

pointed out by his influence in Parliament, by his superior ability, by his capacity as a leader and statesman, and by his prominence in his party,—the predominant party in Parliament. The retiring Premier often advises the Governor-General as to his successor, or the Governor-General may call on some Privy-Councillor for advice. But the man who undertakes the office of Premier and the task of forming a Cabinet takes upon himself the responsibility of his own choice. The Governor-General is never responsible for his acts; it is his advisers who bear this burden. But the new Premier is responsible for his predecessor's dismissal, for all acts done between the dismissal and the new choice, and for his own elevation to office.

If the Governor-General did not possess the nominal power of naming the Premier, the latter would be elected by a formal caucus of that party which is predominant in parliament. The people elect the members of the House of Commons; the members of the predominant party choose, together with their party friends in the Senate, their leader, and the Governor-General must of necessity choose this leader to be Premier.

The President of the United States, on the other hand, is chosen by an electoral college, the members of which are elected by the people solely for this purpose. But, previous to this, each of the two great parties holds a convention and chooses its candidate. Thus each of these two great national executive officers is chosen by a party. In the case of the Premier, the "party" means the members of a certain political stripe in the House of Commons and in the Senate. The Conservative minority in a Reform constituency can have no voice in electing the Conservative leader, because they are represented in Parliament by a Reform member. Thus, such a minority can in reality have no voice in saying who shall be Premier; but in the United

States the minorities in a constituency are represented, *pro rata* with the majorities, in one of the party conventions. This is a well-marked difference between the two systems.

A similarity in the modes of election is that each depends on a "convention of the constitution." In Canada, this "convention" is that the leader of the predominant party in Parliament shall be the person chosen by the Governor-General to be the head of his advisory council, and that this person shall choose his own colleagues. In the United States, the "convention" is, that a candidate shall be chosen by each of the two party gatherings or caucuses, and that the members of the electoral college shall not exercise any independent judgment, but merely cast their votes for the party candidate whom they were elected to support.

One difference between a Premier and a President is, that one is a politician with a history and the other a politician without a history. As a general rule, a Premier will be found to have entered public life as a plain member of the House of Commons, and gradually worked his way up to prominence. Before he can occupy even a subordinate position in the cabinet, he must have marked himself, by his parliamentary conduct, as a man of superior ability, and as a man possessing some of the characteristics of a leader and a statesman. It is only by the respect and favor of the members of his party in Parliament that he can stand high in their councils, and when his party is in power, hold a portfolio in the Government. And it is only when, by his genius as a statesman and his tact and ability as a leader, he shall have proved himself to be the strongest man in his party, that he shall be entitled to be Premier, when his party is the predominant one in Parliament. No man of mediocre ability is at all likely to occupy this important position. He must necessarily be a man tried and