgivings raised by the conflict between Anglicanism and Romanism compared with those which are raised by the conflict between Religion and Science, and by the conflict between Criticism and the Canon? A layman, satisfied at