

immediate retirement of the present Government from office, we were prepared to quit Her Majesty's service immediately, with no other feeling but that which every minister who has served the Queen must possess namely, of gratitude to Her Majesty for the warm constitutional support which she always gives to Her ministers, and, I may add—as it is a truth which cannot be concealed—for the aid and assistance which every minister receives from a Sovereign who now has had such a vast experience of public affairs. (Disraeli, Hansard, vol. 191 p. 1705.)

Here is Mr. John Bright's opinion :

The honorable gentleman asks us (by that dissolution) to lay aside the old usages of Parliament, and there is not a member who will differ from me on that point. He asks this from us in order to maintain *in office a minority who came into power through certain means which do not seem to me to be commendable.* (Hansard, vol. 191, p. 1730.)

On the other hand, Lord John Russell says :

There were two circumstances at that time; one was that, if we had dissolved parliament at that time, we should have been liable to the objection stated by Sir Robert Peel in 1846. That it would have been so understood and represented—in order to maintain a party in power, and that that was not a legitimate use of the prerogative of the Crown. In the next place, it would have been dissolving parliament before the supplies for the army and navy, and before the minister's Bill had passed; and in the state of affairs generally, I did not think it wise to advise the Crown to take such a step. (Hansard, vol. 119, p. 1070.)

He says again :

But it is quite another matter when the question is whether a particular Prime minister or a particular party should remain in office. And when Sir Robert Peel, in 1846, explained his conduct in having declined to propose to, or to advise Her Majesty to dissolve this House, because it was his opinion that that was a most delicate and sacred prerogative of the Crown, and ought not to be exercised for the purpose of any individual who might be at the head of affairs, or for the purpose of any party. Now, that entirely agrees with my opinions. And when I offered my resignation to Her Majesty to dissolve the then Parliament I was acting logically. (Lord John Russell Hansard Vol. C L p. 1075.)

§ 4. — We need not make any more quotations to prove that point. It is quite certain that the government has no new fact to bring forward since the last elections which they carried on themselves at their own pleasure. They cannot even allege the abolition of the Legislative Council, as they appear to have changed their mind on that question, by not submitting a measure during this session for the abolition of that body—so, they cannot pretend that this matter is before the country. They withdrew it themselves out of discussion.