tent man who complies with this condition, no matter what his previous conduct may have Besides, innumerable complaints have been made respecting a "family compact," who are said to have kept all offices among themselves and their favourites; and would it be either wise or just to create a "compact" on the other side? Is it wise to perpetuate such a system, merely shifting its power into other hands? We think not, for we prefer our country to our party; and as a large part of the people of the country would be permanently excluded from office by the adoption of this rule, and thus the old complaints and grievances would still be heard, only from other quarters, we would strongly deprecate every system of policy that did not afford every man competent for office the chance of filling it, provided he give his undivided support to the Government. On this point there must be no demur. The system of governing by party, and keeping all offices within the party, may do for an old country in which parties are strong, but it is very unsuitable for Canada, in which parties are comparatively weak, and in which men competent for office are not as plenty as blackberries. His Excellency's conduct on this point was just-insisting on a full support to his Government from every public officer, and permitting those to retain their offices who would give their support. other course might have satisfied one party, but would have inflamed the other, and thus that peace and union which the country requires would not have been attained. formers will be promoted to offices as vacancies occur, and they are not so eager for place as to be careless of the country's peace; nor yet do they so envy their opponents as to grudge them their offices, provided they honestly render the Government their entire support, which they must do or resign.

It has also been said that the Governor-General has interfered with the freedom of election, partly by expressing an opinion respecting the comparative merits of some candidates, and partly by inducing Government officers to become candidates. The first branch of this objection we dismiss as beneath notice. A candidate's claims on public favour must be very slight if they are dissipated at a breath. The other branch of the objection requires more extended notice. The principle from

which it proceeds is to be respected. A jealousy of Executive interference is proper and necessary; but then it requires to be watched and guarded, or it will defeat its own designs, and like the boy with the butterfly, when in his evger haste to grasp it, he crushes and destroys the object of his desire, this principle will, by its ill-judged sallies, wound the very freedom it wishes to preserve. Is it not so in this instance? A change of system has been demanded. It is required that the public business should be managed in the Legislature by public servants who, if they cannot command a majority there, must retire. Well, the first step towards this is taken, and certain public officers come forward as candidates for the people's suffrages. But no sooner is this done. than some timerous people take the alarm, and scamper like frightened hares through the wood, with the hue and cry in their mouths of "Executive interference." Why, in the name of common sense, how is the Executive to fulfil your wishes? You desire a kind of provincial ministry, and accordingly His Excellency presents his servants before you, saying, in effect, "These men have my confidence; I present them to you to ascertain if they have your's, in order that we may work hermoniously together:" but no sooner is this done than you start as if you had seen a ghost, and exclaim with supernatural horror, "Take any shape but that, and I will meet thee." Why, this is the very shape you desired to see; so don't be alarmed. for it is real, substantial flesh and blood after all. Every system must have a beginning; and Government officers now come forward here as candidates, as they do in England, avowedly in support of the Government. But this, it is said, is the very evil complained of. They are pledged to support the Government. We can hardly repress a smile at this objection: for what is meant by it? Is it meant that His Excellency should choose servants who would not support his policy? Would any man do this? As this is too absurd, the objectors either do not understand their own meaning, or they mean more than they say. Is it the latter? The complaint has been that public officers have served themselves instead of the Government and the people. Then, do all the outcries that have been made for a change of system, mean no more than a change of men-new officials on the old system of serving themselves?