

Cabinet are taken on trust, the better pleased its members are. But the days of "Short's your friend and not Codlin" are passing, and Cabinets of the future must for their own stability and the good of the people, submit to this inconvenience.

On the other hand, the system would be an advantage to the Prime Minister in this respect, that an adverse vote in the House against one of his Ministers would be serving notice on the Prime Minister that one of his administrators did not possess the confidence of a House in which his party has a majority. It is, I think, safe to say that if it is as hard to get into a Ministry as many aspirants have found it, it is still harder for a Prime Minister to get rid of an unsatisfactory colleague.

It would, I think, tend to reduce the demand for ministerial representation which so seriously hampers the choice of any Prime Minister. Most of the anxiety about this springs from the belief that local interests, mostly of a material kind, can best be safeguarded by Cabinet representation. With patronage eliminated, with purchasing done on a business basis, with the Public Works Commission reporting on the essential merits of every scheme for expending money in a local way, there would be very little left to be promoted by inner and secret influences. Sectionalism is a thing which cannot be eliminated, but everything which lessens its evil effects is a benefit. Life-giving water is not drawn from a parish pump.

Again, direct personal individual responsibility would tend to do away with patronage by a more direct and less cumbersome system than that of a Civil Service Commission. This Commission chooses men for work that they do not know about, for the carrying out of which they are not responsible, and reduces to a minimum the power of the people who are responsible for the work to choose, to discipline, to dismiss or to promote the individuals who are carrying it on. If Ministers were individually responsible they would choose their subordinates with care.

If my previous statements that the administrative business of the country was badly organized, expensive and inefficient, were called in question, I would bring forward as an additional argument that practices must be extraordinarily bad which could be bettered by so cumbersome a remedy as this method of choosing people. The truth is, an evil word standing for an evil thing has blinded people to the real significance of the thing. What the thing really is, is **selection** of the best in personnel or material to accomplish certain ends. No one ever heard of the **patronage** of the head of a great railway, of a great bank, of a great industrial institution. It does not exist, although each of