

forces, which have made the English Methodism of to-day so largely Presbyterian, must have in them some power of great efficiency. It has always seemed to us a peculiar fact that the democratic America has maintained her *Episcopal* Methodism, while monarchical England has developed a presbyterial Methodist polity, while in Canada we have retained not a few elements of both.

*Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March, 1895. With its usual excellent table of contents, the present number brings us an article of special interest by Dr. Bourinot on "Elected or Appointed Officials." In this article Dr. Bourinot outlines first the Canadian system of appointed officers for all executive work. He then compares with this the American system of filling these positions by popular election. As this has become a living issue in our Canadian politics, we add the conclusions of this eminent publicist on the subject: "It would be, indeed, an unhappy hour for the good and efficient government of Canada were the intelligence of any section to be so blinded as to lead it away from the sound doctrines that have hitherto preserved us from the evils that have weakened the political structure of the Federal Republic." "Once adopt the elective principle in the provinces, it is obvious the consequences would be most serious to the Dominion. The result would be that Canada would be no longer English as respects a fundamental principle of government. She would become Americanized by the adoption, not of these features of the system of her neighbors which might give her additional strength and unity, but rather of those methods which would be more or less destructive of political morality and in direct antagonism to those principles of sound and efficient government which true Canadians are ambitious to see gather force, while they are laboring to establish on durable foundations a new nationality on this continent."

From "The Progress of the World," in the *May Review of Reviews*, we take the following on the success of South Carolina's liquor system: It seems to have been taken for granted throughout the North that the South Carolina State Dispensary system is a dismal failure. The people of South Carolina, outside of the old liquor interest and certain political circles, have become almost unanimous in the opinion that the system is a splendid success. Governor Evans, when in the Legislature, was the chief promoter of the dispensary law, and now that he is in the executive chair he is quite as staunch in maintaining and enforcing the system as was Governor Tillman. Railway roadmasters and other men familiar with conditions throughout the State, are enthusiastic in their account of the good effects that the law has already produced. Drunkenness and disorder have decreased to a remarkable extent; and whereas the negro laborer was formerly accustomed to spend his week's earnings in carousing on Saturday night and Sunday, he is now spending more upon his family, or else saving his money to buy land. The ten or twelve State dispensaries in the city of Charleston, which have taken the place of scores or hundreds of saloons, are as openly conducted and as orderly as any drug-store, and are absolutely closed at sundown. The effect upon the quiet and order of the city has been too transforming to admit of any denial. Reports from country towns throughout the State are to the effect that the closing of the old bar-rooms in favor of the new dispensaries has been attended with results that have converted almost every good citizen to a belief in the present system. In view of the widely circulated reports in disparagement of the South Carolina dispensaries, these facts ought to be given a wide publicity.