

of wholesome ; the life of patriotism, or the life of political roguery ; and whether the vapours generated by this sulphurous eruption are not more mephitic than those which it dispels. "Nowhere," says Mr. Bryce, "does government by the people, through the people, and for the people, take a more directly impressive and powerfully stimulative form than in the choice of a chief magistrate by twelve millions of citizens voting in one day." Stimulating the form is, with a vengeance ; and impressive it might be, were it not that, as Mr. Bryce truly says, the men between whom the choice is to be made are nominated by party conventions, each of which wants "not a good president but a good candidate." If in its primary effect an institution is mischievous, secondary effects will not repair the mischief. It was after a presidential election that an American citizen who had seen a good deal of politics said to me in his haste—"Well, only put an end to this, and I will take my chance of the Man." A less heroic remedy than a *coup d'état* and an autocracy would be to extend the presidential term, abolishing at the same time the power of re-election. Such a change is in fact now in the air. Civil Service Reform, if it can be really carried out, would be another antidote. The excitement which so surprises Mr. Bryce is caused among the politicians and office-seekers by the greatness of the stake, the presidency carrying all the patronage with it ; and among the people chiefly by the love of faction fights, which is apparently a part of human nature. There is also a good deal of the sporting sentiment at work ; not only is there a prodigious amount of betting, but men mutually pledge themselves to pay ridiculous forfeits and perform grotesque penances if the candidate of their choice does not win. The very slang of the presidential race-course and betting-ring is degrading to the majesty of the State. What the effect of an approaching contest is upon the government when the President is a candidate for re-election, the last acts of Mr. Cleveland have miserably shown. Perhaps the most redeeming features of the affair are the good humour and orderly behaviour of the people, which say much for their love of fair-play and law. I witnessed the second election of Lincoln in the midst of the Civil War. Passion was at fever heat ; yet each party was allowed to hang out its banners across the street, distribute its campaign literature, hold its public meetings, and conduct its torch-light processions without the slightest molestation from its rival. I am a firm believer in the ultimate federation of the whole English speaking population of this Continent by the entrance of Canada into the Union ; but I confess I shrink from seeing her people involved in such a maelstrom as a presidential election.

Washington took Hamilton and Jefferson together into his Cabinet. He evidently regarded party as an accidental evil, and thought that in time and with judicious handling it would come to nothing. Instead of coming to nothing it is everything. It little matters what the forms are, whether they are those of the American Republic or pseudo-Monarchical and Parliamentary, like ours in Canada. Party forces its way through all constitutional regulations and bends everything to its own purposes. If the Presidency and both Houses of the Legislature are in the hands of the same party, that party reigns. Otherwise there is a paralysis of government. The late election has made the Presidency and the House of Representatives, as well as the Senate, Republican. The legislative machine will now begin to operate once more. But for some years past the Presidency and the House being Democratic while the Senate was Republican by a small majority, and the Senate being, unlike our House of Lords, really co-ordinate with the House, legislation has been impossible. The tariff question, the silver question, and other pressing questions have remained in abeyance ; masses of useless silver have been accumulating in the Treasury, and a large surplus revenue has been growing up, while all that the Legislature could do was to bale out the surplus in prodigal grants of pensions, to which both parties agreed from their fear of the army vote, and which have swelled the annual expenditure under that head to eighty millions of dollars, a sum nearly equal, I believe, to the cost of Versailles. For six years Dakota, though fully qualified, has been unable to obtain admission as a State because her vote would be Republican. At the same time, the executive has been incapable of *bona fide* negotiation with any foreign power, and especially with England. It was useless to frame a Fisheries Treaty, since whatever the Democratic President might approve the Republican Senate was sure to throw out, as it did by a straight party vote. The evenly-balanced state of parties in the Senate enabled a single member, described by an American journal as "a dissolute demagogue," at one time to hold the key of legislation in his hands.

Mr. Bryce has given us a vivid and memorable picture of the party "machine," with the swarm of political imps under the names of bosses, wire-pullers, heelers, and bummers, by which it is worked, its intrigues and rogueries, its discipline of falsehood, its loyalty to sinister purposes, and all the evils which it entails, and not the least of which is the estrangement of the best class of citizens from public life. His description, of which I believe no material part can be gainsaid, is enough to make a professional politician blush for his craft. But he does not ask himself or tell us so definitely as we could desire whether the machine is separable from party, or whether party is separable from the elective system. The theory on which the system of popular election rests is that the electors lay their heads together to choose the right man. This, in any but the very smallest of constituencies and one the members of which are well acquainted with each other, is morally impossible. The members of a large constituency

are a heap of grains of sand without intercommunication or cohesion. Hence organization, in other words party, becomes indispensable. So long as there are questions of principle before the nation the parties may be held together by them, and may thus have a moral bond such as justifies the submission of the individual conscience to party discipline ; though even at the best of times there will be a great deal of sheer factiousness, corruption more or less coarse, and depravation of national character by a bitter and calumnious strife. But when the questions of principle are exhausted, as they were in England after Culloden or in the United States after the abolition of slavery, and as in time they must be everywhere, how are parties to be held together ? They can be held together only by "the spoils." They are sure at the same time to become machines, and the machines are sure to fall into the hands of the sort of men who prefer politics to honest work. England is falling under the sway of machines as well as the United States. A Liberal Three Hundred or a Primrose Habitation is a local machine which in combination with its fellows throughout the kingdom forms a national machine, though at present in the rudimentary stage. Give it a little time to purge itself of independent consciences and to fall thoroughly under the power of the men who devote their sharp intellects to politics, and you will have in England a counterpart of American caucus-government as it is depicted by Mr. Bryce. Politics will become in England as well as in the United States a regular trade, and of all trades the vilest. Mr. Schnadhorst is already a "boss" full blown and on the grandest scale. The very nomenclature of the political kingdom of Satan has invaded the English tongue. Honourable amateurs at present maintain the fight ; they are spurred on by a great issue, nothing less than the integrity of the nation ; but they will find in time that they have no chance against the professionals who devote their whole time and energy to the calling by which they live.

For my part, the observations of twenty years have confirmed my faith in social democracy ; but in the system of popular election, if it necessarily means government by demagogues, my faith has not been confirmed. In the meantime the demagogic system has been thoroughly developed in England ; and the fruit of its development is that we have a great faction struggling to oust its rival from place by making all government impossible, by encouraging resistance to the law, by fomenting rebellion, and by conspiring with the foreign enemies of the nation for the dismemberment of the realm. By the same agencies the House of Commons is being turned into a mob, in which mountebanks as low as ever disgraced Congress play a conspicuous part, and which is totally unfit for the exercise of supreme power. I am glad that Mr. Bryce is cautious in proposing American institutions as a model for British reform. England has in the Instrument of Government a model far better suited to her case.

Society on the American continent, notwithstanding all our boasts of popular intelligence, would be in a critical situation if the realm of commerce and industry were not practically ruled by a government very different from that of the politicians. No doubt much of what is commonly said, and is recorded in Mr. Bryce's pages, about the railway managers is true. No doubt they sometimes play a mischievous part in politics, though largely in self-defence. Masters, too, in the passionate pursuit of wealth are sometimes grasping, hard, and forgetful of their duty to their workmen. Still, these men have been raised to their positions by genuine qualities, not by stump-oratory or intrigue : some of them behave nobly, and as a class they exercise their authority with justice and firmness, confront mutiny with calmness, and in their own province hold society together. Commercial morality is certainly higher than political morality, all the stock-gambling and "cornering" notwithstanding.

There is one point in the procedure of Congress which hardly seems to have caught Mr. Bryce's eye, but which illustrates political morality as well as procedure. I was astonished to see, more than a century after the passing of the Grenville Act, an election petition decided not by a committee or an impartial tribunal of any kind, but in the full House and by a straight party vote. I found myself carried back to the days of Walpole when no quarter was given in elections. The shortness of the Congressman's term, which makes it hardly worth while to unseat him, is the only apparent limit to the misuse which a dominant and infuriated party might make of such a power.

Everybody who is not in a ring will agree with Mr. Bryce in thinking that the government of cities is one of our chief difficulties—I say ours, because Canada does not differ in this, or in any material respect, from the United States. The fact is that the elective system of municipal government is a survival from the time when the objects of city government were largely political or industrial, consisting in the defence of burgher liberties or the regulation of trades, when comparatively little regard was paid to police, health, water-supply, or lighting ; when, moreover, civic life still made the citizens acquainted with each other, and the great men of the city, the Fuggers and Greshams and Whittingtons, lived in the city and were its mayors. Now a city is merely a densely peopled district in need of a specially skilled administration. It is from want of skill, and from want of the permanency essential to foresight and economy, especially in the conduct of public works, that we suffer, more than from corruption, as to the prevalence of which exaggerated ideas perhaps prevail. There is on the continent one bright exception to the generally unsatisfactory state of things. Washington has a heavy debt, the legacy of a former régime ; but is now a thoroughly well-governed city. Its government is a Board of

three commissioners appointed by the President of the United States, the district being the political property of the Federation. An attempt was made some time ago to introduce "municipal liberties," but it was defeated by the combined and strenuous resistance of all who had anything to be pillaged. I may say, by the way, that Washington, by the attractions of its good city government, as well as by those which it holds out as the seat of the Federal Government and of the Embassies, bids fair to supply the United States with a capital, the lack of which is noted as a defect by Mr. Bryce. Within my memory Washington has grown from a dismal mudhole into a gay and beautiful city, full of social and intellectual life, of which the politicians are the least part.

Mr. Bryce's account of that most vital subject, the character of the American judiciary, is, so far as I am competent to form an opinion, correct. I have often inquired in different States whether confidence was felt in the integrity of the judges, and have generally been told that it was. Englishmen came into contact at New York, in the evil days of Tweed and Sweeney, with judges such as Barnard and Cordozo, elected by the Irish vote ; and they generalized too much from that case. The elective system is bad ; it was never adopted by Massachusetts, and in other States its evils are being practically mitigated by an extension of the term of office. The main defect now is the inadequacy of the salaries, which are insufficient to draw the best men to the Bench. The consequence is a want on the part of the Bench of control over the Bar, in comparison with the control exercised by an English Judge, which is visible even to an unprofessional eye. The consequence of this again is inferiority in the despatch of business, so that the saving is costly in the end. But it would be difficult to obtain a large increase of salaries, which to a farmer already seem enormous. The salary of the President is still inadequate ; and the same thing may be said of regular salaries in every department and all down the scale. It is the dignity of the office rather than its emolument—which, allowance being made for the cost of living, is hardly above that of a County Court judge in England—that draws men of the highest eminence to the Bench of the Supreme Court. As to the purity of the Supreme Court, not the slightest suspicion has ever been felt, though some of its decisions, such as those in favour of slavery on one side and those in favour of the Legal Tender Act on the other, may not have been free from political bias. I heard Lincoln say that he would take care to appoint a judge who was right on the great political question of the day.

You cannot remark to an American that the weather is disagreeable without receiving an intimation in reply that there is worse weather in England. Americans, when they are unable to deny the existence of a flaw in their institutions or a stain on their record, are apt to lay flattering unctious to their souls by persuading themselves that there is something in English institutions or history as bad or worse. I have learned to regard this curious habit as a compliment in disguise. Yet the habit is somewhat slavish, and I venture to think it is rather too much countenanced, though unconsciously perhaps, by Mr. Bryce. Among other instances, he, to comfort the Americans under the imputation of judicial corruption, tells them that there was a case of it in England as late as the last century. He refers to the case of Lord Chancellor Macclesfield in 1725. But the offence of which Lord Macclesfield was found guilty was not, I believe, judicial corruption ; it was complicity in the sale of Masterships in Chancery and improper dealings with the suitor's fund. Even with regard to this charge, Lord Stanhope, who though not a masterly is a very fair and careful writer, intimates his belief that Lord Macclesfield suffered rather as the head of a system than as an offender in his own person. There has been, so far as I remember, no case of judicial corruption in England since that of Bacon ; and historical criticism has greatly reduced the dimensions even of Bacon's delinquency. People whose judges take, or are suspected of taking, bribes will derive small comfort from any stains which they are likely to find on the British ermine.

There is a school of English politicians and political writers which seems to think that it owes no affection to England, and that liberality consists in being just, or something more than just, to every country except their own. I do not suspect Mr. Bryce of any sympathy with such a school. But I think he does sometimes show a tendency to be rather too hard on England. He lays on her discourtesy towards the Americans the blame for the continuance of bitter feeling after the Separation. This is not fair. For a proud nation it was hard to digest defeat. But George the Third received the first American ambassador with magnanimous courtesy, and the flags of a British fleet were half-masted at the death of Washington. Such ill-feeling as there was on the part of England was largely kept alive by the American loyalists whom the vindictive cruelty of the victorious party had driven into exile in England and Canada. But nothing could exceed the venomous violence of the feeling manifested by the Jeffersonian party, which was the majority in the United States, against England, not on account of anything that she did, but simply for being what she was. Washington found himself called upon solemnly to warn his fellow-countrymen against becoming the "slaves of a hatred." The breaches of international courtesy and law of which American assemblies and ports were the scene at the outbreak of the war between England and Revolutionary France, cast the Alabama cost utterly into the shade. Nothing but Washington's influence, in fact, prevented the United States from rushing into a conflict with England which