

Guard fired upon the fugitives, of whom one man was killed and another dangerously wounded. An inhabitant of Coulogne, who had been one of the National Guard in 1840, expressed to us the indignation which he felt at beholding men who were swimming for their lives being fired upon when their power of doing mischief was at an end. Louis Napoleon swam back and surrendered himself. He was taken to the dungeon of the château, where he remained two days before being conveyed to Paris.

The trial of the prince and of nineteen other conspirators took place on the 6th of October before the Chamber of Peers. Louis Napoleon maintained a bold front upon his trial. In the speech which he addressed to his judges he said, "I represent before you a principle, a cause, a defeat: the principle, it is the sovereignty of the people; the cause, that of the empire; the defeat, Waterloo. The principle, you have recognized; the cause, you have served; the defeat, you desire to avenge." He was sentenced to imprisonment for life; his companions to various terms of confinement. The prison of Louis Napoleon was the fortress of Ham in the department of Aisne. The six years of solitude which he there passed were not unprofitably employed in study. In 1846 he escaped in the dress of a workman, and again found a refuge in England. The Paris press of 1840 teemed with denunciations against the ministers of Queen Victoria, maintaining that they had encouraged the prince in his project, being angry with the government of Louis Philippe. It was asserted that lord Palmerston had made a visit to Louis Napoleon, or had been visited by him, previous to his departure. Lord Palmerston found it necessary to assure, upon his honour, le baron de Bourqueney, who represented the French embassy in the absence of M. Guizot, that neither he nor lord Melbourne had seen Louis Napoleon for two years, nor any one of the adventurers who had accompanied him.\*

The conferences at the Château d'Eu were soon terminated. The king of the French went to Boulogne to express his thanks to the inhabitants for their loyalty on the 6th of August. To a deputation of the English he said that affairs between France and England were taking a favourable turn. M. Guizot returned to England, and was satisfied by the cordiality of his reception by the authorities and populace of Ramsgate that the English people bore no ill-will towards France. Arrived in London he found an invitation from the queen to visit her at Windsor, where he met the

\* The details of this extraordinary attempt are to be collected from the proceedings on the trial of the conspirators, given in "Annuaire Historique," 1840, p. 268 to p. 291. See also Guizot's "Mémoires," tome v. p. 253 to p. 264.

king and queen of the Belgians, lord Melbourne, and lord Palmerston. With Leopold he had many confidential discussions, the sagacious king manifesting the strongest desire that the amicable relations between England and France should be preserved. M. Guizot says that not a word of politics passed between him and lord Palmerston or lord Melbourne. He was satisfied that Leopold's attempts to shake the resolution of the Foreign Secretary had produced no effect, that the situation was in no degree changed, and that events would follow the obscure course indicated by the treaty of the 15th of July. In a few days he had a private after-dinner talk with lord Palmerston. One part of that conversation still preserves its interest. "Is it true, my lord," said Guizot, "that you are increasing your fleet by several vessels?" This question had reference to the Mediterranean fleet. "Yes," replied lord Palmerston, "we will raise it to sixteen vessels,—you, at this moment, have raised yours to eighteen. Moreover, you have five new ships building, which will give you a preponderance which we cannot accept."\* Mr. Cobden shows that in 1840-41 the accustomed proportion of the French navy to ours underwent a great and sudden derangement, and that instead of being content with two-thirds of our force, the French navy approached almost to an equality with our own.† M. Thiers, a few weeks later, contemplated an increase of 150,000 men to the French army, making a total of 639,000.‡ It was not raised to this height, but it was greatly increased. The duke of Wellington, at the beginning of 1841, wrote: "I very much fear the consequences of these large armaments. It would almost appear that it was the interest of France to recommence the war in Europe."§ One consequence of the feeling in France that produced these armaments was the interruption to two important treaties with England. M. Guizot on the 2nd of September wrote to M. Thiers: "If you conclude at the same time with England a treaty on material interests—the treaty of commerce, and a treaty on a great moral interest—the abolition of the slave-trade, that will produce a great effect and a good effect upon the English public."|| At this period Mr. Porter, of the Board of Trade, had been sent to Paris to negotiate a commercial treaty. "I will receive Mr. Porter well," replied M. Thiers, "but it is a serious thing to consent to a treaty of commerce in our present situation. Nevertheless I comprehend the inconveniences of a refusal . . . I must hold counsel as to the treaty about the

\* Guizot—"Mémoires," tome v. p. 282.

† "The Three Panics," p. 5.

‡ Guizot, tome v. p. 342.

§ Raikes's "Private Correspondence," p. 248.

|| Guizot, tome v. pp. 297, 300.

negroes. I dread to make treaty upon treaty with folks who have done so ill by us." \* We have heard Mr. Porter say that one morning Thiers dipped his pen in the ink to sign the treaty, but suddenly said that he would wait another day. When that day came Mr. Porter had been ordered to proceed no further in the business. He believed that Thiers was sincere. He further believed, most unjustly, that lord Palmerston was the instrument of Russia. Mr. Porter—one of the most honest and confiding of men—was in some degree under the same influence as many other persons ordinarily of calm judgment. He surrendered his judgment to a monomania which acquired a plausible shape in the hands of a man of great talent and powers of persuasion, who talked of "treason" and "Russian gold" in a way that attracted many followers. These, by their frantic denunciations of lord Palmerston at "Urquhartite meetings," constrained even his political enemies to vindicate his personal honour. † The Foreign Secretary remained unmoved either by the extravagancies of a feeble minority in England, or the threatenings of a war-majority in France. He vindicated his policy by the promptitude of his acts.

The four powers had determined that the ports of Syria and Egypt should be declared to be in a state of blockade. Our Mediterranean fleet was under the command of sir Robert Stopford, and his second in command was Charles John Napier. Whilst in August admiral Stopford was blockading the port of Alexander, captain Napier was blockading Beyrout. On the 9th of September admiral Stopford was before Beyrout with the English fleet and a few Turkish and Austrian vessels. On the 10th the bombardment of the town and fortress commenced; which continued till the 16th, when the Egyptian troops abandoned the place. Meanwhile Napier, who had landed with 5000 men, had routed the army of Ibrahim Pasha, and had taken Saida by storm. On the 3rd of November the allied squadron commenced hostilities against the famous fortress of St. Jean d'Acre, which was considered to be almost impregnable. It was bombarded through that day. In the night the Egyptian troops quitted the town, and it was taken possession of by a party of Turks and Austrians. The bombardment of St. Jean d'Acre was remarkable as being the first occasion on which war-steamer had been employed in battle. To the rapidity of movement of four English steamers, which enabled them to take the most advantageous positions, it was in some degree owing that so strong a fortress was reduced by the cannon of ships of war in so

\* Guizot, tome v. pp. 299, 300.

† See "Quarterly Review," vol. lxvi. art. viii.

short a time, and with scarcely any loss to the assailants. When the thanks of the House of Lords were voted to admiral sir Robert Stopford and to commodore sir Charles Napier, the duke of Wellington stated that he considered the achievement of St. Jean d'Acre one of the greatest deeds of modern times. He thought it his duty on this occasion to warn their lordships that they must not always expect that ships, however well commanded, or however gallant their seamen might be, were capable of commonly engaging successfully with stone-walls.\* The decided naval successes led to the final submission of Mehemet Ali. The British government, with the other powers, had recommended that if he yielded in a reasonable time; gave up possession of the Turkish fleet; and evacuated Syria, Adana, Candia, and the Holy Cities, he should be reinstated as Pasha of Egypt, and have an hereditary tenure of his pashalic. On the 2nd of December he accepted the terms proposed. The contest was at an end.

Looking at the execution of the treaty of the 15th of July, M. Guizot frankly acknowledges the errors of the policy of the French government. "We had attached to this question an exaggerated importance; we had regarded the interests of France in the Mediterranean as more associated than they really were with the fortunes of Mehemet Ali." France had, he says, believed that Mehemet Ali would have been able to resist all the efforts of the four powers united, when it was finally shown that an English squadron would be sufficient to subdue him. These errors, he continues, were public, national, everywhere spread, and maintained in the Chambers as well as in the country, in the opposition as well as in the government. "The hour of disappointment was come, and it was the cabinet over which M. Thiers presided which had to bear the burden." † Louis Philippe refused his assent to the warlike speech which M. Thiers proposed for the opening of the Chambers. The ministry resigned, and Soult and Guizot were their successors.

The belligerent spirit which had been called forth in France by these differences between the English and French governments were not likely to subside into cordial friendship under the influence of a pageant which recalled the glories and the humiliations of the Empire. The population of Paris had the gratification of a magnificent spectacle on the 15th of December, when the remains of Napoleon were interred in the church of the Invalides. The procession has been described as wearing more of a triumphant than a funeral air. Long cavalcades of troops were succeeded by a few mourning coaches; Grenadiers of the Old Guard and Mame-

\* Hansard, vol. lvi. col. 254.

† "Mémoires," tome v. p. 644.

lukes followed the splendid car on which was placed the body. Imperial eagles veiled with crape were carried by eighty-six non-commissioned officers. Even to the sword and the hat of the Emperor, which were laid upon the coffin, the whole solemnity was calculated to call up remembrances of the past which were not favourable to the security of the reigning family. There was no tumult; but there were demonstrations of popular feeling which showed that the pacific policy of the king and of his new ministry was not so welcome to the populace as M. Thiers and war with Europe.

The public interest in foreign affairs became merged in the more immediate importance of the discussions upon great subjects of domestic policy, which signalized the Session of parliament opened by the queen on the 26th of January, 1841. This Session will be memorable, not more for the defeat of the Whig government after ten years of power, than for the unexpected adoption of the principles of free-trade by that government, after a long period of indecision, if not of hostility to any vital changes, especially in regard to the Corn-Laws. In February, 1839, Mr. Villiers was not supported by the members of the Cabinet, with the exception of Mr. Poulett Thompson, in his motion that evidence should be taken at the bar of the House on the operation of the Corn-Laws. Lord John Russell had, however, declared to his constituents at Stroud that the time had come for a change in the Corn-Laws, which he considered as indefensible in principle. The motion of Mr. Villiers was negatived by a majority of a hundred and eighty-one. Between the Session of 1839 and that of 1841 a most effective agitation against these laws had been carried on throughout the country. Associations were established in Manchester, and in other great manufacturing and commercial towns, for promoting the principles of free-trade; and their scattered efforts were effectually combined by the formation of the Anti-Corn-Law League. This name was adopted by a convention of three hundred delegates assembled in London at the opening of the Session of 1839. Large sums were subscribed for the purpose of circulating tracts, and for engaging lecturers to enlighten public opinion upon the injurious operation of the Corn-Laws and other laws called protective. These efforts produced necessarily strong convictions in the minds of many of the thinking part of the community. But the principle of abandoning protection for agriculture could scarcely be expected to find favour with any large portion of landlords and cultivators, who believed that a fall in prices would be the ruin of their property and the bane of their industry. The class of mechanics and factory-workers were too ready to believe the fallacy proclaimed in

parliament, that a fall in the price of food would inevitably produce a lowering of the wages of labour. The Chartists always presented themselves in force at the Anti-Corn-Law Meetings, to maintain the one panacea for the distress of the country—universal suffrage. It is difficult therefore to imagine that when lord John Russell, on the 7th of May, 1841, announced the intention of the government to propose a fixed duty on the importation of foreign corn, instead of the sliding-scale which was then in operation, the Cabinet had come to this resolve solely with the object of obtaining some popularity that might eventually compensate them for the gradually increasing loss of their strength in parliament. The popular opinion was decidedly against them. The interests that would be affected by Free Trade were too deeply rooted in old habits and traditions—the benefits were too remote—to be swayed by the convictions of believers in the doctrine that legislation ought first to have regard to the general good—that of the consumers. Members of the government were necessarily open to the charge of inconsistency. Lord Melbourne, on the 3rd of May, was twitted by the duke of Buckingham that in the previous year, upon the motion of earl Fitzwilliam, “that it is expedient to reconsider the laws relating to the importation of foreign corn,” he had opposed the motion, believing that the advantages to be gained by the change were not worth the evils of the struggle. Lord Melbourne answered this reproof by stating that the words which he used also conveyed his opinion that a time might come, and circumstances might arise, when this question must be taken into consideration. Those circumstances had arisen; that time in his opinion had now come when it was found necessary, in order to meet the exigencies of the country, to adopt wide and extensive financial measures. Sir Robert Peel, in Part III. of his Memoirs relating to “Corn-Laws, 1845—46,” says that at the close of the Session of 1845 “the progress of discussion had made a material change in the opinions of many persons with regard to the policy of protection to domestic agriculture, and the extent to which that policy should be carried.”\* He names lord John Russell and lord Melbourne as having adopted, as well as himself, the opinions on this subject generally prevalent at an early period of his public life among men of all parties. It would seem, therefore, rather unjust not to give the Whig Cabinet of 1841 some credit for being influenced by “the progress of discussion,” instead of repeating the charge commonly made against them of having rushed into free-trade principles “to make a bid for popularity” when the agitation of the League had produced its effect

\* “Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel,” vol. ii. p. 98.

upon public opinion. Little effect had been produced in 1841. What lord John Russell proposed was not accepted by the League, which in point of fact repudiated his plan of a fixed duty, demanding an absolute freedom from all duty upon foreign corn.

The "wide and extensive financial measures" to which lord Melbourne alluded on the 3rd of May, were brought forward in propositions by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his budget, to raise the duty on colonial timber, reducing that on Baltic timber; and to keep the existing duty on colonial sugar, lowering the duty on foreign sugar. These propositions were really a considerable step in the direction of Free Trade. The proposal in reference to the sugar duties was brought forward by lord John Russell in a Committee of Ways and Means on the 7th of May. During eight nights was this proposal debated with all the zeal that was stimulated by the fears of West India merchants and Canadian timber merchants, and by the more influential terrors of the landed interest. All saw in this abandonment of the principle of protection a dismal future of the general ruin of domestic industry. It was expected, moreover, in this protracted debate that the result would involve the fall of the Whig government, which had prematurely and rashly espoused the Free Trade doctrines. A necessary consequence would be the restoration to power of the Conservative party, who, it was supposed, would always hold to the principles of Protection, which Toryism had never willingly relaxed even when under the pressure of the economical doctrines of Canning and Huskisson. The importance of these debates on the sugar-duties has necessarily in a great measure passed away; but it is interesting to look back upon the opinions maintained by two of the most accomplished debaters of that day—sir Robert Peel and lord Palmerston. Sir Robert Peel maintained that if the principle of Free Trade announced by the government was that, without reference to any other consideration, we should go to the cheapest market, he could not concur in it. "In a country of such complicated relations as this, the rigid application of such a principle would involve us in inextricable confusion." Never, on the other hand, were Free Trade principles more ably advocated than by lord Palmerston. "We intend to supply the deficiency of the revenue by striking a blow at some of the great monopolies which have hitherto retarded the prosperity of the country. . . . The question is, whether the great springs of our national industry shall be relieved from some of those artificial obstructions which have hitherto retarded their development, or whether the sources of our national prosperity shall, for the benefit of private interests

and of privileged classes, continue to be choked up. The question is between Free Trade (and by Free Trade I mean trade open to competition) on the one side, and monopoly on the other. The question is between reason and prejudice: between the interests of the many and the profits of the few. . . . Protection, in the sense in which the word is used by those who now oppose the plan of the government, is a tax levied upon the industry and skill of the mass of the community to enable a few to remain indolent and unskillful. Such protection is not only erroneous in principle, but, after all, utterly useless to those for whose particular benefit it is maintained. Show me a trade that is free, by which I mean, open to fair competition, and I will show you a trade carried on with intelligence, enterprise, and success." From his own official experience he adduced many examples that "Protection is a game that two can play at." He showed conclusively that it was impossible that a great country like England could go on protecting, as it was called, its various interests, and that other countries should not follow its example.\*

In his reply, which concluded the last night of the debate, lord John Russell emphatically asserted the principle of a free trade in corn. The noble lord the member from North Lancashire (lord Stanley) "had said, that the producer of corn could not depend upon his own skill and industry, but must rely upon the sunshine or the storm for the abundance or scarcity of his crop. That was true as to the producer of a particular country; he must depend upon a higher power. But the same power that directs the storm had given a remedy for any local disadvantage, for such was the bounty and benevolence of Providence, that if in one country there was a bad season and a deficient crop, another was blest with a good season and an abundant harvest. It was fortunately in the power of man, by his skill and ingenuity and the means they gave of traversing the ocean, to take advantage of the beneficence of the Creator. If that intercourse were not permitted by short-sightedness and error, do not let it be said that it was to the infliction of heaven that a deficiency of food was to be attributed. Let the blame be laid where it was due. Let the laws be blamed which defeated the magnificent scheme by which plenty would be given to all the nations of the world, more or less depending upon each other, and keeping up a kindly and a beneficial intercourse. Let the laws be blamed which blasted the fair prospects of a nation, and inflicted the curse of sterility, barrenness, and scarcity upon a land where plenty might reign, and marred the gracious designs of Providence by unjust legislation." †

\* Hansard, vol. lviii. col. 655.

† *Ibid.*, col. 666.

Upon the question of the Sugar Duties the ministers were defeated by a vote of 317 to 281. With this majority of 36 against them it was expected that there would have been an immediate resignation. The notice to quit did not expel the tenants of Downing Street. On the 27th of May sir Robert Peel moved, "that her majesty's ministers do not sufficiently possess the confidence of the House of Commons to enable them to carry through the House measures which they deem of essential importance to the public welfare; and that their continuance in office under such circumstances is at variance with the spirit of the constitution." This Resolution was carried by a vote of 312 to 311. On the 7th of June lord John Russell stated that the ministry had determined to appeal to the country. On the 22nd the parliament was prorogued by the queen, and the dissolution was proclaimed the next day.

When the new Parliament met on the 19th of August, 1841, it had been ascertained with tolerable accuracy that the results of the elections were wholly unfavourable to the continued existence of the ministry. What was called the Conservative principle was not only triumphant over the Free-trade principle boldly proclaimed at the last hour by the Whigs; but many of their former supporters, now known as the Radical party, were either distinctly hostile towards the ministry, or very lukewarm in their support. The parliamentary trial of strength was close at hand. Mr. Charles Shaw Lefevre was re-elected Speaker without opposition. The queen did not open the Parliament in person, the Speech being read by the Lords Commissioners. With the absolute certainty that a change of administration would very quickly ensue, some expressions in the Speech from the throne must have appeared rather as the challenge to a future contest from a retreating force to an enemy about to drive it from the field, than as the measured and conciliatory language of the sovereign to those ranged in battle array on either side. The attention of Parliament was in this Speech called to the revision of duties affecting the productions of foreign countries. It would be for Parliament to consider not only whether some of those duties were unproductive to the revenue, but were vexatious to commerce; whether, further, the principle of Protection, upon which others were founded, was not carried to an extent injurious alike to the income of the state and the interests of the people. Her Majesty also expressed her desire that the Parliament should consider the laws which regulated trade in corn. It would be for them to determine whether those laws did not aggravate the natural fluctuations of supply, embarrass trade, derange currency, and diminish the

comfort and increase the privations of the great body of the community. Lord Stanley, on a subsequent night, expressed his regret that the Speech had been so framed as to be liable to misconstruction in the eyes of the country; that its recommendations appeared to be the recommendations of the Crown, and not of the ministers who constitutionally advised the Crown. Lord John Russell answered, that he thought it was generally understood that the Speech from the throne was the Speech of ministers; the Speech was the result of the advice of ministers, and ministers alone were responsible for it. M. Guizot shrewdly observes, that with the sagacity of party spirit the adversaries of sir Robert Peel estimated more accurately than perhaps he did himself the difficulties which awaited him. "Retiring with every possible advantage, the Whigs charged sir Robert Peel to repair their faults, and to perform their promises." \*

In the House of Commons an Amendment to the Address was moved by Mr. Stuart Wortley, to the effect that the public expenditure having for several years exceeded the annual income, the House was convinced of the necessity of adopting measures for the purpose of remedying so great an evil; that it was the duty of the House humbly to submit to her Majesty that it was essential to the satisfactory results of their deliberations in reference to the subjects to which their attention had been especially directed, and other matters of public concern, "that your Majesty's government should possess the confidence of this House and of the country; and respectfully to represent to your Majesty that that confidence is not reposed in the present advisers of your Majesty." The debate on the Address was continued four nights. The speeches by the leaders of the two parties, sir Robert Peel and lord John Russell, were necessarily the most important. Sir Robert Peel, in concluding his address, said "If I accept office, it shall be by walking in the open light and in the direct paths of the constitution. If I exercise power, it shall be upon my conception—perhaps imperfect—perhaps mistaken—but my sincere conception of public duty. That power I will not hold unless I can hold it consistently with the maintenance of my own opinions, and that power I will relinquish the moment I am satisfied that I am not supported in the maintenance of them by the confidence of the House and of the people of this country." † The conclusion of lord John Russell's speech was equally emphatic: "I have only to express my conviction, that if this country is governed by enlarged and liberal counsels, its power and might will spread and increase, its influ-

\* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 91. † Hansard, vol. lix. col. 429.

ence will become greater and greater; that liberal principles will prevail, and civilization will be spread to all parts of the globe; that you will bless millions by your dominion and mankind by your example.\* On the 27th of August the House divided on Mr. Wortley's Amendment, when in a House of six hundred and twenty-nine members the government was in a minority of ninety-one. In the House of Lords, when an Amendment to the Address, similar to that of the Commons, had been proposed by the earl of Ripon, the majority against ministers was seventy-two. Her Majesty's answer to the amended Address of the House of Commons conveyed the only decision which could be made by a constitutional sovereign. "Ever anxious to listen to the advice of the Parliament, I will take immediate measures for the formation of a new administration." The resignation of ministers was announced in both Houses on the 30th of August.

The biographer of sir Robert Peel has said, "Never perhaps had a first minister united at his accession so many elements and guarantees of a safe and strong government. But he was called on to perform the most difficult of tasks—a task essentially incoherent and contradictory. He was obliged to be at once a Conservative and a Reformer, and to carry along with him, in this double course a majority incoherent in itself, and swayed, in reality, by immovable and untractable interests, prejudices, and passions." † Sir Robert Peel has given his own testimony to the difficulties which beset his path at the very onset of his attempts as a commercial reformer. One of his first acts was to propose to his colleagues a material change in the Corn-Law of 1828. He had also to propose a removal of the prohibition which existed on the import of foreign cattle and meat. "These changes," he says, "although they gave little satisfaction to the most eager opponents of the Corn Law, and were indeed denounced by some as perfectly nugatory, were not effected without great murmuring and some open opposition to the government on the part of many of its supporters. The duke of Buckingham resigned his seat in the Cabinet rather than be a party to them, nor was it an easy matter to procure the unanimous adoption of the measures I proposed by the remaining members of the government." ‡

\* Hansard, vol. lix. col. 449. † Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 89.

‡ "Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel," vol. ii. p.

## THE MINISTRY AS FORMED BY SIR ROBERT PEEL.

## CABINET.

Lord Wharnccliffe . . . . .	Lord President of the Council.
Lord Lydhurst . . . . .	Lord High Chancellor.
Duke of Buckingham . . . . .	Lord Privy Seal.
Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel . . . . .	First Lord of the Treasury.
Right Hon. Henry Goulburn . . . . .	Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Earl of Haddington . . . . .	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Right Hon. Sir James Graham, Bart. . . . .	Secretary of State for the Home Department.
Earl of Aberdeen . . . . .	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Lord Stanley . . . . .	Secretary of State for the Colonies.
Lord Ellenborough † . . . . .	President of the Board of Control.
Earl of Ripon . . . . .	President of the Board of Trade.
Right Hon. Sir Henry Hardinge . . . . .	Secretary of War.
Right Hon. Sir E. Knatchbull, Bart. . . . .	Paymaster-General.
Duke of Wellington . . . . .	Without office.

## NOT OF THE CABINET.

Lord Lowther . . . . .	Postmaster-General.
Lord Granville Somerset . . . . .	Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.
Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone . . . . .	Vice-President of the Board of Trade and Master of the Mint.
Earl of Lincoln . . . . .	First Commissioner of Land Revenue.
Right Hon. Sir George Murray . . . . .	Master-General of the Ordnance.
Sir Frederick Pollock . . . . .	Attorney-General.
Sir William Webb Follett . . . . .	Solicitor-General.

## GREAT OFFICERS OF STATE.

Earl of Liverpool . . . . .	Lord Stewart.
Earl Delawarr . . . . .	Lord Chamberlain.
Earl of Jersey . . . . .	Master of the Horse.

## IRELAND.

Earl de Grey . . . . .	Lord Lieutenant.
Sir Edward Sugden . . . . .	Lord High Chancellor.
Lord Eliot . . . . .	Chief Secretary.

## SCOTLAND.

Right Hon. Sir William Rae, Bart. . . . .	Lord Advocate.
Duncan M'Neil, Esq. . . . .	Solicitor-General.

\* His Grace resigned January 31, and was succeeded by the Duke of Buccleuch.

† Lord Ellenborough accepted the Governor-Generalship of India, and was succeeded by Lord Fitzgerald and Vesel, October 23.