

to complete one typical budget, taking the average of the food prices of the five cities as a representative starting point. Here is the result:

#### TOTAL BUDGET FOR ARTISAN FAMILY.

	March, 1910.	March, 1912.
Food .....	\$6.53	\$7.41
Rent .....	4.00	4.25
Fuel .....	1.00	1.00
Clothing .....	2.25	2.30
Unspecified .....	2.00	2.10

15.78      17.06

Increase in two years \$1.28, or 4 per cent. per annum.

From this table we conclude that a man who two

years ago was living on a wage of 26c. per hour will now require 28c. per hour if his consumption is to remain constant. In other words, the effect of rising prices on the cost of living is such that the working man requires an advance of \$25, or one cent an hour, every year, in order that he maintain the same standard of necessary expenditure, and that a still further increase is required before any expansion in the scale of consumption can be allowed for. In the case of a larger income—say \$5,000 a year—the increase in the cost of necessities could easily be met by current savings.

claim to have affected the choice of the Government. It would have simply been ignored, while the Government named the official who would have got the job in any event. That is not the way that "patronage committees" and "patronage-fed" members earn the active gratitude of office-hunters—that gratitude which is "a lively sense of favours to come." Not a bit of it. "Patronage" does its work and earns its wages by appointing the unfit. It is a method of loot; or it is nothing.

\*\*\*

ALL men, fit to be in Parliament, hate "patronage." It wastes their time, destroys their tempers, soils their souls—when they have one—and goes far to disgust them with public life. Moreover, it hurts them politically in the end. They cannot compete with the small-minded man who gets into power through "patronage" and knows no other way of keeping power. If a vote of the Front Benchers of both parties could be taken, they would abolish "patronage" utterly and forever. But one Front Bench cannot work this emancipation alone. It must be done by bi-party co-operation.

\*\*\*

CIVIL service Reform—if extended to all the offices held under the State, with several necessary exceptions—would pretty well abolish this evil so far as office-holding is concerned. Then there would still be the matter of purchasing supplies and similar departments of Governmental activity to deal with. But this would be comparatively easy, once the office-hunter was eliminated. The office-hunter certainly creates the greatest public nuisance. The man who wants to sell supplies at fancy prices may be quite as active; but we do not hear the squeals of the victims whose heads he causes to be cut off without chloroform. Still when public spirit once attains a white heat which will enable it to abolish the ignoble sport of office-hunting, it will speedily dispose of the more secret and quite as dishonest form of the same till-tapping operation!

\*\*\*

OF course, the people who must kill "patronage" are the chief sufferers from poor appointments—the men who pay their wages and put up with their inefficient services. The politicians probably cannot quite do it alone. The mercenaries who hope to profit by political "patronage" are a numerous, a hungry and an active company. They exercise great influence in a campaign. As things stand, I would venture the prediction that if one of our parties declared that it would retain "patronage," and the other pledged itself to abandon it—and the office-hunters believed the latter—they would combine and put the former party in power. But if the people will meet this onrush of the rabble "camp-followers" with a firm determination to support the party which will regard "public office as a public trust," they can get Civil Service Reform and their money's worth in every appointed official.

THE MONOCLE MAN.

## THROUGH A MONOCLE

### "PATRONAGE."

THE Government press mortified its readers recently by publishing a telegram from Halifax which told in what manner the Conservatives of that constituency were dissatisfied with the administration of Government patronage by a local "patronage committee," and that they wanted the job turned over to its usual sponsors, the two Conservative candidates at the late elections. One of these happens to be a particularly busy man with a marked distaste for such a truckling task, the Right Hon. R. L. Borden. Of course, they can no more get Mr. Borden to bother with their petty "patronage" quarrels than they can get him to sweep out the Privy Council offices at Ottawa. If there must be what is called "patronage," he did the best thing he could in handing it over to a local committee; and he will probably leave it there. I merely mention the incident to-day to call the attention of people, who do not quite credit the hunger of certain partizans of the baser sort for "patronage," to the fact that they are quite as "base" and quite as "hungry" as has been reported.

\*\*\*

WHAT is "patronage"? If it is anything at all, it is stealing. It is downright, vulgar, often contemptibly petty, sneak-thieving. Consider the facts. Here is an office to be filled. The public is to be served by the man chosen to fill it; and the public is to pay him for his services. Naturally the public wants to get the best service it can for its money. It does not want to be limited in its choice of a servant by confining its selection to tall men or red-haired men, or Methodists or Anglicans, or Grits or Tories. It simply wants to secure the best value it can for its "cash." Now the Government steps forward to choose this public official. He will either be a good partizan of the Government or he will not. In the latter class are included, of course, opponents of the Government and "Independents." If the best man for the position is a

partizan of the Government, he ought to be appointed. And he will be appointed without the intervention of anything like "patronage." If the best man is not a partizan of the Government, "patronage" will prevent his appointment, and compel the appointment of a man less worth the public's money. Thus "patronage" will steal from the public for the benefit of the party exactly the difference in value between the best man and the man who is appointed.

\*\*\*

THERE is nothing complicated about that. A child can see just where the stealing comes in. A part of the salary of that official is stolen for the "campaign fund" of the Government party; and the member—where he acts—or the local "patronage committee," are the active thieves. The "party" is the receiver of stolen goods. Sometimes the stealings are very, very small. Sometimes they are very, very mean. I have known cases—not under this Government—where the ghoul who would steal the pennies from the eyes of a poor woman's dead "bread-winner" would be ashamed to associate with the "petty larcenist" who acted on behalf of a great party and a wealthy Government. In this department, there is done some of the dirtiest work which is ever "committed"—committed is the right word—in the name of politics.

\*\*\*

BUT—the partizan will urge in extenuation—often there are two equally good men; and we simply choose our friend rather than our foe. Where that miracle happens, I have no objection—except to point out that the maintenance of a party "machine" for discovering these marvellous cases of incredible coincidence, creates a constant temptation to the purest party to use that "machine" for getting vulgar and dishonest "patronage" for its friends when they are not just as good as the best. We all know, in practice, however, that "patronage" is not kept alive and fed fat on cases in which the best man gets the appointment. It could not live long on such fare. It would have nothing to do. It could not

## A Monument to The Author of "The Maple Leaf"



On Saturday, May 18th, There Was Unveiled in Mount Pleasant Cemetery, Toronto, a Monument to the Late Alexander Muir, Author of Canada's National Song. The Children of the Alexander Muir School, of Which the Late Author Was Principal, Sang "The Maple Leaf" and Decorated the Monument.