

a certain connection between the service and the holders of political power; that where such a connection exists the service will respond more readily to public needs than it would if it were a caste made up of the special style of men who usually do best in examinations; that a man who owes his appointment to a political friend will have one point of union with the political world, and, if he is a man of force and intelligence, will soon have more; that one of the school-teacher type who has gained the highest number of marks in an examination will be apt, in the first place, to be puffed up by his success, and, in the second place, to fancy that he belongs to a body independent of all the powers of the State, and set to rule the country for the country's good. Our friend would be content with a qualifying, instead of a competitive, examination, which he thinks would be a sufficient safeguard against improper appointments. The man who had merely passed a qualifying examination, he argues, standing on a level with many others, would not have any such temptations to conceit, and having, through the very circumstances of his appointment, a certain insight into the political institutions of the country, would be more in sympathy with those institutions and with public feeling; he would not be so likely as the other to become a red tapist. The responsibility of patronage our friend, moreover, maintains is good for a legislator, who may well be proud of having given a good man to the public service. We confess that we incline ourselves to this view. The strongest argument in favour of competitive examination, as it seems to us, is that it effectually prevents the use of the patronage as a bribery fund. In England it has been an immense relief to the Ministers, whose lives were made a burden to them by applications for small places. Its effect on the mind of the people, on the other hand, would be questionable; it would make employment in public offices too much of a prize, and for one youth who succeeded, it might unsettle twenty, and fill them with a misleading ambition. In the case of the United States, the evils of party patronage have been so great as to call for the most drastic remedy. But this cannot be said