

The long familiarity of Englishmen with this institution, and with the copies of it made in the European countries which possess constitutions, has blinded them to its extreme singularity.—*Popular Government (Maine)*.

When an appointment is necessary in the Supreme Court it is made nominally by the Governor in Council, but in reality by the Ministry in office at the time. Is there any guarantee that the Ministry of the day will select the man most fitted for the judicial seat? There is none whatever. There is a check—that of public opinion. But this check is so weak that it will hardly ever be sufficient to prevent a bad appointment, especially in view of the inducements to make appointments in the interests of the members of a Ministry rather than in the interests of the public. The appointment by the Ministry, therefore, practically means leaving it with the Attorney-General, with power to appoint himself if he should so please. He will naturally be desirous of the office. His colleagues will be not only disposed to give, but afraid to refuse, it to him. Appointing him means another ministerial office at their disposal, the judicious filling of which may quicken the zeal of friends or disarm the hostility of opponents. Refusal means the secession of a colleague and the future opposition of the slighted Minister.—*Jeremiah Dwyer, Melbourne Review, 1877*.

The partisan who abandons his own judgment and blindly follows his leader is despicable enough, and may be a peril to the State.—*Thomas Burt, "Contemporary Review," 1890*.

In party contests, men do not battle for measures; they fight for candidates. . . . Politics, from being the science of Government, has become co-operative office-seeking.—*"The Co-operative Commonwealth" (Gronlund)*.

Where there are no real politics, office has few responsibilities, and its freedom from these and the chances it affords to the unscrupulous give intense keenness to the contest for it. Angry men hotly in earnest are not usually meally-mouthed. So we have assertion and contradiction; the lie direct given and retorted; charges of corruption hurled backwards and forwards between the Treasury and the Opposition benches.—*Froude, "Edinburgh Review," 1886*.

The working of the system is at variance with the true principles of representation and free parliamentary government, tending to the prostitution of public interests to unworthy party ends, throwing the legislative machine out of gear, and involving administrative affairs in utter confusion. . . . War to the knife should be declared by the constituencies against the present corrupt excrescence of party organisation; for unless this is done, the evils complained of will in the future be intensified rather than reduced.—*Matthew Macfie, "Contemporary Review," 1884*.

Party obstruction, legitimate and otherwise, causes such a loss of time in the early part of the session that numberless useful Bills are thrown out towards its close.—*Monthly Review, Vol. I*.

The liberty to throw out bad Bills without involving the necessity of throwing out the Government, too, would be one of the greatest advantages to be derived from the abolition of party government. In the second place, if men were not bound together by party ties, there would be no reason why they should all attack and defend the same measure; reason and conviction would have fair-play, while in great emergencies the leading statesmen of the House would have less difficulty in coming together, and making it impossible for a really bad Minister to retain office. . . . The spontaneous agreement of men not compelled to act together by the force of party discipline, and each one coming forward on the strength of his own convictions only, would certainly carry more weight than a majority composed of men who are bound by the rules of their system to stand shoulder to shoulder and obey the commands of their leaders, whether they approve of them or not. . . . In the eyes of the independent public we fear the antagonism of parties has latterly seemed little better than a fight for place, to which everything else is sacrificed. What did even Mr. Cowen say on the subject not two months ago? "I am indifferent," he said, "to party organizations. I think the objects which lead men to union very paltry. They bring out the worse features of human nature. We may depend upon it, the feeling is spreading very widely. Place! Place! Place! That is the sole meaning which large masses of the nation are beginning to attach to politics." . . . The party system can no longer be conducted on those terms which compel honourable men to stoop to evasions and subterfuges, which in any other walk in life they would despise, and produce on the public mind the unfortunate conviction that the game of politics is played only for selfish objects, in which principles have no part.—*Quarterly Review, 1886*.

The Opposition has lately shown itself willing to make bargains with the Government. If the Premier will make a small concession on some petty point, like, perhaps, the granting of uniforms to the police, to some private member of the Opposition, then the leader of the party will be prepared to vote for important measures *en bloc*. Parliamentary proceedings have become a traffic or a species of barter. The leader of the Opposition seeks the Premier in some small room behind the Chamber, and says in effect, "If you will consent to do this or that, I shall accept your measures as they stand."—*The Australasian, 22nd December, 1888*.

The paralysis of the House of Commons is frightful, and threatens the very existence of representative government in this country.—*Sir Mountstuart E. G. Duff, "Nineteenth Century," 1887*.

The constituencies have elected a House of Commons, but it is not allowed to work. They have appointed a Government, but it is not permitted to transact even the most ordinary business of the