

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.

1820.—LIST OF THE KING'S MINISTERS.

CABINET MINISTERS.

Earl of Harrowby	Lord President of the Council.
Lord Eldon	Lord High Chancellor.
Earl of Westmoreland	Lord Privy Seal.
Earl of Liverpool	First Lord of the Treasury.
Right Hon. Nicholas Vansittart	Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Viscount Melville	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Duke of Wellington	Master General of the Ordnance.
Viscount Sidmouth	Secretary of State for the Home Department.
Viscount Castlereagh	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Earl Bathurst	Secretary of State for the Department of War and the Colonies.
Right Hon. George Canning	President of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India.
Right Hon. C. B. Bathurst	Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.
Right Hon. W. W. Pole	Master of the Mint.
Right Hon. F. J. Robinson	Treasurer of the Navy, and President of the Board of Trade.
Earl of Mulgrave	Without office.

NOT OF THE CABINET.

Viscount Palmerston	Secretary at War.
Right Hon. Charles Long	Paymaster-General of the Forces.
Earl of Chichester	} Joint Postmaster-General.
Marquess of Salisbury	
Right Hon. C. Arbuthnot	} Joint Secretaries of the Treasury.
S. R. Lushington, Esq.	
Right Hon. Thomas Wallace	Vice-President of the Board of Trade.
Right Hon. Thomas Plumer	Master of the Rolls.
Right Hon. Sir John Leach	Vice-Chancellor.
Sir Robert Gifford	Attorney-General.
Sir John Copley	Solicitor-General.

GREAT OFFICERS OF STATE.

Marquess of Cholmondeley	Lord Steward.
Marquess of Hertford	Lord Chamberlain.
Duke of Montrose	Master of the Horse.
His Royal Highness the Duke of York	Commander-in-Chief.
Sir Hildebrand Oakes	Lieut-General of the Ordnance.
Right Hon. William Huskisson	First Commissioner of Woods and Forests and Land Revenue.

IRELAND.

Earl Talbot	Lord Lieutenant.
Lord Lanners	Lord High Chancellor.
Right Hon. Charles Grant	Chief Secretary.
Right Hon. Sir G. F. Hill	Vice-Treasurer.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Meeting of Parliament on the demise of George III.—Prorogation and dissolution.—The Cato-street Conspiracy.—Debate on the subject of Queen Caroline.—Differences between the King and the Cabinet regarding the Queen.—The ministerial propositions finally agreed to.—Opening of the new Parliament.—Preparations for the Coronation of the Queen expected.—Her arrival.—Green bag containing papers laid before Parliament.—Adjournment.—Conferences for averting a public proceeding.—Failure of the negotiation.—The Bill of Pains and Penalties.—Scenes in the streets.—Scenes in the House of Lords.—The Third reading of the Bill carried by a small majority.—The Bill finally abandoned.—Joy of the country.—Discussions on the subject of the Queen in the next Session.—The Coronation of the King.—The Queen vainly endeavours to be present.—Her death and funeral.

UPON the Accession of George the Fourth there were the same Ministers in the Cabinet as those which formed the Administration of the Earl of Liverpool at the close of the war; with the exception of Mr. Canning, who in 1816 succeeded the earl of Buckinghamshire as President of the Board of Control.*

The Statutes of William and of Anne provided that the demise of the Crown should not interfere with the regular course of Constitutional government. Under these Statutes the Parliament, although adjourned to the 15th of February, assembled on Sunday morning the 30th of January; adjourned till the next day; and then proceeded to the swearing in of members. On the 17th of February, the Houses having again assembled, a message was delivered from the King, recommending that such measures should be adopted by the House of Commons as were necessary to provide for the exigencies of the public service, during the short period that must elapse between the termination of the present Session and the opening of a new Parliament, which it was his Majesty's intention to call without delay. The Houses sat till the 28th of February. During a few days after the death of his father, the King had been seriously ill, not without some apprehension that this would be the shortest reign in English history. When the Parliament was prorogued, with a view to its immediate dissolution, the Speech of the Royal Commissioners alluded to

* See volume vii. p. 576. The List in the opposite page of the King's Ministers, of the Great Officers of State, of the Law officers, and of the Irish Administration, is of the date of June, 1820.

"the flagrant and sanguinary conspiracy which has lately been detected."

"The Cato-street Conspiracy," atrocious as were the objects which it proposed to accomplish, base and brutal as were the wretched persons engaged in it, fearful as might have been the national terror had it been successful, was certainly not calculated, as affirmed in the Royal Speech, "to vindicate to the whole world the justice and expediency of those measures" [the Six Acts] to which the Parliament had resorted "in defence of the laws and Constitution of the Kingdom." The detection and prevention of what was something more formidable than "a little plot in a hay-loft,"* though not in any degree a symptom of a revolutionary spirit in the country, were certainly not advanced by the enactment of an unconstitutional code. The proceedings of a knot of sanguinary madmen had for some time been well-known at the Home office. "The principal informant was a modeller and itinerant vendor of images, named Edwards, who first opened himself at Windsor, as early as the month of November, to Sir Herbert Taylor, then occupying an important official situation in the establishment of George III." † Arthur Thistlewood, the leader of the gang who desired to assert their patriotism by the murder of all the King's ministers, had been a subaltern officer in the militia, and afterwards in a regiment of the line. He had sojourned in France in the early stages of the French Revolution, and was amongst the number of those who held that violence and insurrection were the proper modes of redressing the evils of what they considered bad government. He was one of the persons engaged in the Spa-fields riot; and in company with Dr. Watson, was tried for high treason. Upon his acquittal his rashness displayed itself in sending a challenge to Lord Sidmouth, for which folly he was convicted of a misdemeanour, and underwent a year's imprisonment. This term of confinement expired about the period of the affray at Manchester. Upon his trial he declared that his indignation at this occurrence prompted him to take his resolution of murderous vengeance: "I resolved that the lives of the instigators should be the requiem to

* Sydney Smith's "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 195.

† "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 316. The Author of the "Popular History" well recollects this man, who had a small shop in the High-street of Eton, where the most profitable exercise of his art was in the production and sale of a little model of Dr. Keate, the head master of Eton, in his cocked hat, the consumption of which image was considerable, from its rapid destruction by the junior boys as a mark to be pelted at. Sir Herbert Taylor, whose honour was unimpeachable, was utterly incapable of suggesting to the spy that he should incite these wretched men to the pursuance of their frantic designs. Yet in this, as in most similar cases, the functions of the tempter and the betrayer are very closely united.

the souls of the murdered innocents." He adds, "In this mood I met with George Edwards." He had decided that "insurrection became a public duty" before he met with George Edwards, "the contriver, the instigator, the entrapper," as he terms him.*

A noble writer, whose facts are in most cases of far higher value than his opinions, says, "the history of the Thistlewood Conspiracy, as related in the criminal annals of the period, illustrates in a remarkable manner the diseased state of political feeling then existing in England." † Lord Sidmouth has himself testified to the general healthfulness of public opinion: "Party feelings appeared to be absorbed in those of indignation, which the lower orders had also evinced very strikingly upon the occasion." ‡ It was not in the nature of Englishmen to entertain any other feeling than indignation at the scheme of assassination which was intended to be carried into effect on the 23rd of February. On Tuesday the 22nd, the Earl of Harrowby, President of the Council, was riding in the Park without a servant, when he was addressed by a person who said he had a letter directed to Lord Castlereagh. On the 23rd Lord Harrowby was to have had a Cabinet dinner at his house in Grosvenor-square, to which, as is usual, none but members of the Cabinet were invited. The person who accosted Lord Harrowby met him the next morning in the Ring at Hyde Park by appointment. That person was Thomas Hidon, a cow-keeper, formerly a member of a Shoemakers' Club, where he knew one of the conspirators, Wilson. By this man Hidon was invited to come forward and be one of a party to destroy his Majesty's ministers, when they were assembled at dinner, by hand grenades thrown under the table, and by the sword if any escaped the explosion. The paper which Lord Harrowby received from Hidon was described as "a note containing the whole plot." § The plans of Thistlewood had been also communicated to an Irishman named Dwyer, who revealed at the Home Office what he had heard. The evidence of Hidon and Dwyer sufficiently agreed to make the Cabinet take their resolution. They determined not to dine at Lord Harrowby's house, but that the preparations for dinner should go on as if no alarm had disarranged them. Mr. Birnie, the police magistrate, was to proceed to Cato-street, with a strong party of police-officers, at seven o'clock, the appointed dinner hour. In Cato-street, which runs parallel with the Edgeware-road, a loft had been engaged by the

* "State Trials." See also "Annual Register," 1820, p. 946.

† Duke of Buckingham, "Court of George IV.," vol. i. p. 9.

‡ "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 326.

§ "Annual Register," 1820, p. 932.

parties to the plot, and during the afternoon of the 23rd they had been observed conveying sacks into their place of rendezvous. A detachment of the foot-guards had been ordered to turn out for the purpose of accompanying the police, but through some mistake the civil officers had to enter the loft to execute their warrant without the military support. As Smithers, the police officer, first confronted the twenty-four whom he found assembled, having gone up into the loft by a ladder, he was stabbed through the heart by Thistlewood, whilst three others of his comrades were stabbed or shot. The lights were put out, and in the confusion Thistlewood, with about fourteen, escaped. The leader, however, was arrested the next morning, the government having offered a reward of a thousand pounds for his apprehension. When the soldiers arrived they captured nine of the party, with arms and ammunition.

Thistlewood and four of his principal accomplices were tried for high treason in April. Chief Justice Abbott, in passing sentence of death upon the prisoners, expressed what was the universal public sentiment—"That Englishmen, laying aside the national character, should assemble to destroy in cold blood the lives of fifteen persons unknown to them, except from their having filled the highest offices in the State, is without example in the history of this country, and I hope will remain unparalleled for atrocity in all future times." These five were executed on the 1st of May. A motion of Alderman Wood on the day after the execution, the object of which was to blame the conduct of the government in the employment of Edwards, did not call forth the same animadversion as in the former case of Oliver at Derby. Lord Campbell says,—and few will disagree with him in his opinion—"I do not think that Ministers deserved any censure for the manner in which they conducted themselves in this affair."* In such cases there is always the difficulty of interfering too soon or too late. Some members of the Cabinet proposed that the dinner should take place; that guards should be stationed near lord Harrowby's house, and that the conspirators should be arrested at the moment of their attempt. Others contended that ministers, being in possession of evidence to satisfy reasonable men, ought to stop the progress of the crime before it went on to the last step. "Lord Castlereagh was for going to the dinner in the face of it all at the hour invited, and letting each gentleman arm himself if he thought proper; whilst the duke of Wellington counselled to the course that was taken."†

The Cato-street Conspiracy for a while absorbed every other

* "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. x. p. 3.

† Rush, "Residence at the Court of London," second series, vol. i. p. 289.

topic of popular interest. If this extraordinary event had not occurred, the public journals would probably have attached more importance to a short debate in the House of Commons, on the subject of Queen Caroline. On the 21st of February, in a Committee of Supply, Mr. Hume, the Member for the Montrose Burghs,—who, since his return in 1818, had begun to take an active part in the discussion of financial questions—pressed to know whether any distinct provision was to be made for the Queen, inasmuch as the Act which granted to the Princess of Wales the sum of 35,000*l.* a year, expired on the demise of his late Majesty. He complained, also, that the Queen was slighted, and asked why her name was not inserted in the Liturgy. Mr. Tierney took the same course, with an important variation: "While the noble lord (Castlereagh) called her merely that 'high personage' instead of recognizing her as the Queen—while all Italy, nay, all Europe, was filled with rumours of her guilt, and of official inquiries about it—while her name was omitted in the Liturgy—while she was not acknowledged,—he could not agree to vote her the means of maintaining herself, until the reasons for such extraordinary circumstances as he had recited should be satisfactorily explained."* Mr. Brougham, who was the chief legal adviser of the Queen, maintained that her title did not depend upon any words in the Liturgy, or upon any Act of Council, or upon any expression of a Minister of the Crown. The provision for the maintenance of her dignity was, it appeared, to be made out of the general sum for which the Minister was about to move, and that arrangement was at present to his mind quite satisfactory. He totally disregarded the rumours which were imagined to cast a cloud of suspicion upon the Queen's character. Till some specific charge should be submitted to that House, his lips should be sealed upon the subject. If any charge should be preferred, he must beg it to be recollected, that this illustrious personage was not remarkable for any slowness to meet accusation, nor for any difficulty to prove her innocence. He trusted no appeal upon this matter would ever be made to any turbulent passions out of doors. Lord Castlereagh rose to thank the honourable and learned gentleman for a speech which did equal honour to his head and his heart.

The perfect agreement between Mr. Brougham and lord Castlereagh must have excited some surprise. But the Queen's legal adviser was no doubt fully cognizant of an arrangement by which the Cabinet had on the 21st of February tided over a difficulty which only four days before threatened their removal from office. On the 13th lord Sidmouth had written to earl Talbot, the Lord

* Hansard, vol. xli. col. 1625.

Lieutenant of Ireland, a brief note, in which he apologizes for not having answered a letter received on the 12th. "If you knew how the day was passed you would not be surprised at the omission. The Government is in a very strange and I must acknowledge in a precarious state." The King had for his confidential private adviser Vice-Chancellor Leach, who, in 1818, had arranged the Milan Commission, for the purpose of making inquiries into those rumours of the conduct of the Princess of Wales, which appeared to have determined the King to press the conduct of some very hazardous enterprise upon his Ministers. Six months before the death of George III., the Cabinet had a full sense of the difficulty and danger that would arise if Caroline of Brunswick should return to England as Queen Consort. But they steadily refused to meet the difficulty by acceding to the Prince Regent's passionate desire for a divorce. With Mr. Brougham, as the Princess of Wales's law-adviser, they then communicated "in order to bring about some arrangement which should hold good in the event of her Royal Highness becoming Queen." † In August, "the lady in question," as Mr. Brougham terms his client, wrote to him to express her resolve to come over herself, saying she had written to Lord Liverpool to tell him so. The Princess of Wales's law-adviser expresses himself with some vivacity upon the public danger, and the private discomfort to himself, that would result from this rash determination. "I am confident from her letter of to-day that she now intends to come, and I am still more clear that her coming would be pregnant with every sort of mischief." Mr. Stapleton, who was private Secretary to Mr. Canning, gives the date of this letter, August 5th, 1819, but does not state to whom it was addressed. It is evidently addressed to some official personage, as Mr. Brougham says, "You had better communicate this. I rely on the honour of the party principally concerned to have justice done to my motives, in the event of the other setting the mob against me, which she is quite capable of doing." ‡

In a minute of the Cabinet on the 10th of February, the Ministers communicated to the King their opinion; individually as well as collectively, that a proceeding for high-treason against the Queen was out of the question, and that a measure of divorce might seriously prejudice the interests of the King and of the Monarchy. They honestly stated that any private individual, circumstanced as the King had been with respect to the Princess, could not expect to obtain a divorce according to the established

* "Life of Lord Sidmouth," vol. iii. p. 310.

† Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," 1859, p. 265. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

usage of Parliament. They were of opinion, therefore, that the notoriety of what had been and still were the situation and conduct of the Princess of Wales upon the Continent, would induce Parliament to give a ready consent to any measure which, while it afforded to the King security against the invasion of his dignity and comfort by the return of the Princess to England, would be calculated, at the same time, to avoid discussions and disclosures offensive to public decency, and likely to disturb the peace of the country. They proposed, therefore, a Bill to make provision for the Queen by an annuity, payable only during her continued residence abroad. They thought that the King would be fully justified in withholding those distinctions which it was in the option of his Majesty to confer upon her,—to be named in the Liturgy, and to be crowned. They add, "the intercourse which took place with Mr. Brougham last summer affords just reason for believing that the Princess would be advised to acquiesce in an arrangement founded upon these principles." On this Minute Mr. Canning made a memorandum. "As a part of the whole I agree to the proposed alteration in the Liturgy. . . . I could not have agreed to the omission of her name if any *penal* process, of whatever kind, had been in contemplation."*

On the 12th of February the King replied *seriatim* to the various objections to his wishes offered by the Cabinet. He altogether disapproved of the proposal of settling an annuity upon the Princess, payable only during her residence abroad. On the 14th of February the Cabinet re-stated to the King their unanimous opinion that, whatever other measure they might feel themselves justified in proposing, the originating a Bill of Divorce is that which they cannot recommend. On the 17th the King yielded, being "ready, for the sake of the public decorum and the public interest, to make, therefore, this great and this painful sacrifice of his personal feelings." He recited the terms of the proposed arrangement, "to avoid all future misconception;" and he added, "the King further understands that it is the intention of his servants to assert and justify the omission of the Princess's name from the Liturgy."

Such was the prologue to the great "sensation" drama which was to be enacted four months afterwards. All political agitation appeared to have subsided. Mr. Hunt, and others concerned in the Manchester meeting, were tried at York on the 16th of March and nine following days, on the charge of unlawfully assembling for the purpose of moving and inciting to contempt and hatred of the

* The Minutes and the Memorandum are given in Mr. Stapleton's work, pp. 266 to 274.

Government. Henry Hunt, Joseph Johnson, John Knight, Joseph Healey, and Samuel Bamford, were found guilty, and being brought up for judgment in the Court of King's Bench, were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. At the Leicester Assizes, on the 23rd of March, sir Francis Burdett was found guilty of a seditious libel. The verdict was impeached in the Court of King's Bench, and the various arguments upon the case had the effect of postponing the judgment till the beginning of 1821. The baronet was sentenced to three months' imprisonment, and to pay a fine of two thousand pounds. Amidst this political quiet, now and then a flying rumour about the Queen appeared in the newspapers. In the gossip of the higher circles there was no foreboding of a coming storm. "Brougham attends frequently at the Treasury upon the Queen's business," writes Sydney Smith on the 15th of April. Every one was thinking of the expected Coronation, in which it appears to be understood as a matter of course, that the Queen was not to appear. "The King sits all day long with Lady C—, sketching processions, and looking at jewels; in the meantime, she tells everywhere all that he tells to her."* The placidity of the royal mind appears to have been somewhat disturbed in the midst of these pleasant occupations. On the 26th of April the Chancellor writes to his daughter, "Our Royal Master seems to have got into temper again, as far as I could judge from his conversation with me this morning. He has been pretty well disposed to part with us all, because we would not make additions to his revenue."† These minor troubles have a happy capacity for adjustment in a constitutional monarchy, when responsible Ministers possess the requisite degree of firmness. The King opened the session of the new parliament in person on the 27th of April, and had a brief popularity in declaring that he left entirely at the disposal of Parliament his interest in the hereditary revenues, and that so far from desiring any arrangement which might lead to the imposition of new burdens upon his people, or even diminish the amount of reduction incident to his accession, he had no wish that any addition whatever should be made to the settlement adopted by Parliament in 1816.

Amidst this sunshine the little cloud, no bigger than a man's hand, was seen from afar. Some members of Opposition began again to call attention to the position of the Queen. Mr. Tierney, in a debate on the Civil List on the 8th of May, said that he never expected to be called upon to vote for a Bill to provide for the main-

* "Memoir of Sydney Smith," vol. ii. p. 195.

† Twiss, "Life of Eldon," vol. ii. p. 362.

tenance of the royal family and household, out of which the Queen of England herself was to be excluded, after being recognized by the lord high chancellor. His allusion was to this circumstance; In the Court of Chancery, on the 11th of April, Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman had presented their appointments as attorney-general and solicitor-general to the Queen, which appointments the lord chancellor immediately accepted, saying that "he would consult no views, and regard no considerations in the matter, except such as were purely professional." In the last days of May the preparations for the King's Coronation still formed the chief topic at court. The committee for settling the forms of that ceremony had reported to the King that, as there was to be no crowning of a Queen, peeresses should not be summoned to attend. His Majesty had a ready answer, that as "Queen Elizabeth, though a lady, had both peers and peeresses, so he, though he has no Queen, will have both ladies and gentlemen to attend him."* While these discussions were proceeding within the palace, the people in public places were thinking very seriously of some other possible occurrence than a coronation—so seriously, that they committed their opinions to the usual issue of a bet. Some, who thought the Queen would not come very speedily, paid fifty guineas to receive a guinea a day till she did come. This was the common entry in the gambler's 'book' on the 29th of May, on which day Eldon wrote, "I retain my old opinion that she will not come unless she is insane." On the 1st of June the Queen was at St. Omers, having rapidly travelled thither, accompanied by alderman Wood. She had previously despatched a courier with letters to London, demanding that a yacht should be sent to convey her to England, and that a palace should be provided for her reception. The Cabinet authorized lord Hutchinson immediately to proceed to St. Omers to make the proposal of an annuity according to the arrangement of February, but with conditions which appear to have been capable of a different construction from those which formed part of the proposition made in the "intercourse which took place with Mr. Brougham last summer." Her Majesty's attorney-general accompanied lord Hutchinson. The proposition, which it appears was made then for the first time in a letter addressed by lord Hutchinson to Mr. Brougham, and which, as her legal adviser, he read to the Queen, was rejected by her under his advice.† Her Majesty, with her civic councillor, hurried off to Calais, was quickly on board a packet, landed at Dover amidst the shouts of the populace, and entering London on the evening of the 6th surrounded by huzzaing thou-

* Twiss, "Life of Eldon," vol. ii. p. 366. † Hansard, vol. i. new series, col. 973.

sands, took up her abode at the house of alderman Wood in South Audley-street. On that same evening a message from the King was presented to both Houses, stating the arrival of the Queen, and announcing that his Majesty had thought it right to communicate certain papers respecting the conduct of her Majesty since she left this country. On the table of each House a green bag was laid which contained the papers, sealed up.

In the House of Lords, after some discussion, it was agreed that the papers should be referred to a Secret Committee. In the House of Commons, previous to taking into consideration the King's Message, Mr. Brougham, as her Majesty's attorney-general, presented a communication from the Queen, in which she stated that she had returned to England in consequence of measures pursued against her honour and her peace by agents abroad. She protested against the formation of a Secret Committee to examine documents privately prepared by her adversaries. She complained of the omission of her name in the Liturgy, as calculated to prejudice her cause. Lord Castlereagh declared that the Secret Committee was only a preliminary step, to ascertain whether there was any case to proceed with. Mr. Brougham strongly resisted the appointment of the Committee, and commented in the most unqualified terms upon the proposition made to the Queen, which was nothing more nor less than to ask her to say, "Give me fifty thousand a year, and I will plead guilty." Mr. Canning, in vindicating the conduct of the Government, expressed his earnest desire, that this unhappy business should be terminated without any further public proceedings. In reply to Mr. Brougham's complaint of the terms offered to the Queen, he declared that they were the same terms which the Queen's legal adviser had previously considered reasonable. Mr. Brougham, in reply, complained that if Mr. Canning had not considered himself bound to secrecy, he, Mr. Brougham, felt himself, in some degree, under that obligation. He pledged himself to show that there was nothing inconsistent in his taking part in the negotiation of July, and in his present course. There was one circumstance in the date of the transaction referred to, which constituted an essential difference between the terms then suggested, and those proposed by lord Hutchinson. "The illustrious person was not then Queen, and it was a very different proposal that she should forbear to assume a title which might fall to her at some distant and contingent time, and that she should lay down what she had in course of law assumed. Widely different, too, was that proposal from the proposition of lord Hutchinson; the one calling on the Princess of Wales not to assume a particular

title, which might afterwards descend to her, the other to renounce any title taken from the royal family of England."* Mr. Brougham declared, on his honour, that her Majesty was not in the slightest degree implicated in the proceeding adverted to. "The right honourable gentleman might treat as he pleased the person who made those propositions, but her Majesty had no more knowledge, no more influence over those propositions, than the child unborn." The historical inquirer may ask, how was it that the Queen had "no more knowledge than the child unborn" of those propositions? We cannot doubt that when the time for a complete revelation shall arrive, there will be a juster solution of the question than the suspicions of Mr. Canning of an absence of "plain dealing;" less tinctured, possibly, by political rivalry than his assertion that "the Government was not prepared to pursue their own course by any means but those which were indicated to them; and these indications came from a quarter which wished for extremities." †

The temper of the House of Commons on Wednesday, the 7th of June, was signally manifested by its cordial assent to Mr. Wilberforce's motion, that the debate should be adjourned till the following Friday. Mr. Wilberforce says in his Diary, "I endeavoured to interpose a pause, during which the two parties might have an opportunity of contemplating coolly the prospect before them." ‡ The proceedings of the House of Lords were also suspended. On the Friday, Mr. Brougham, by command of the Queen, transmitted a note to lord Liverpool, in which her Majesty said that, submitting to the declared sense of Parliament, she was willing to consider any arrangements that might be proposed consistent with her dignity and honour. Lord Liverpool, in reply, referred to a note delivered to Mr. Brougham on the 15th of April, as the proposition made on the part of the King. The Queen replied that she had never seen this note. Mr. Brougham explained that her official advisers had not had an opportunity of delivering it previous to the interview with lord Hutchinson. It was then agreed that two of the King's confidential servants should meet two persons to be named by the Queen, to frame an arrangement for settling the necessary particulars of her Majesty's future situation, upon the condition of her residence abroad. The duke of Wellington and lord Castlereagh were appointed on the part of the King, and Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman on the part of the Queen. This negotiation failed through the want of concession on

* Hansard, vol. i. second series, col. 971.

† Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," p. 300. Letter from Mr. Manning to Mr. Huskisson, October 2nd, 1820.

‡ Life, vol. v. p. 55.