

new Ministerial arrangement. Lord Moira, who acted for the Regent, refused to allow any such change. Lords Grenville and Grey contended that the change they proposed was essential as a public proof of the Royal confidence and support. On this issue the negotiations were broken off. Subsequently, however, these offices were usually treated as political; and in a Minute of the Cabinet in opposition to Sir Robert Peel's views on the Bed-Chamber question, it was admitted to be "reasonable that the great offices in the Court, and the situations held in the Household by Members of Parliament, should be included in the political arrangements made upon a change of Administration." The other case to which I have referred was the extension by Sir Robert Peel of this principle to the offices held by the ladies in the Court of a Queen Regnant. Although, when the question first arose in 1839, Lord Melbourne's Ministry denied that such offices were political, the practice for which Sir Robert Peel contended was adopted in 1841, and has since that time been followed. The Mistress of the Robes and the Ladies of the Bed Chamber, when they are closely connected with the outgoing Ministry, are regarded as holding political offices. But when the Ladies of the Bed Chamber belong to families not occupying any prominent political position, no objection is made by the new Ministry to their continuance in office.

APPENDIX B.

Extract from "The Government of England," by Professor Hearn.

THESE examples indicate the true principles upon which disqualifications arising from office depend. They are not penal measures towards individuals, and should be regarded not as conveying any slight or degradation, but as based upon sound public policy. Whatever may have been their origin, these disabilities cannot now be considered as securities against an overgrown prerogative. They are not the props and appliances by which the weakness of Parliamentary virtue is supported. They are not the safeguards against the ignorance or imbecility of electors. All these reasons have indeed been urged in their defence, and some of them, if not all, were once true. But the reason for which a law was passed is not necessarily a reason for its continuance. In the present state of the Royal authority its influence is perhaps less than we should desire. With the present constitution of Parliament, under the present conditions of publicity, and with the present increasing tendency in England to elect none but wealthy representatives, there is little danger that Members will be directly bribed with places or by any other direct means. In the present state of public intelligence, and with the present means of forming and enlightening the public opinion, electors do not require protection against themselves. But under the existing system of Parliamentary control, enforced by Ministerial changes, and guarded by an official profession, with a fluctuating body of chiefs and a permanent body of subalterns, a seat in Parliament and a permanent official position are irreconcilable. It is a case of inconsistent offices. It would not conduce to official discipline if an officer were in the evening to denounce those instructions which during the morning he had been engaged in carrying into effect. Nor could any cordial co-operation be expected between a Minister and the subaltern who, the night before, had been striving to drive him from his office. On the other hand, if friendly Parliamentary relations existed between the Minister and his subalterns, two other difficulties would arise. There would be the temptation to fill, and to keep filled, the public offices with men whose qualification was steady voting and not official aptitude; and there would be the certainty that the qualities which were the highest merit in the eyes of one Minister would appear intolerable defects to his successor. Thus the number of officers liable to change would be unduly increased, and the efficiency of the service would be proportionately injured.

APPENDIX C.

Extract from "The Annual Register," 1839.

AT about the same period, the presence of the Colonel and Officers of the 20th Regiment at another dinner of the Conservative Association of Ashton-under-Lyne, where very intemperate speeches of a similar nature were delivered, attracted the notice, and eventually severe censure, of the Horse Guards. By order of the Commander-in-Chief, the Adjutant-General, Sir John Macdonald, was instructed to forward to Colonel Thomas, on the 3rd of November, an extract of "expressions most insulting and disrespectful towards the Queen," which were reported in the *Times* to have been used by Mr. Roby on that occasion, and to beg him to acquaint the writer, for Lord Hill's information, whether Colonel Thomas heard them, and whether, if they reached his ears, he expressed immediately his disapprobation of those sentiments. "I am to add," said Sir John, "that it is most painful to Lord Hill to know that officers of the army were present on such an occasion, but that his Lordship will refrain from passing any opinion on the case until you shall have furnished such explanation relative thereto as you may be prepared to submit for his consideration."

Colonel Thomas acknowledged the receipt of the letter on the following day. Without pretending to answer for the accuracy of the isolated passages taken from the newspapers, he stated in reply, that as no expression uttered by Mr. Roby conveyed to his mind that the slightest disrespect, much less insult, was intended by that gentleman for the Queen, there appeared to be no ground for manifesting any disapproval. "I had flattered myself," continued the gallant officer, "that my long and painful services of upwards of one-and-forty years might have assured Lord Hill that I would not have been wanting had such an impression been received by me.

"I have to lament that the knowledge of officers having been present on such an occasion should be painful to Lord Hill. With reference to myself, I was honoured with an invitation as a Member of Parliament to meet Sir Francis Burdett, which I could have no hesitation in accepting."

The Horse Guards were not satisfied with this explanation, and desired Colonel Thomas to restrict his answer to "the simple denial or admission required of him in their first communication."

Colonel Thomas replied, that after the assertion made in his first answer, and the further statement subsequently given in a letter of the 14th instant, in which he denied having heard the particular expressions quoted, and gave his opinion that the extract was "a garbled report" of