

himself a millionaire out of his earnings. The hovel and the palace are alike closed to him; the civil servant dwells in a house.

This is the essential idea back of all civil service laws and all civil service reforming. If it were more clearly and constantly kept in mind our management of civil service affairs would be all the better.

In the first place, for instance, this idea shows us without need of further demonstration that it is not reasonable, or even possible, to apply to the civil service the methods that are applied to an ordinary competitive business. The employee of a grocery firm may go on to become a partner in the business and a millionaire; or he may be discharged at any time and die of starvation. As the hope of the first is denied the civil servant, so he will not face the chance of the second. Therefore, we must have permanent appointment for the civil servant. Thus, our present system in this matter is not the result of politics or of organizations of civil servants; it is the natural outworking of inherent forces. On the other hand, the civil servant must keep out of politics—not because his minister tells him so or even because the law of the land so declares, but because that is an essential part of the system which fixes the civil servant's life at an average. In other words, the civil servant is, by the very facts of the case, a middle-of-the-road person and cannot take a side without violating the law of his existence.

Again: The salary of the civil servant must be higher at beginning and lower at ending than that of other people in employments calling for equal qualifications. Some people will not believe this at first; but when they see how this tendency to average works, they will understand that the forces in the situation will have it so. On the other hand, the spending of those salaries may more easily run on lines of co-operation

than the spending of the earnings of other people, this also being an outcome of the natural law which fixes the civil servant's position at an average.

And so we might go on through many sermon-headings. But, to come at once to lastly and application, the point is this: Many civil servants, even leaders in the movement to improve the service, are too apt to think that conditions are the outcome of arrangement with the government or of agitation within the service. It is very true that we cannot attain the ideal in this any more than in any other matter without much discussion and much arranging. But it is also true that the ideal to be attained in this matter is not a maximum but an average. Could we by any means gain special privileges and advantages for the civil service, it would do no good; it would only mean that people not fit to serve the public—mere grafters, idlers and fakers—would crowd the ranks, grab the privileges, and leave the workers to lower pay and worse conditions than ever. It is not for the civil service to ask for favors. But neither should we submit to unfairness. The very nature of our position makes it necessary that we should have all the disadvantages of the average; but the public service will suffer unless the advantages of the average are equally confirmed to us.

---

A correspondent of the *Daily Mail* of London, England, makes the remarkable statement that the reason why it is impossible in some districts to carry out the "back to the land" idea by dividing the land amongst many small holders and cultivators is the absence of railway communication. He advocates the building of light railways or some other means of affording ready communication with the towns and cities.