

the sovereign, after all the circumstances shall have been explained to him and he shall have duly considered them. (Wellington in Peel's Memoirs, vol. II, p. 300).

Todd, speaking of complaints made by the Houses or by different members against the Government, says :

But in extreme cases, when it may be advisable to endeavour to reconcile conflicting opinions and reconcile rival parties, we are warranted by constitutional precedent in claiming for the sovereign a right to interpose, and with the weight which belongs to his elevated position, to offer counsel and advice to any influential statesmen, irrespective of their particular standing towards the existing administration. But such an act of interposition is only suitable as a last resource to restore harmony to the body-politic. (Todd, vol. 2, p. 206).

It is not a legitimate use of this prerogative to resort to it, when no grave political question is directly at issue between the contending parties and merely in order to maintain in power the particular ministers who hold the reins of government. The dissolution in 1834 has been impeached on this ground. (Todd, vol. II, p. 406.)

Sir Robert Peel says :

Those measures having thus become law, I do not feel that we should be justified, for any subordinate consideration, for the mere interests of government or party, in advising the exercise of the prerogative to which I have referred and the dissolution of Parliament. I feel very strongly that no administration is fortified in advising the exercise of that prerogative, unless there be a reasonable presumption, a strong moral conviction indeed, that after a dissolution they would be enabled to administer the affairs of the country, through the support of a party sufficiently powerful to carry their measures.

I do not think a dissolution justifiable for the purpose merely of strengthening a party. The power of dissolution is a great instrument in the hands of the Crown, and it would have a tendency to blunt the instrument if it were employed without grave necessity. (Hansard vol. 87, p. 1042.)

This great statesman, although interested in asking for the dissolution of the House, at the time of the formation of his Cabinet, writes in his memoirs :

I shall forever remember the remark of Lord Clarendon, at the commencement of his *History of the Revolution*, on the bad effects of the untimely exercise of the right of Royal prerogative : "no man," said he, "can show me the source from whence these bitter waters we now taste flow, as these unreasonable and precipitate dissolutions of Parliament," and farther "the passion and disorder which troubles Parliament can neither be appeased nor banished by a dissolution, which is of a still more passionate nature." One may readily call to mind that Mr. Pitt did not immediately dissolve Parliament on his elevation to power in 1783. (Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel, French version, 2nd vol. pages 49-51).

I consider that no ministry ought to advise a Sovereign to dissolve Parliament, without a moral certainty that the dissolution will enable