

by their superiors, to abstain from so doing, and I have always regarded this exemption from party exposure, as a valuable civil boon.

I would close my observations on this part of my subject, with the following quotation from a recent number of an able, popular American journal, and allow me to say that I would not myself presume to speak of the civil service of the United States in similar severe terms:

"There is no doubt whatever," says this writer, "that the work of the country has been and still is incompetently done, and no doubt whatever that the 'spoils doctrine,' as it is called in party politics, is the source of incalculable corruption, and incalculable degradation of the civil service."—*Scribner*, April, 1881, p. 948.

Again this writer says of the unhappy exigencies of a public officer: "He is always to feel that he can not keep his place by any excellence of work, or any superlative fitness for it, but only by intriguing, and showing himself ready to do the dirty work of the party on whose good will he depends."

The severity of these strictures forbids comment by an outsider.

The next evil to which I would allude, as calling for serious consideration, is that of the interference of the governors or trustees of asylums, with the appointments of assistants of every class or grade; and the same remark applies with even greater force to all higher authorities. I assume it as a certainty that every superintendent is capable of best judging as to the fitness and competency of all his assistants, and it consists with common sense that he will endeavor to procure and to retain the best he can find; if not, he is unfit for his position, and the sooner he is released from it the better.