

promise of petty offices and the thousand and one advantages which a party in power can deal out, and does deal out, to its supporters? It is an accepted principle of politics that constituencies returning Government supporters shall be more favoured than those returning members of the Opposition. "If I had a son," I once heard a member of Parliament say, "that checked me, do you think I should feel like doing anything for him? I rather think not. Well, neither should a Government do anything for constituencies that go against it." This was several years ago; but much more recently a bright young man, a political worker in one of the newer parts of the country, remarked to me that a new constituency should always side with the Government of the day, as otherwise its growing interests would be in danger of being overlooked. Is it not time that *some* one should say to the people of Canada: "Come, let us reason about this matter. Is the suffrage in this country free or is it not? What do you understand by a free suffrage? You mean, do you not, that every citizen is at perfect liberty to vote according to his views and convictions of public duty? But can a man be said to be at *perfect* liberty to vote in that way if certain very material disadvantages attach to his exercising the suffrage in opposition to the Government of the day? You know, of course," such a speaker would add, "that no man who has voted against a Government candidate has the remotest chance of any public employment unless he recants his political opinions, and promises to reverse his vote on the next occasion. Is this freedom? If so, what would you understand by restraint? You have heard of "pulls," have you not? The way to get a "pull" is to "swing" votes—that is the up-to-date expression. The more votes you can swing, the stronger your pull. By means of a pull a man can exert a deflecting influence on Government action. A Government left to itself will generally want to do the right thing. The head of a public department gets interested in his work, and devises many things for the public good. But what does the man with the pull care about the public good? What are laws and regulations, or the rights of individuals, or the efficiency of the public service to him? Such ideas are foreign to all his ways of thinking. All he knows is that he did his work, and that he wants his reward. You complain sometimes that the public service is not what it ought to be; but under such a system how can it be what it ought to be? Yet it is *your* service; it is your money that goes to maintain it; and in whose interest should it be run but in yours? Why should any man have it in his power to cause that to be done which is not in your interest?

An earnest appeal to the public on these lines could hardly fail of producing some good effect. There are other points of view which might be taken. Surely it is somewhat undemocratic that in each locality there should be a boss who more or less commands the avenues of approach to a Government that is supposed to exist for all. Why should one man be more readily listened to than another upon a matter of public business? Do we not all pay taxes alike? Why should one man have to go and