

CHAPTER XXI.

The Pretender in Paris.—He discards Bolingbroke.—The Septennial Act.—The king leaves for Germany.—His foreign predilections.—Negotiations at Hanover for a French alliance.—The king's jealousy of the prince of Wales.—Lord Townshend dismissed from his office of Secretary of State.—Arrest of the Swedish ambassador.—Schism in the ministry.—Stanhope prime minister.—Trial of the earl of Oxford.—The Quadruple Alliance.—Open quarrel between the king and the prince of Wales.—Byng's destruction of the Spanish fleet.—Measures of toleration proposed by Stanhope.—Spanish expedition to Scotland.—Successes of France and England in Spain.—Alberoni disgraced.—Spain accedes to the Quadruple Alliance.—The Peerage Bill.

WITHIN a fortnight after the fugitive prince, who had slunk away at night from the brave mountaineers who would have fought for him to the last, had landed on the Continent, king George announced the fact to Parliament. Both Houses addressed the king, desiring that the most effectual means should be taken "towards preventing the Pretender from finding refuge or protection in any country in amity with your majesty." The Pretender himself took the most effectual means to quiet the alarm of the Whig politicians. On his arrival at St. Germain, *incognito*, he was met by Bolingbroke; received from his secretary the sound advice to hasten to his old residence at Bar-le-duc; promised Bolingbroke that he would immediately set out, embracing him at their parting; and, instead of taking a journey to find a safe asylum, before it was too late, lingered in Paris, and sent to Bolingbroke, by the hands of the duke of Ormond, a dismissal from his service. James at once fell into the hands of weak politicians and intriguing priests. He was politely refused admission to the territory of Lorraine; and he finally settled in the Papal States—a locality precisely calculated to render the Protestant feeling of Great Britain more acute. Bolingbroke never forgot the indignity he had received. He vowed that never more should his sword or his pen be employed for a Stuart; and he kept his word. The character which he drew of James is marked by the intensity of his dislike: "He is naturally inclined to believe the worst, which I take to be a certain mark of a mean spirit and a wicked soul . . . Prone to judge ill of all mankind he will rarely be seduced by his credulity; but I never knew a man so capable of being the bubble of his distrust and jealousy."*

* Letter to Sir W. Wyndham.

The vindictive and intolerant spirit of the English legislature against Roman Catholics was again called into action by the Rebellion of 1715. A few days after the execution of lord Derwentwater, whose adherence to the old religion and the old dynasty cost him his life, and bereft his family of their fair possessions, a Bill was brought in by Mr. Lechmere, "to strengthen the Protestant interest in Great Britain by enforcing the laws now in being against Papists." One of its provisions was to punish Papists for enlisting in the service of the king. All such securities for the Protestant interest have happily yielded to the influence of time. One important Act of Parliament, which was mainly intended to avert the dangers which threatened the peaceful continuance of the Hanoverian succession, remains in force, after nearly a century and a half, when all such apprehensions have long since passed away. Amidst the vital changes in Parliamentary Representation which we have seen in our time, the Septennial Act of George I. has endured, and will probably continue to endure, without reference to the temporary objects of its original enactment. The Bill which provided that no Parliament should in future sit more than three years, upon which William III. exercised his Veto in 1693, was passed in the year following. Before the passing of this Triennial Act of the 6th of William and Mary, the duration of Parliament was only limited at the will of the reigning sovereign, or was determined by his death. The second Parliament of Charles II. sat for seventeen years. The preamble to the Septennial Act, after reciting the portion of the Statute of William and Mary regarding the duration of Parliament, says, "Whereas, it hath been found by experience, that the said clause hath proved very grievous and burdensome, by occasioning much greater and more continued expenses, in order to elections of members to serve in Parliament, and more violent and lasting heats and animosities among the subjects of this realm, than were ever known before the said clause was enacted; and the said provision, if it should continue, may probably, at this juncture, when a restless and Popish faction are designing and endeavouring to renew the rebellion within this kingdom, and an invasion from abroad, be destructive to the peace and security of the government." The Septennial Act was called by Dr. Priestley, "a direct usurpation of the rights of the people; for by the same authority that one Parliament prolonged their own power to seven years, they might have continued it to twice seven." Had the Parliament of George I. simply repealed the Triennial Act, they might have sat to the end of his reign without interruption except from the pleas-

ure of the Crown. The preamble to the Septennial Act looks to its temporary expediency; to the evils that might have been produced in the agitated state of parties—(when the greater number of Tories had become Jacobites, as Bolingbroke asserts)—if a general election were to take place in 1717. The debates on this question had principally relation to the Septennial Bill as a permanent measure. It was introduced in the House of Lords, where it passed by no very preponderating majority. In the Commons the proportionate majority was much greater. Amongst the people generally the measure appears to have excited very little interest, and scarcely any opposition; there being only petitions against it from ten boroughs, half of these being places of small populations,* and open to that corruption which made frequent elections occasions for dishonest traffic. During the passing of the Bill lord Somers was in his last fatal illness. His intellect was sufficiently clear for a short time to give an opinion upon the measure to lord Townshend: "I think," he said, "it will be the greatest support possible to the liberty of the country." The great constitutional lawyer died on the day the Bill was read a third time in the House of Commons. Speaker Onslow often declared that the passing of the Septennial Bill formed the era of the emancipation of the British House of Commons from its former dependence on the Crown and the House of Lords.† The period would arrive when this greater power of the House of Commons produced by the Septennial Act would be looked upon with jealousy by large portions of the middle classes, and of those beneath them in station; and when a principle even more democratic than that of triennial elections should be ardently desired, as one of the modes of converting the member of parliament into a delegate instead of a representative. Practically, very few parliaments of recent times have had a septennial existence; and many thinking persons have been disposed to agree with Mr. Hallam, that under the existing custom of considering six years as the natural life of a House of Commons, "the usual term of duration should be permitted to take its course, except in cases where some great change of national policy may perhaps justify its abridgment." Our constitutional historian holds that "the Crown would often obtain a very serious advantage over the House of Commons, if it should become an ordinary thing to dissolve Parliament for some petty ministerial interest; or to divert some unpalatable resolution."‡ Whilst the Septennial Bill was passing through committee in the Commons, Mr. Lechmere desired to in-

* Lord Mahon—"History," vol. i. p. 307.

† Coxe's "Walpole."

‡ "Constitutional History," chap. xvi.

roduce a clause to disable the holders of pensions during pleasure from becoming members of *either house* of Parliament. This was opposed as interfering with the privileges of the Peers. But Stanhope, one of the Secretaries of State, brought in a Bill, which provided that no person having a pension from the Crown during pleasure, or for a term of years, either in his own name, or in the name of any person for his benefit, should sit or vote in the House of Commons, under a penalty of twenty pounds for every day in which he should so sit or vote.*

By the Act of Settlement, the descendant of the princess Sophia of Hanover, who should be called to the throne of Great Britain, was restricted from going out of the kingdom without the consent of Parliament. A Bill was brought in to repeal that clause of the Act; and becoming law without opposition, the king prepared to set forth to his German dominions. Previous to his majesty's departure there was a creation of eight peers. The king's anxiety to visit Hanover at this juncture was extremely objectionable to his responsible advisers. But their remonstrances were useless. When Addison eulogized what he described as the "uniformity and firmness of mind" of George I.,† he, of course, did not recognize that family characteristic which carried firmness, too often, into obstinacy. "His majesty was bred up from his infancy with a love to this our nation," continues Addison. He did not speak of the greater love which the king, not unnaturally, bore to his own hereditary dominions. "By his succeeding to the dukedom of Zell," writes the political essayist, "he became one of the greatest princes of Germany, and one of the most powerful persons that ever stood next heir to the throne of Great Britain. The duchy of Bremen, and the bishopric of Osnaburg, have considerably strengthened his interests in the empire; and given a great additional weight to the Protestant cause." Happier might it have been if this great prince of Germany, and his successor, could have mitigated their excessive "predilection for their native country, which alone could endanger their English throne."‡ There was a constant suspicion, during their reigns, that continental alliances and wars were in the interests of Hanover rather than in that of Great Britain; and although this belief was in some instances unjust, every minister had to contend against the unpopularity which it threw upon the government. Every minister, from Walpole to Chatham, was, in his turn, obliged to yield, however unwillingly, to the "uniformity and firmness of mind" which governed the continental policy of these princes. Their repeated

* 1 Geo. I. stat. 2, c. 56.

† "Freeholder," No. 2.

‡ Hallam.

absences from England were no light interruption to the tranquil progress of English affairs. These absences became a positive danger when each of these kings was known to stand upon the worst terms with his eldest son. Speaking a foreign language, surrounded by foreign mistresses and favourites, and constantly called away to his foreign states, George I. never ceased to be regarded by the English people as a foreigner. He was imperfectly acquainted with the character of the people he had been called upon to govern; and he took no pains to understand their reasonable wishes, or to conciliate their unreasonable prejudices. The government of the kingdom naturally fell into the hands of the ministers who represented the stronger party. It was fortunate that eventually a minister obtained almost exclusive power, who for many years kept the nation quiet, and allowed its growing industry to become the source of great material prosperity. The system of sir Robert Walpole was little fitted to call forth any high political aspirations; to originate any great reforms; to widen and deepen the foundations of freedom and toleration. But it preserved the country from convulsions, if it failed to destroy the bitterness of parties. Walpole was neither tyrannous nor unjust. He governed by corruption, in our present improved view of what is corruption, when a bribe is no longer termed "a consideration;" but having obtained his parliamentary supremacy by unworthy methods, he did not employ his venal instruments to trample upon the liberties of his country. He laughed at the noisy patriots whom he did not care to buy, or was unable to buy; but during the twenty years of his unassailable possession of power, amidst the constant sense of danger from the tendency of Toryism to identify itself with Jacobitism, he proscribed no political enemy. It has been truly said, "Sir Robert Walpole was the minister who gave to our government that character of lenity which it has since generally preserved."* Before Walpole became the supreme director of affairs, there was much complication of foreign policy, which we will endeavour to relate as succinctly as the necessary details will permit.

In the spring of 1716, defensive alliances had been concluded by the British government with the States-General and with the Emperor, to operate in case of aggression on either by France or other powers. The issue, however, of the rebellion of 1715 had entirely indisposed the government of the Regent of France to any rupture with England. The duke of Orleans was moreover anxious to procure the support of England to his succession to the

* Macaulay—"Essay on Horace Walpole."

crown of France, in the event of the death of Louis XV., a sickly boy. The claim to that crown had been renounced by the Bourbon king of Spain; but Philip V. might interpret that renunciation according to the power which he might possess of setting his agreement at naught. Whilst George I. was at Hanover this summer, negotiations were going forward between Stanhope, his Secretary of State and the Abbé Dubois, the profligate but most able servant of the Regent. The English government desired the expulsion of the Pretender from France and its dependencies; and was anxious to stipulate that a new harbour should be abandoned which Louis XIV. had begun to construct at Mardyke, to serve the same warlike purposes as Dunkirk, which had been demolished according to the terms of the treaty of Utrecht. The agent of the regent was ready to yield these points, to secure the friendship of the government of king George. Thus the policy of England and France tended towards peace and a more intimate alliance. On the other hand, the continental objects of George I. threatened to involve his island subjects in a war, in which they would certainly not have engaged had their king not also been Elector of Hanover. When Charles XII. of Sweden, in 1714, after those five years of seclusion at Bender which followed the disastrous day of Pultowa, burst upon Europe again, he found a large part of his territories divided among many rapacious neighbours, with whom he would have to fight if Sweden were to regain any semblance of her old power. Frederick IV. of Denmark, in 1712, had conquered Schleswig and Holstein, Bremen and Verden. To strengthen himself against Charles, "the Swedish-iron hero"—as Mr. Carlyle calls him,—Frederick bartered away Bremen and Verden to the Elector of Hanover, in 1715, for a hundred and fifty thousand pounds, on condition that George should join a coalition against Sweden. George's son-in-law, Frederick William of Prussia, had gone to war that same year, with his giant grenadiers, to compel Charles to resign his pretensions to Stettin, which Prussia had obtained in pawn for a payment of sixty thousand pounds. The northern war blazed furiously. The Elector of Hanover sent a British fleet into the Baltic to coerce Sweden; and with six thousand Hanoverians joined the Prussians, Danes, and Russians, against "the Lion-king." At Stralsund Charles made his last effort. He was overpowered; and getting away to Sweden, meditated schemes of vast import, but thoroughly impracticable. Charles endeavoured to gratify his revenge against England in stirring up another Jacobite insurrection. Northern Europe was now still more agitated; for the Czar Peter had marched with his Muscovites into Mecklenburg, and was

threatening Denmark. George was for violent measures against Russia, which his minister Stanhope very wisely discountenanced. This smoke did not burst into flame. In the conduct of the negotiation with France there was a difference of opinion between Stanhope at Hanover, and Townshend at home; and this, with other less dignified causes, produced a partial-breaking-up of king George's first Whig ministry.

The history of the schism which drove Townshend from the helm is given with great minuteness by the excellent descendant of Stanhope; and with a laudable anxiety to acquit his ancestor of any paltry attempt to abuse the confidence of George I., to the prejudice of his honest and able minister at home.* It is scarcely necessary for us to enter generally upon these details. One point, however, connected with this ministerial change is of importance, as a characteristic of the domestic politics of the first, second, and third princes of the House of Brunswick who were kings of England. From the second year of George I. may be dated the manifestation of that national calamity which our country had to endure during three successive reigns,—the hateful exhibition of a party in opposition to the government of the actual sovereign gathering round the heir apparent. When king George set out for Hanover in the summer of 1716, he was extremely jealous of entrusting, during his absence, any special power and authority to the prince of Wales. The king wished to join others in commission with the prince. Townshend opposed this. The king so far yielded as to appoint his son Guardian of the Realm and Lieutenant; but he withheld the title of Regent from him, and imposed several restrictions upon his administrative power. The popularity which the prince acquired during the king's absence was looked upon with fear and suspicion at Hanover. He was affable; appeared fond of English customs; spoke our language tolerably well; and went amongst the people in a free and unreserved manner. Party-writers began to contrast the son with the father. The prince was not discreet in a position where discretion was so essential. He manifested an eagerness to open the parliament in person during the king's absence; whilst the king desired that the prorogation might be extended, to enable him to remain longer at Hanover. Townshend, in his communications with Stanhope, had pressed that the king should speedily decide as to his return; intimated the prince's wish to open parliament; and suggested that in certain emergencies a larger discretionary power should be given to the "Guardian of the Realm." The king was enraged; and avowed his determina-

* Lord Mahon—"History," vol. i. ch. vii.

tion to dismiss his chief minister from his office of Secretary of State. To soften this dismissal Townshend was offered the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The Secretary at first stoutly refused. His colleagues were indignant. Stanhope, from Hanover, tried to persuade them to acquiesce in the king's determination. The Whigs, he wrote to Mr. Methuen, one of the Commissioners of the Treasury, "may possibly unking their master, or (which I do before God think very possible) make him abdicate England; but they will certainly not force him to make my lord Townshend Secretary."* When Townshend was removed from the administration, the public indignation was loudly expressed. He was considered to be sacrificed to the cabal which looked upon Hanover as more important than England. He was known to be hated by the rapacious Mademoiselle de Schulenbergh, the king's mistress, who was afterwards created duchess of Kendal. George hastened his return to England; and having probably been made aware of the danger he incurred in breaking with the most important members of the great Whig party, expressed his regret to Townshend for having acted with precipitation. The fallen minister was at last induced to accept the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland; and Methuen was appointed Secretary of State as the colleague of Stanhope. The apparent renewal of the friendly relations of the sovereign and his ministers was not of long duration.

The king opened the Session of Parliament on the 20th of February, 1717. He announced that a Treaty of Alliance had been concluded between Great Britain, France, and the States-General. There were to be no longer apprehensions about Dunkirk and Mardyke; the pretender was to be removed beyond the Alps. This Treaty, concluded on the 4th of January, 1717, is known as "the Triple Alliance." The king farther notified that he had directed papers to be laid before Parliament, "which contain a certain account of a projected invasion." These papers were "Copies of letters which passed between count Gyllenburg, the barons Gortz, Spaar, and others, relating to the design of raising a rebellion in his majesty's dominions, to be supported by a force from Sweden." The discovery of this scheme had delayed the opening of the Session. In October, some letters between baron Gortz, the bold and intriguing minister of Charles XII., and count Gyllenburg, the Swedish envoy in London, had been intercepted and deciphered by the English government. On the 20th of January, Stanhope, as Secretary of State, laid the information thus obtained before the Council; and it was determined to resort to

* Coxe—"Life of Walpole."

the extraordinary measure of arresting the Swedish envoy, and of seizing his papers. Gyllenburg, of course, stoutly resisted; and pleaded the protection to which the representatives of foreign governments are entitled by the law of nations. That law, however, does not sanction an ambassador in being the active instrument of plots against the government to which he is accredited. General Wade carried off the contents of the Swede's *escrutoire*; and put a guard over his prisoner. The contents of the papers fully justified the act of the government. Gortz had organized a scheme for an insurrection in England, and a simultaneous invasion of Scotland by the king of Sweden. Spain had entered into the confederacy. Its prime minister, Alberoni, had remitted a million of French livres to Spaar, the Swedish envoy in Paris, to set the forces of Charles XII. in motion. The Pretender had offered sixty thousand pounds for the same object. The whole affair exploded upon the arrest of Gyllenburg. The king of Sweden did not disown the acts of his ministers, neither did he own them; but he ordered the British resident at his court to be put under arrest. Apprehensions of danger from Sweden were still professed by the English ministry; and on the 3rd of April, Stanhope delivered to the Commons a royal message, asking for an additional supply, "not only to secure his majesty's kingdoms against the present dangers with which they are threatened from Sweden, but likewise to prevent as far as possible the like apprehensions for the future." In the debate which ensued, strong objections were made to the proposition. "It must needs be very surprising to the whole world," said one member, "that a nation, not long ago the terror of France and Spain, should now seem to fear so inconsiderable an enemy as Sweden." The motion for a Supply was only carried by a majority of four votes. It was opposed by many of the Whigs, and coldly supported by others. Walpole, to whom the House looked up on all financial questions, spoke indeed in favour of the motion, but with a reserve that was more significant than censure. It was clear that the most important of the Whig leaders were jealous of the influence of Sunderland, who was now held to be the king's chief adviser. The result of this debate was that the same evening Townshend was dismissed from his office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; and that, the next morning, Robert Walpole resigned—firm in his resistance to the entreaties of the king to keep the seals of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Other resignations followed, including that of Methuen. Stanhope now became the head of the government; Sunderland and Addison were appointed Secretaries of State; and James Craggs Secretary at War.

Robert Harley, earl of Oxford, having been two years a prisoner in the Tower, presented a petition to the House of Lords, praying that his confinement might not be prolonged. The day of his trial was therefore fixed for the 24th of June. The Peers were assembled in Westminster Hall; the Commons were in attendance as prosecutors; the prisoner stood at the bar with the axe by his side; one of the managers opened the first article of impeachment regarding the treaty of Utrecht. Lord Harcourt, the ex-chancellor, then moved that the Peers should retire to their own House; and he there proposed a resolution, which was carried by a majority of thirty-two, "that no evidence should be received on the charges for misdemeanour till the charges for high treason were disposed of." It was known that the evidence was insufficient to convict Oxford of the crime that would have affected his life and estate. The Commons were indignant at this proceeding of the Peers, which it is affirmed was suggested by Walpole; and they refused to comply with it, regarding it as an infringement of their privileges. The Lords persevered; and named the 1st of July as the day when the trial should proceed according to the principle they had laid down. The Commons resolved that, justice being denied to the nation, they would abandon the prosecution. The defeat of the government was no doubt fortunate. Oxford was acquitted, as no prosecutor had appeared. The multitude cheered, and the nation generally, as well as the Tories, was not displeased that there should be some oblivion of political offences. The Session of Parliament was concluded by an Act of Grace, from which Oxford and Prior were excluded; but which released from prison the lords Carnwath, Widdrington, and Nairn, and others, who were under sentence of death, or in confinement, for their participation in the Rebellion of 1715.

The period during which Stanhope had the chief administration of affairs, from 1717 to his death in 1721, was a period of extraordinary excitement in the complicated policy of various European States, and of momentous embarrassment in the financial operations of the English people and the English government. It is difficult to describe our foreign relations in a brief narrative; and it would not be very interesting to relate the events connected with them in any lengthened detail. The whole course of these events is calculated to show how, in many cases, those territorial arrangements which appear to have been finally settled by Treaties, are suddenly broken up by unforeseen combinations; how the restless ambition of princes and ministers, the pretensions of rival dynasties, the dissatisfaction of peoples shifted from master to master, render what

is called the Balance of Power a condition of things in which those who fancy they may preserve an equilibrium, fall under the necessity of perpetually throwing a weight into one scale, or taking a weight out of another. Such attempts being generally failures, the blind-folded phantom of Justice terminates the abortive labour by throwing away the scales, and drawing the sword.

The chief instigator of the disputes which in 1717 threatened to involve Europe again in a general war was cardinal Alberoni, the prime minister of Spain. Philip V. had never displayed any vigour of mind; and he was now governed by his queen, over whom Alberoni had an absolute control. This remarkable Italian, the son of a labourer, had been in Spain with the duke de Vendôme during the war of the Succession. His agreeable qualities had gained him the favour of Vendôme; and he had gradually worked his way to the highest trust and dignity. When general Stanhope was a prisoner in Saragossa he became acquainted with Alberoni; and when the same general became king George's Secretary of State, their correspondence on the subject of a commercial treaty was marked by a more than usual manifestation of a desire on the part of the Spanish minister, to be on good terms with the British government. But the emperor had never recognised Philip as king of Spain. Under the peace of Utrecht he held the dominions in Italy which had formerly belonged to Spain. In the defensive treaty between Great Britain and the emperor the territorial guarantee was thus offensive to the court of Philip V. The alliance with France was still more offensive. The tone of Alberoni towards the British government became wholly changed. He had great projects in view, which he thought would raise Spain in the scale of nations. He prepared an armament at Barcelona, whose destination was wholly unknown. In August, 1717, a Spanish fleet anchored in the bay of Cagliari; and eight or nine thousand troops made a descent on the island of Sardinia, of which they took possession after a stout resistance from Spaniards of the Austrian party. The expedition was not merely intended to seize this barren territory. Spain had an eye to Sicily, which had been ceded at the peace to Victor Amadeus. England interposed, in the endeavour to preserve the peace of Europe. Negotiations went forward, without much effect; Stanhope having sent his cousin, afterwards earl of Harrington, as ambassador to Spain. The Regent of France also sent his ambassador. But the bold and crafty Alberoni wanted only to gain time, and he made the most extensive preparations for war upon a great scale. Spain, directed by the energy of this adventurer, threw off her accustomed lethargy.

In a year or two he had set in motion every instrument of intrigue against France and England. The Turks had been totally defeated by prince Eugene at the great battle of Peterwaradin. Alberoni urged the Sultan to persevere in the war with the Emperor. He had encouraged baron Gortz in his schemes for the invasion of England by Sweden. He entered into correspondence with the Pretender, and proposed a Spanish expedition to land in Britain, to be commanded by James, or by the duke of Ormond. He fomented insurrections and conspiracies in France. In 1718 it became evident that the British government must prepare for war-like operations; and give up its attempts at mediation. Alberoni, whose vanity made him presumptuous, but whose acuteness gave him signal advantages over ordinary politicians, must have offered many a rude shock to the complacency of diplomatic routine. The English negotiators had to attempt the difficult task of reconciling the conflicting interests of the Emperor and the Bourbon king of Spain. The treaty of Utrecht had failed in placing the peace of Europe on a durable foundation. There must be other territorial arrangements, which it was the object of the Quadruple Alliance of England, Holland, France, and the Emperor to effect. Exchanges of dominion were to be made between the rivals; something gained and something yielded on either side; doubtful successions guaranteed; compensation; all interests consulted but that trifling one, the welfare of those handed about from potentate to potentate. It is impossible not to feel a sort of respect for the vain and insolent Alberoni, when he encountered with words such as these the solemn bargain-makers whom the English cabinet employed to arrange articles of accommodation between the Austrian and Bourbon rivals: "You made war to establish the Balance of Power; and you concluded a peace without any balance whatever. . . . There are certain men who would cut and pare states and kingdoms as though they were so many Dutch cheeses." Thus treating their projects of pacification with contempt, he went his own way to redress the wrongs of which he complained, describing the peace of Utrecht as "a treaty made by the devil," and the scheme of another Balance as a monster which he termed "a goat-stag." He resolved for war, exclaiming "The Lord's hand is not shortened."

With this threatened interruption to the peace to Europe, the administration of Stanhope, who was now raised to the peerage, had to meet the Parliament which was summoned for the 21st of November. Just at this time a scene took place within the walls of St. James's Palace, which threatened as much embarrassment to the tranquil progress of the government as any complication of foreign