

every civilized country. Mr. Eaton has carefully read the recent historians ; has had access to all the official publications on Civil Administration ; and has the advantage of personal communication with Sir Charles Trevelyan, the now veteran reformer of the English Civil Service. Our author is thus able to throw upon his subject sharp side-lights from rather unexpected sources.

The Civil Service of England has passed through three well-marked eras : (1.) The period prior to 1693. (2.) The interval, 1693 to 1853. (3.) The period from 1853 to the present time.

The feudal theory made public offices the personal property of the Sovereign, as much as the crops on his estates ; the former were almost as frequent in the market as the latter. In the 45th Article of Magna Charta, and in a Statute of Richard II., we have rudiments of a conviction that some qualifications are requisite for public offices. The originality of many supposed American products of political life can scarcely be conceded ; General Jackson was not half as original as is commonly supposed. The peculiarities of many American sheriffs and city marshals existed in full efficacy under Edward the First. Henry the Sixth prohibited bogus election returns long before Louisiana and Florida were named or thought of ; James the Second manipulated and gerrymandered election districts three-quarters of a century before Elbridge Gerry or the American Republic was born ; the same exemplary monarch restricted beer licenses to his staunch supporters, and introduced many other administrative novelties that the American politicians have used without proper acknowledgment.

In 1693, simultaneously with Sunderland's new device of Government by Cabinets, the patronage of public offices passed from the Crown and nobility to the Cabinet and to its supporters in Parliament. William III. was a strenuous administrative reformer ; he spent his days frequently pruning accounts at the Navy Department and the Treasury ; but for long years after his time the moral sense of the English people remained benumbed by the old custom of making merchandise of public authority. Under the party system, the whole country became divided into two political camps ; the theory took firm hold that a party could be held together only

by patronage, just as it was firmly believed that an army could be raised or maintained only by prospects of rapine and pillage. Under Walpole, the corruption of the Civil Service, and of every branch of the administration, was appalling ; even George II. and his Queen were bribed. For a long series of years letters passing through the post-office were systematically broken open and read for political reasons. The poet Pope suffered frequent involuntary perusals ; Pitt complained that even his letters to his family were constantly ransacked. Chatham and Burke were the first to recognise the imminent perils that threatened the country from its administrative abuses ; and from their time down to 1853, a succession of mild reforms occurred. Even at this latter date, however, gross scandals were not infrequent ; the Civil Service appointees even to the audit office, were sometimes actual imbeciles or idiots. As Sir Charles Trevelyan says in an interesting letter to Mr. Eaton, the fool of the family was thrust into the Civil Service, and the scamp of the family fought his way into the military service. The revolutionary earthquake of 1848 was sufficiently felt across the Channel to rudely awaken many Englishmen to an introspection ; and it was thought high time to set the house in order. Sir Charles Trevelyan and Sir Stafford Northcote (the present Chancellor of the Exchequer) were commissioned to report on the whole administrative system ; their masterly Report, and the immense mass of evidence on which it was based, furnish our author with much of his raw material. Appointment by competitive examination was recommended. The almost simultaneous Report of Macaulay and Ashburton, recommending open competition for the valuable India appointments, powerfully influenced public opinion. The *Home* branch of the Civil Service was timorously handled. First, there was an easy pass examination for the nominees of the politicians. This was found utterly abortive. Then came the phase of limited competition. The best of the nominees was undoubtedly appointed ; but these nominated candidates were often, in literal truth, a 'job lot ;' the successful competitor was only good '*of his kind*.' This restrained competition was compared to a Derby race, at which none but 'sprained and sickly colts, ring-