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Answer FOUR questions. All questions carry equal marks.

Candidates are reminded of the necessity for good English and orderly presentation in their answers.

1. Mr. Churchill had a small Cabinet to deal purely with the direction of the Second World War. Discuss the arguments for and against the use of an Inner Cabinet in peacetime in 1974.

2. Not long ago Lord Robens, then Chairman of the National Coal Board, said that the government of the United Kingdom would be more efficiently carried on by 'a board of business men' than by a cabinet of party politicians. Is this a justifiable point of view?

3. Is there any good reason why the judicial function of the House of Lords should not be transferred to a Supreme Court of Appeal, which would be part of the High Court of England and Wales?
4. Walter Bagehot, writing in 1867, argued that the British Constitution was a cabinet system of government. Mr. R. H. S. Crossman, writing in 1967 an introduction to a reprint of Bagehot’s book “The English Constitution”, thought that today the system has become one of prime ministerial government. Is Mr. Crossman right or wrong?

5. Describe how the police are controlled in England and Wales, and discuss the case for and against a national police force.

6. Is a jury chosen at random really capable of understanding and judging a long, complicated case, or a bench of lay Justices of the Peace competent to adjudicate on motoring offences?

7. “Most of us dislike paying rates, but most of us also realize that rates are a necessary evil and that we should pay them.” Discuss these conflicting sentiments.

8. Are the national political parties, when they take part in local party politics, helping or hindering the cause of local democracy?

9. Discuss, with examples, the ways in which we attempt to make our political institutions meet the needs of modern society.

10. “Senior Civil Servants ought to be allowed to defend and explain the advice they have given to Ministers.” Is this wise, and is the change in ministerial attitude to public criticism a significant pointer that policy is changing?