The debate on this resolution was almost altogether taken up with the attitude of the cabinet towards the American minister, who had a grievance against the Bulletin newspaper for publishing reflections on his not sending out the Boston in search of a missing American boat's crew. Mr. Stevens seemed to think that the cabinet controlled the Bulletin—which it did not—and a rather lengthy correspondence took place between him and the foreign office on the subject, which ended in the attorney-general's entering a suit for libel against the paper, after the editor's refusal to publish an apology dictated by the American minister.

During the debate I was anxious to have this correspondence read, which would have shown that we had tried to meet Mr. Stevens's wishes in every way, but the house would not allow the correspondence to be read. I regret that I cannot here reproduce the letters, which would show a conspicuous absence of the hostility dilated on in the resolution.

I have already said that I was prepared with a financial statement; as to the other count in the indictment—alleging scandals in the police department—this resolved itself into a demand for the dismissal of the marshal; but, though much was said, nothing was proved against him. When the reform cabinet took office, the members of it seemed to forget how very scandalous the marshal was, for they retained him in office during the whole term of their incumbency.

On Tuesday, November 1, the Cornwall-Nawashi cabinet took office and was voted out the same day, no opportunity being afforded to outline a policy.

On Friday, November 4, Her Majesty called upon Cecil Brown to form a cabinet, Mr. Brown not being at the time a member of the assembly. This fact, however, did not call forth from Mr. Thurston and his friends any protest, as it was well understood that he (Mr. Brown) would form a ministry that would be acceptable to the reform party; the "constitutional principle" which Mr. Thurston and his friends had contended for being easily forgotten when occasion required. They continued in office simply because they allowed the assembly to do as they pleased with the appropriation bill, the result being that the grand total of the budget alarmed the assembly and produced disaffection, leading up to a vote of want of confidence. The vote, however, failed to carry, but a second attempt was made soon after, and the cabinet was voted out on the 11th of January, 1893. Two days later the Parker-Colburn cabinet took office, and the house was prorogued the following day.

During the time I had a portfolio frequent conferences with Her Majesty satisfied me that she was anxious to promote legislation and to keep down expenses of government, going so far as to suggest to me that the first reduction in the appropriation bill should be made in her privy purse and royal state.

In reference to the lottery bill, about which so much has been said derogatory to the Queen, it should be said that Her Majesty was quite willing to see it fail; but a majority of the members of the Legislature had been worked upon by individuals who had circulated petitions favoring the establishment of a lottery, and the bill having passed, Her Majesty declined to exercise her prerogative in vetoing the bill, a prerogative which she refused to avail herself of, excepting upon the advice of her constitutional advisers.

In this connection I should say that the lottery bill was, during my brief ministry, in the hands of a committee and did not come up at