

denounce it? Why, moreover, do they persist in assailing Mr. Goldwin Smith, whom they regard as its hierophant, with a violence and rancour never before employed against any man not in public life, and seldom against those actively engaged in it? Even Sir John Macdonald, the *bête noire* of Gritism, is not abused by the Government organ with a tithe of the scurrility it chooses to pour upon an absent scholar. Why not expend a little of it on Mr. Blake, Mr. Bethune, or any of those public men who are striving to give practical effect to National principles? Simply because it dare not; simply because it has the courage of the bravo, smiting only where it is sure there is no danger of its being smitten in return.

Two motions introduced during the current session sufficiently attest the vitality of 'Canada First.' The first step towards the disintegration of our effete parties is the destruction of patronage in the Civil Service. Mr. Casey's resolution is a move in the right direction, and, sooner or later, will result in the purification of the Algean stable. It is surely time that we, in Canada, were alive to the importance of the subject, when, even in the United States, the paradise of party office-seekers, the President is making an earnest effort to abate the nuisance. It is not at all surprising that neither political party grows enthusiastic over the motion of the member for West Elgin. To oppose it boldly and openly was out of the question, because party men know that the existing system, which they are at pains to maintain and extend, is utterly indefensible from any point of view; they therefore look askance at Civil Service reform, nibble and quibble at it, and resolve in their hearts to stave it off, if possible, to the crack of doom. The *Montreal Herald*, as might have been expected from its wonted independence of tone, repudiates the favorite hack word 'hobby' as applied to Mr. Casey's labors in the cause. That term is one of the rusty weapons' in the armoury of party always at hand to be 'furbished up' whenever a distasteful principle is persistently urged or a crying abuse deftly exposed. The abolition of slavery was Wilberforce's hobby, retrenchment, Burke's, Parliamentary Reform, that of Lord John Russell. William

Pitt boasted two hobbies, Catholic Emancipation and Reform, which he rode in turn until his Royal Master ordered him to turn them both out to pasture. Every salutary reform of the last hundred years has been called a 'hobby,' and Mr. Casey's, if its secret enemies choose, may rank in the honorable list. The reason of the natural opposition to any effective reform in the Civil Service is almost too obvious to need exposure. It is only necessary to deprive politicians of the power of rewarding party services by offices, bestowed without regard to fitness, and the zeal of many an unscrupulous adherent will rapidly wax cold. As there are electors who will not vote at all unless they be bribed, so there are party schemers and wire-pullers in every constituency who will not work unless the glittering bait of office be dangled invitingly before their eyes. To lose so potent a political agency as patronage would of itself be an important step towards the emancipation of the country from party thralldom. It is not to be expected that so important a measure as Mr. Casey is prepared to submit, will triumph for some years to come. The champions of the old system cannot attack it overtly; but they will take order that it shall be quietly buried so long as they can do it with safety. It rests with the people to assert themselves in their own case, and to insist upon it that the Civil Service for which they pay so much shall be constituted so as to subserve its ostensible purpose, and that party hacks, good for nothing elsewhere, shall not be quartered upon them and pensioned off with money abstracted from their pockets.

Mr. Devlin's motion on the representative system opens up another 'unsettling question' to the discomfort of all rigid partisans. It is a singular proof of their obtuseness that, notwithstanding the lucid explanatory speeches of Messrs. Blake and Devlin, they have not yet managed to grasp the significance of the proposed reform. Mr. Dymond made a temperate speech on the other side, but since he 'reserved to himself the right to be convinced by argument' he may be regarded, as the old theologians used to say, as still in a salvable state. Yet it is clear that neither he nor the *Globe*, which followed in his wake, has the faintest glimmering of intelligence on the