

claims. This was the one test of fitness for office with the duke of York and with the Lord Chancellor, who thus recorded their mutual opinions.\* Mr. Canning was especially hateful to them at the time of the duke's illness, when the Chancellor "saw a great deal of his Royal Highness." The Foreign Secretary's memorable speech of the previous 1st of December, on the subject of the aggression of Spain upon Portugal, "was regarded by the Tories as amounting to a demonstration in favour of liberalism." †

The funeral of the duke of York took place at Windsor on the night of the 20th of January. Nothing in that ceremony was more remarkable than the mismanagement by which the Cabinet ministers were marshalled by the heralds in the nave of St. George's Chapel two hours before the arrival of the funeral procession. The night was bitterly cold. As we ourselves looked down from the organ loft upon the greatest in the land, thus doomed to stand upon the unmatted pavement, shivering and shifting their uneasy positions, we observed the oldest man of the Cabinet taking very wise precautions for his personal comfort and safety. One who was by the side of Mr. Canning, attributes to his kindness of heart a suggestion to the Chancellor that he should lay down his cocked hat and stand upon it. ‡ The Chancellor's health was preserved by this precaution. The funeral of the duke proved fatal to Mr. Canning. He caught a cold there which resulted in an illness from which he never really recovered. §

The removal from the active concerns of life of a public man more immediately important to the nation very soon followed the death of the duke of York. On the 16th of February lord Liverpool moved an address to the King, expressive of the concurrence of the Peers in a message recommending a provision for the duke and duchess of Clarence. The next morning the servant of the Prime Minister, going into his sitting-room after breakfast, found him senseless on the floor in a fit of apoplexy. On the 18th lord Eldon thus expressed his opinion as to the results of this event; "His life is very uncertain, and it is quite certain that as an official man he is no more. Heaven knows who will succeed him." ||

The hopeless illness of lord Liverpool must have been a heavy blow to Mr. Canning, whatever prospect might have opened to him of taking that post in the state which might be called his by inheritance. The fatal stroke of apoplexy broke up a friendship of forty years between the two statesmen. Immediately after the

\* Twiss, "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. ii. p. 581.

‡ Stapleton—"George Canning and his Times," p. 578.

|| Twiss, vol. ii. p. 583.

† *Ibid.*, p. 578.

§ *Ibid.*

funeral of the duke of York they were together at Bath, telling stories of their early years, and amusing each other with recounting all sorts of fun and adventures.\* They were college friends at Christ Church. They entered the House of Commons together in 1792. They differed, as leading members of the same cabinet, only upon one point of policy—that of Catholic Emancipation. The moderation of lord Liverpool prevented that difference operating in the slightest degree against the cordial support of his friend's liberal foreign policy, and that support of the Prime Minister carried the Foreign Secretary through the opposition which otherwise might have overwhelmed him. This prop was gone, and he must now trust to his own resources to contend with or to propitiate jealous colleagues, or retire at once from the position which he had won by his administrative talents and his unrivalled eloquence. The Catholic question was the chief barrier which opposed his natural claim to be the head of a ministry such as existed under lord Liverpool. It was a time when the advocates and the opposers of relief to the Catholics would be pitted against each other, and no possible doubt could be entertained of the consistency with which the leaders of each party would maintain their opinions. On the 5th of March sir Francis Burdett had proposed a resolution, "That this House is deeply impressed with the expediency of taking into consideration the laws imposing civil disabilities on his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, with a view to their relief." In the adjourned debate on the 6th, Mr. Secretary Peel and Mr. Secretary Canning were distinctly marshalled against each other; and each, without any direct personal allusions, sufficiently expressed his own views for the guidance of his followers. Mr. Peel, alluding to the death of the duke of York, and the incapacity of lord Liverpool, declared that he had now an opportunity of showing his adherence to those tenets which he had formerly espoused—of showing that he stood by his opinions when the influence and authority which might have given them currency was gone, "and when it was impossible, he believed, that in the mind of any human being he could stand suspected of pursuing his principles with any view to favour or personal aggrandizement." † The biographer of sir Robert Peel, his diplomatic friend and ardent admirer, says that this language did not meet with entire credence, it being a prevalent opinion that as Mr. Canning was growing daily in influence with the liberal party, Mr. Peel was anxious on his side to secure to himself the firm support of the Tories, "in order to raise himself eventually to the head of the

\* Stapleton, p. 580.

† "Hansard," vol. xvi. col. 910.



government.\* Mr. Canning, in his reply, glanced with a very intelligible meaning at the consequences that would result from throwing away any chance of improving the condition of Ireland, if a ministry wholly Anti-Catholic should carry into effect the doctrine of Mr. Peel, that the troubles and difficulties of that country should be met by firmness and decision:—"Firmness and decision, sir, are admirable qualities; but they are virtues or vices according as they are used. I will not take them in the unfavourable sense in which they have been taken generally, by the ears which have heard them this night; for if I did, I should not envy the hand on which would devolve the task of carrying such a system into effect." † The king had quickly to determine upon his choice, not of either of the principles avowed by these two parliamentary leaders, but of the possibility of reconciling those differences of opinion under a premiership which might allow the continuance of that system of compromise which made the Catholic question an open one for the Cabinet. The king consulted the duke of Wellington, Mr. Peel, and Mr. Canning. These ministers had repeated conferences with each other, but no solution of the difficulty could be arrived at. There was no one to be found, either Pro-Catholic or Anti-Catholic, who could be placed at the head of the government with the same power and influence as lord Liverpool had exercised for continuing the system of compromise. Mr. Canning saw the difficulty, and offered to retire if the king could form an administration wholly composed of persons thinking as the king himself thought. His Majesty did not see the possibility of maintaining such a ministry; and finally on the 10th of April, gave his commands to Mr. Canning to prepare, with as little delay as possible, a plan for the reconstruction of the administration. ‡

On the 12th of April a new writ for the borough of Newport was moved in the House of Commons, in consequence of the acceptance by Mr. Canning of the office of First Lord of the Treasury. At the same time it was agreed that the House should adjourn till the 1st of May. During this interval the greatest excitement prevailed, not only amongst political partisans, but in every circle in which the characters and opinions of public men formed subjects of discussion. The commanding talents and the liberal policy of Mr. Canning produced a very extended hope that he would be able to maintain his great position against the attacks of his numerous enemies. At this time lord Eldon wrote

\* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 28. † "Hansard," vol. xvi. col. 1007.  
‡ See Note at the end of this chapter.

—"the whole conversation in this town is made up of abusive, bitterly abusive, talk of people about each other—all fire and flame; I have known nothing like it." \* It was pretty generally known that the offers of Mr. Canning to six of his late colleagues in the Cabinet had been either contemptuously or civilly rejected. Those of his colleagues who resigned their offices before or on the 12th, were—the Lord Chancellor, the duke of Wellington, lord Westmoreland, lord Bathurst, lord Bexley, and Mr. Peel. Mr. Canning went into the King's closet and said, presenting these letters of resignation to the King, "Here, sire, is that which disables me from executing the orders I have received from you respecting the formation of a new administration. It is now open to your Majesty to adopt a new course." The King gave Mr. Canning his hand to kiss, and the minister had to look around for new supporters. Lord Bexley afterwards withdrew his resignation. Lord Melville retired from the office of First Lord of the Admiralty, and the duke of Clarence was appointed Lord-High-Admiral. The duke of Wellington, contrary to the desire of the King and his minister, subsequently resigned, in addition to his seat in the Cabinet, his office of Commander-in-chief. When the Houses met, after the Easter recess, on the 1st of May, Mr. Canning had completed the formation of his ministry. † On that day all the avenues to the House of Commons were crowded by persons anxious to catch a glimpse of the minister so beloved and trusted, so feared and hated. He walked up the old staircase which led to the lobby with a firm and agile step, and one of the crowd, at least, who looked upon his radiant face, thought of Burke's famous description of Conway, "hope elevated and joy brightened his crest." ‡ The House of Commons on that night presented an unusual spectacle. Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Tierney sat immediately behind the minister. Mr. Brougham took his seat on the ministerial side; with other members who three weeks previously had sat on the benches of Opposition. In the House of Peers, lord Lyndhurst was on the woolsack. Three new peers took the oaths, viscount Goderich (late Mr. Robinson), lord Plunkett, and lord Tenterden. Mr. Peel on that night made a most elaborate exposition of the causes which had led to the resignation of himself and other members of the late government. There was no acrimony in his studied oration. Mr. Canning had the gratify-

\* Twiss, vol. ii. p. 353.

† We give, at the end of this chapter, a list of the Administration as it stood on the 1st of May, and as it was modified before the close of the session.

‡ See *Ante*, vol. vi. p. 97.



ing assurance from Mr. Brougham, who in the eminent position which he had won had the right to speak the sentiments of a large and powerful body, that the new government should have his support, without the possibility of his taking office himself. Mr. Canning made his explanation calmly as befitted his great place. He could scarcely then have been prepared for the fury of the tempest with which he was soon to be assailed. In the House of Commons he, with his friend Huskisson by his side, was well able to hold his ground against any assailant. Mr. Peel did not offer any opposition to the minister which could imply a difference of opinion amounting to personal hostility. A few of the immediate friends of Mr. Peel were not so guarded in joining what has been termed "a teasing opposition." Some "of that species of orators called the yelpers," of whom Canning was the terror,—for his "lash would have penetrated the hide of a rhinoceros."\*—were perpetually pestering the minister "to give some explanation of the circumstances which led to the dissolution of the late, and the formation of the present, administration." Canning was contented to say, "I will not answer a single question relative to the late transactions, unless it be brought forward as a motion." Mr. Brougham steadily supported Mr. Canning in his determination, declaring that such questions were really suggested for the sake of exciting unfair and irregular discussions. Alluding to the same tactics that had been practised in another place, he could only express his unfeigned regret that a prayer that he had heard on the previous Sunday had not hitherto been fulfilled—that it had not yet pleased Divine Providence "to endue all the nobility with grace, wisdom and understanding." Such an enlightenment might have saved a great statesman from what appeared to many as a blot upon his otherwise high-minded career. One of the most judicious politicians of another country has spared us the pain of expressing our own opinions upon the conduct of the most distinguished amongst the Whigs: "Attacked in the House of Peers by lord Grey with *haughty and contemptuous violence*, Mr. Canning had been but feebly defended by his unskilful and intimidated friends in that House; and he was so much wounded at this, that for a moment, it is said, he entertained the idea of resigning his seat in the House of Commons and obtaining a peerage, that he might have an opportunity of vindicating his policy and honour in the House of Lords."† He might have calmly said, with Lear, "The little dogs and all, see, they bark at me;" but "tooth that

\* Scott, Diary in Lockhart's "Life," vol. vii.

† Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 21.

poisons if it bite" would leave a rankling wound. The duke of Newcastle might call upon every friend of his country to aid in dispossessing "one who was the most profligate minister who had ever been placed in power." Such impotent rage carried its own antidote. But lord Grey was of another order of minds. Lord Holland stood up boldly to defend himself and his friends from the charge of having given an unworthy support to the minister thus assailed by the strong and the impotent. He showed, as Mr. Brougham had shown, how the liberal opinions of Mr. Canning claimed support from those who professed similar principles. The attack by lord Grey upon Mr. Canning's foreign policy was not difficult of refutation. But there was one point of material importance upon which lord Grey must have known that he could not receive an answer when he said, "I ask of the noble lords opposite, or of any one of them, to answer me, aye or no,—has or has not an engagement been entered into not to bring forward the Catholic question as a measure of government?" He added, "If such an engagement have been made, that at once settles my mind, because it is a principle which I have always opposed. It is nothing less than that which in 1807 I rejected, and to which nothing shall ever induce me to agree."\* It is possible that the somewhat loose manner in which George IV. was accustomed to talk of state affairs to his familiar friends, and which thus became the tattle of the Court circle, might have warranted lord Grey in more than insinuating against the conduct of the Prime Minister that he had given an unconstitutional pledge such as had been refused by the ministry of which lord Grey himself formed a part in 1807. But the confidences of his majesty extended beyond those among whom he passed a life of gentle dalliance and practical jokes at the Lodge in Windsor Great Park. The duke of Buckingham, whom he raised to the loftiest eminence of the Peerage, relates, in the "Private Diary" which the lapse of thirty-five years has brought to light, that the king unbosomed himself to him in the most unreserved manner as to the recent changes of administration. The duke was very wroth with Mr. Canning, who had not propitiated him by the offer of some great office, although the Grenvilles were represented in the Cabinet; and he was himself friendly to Catholic Emancipation. The conversation turned upon this absorbing question: "Canning," said the king, "has pledged himself never to press me upon that subject, and never to be a member of the Cabinet that does." His majesty added, with an oath, that the moment his minister

\* "Hansard," vol. xvii. col. 724.



"changed his line he goes." \* We can understand how the king's uncontradicted talk might have provoked the indignation of lord Grey against one whom he deemed ready to sacrifice honour for power. Two years afterwards his majesty repeated the same narrative of what passed in the closet when there was no witness present. On the 28th of March, 1829, when lord Eldon was using his influence over his sovereign to prevent the Catholic Relief Bill proposed by the duke of Wellington and sir Robert Peel becoming law, the ex-chancellor makes this entry in his Diary: "His majesty employed a very considerable portion of time in stating all that he represented to have passed when Mr. Canning was made minister, and expressly stated that Mr. C. would never, and that he had engaged that he would never, allow him to be troubled about the Roman Catholic question." † In the "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel"—those most interesting revelations published by the trustees of his papers,—this passage from the Diary of lord Eldon is quoted by him for the purpose of appending to it a vindication of the character of the man of whom Mr. Peel said in the great debate on the Catholic Relief in 1729—wishing that Mr. Canning were alive to reap the harvest which he sowed, and to enjoy the triumph which he gained,—"I was on terms of the most friendly intimacy with my right honourable friend, down even to the day of his death." The testimony to the political integrity of Mr. Canning upon the question of Catholic Emancipation in 1827 is as follows:—"There must no doubt have been some misapprehension on the king's mind as to the engagement or intentions of Mr. Canning with regard to the Catholic question. I feel very very confident that Mr. Canning would not have accepted office having entered into any engagement, or given any assurances, which would have the effect of placing his government and himself in that relation to George the Fourth with respect to the Catholic question in which preceding ministers had stood to George the Third." ‡ What Sir Robert Peel concluded to have been a "misapprehension on the king's mind" has been designated by a coarser term in the "Private Diary" of the Duke of Buckingham, which contains these entries: July 17—Received a letter from George [Lord Nugent]—"He treats the pledge of Canning not to press the Catholic question as a lie of the king's." . . . July 19—"I had a long letter from George, strongly urgent against the

\* "Private Diary of Richard, Duke of Buckingham," 1862, vol. i. pp. 13 and 14.

† Twiss, "Life of Lord Eldon," vol. iii. p. 82.

‡ "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. i. p. 275.

line which I have adopted, and declaring the king to tell falsehoods, and to intend to deceive." \*

During the two months in which the Session was continued after the re-assembling of Parliament on the 1st of May, the irregular discussions in both Houses left but little opportunity for real progress in the nation's business. The personal hostility to Mr. Canning, which the duke of Wellington almost acknowledged, was something strange in parliamentary tactics, and some attributed it to the traditional jealousy of the aristocracy, whether Whig or Tory, that a plebeian—an adventurer—should presume to take the helm of the State instead of one of their "Order." Others ascribed the personal attacks of many peers and commoners to that hatred of genius, too often entertained by mediocrity of understanding. The incessant exhibition of this spirit rendered it impossible for the minister either to make a triumphant display of his oratorical power, or to carry through any measure of great public importance. He spoke for the last time on the 18th of June, on the subject of the Corn-trade. The Session was closed on the 2nd of July.

When men were speculating in February on the probable successor of lord Liverpool, lord Eldon wrote, "I should suppose Canning's health would not let him undertake the labour of the situation; but ambition will attempt anything" † The prorogation of Parliament did not produce the usual effect of comparative relaxation upon the toil-worn Minister. Four years previous, Mr. Canning, Mr. Huskisson, and Mr. Robinson were described after a prorogation, as "boys let loose from school." The American minister who was thus astonished at the department of grave statesmen, was more astonished when the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, after dinner, proposed that the company should play at the game of "Twenty Questions." Complete relaxation, however impaired may be the health of a Prime Minister, is one of the few things which he is utterly powerless to command. Mr. Canning had an interview with the king on the 30th of July, when his majesty was so struck by the looks of the Premier, to whom he had given a cordial support, that he sent his own physician to attend him. The next day Mr. Canning had to work in Downing-street. The duke of Devonshire had lent him his villa at Chiswick, in the belief that change of air would restore him. He occupied the bedroom in which Fox had died. On the 31st a few friends had dined with him; but he retired early. The suffering from internal inflamma-

\* "Private Diary," vol. i. p. 21. See Note at end of this chapter.

† Twiss, vol. ii. p. 583.



tion which he felt on that last night of July, terminated in his death on the 8th of August. He was buried in Westminster Abbey on the 16th in the most private manner. But the universal display of sorrow told more than any funereal pomp that a great man had departed.

The settlement of a treaty between Great Britain, France, and Russia, on the subject of the affairs of Greece, was the latest, as it was amongst the most important, of the official acts of Mr. Canning. That treaty was signed on the 7th of July, 1827. Forty years had elapsed since, a schoolboy at Eton, he had written a very eloquent poem on "The Slavery of Greece." He painted the ancient glories of her arms and her arts; he evoked the great names of her philosophers and her poets, to point the contrast of her glories fading into shame,—servitude binding in its galling chain those who had stood up against Asia's millions,—cities mouldering,—the fallen column on the dusty ground,—worst of all, the sons of the freedom-breathing land sighing in abject bondage, groaning at the labours of the oar or of the mine, trembling before

"The glitt'ring tyranny of Othman's sons."\*

The position of Greece since 1821 was such as to arouse the deepest sympathies of every Englishman who knew anything of her ancient story. The Greeks in that year, seizing the opportunity of a war between the sultan and Ali Pasha, rose in revolt. A proclamation issued by the archbishop of Patras produced a general insurrection. For six years a cruel and devastating war had gone on, in which the Greeks, at first successful, had more and more quailed before the greater force which the Porte was able at last to bring against them, by employing the disciplined troops of the pasha of Egypt. The story of this war has a peculiar interest to us in connection with the individual efforts of Englishmen to promote this struggle for freedom,—of Byron, who died at Missolonghi with "Greece" on his lips,—of Cochrane, whose hopes of rousing the Greek leaders to decisive and unanimous action came to an end when all was lost at the great battle before Athens. In September, 1826, the Divan having obstinately refused to enter into negotiations with those over whom they considered themselves the absolute masters,—those "who form part of the nations inhabiting the countries conquered ages ago by the Ottoman arms,"†—the British Government proposed to Russia that the Porte should be apprised that the result of this obstinacy would be the recognition of the independence of Greece. What, according to international laws, should be the basis of this recognition, was clearly

\* *Microcosm*, 1787, No. 5.

† Manifesto of the Ottoman Porte, 1827.

laid down by Mr. Canning. The Turks were to be told that Great Britain and Russia "would look to Greece with an eye of favour, and with a disposition to seize the first occasion of recognizing, as an independent state, such portion of her territory as should have freed itself from Turkish dominion; provided that such state should have shown itself substantially capable of maintaining an independent existence, of carrying on a government of its own, of controlling its own military and naval forces, and of being responsible to other nations for the observance of international laws and the discharge of international duties." Such was the exposition which the British government then adopted, in the affairs of Greece, of the principles which should determine the recognition of the independence of a revolting or separating state. The principle of what should constitute a belligerent was laid down with equal clearness by Mr. Canning at an earlier stage of this conflict: "The character of belligerency is not so much a principle as a fact. A certain degree of force and consistency acquired by any mass of population engaged in war entitles that population to be treated as a belligerent, and even if their title were questionable renders it the interest, well understood, of all civilized nations so to treat them. For what is the alternative? A power or community (whichever it may be called) which is at war with another, and which covers the sea with its cruisers, must either be acknowledged as a belligerent, or treated as a pirate."

Upon the conclusion of the treaty of July, 1827, it was agreed that instructions should be sent to the representatives at Constantinople of the three contracting Powers that they should present a joint declaration to the Divan, stating that as the war of extermination had been prolonged for six years, producing results shocking to humanity, and inflicting intolerable injury on the commerce of all nations, it was no longer possible to admit that the fate of Greece concerned exclusively the Ottoman Porte. They were to offer their mediation between the Sublime Porte and the Greeks to put an end to the war, to settle by amicable negotiation the relations which ought for the future to exist between them, and to propose that all acts of hostility should be suspended by an armistice. A similar proposition should be made to the Greeks. A month was to be given to the Ottoman Porte to make known its determination. If no answer were returned, or an evasive answer were given, the Divan was to be informed that the three Powers would themselves interfere to establish an armistice. Although the admirals of the allied squadrons of the three Powers were to be instructed to take coercive measures to enforce an armistice,



they were to be warned against any hostile step which would be contrary to the pacific character which the three Powers were desirous to impart to their interference.

Such were the views of a statesman who, ardently desiring the preservation of peace, would not hesitate to enforce the true principles of international law that should govern the recognition of a belligerent Power, and of a State claiming to be independent. These were principles which would remain for our guidance in all future questions involving a similar exercise of discretion and forbearance, but calling for resolute action when it might become necessary to assert the right of civilized communities to decide upon such questions without reference to the passions and prejudices of the contending parties. Mr. Canning was most anxious, in the terrible conflict between Turks and Greeks, to avoid any course of action which would lead to direct hostilities, and especially to avert the possible danger of a policy of absolute neutrality on the part of Great Britain which might have placed the Turkish empire at the feet of Russia. By completing the treaty with Russia and France, he secured that co-operation which would prevent that separate action of Russia which would have necessarily resulted in her own aggrandizement. All the complicated previous negotiations for the pacification of Greece had reference to this difficulty.

#### THE CABINET OF MR. CANNING.

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Earl of Harrowby . . . .             | President of the Council; succeeded by the Duke of Portland.                        |
| Lord Lyndhurst . . . .               | Lord Chancellor.  |
| Duke of Portland . . . .             | Lord Privy Seal; succeeded by the Earl of Carlisle.                                 |
| Right Hon. George Canning . . . .    | First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer.                        |
| Right Hon. W. S. Bourne . . . .      | Secretary of State for the Home Department; succeeded by the Marquess of Lansdowne. |
| Viscount Dudley and Ward . . . .     | Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.   |
| Viscount Goderich . . . .            | Secretary of State for the Department of War and Colonies.                          |
| Right Hon. C. W. W. Wynn . . . .     | President of the Board of Control.  |
| Lord Bexley . . . .                  | Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.   |
| Right Hon. William Huskisson . . . . | Treasurer of the Navy, and President of the Board of Trade.                         |
| Viscount Palmerston . . . .          | Secretary-at-War.   |
| Right Hon. George Tierney . . . .    | Master of the Mint.   |
| Earl of Carlisle . . . .             | First Commissioner of Woods and Forests; succeeded by the Right Hon. W. S. Bourne.  |

#### NOTE ON THE NEGOTIATIONS WHICH PRECEDED MR. CANNING'S PREMIERSHIP.

The editor of the "Private Diary" of the duke of Buckingham announces that portion which relates to an audience of George IV. as of singular interest: "such an exposition of ministerial intrigue does not exist in any published work." We are constrained to believe that the whole of the exposition, whether relating to the duke of Wellington, Mr. Peel, or Mr. Canning, is, for the most part, a figment of the king's. We have noticed in the text what his Majesty said as to a pledge given by Mr. Canning (p. 613). We have a few words to write upon what the duke of Buckingham accepted as a story clearly made out "against Peel and the duke of Wellington, the truth of which I cannot doubt." Twice, said the king, he saw the duke of Wellington, and twice the duke said that "he could not be his minister"—"the duke persevered in excluding himself." The king went on to say that "at last Peel, who had kept a very high and mighty bearing" agreed to meet Canning, and after this meeting wrote to him to say that one had been suggested as Premier whose name he did not like to put in writing; that delays intervened, and that at last "Peel came to the king and thundered out the duke of Wellington's name," upon which his Majesty said that "having been refused twice by the duke himself," he would not, "in the eleventh hour, have a man crammed down his throat." Peel then refused to act with Canning; the king refused to accept Wellington; named Canning as his minister; and then the resignation took place.

The circumstances thus recorded and credited are totally at variance with the statements and documents published by Mr. Stapleton in 1859. Mr. Canning had a long audience of the king on the 27th of March, the particulars of which are minutely detailed in a paper dictated by him to his secretary. Between the 31st of March and the 6th of April, he had no communication with the king on the subject of the cabinet arrangements; but he had frequent conferences with the duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel. On the 9th of April, Mr. Canning, *by the king's command*, saw Mr. Peel, "who came for the purpose of stating the name of an individual whose appointment as premier Mr. Peel conceived likely to solve all difficulties." That individual was the duke of Wellington. Under him Mr. Canning declined to serve, as the duke "for years had been combating in the cabinet Mr. Canning's system of foreign policy." On the next day the king gave his commands to Mr. Canning to prepare a plan for the reconstruction of the administration. The "story clearly made out against Mr. Peel and the duke of Wellington," like many other stories, is destroyed by a little cross-examination. So far from the king refusing the duke of Wellington, he sent Mr. Peel to Mr. Canning to endeavour to induce him to accept the duke as the Anti-Catholic head of the Ministry.