sees the support and confidence of, and represent the majority of, the Legislature, the elected representatives of the people."

The opinion is expressed that Her Majesty should summon a leading member of the Legislature who voted in favor of a resolution of want of confidence to form a new cabinet.

Sincerely desiring to meet the wishes of the representatives of her subjects, it has pleased Her Majesty to summon the Hon. A. P. Peterson to assist in the formation of a cabinet.

Her Majesty trusts that the acceptance of the suggestion to call a member of the majority of the Legislature to form a cabinet will bring about the result sought for.

Her Majesty also desires to express her appreciation of the courtesies received at the hands of the gentlemen of the committee.

I have the honor to be, gentlemen, yours respectfully,

JAMES W. ROBERTSON,
Her Majesty’s Chamberlain.

Mr. Peterson endeavored in every way to meet the wishes of the caucus in the formation of a cabinet, but the reform faction were irreconcilable, and would not agree to anything that he suggested. The resolution above quoted is misleading. I will not say designedly, for the contention was persistently made in caucus by Mr. Thurston, the framer of the resolution, that upon the defeat of a ministry, not only should Her Majesty send for a leading member of the victorious opposition, but that the opposition should select a cabinet, and send their nominations to the Queen for her acceptance, insisting that she should recognize this course as a constitutional principle.

I and a few others objected to the establishment of such a precedent, urging that under the constitution the Queen had the right to name her cabinet, which could only be removed by a want-of-confidence vote of the majority of all the elective members of the Legislature. See article 41 of the constitution, which reads:

The cabinet shall consist of the minister of foreign affairs, the minister of the interior, the minister of finance, and the attorney-general, and they shall be His Majesty’s special advisers in the executive affairs of the Kingdom; and they shall be ex officio members of His Majesty’s privy council of state. They shall be appointed and commissioned by the King and shall be removed by him only upon a vote of want of confidence passed by a majority of all the elective members of the Legislature, or upon conviction of felony, and shall be subject to impeachment. No act of the King shall have any effect unless it be countersigned by a member of the cabinet, who by that signature makes himself responsible.

I see no good reason for departing from the meaning of this clause of the constitution so plainly expressed, and there was at least one good reason for doing so—the possibility of a majority of the Legislature which contained no material from which to form a cabinet outvoting that part of the Legislature from which a cabinet would naturally be selected. And again, it implied that Her Majesty could not go outside of the house to select her ministers. I consider it a decided advantage in the community that the Sovereign should have the privilege of selecting his or her advisers from the whole country.

The meaning of the constitution is plainly that it is the Queen’s prerogative to appoint a cabinet, and that of the Legislature to dismiss it—not by any scratch vote, but by a majority of all the elective members.

Over a week passed without arriving at any settlement in the matter of forming a cabinet, during all of which time Mr. Peterson and myself met the members in caucus, from time to time, without reaching any result.

Mr. Peterson failing to form a cabinet, Her Majesty called upon me, on a Saturday, to do so, saying to me that a ministry must be formed to meet the house on the Monday morning following, as the tension