

either side upon one point alone. The insertion of the Queen's name in the Liturgy was demanded on the one side, and refused on the other, although something like an equivalent was tendered by the agents of the King. Mr. Wilberforce has succinctly stated the general character of these proceedings. "The concessions made by the King's servants, as Mr. Brougham afterwards declared in the House of Commons, were various and great. The name and rights of a Queen were granted to her Majesty without reserve, any recognition of which had formerly been carefully avoided. A royal yacht, a frigate, &c., were offered. It was agreed that her name and rank should be notified at the Court either of Rome or Milan—the capitals of the countries in which she had expressed her intention to reside; and that an Address should be presented to the Queen no less than another to the King, to thank her Majesty for having acceded to the wish of the House of Commons."* On the 19th of June this negotiation was announced to Parliament as having failed. Again Mr. Wilberforce attempted to put an end to this unfortunate conflict, by moving a resolution on the 22nd of June, in which, amidst many qualifying phrases, the House declared its opinion that if the Queen would forbear to press farther the adoption of those propositions on which any material difference yet remained, such forbearance would by no means be understood to indicate any wish to shrink from inquiry. The motion was agreed to by a very large majority. Mr. Wilberforce, as part of a deputation of members, waited the next morning upon the Queen with this resolution. He and his companions were saluted by the groans of the populace. The answer of the Queen rejected the proposed mediation. When this attempt failed Mr. Wilberforce was accused in the newspapers "with trifling with the House of Commons, and attempting to deceive the people." He had in his possession a triumphant answer to the charge in the positive engagement of the Queen's chief law-adviser. 'She will accede to your Address,' he wrote to Mr. Wilberforce (June 22nd), 'I pledge myself.' His influence was overborne by a less sagacious counsellor, and with 'a political forbearance which,' says the party whom it spared, 'I never knew equalled,' he suppressed this unfulfilled pledge, and bore quietly the groundless charge of an unreasonable interference.† There was now an end of all attempts at compromise. Mr. Canning, when he saw that the chances of an amicable adjustment were over, waited upon the King to express the impossibility for him to take part in any criminatory proceedings towards a per-

* "Life of Wilberforce," vol. v. p. 56.

† *Ibid.*, p. 65.

son to whom he had formerly stood in confidential relations. The King, who sent his answer through lord Liverpool, insisted that Mr. Canning should remain one of his Ministers, following his own course with regard to the Queen. He went abroad, to avoid taking any part in discussions of the House of Commons. That House adjourned on the 26th, that the initiatory proceedings upon the Green Bag might take place in the Upper House. On the 4th of July the Secret Committee of the Lords made its Report, declaring that the evidence affecting the honour of the Queen was such as to require a solemn inquiry, which might be best effected in the course of a legislative proceeding. Lord Liverpool then proposed a Bill of Pains and Penalties, which had for its object "to deprive her Majesty Queen Caroline Amelia Elizabeth of the title, prerogatives, rights, privileges, and exemptions of Queen-Consort of this realm, and to dissolve the marriage between his Majesty and the said Caroline Amelia Elizabeth." The second reading of the Bill was fixed for the 17th of August, and on that day commenced what is popularly known as The Queen's Trial.

It is scarcely necessary for us to refer to the chronicles of the time for the purpose of recalling the impressions which live in our memory of the extraordinary scenes of that summer and autumn of 1820. On the 3rd of August the Queen had removed from her temporary abode in London, to take up her residence at Brandenburg House at Hammersmith. For four months from that day there never was a cessation of processions marching to Hammersmith, or of cavalcades shouting around the Queen's carriage. On the day before the judicial proceedings commenced, addresses were presented to the Queen by deputations from the county of Middlesex, from St. Leonards Shoreditch, and from the Mechanics of the Metropolis. These assemblages, whether led by the radical Sheriff of Middlesex, in his state carriage, or by enthusiastic committeemen with white wands, gradually swelled into a multitude, of which the advanced guard were trampling down the laurels in her Majesty's garden at Hammersmith, before the rear-guard had passed Hyde Park Corner. Not on that 13th of November, 1642, when London poured forth its thousands, whilst Rupert was fighting in the streets of Brentford, was there a greater earnestness than in those mechanics who marched to Hammersmith under a burning sun, and marched back again, hungry and weary, satisfied that their shouts had advanced the cause of justice for the oppressed. It is impossible not to recognize something of grandeur in such demonstrations, however capable they may be of affording matter for ridicule.

"All kinds of addresses
From Collars of SS,
To venders of cresses,
Came up like a fair;
And all through September,
October, November,
And down to December,
They hunted this Hare!"*

The weekly journal from which we quote these lines was the chief of those new papers which "were established with the professed object of maintaining a constant war against all who espoused her Majesty's cause."† There certainly never was a time in which the proper functions of the press were more degraded to the purposes of private slander. But it must be said in fairness, that if the Queen and her partisans were attacked with the coarsest reviling or the bitterest wit, the King and his supporters were no less subject to libellous attacks far exceeding the accustomed licence of periodical writing. Milton has described the controversialists of London, sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, assenting to the force of reason and conviction. It is scarcely necessary to point the contrast furnished by the writers of 1620. The violence and ribaldry of the journals were perfectly in accord with the floods of indecency that were poured out every morning in the short-hand reports of the evidence on the trial—reports which were regularly printed by authority, circulated amongst the Peers, and thence duly copied in the daily papers.

If the scenes that were passing in the streets were extraordinary, certainly the appearance presented by the House of Lords, on any one of the days of this trial, was no less remarkable. That House, the old Court of Requests, had been fitted up anew on the accession of George IV. The elevated arm-chair, from which former monarchs addressed the Parliament, had been supplanted by a magnificent throne—a canopy of crimson velvet, supported by Corinthian columns, and surmounted by the imperial crown. For this special occasion of the Queen's trial, galleries had been erected on each side of the House for the accommodation of the unusual number of Peers who were expected to attend. A chair of state was placed for the Queen a little beyond the bar, fronting the throne and the woosack. The places for her counsel were immediately behind her. On the 21st of August, the Attorney-General was concluding his speech in support of the Bill, when drums and trumpets, mixed with the shouts of the people,

* From Theodore Hook's song of "Hunting the Hare," in "John Bull."

† "Lord Brougham's Speeches"—Introduction to the case of Blacow.

announced the Queen's arrival. She takes her seat. The interpreters being sworn, Teodora Majocchi was called in. The Queen turned suddenly round, uttered a loud exclamation, and rushed out of the House. This man had been one of her domestic servants. The examination of witnesses for the Bill proceeded till the 6th of September. The Solicitor-General summed up on the 7th, and on the 9th, upon an application from the Queen's counsel, an adjournment took place till the 3rd of October. The examinations and cross-examinations of the witnesses for the Bill, gross and revolting as were many of the details, were signal exhibitions of legal acuteness. It was impossible to deny the right of counsel to put questions offensive to delicacy; but it was scarcely possible not to feel some indignation when a noble lord now and then asked a question which the most brazen advocate would have attempted to clothe in somewhat more decent language. The universal licence of that unhallowed time seemed occasionally to make some of the highest forget their self-respect. There probably would have been more instances of unseemly interference with the ordinary course of legal inquiry if one man had not stood in the midst of that assembly, whose whole bearing was that of authority and command; whose look, denouncing "battle dangerous" if any rash offence were given, made the boldest peer prudent. The great admiral, who in the bay of Algiers, was "all-fightful," complained of "the disrespect of counsel [Mr. Brougham] in fixing his eyes on him at the time that he was presuming to check him for an expression which had not been used by him, but by another noble lord." There was another of the Queen's law-officers who dared even to fix his eyes upon a prince of the blood, exclaiming, "Come forth, thou slanderer." Some who heard these things might well fear that the old respect for "degree, priority, and place" was coming to an end.

On the 3rd of October Mr. Brougham entered on the Queen's defence. His speech on that day and the following may be cited amongst the greatest examples of forensic eloquence. "At half-past twelve to-day," writes Lord Dudley, "Brougham concluded a most able speech with a magnificently eloquent peroration. The display of his power and fertility of mind in this business has been amazing; and these extraordinary efforts seem to cost him nothing. He dined at Holland House yesterday, and staid till eleven at night, talking 'de omni scibili'—French cookery, Italian poetry, and so on."* Mr. Rush, the American minister, notices as illustrative of the English bar, and individually of Mr. Brougham, that during the adjournment of the Queen's trial, her Attorney-General

* Lord Dudley's "Letters," p. 267.

attended the assizes at Yorkshire, and engaged in a cause in behalf of a poor old woman, upon whose pig-cote a trespass had been committed, for which trespass the old woman obtained a verdict of forty shillings damages.* From the 4th to the 24th of October, the examination of witnesses on behalf of the Queen was continued. Mr. Denman then summed up the evidence in an address, which lasted two days. His denunciations were so unmeasured, that some noble lords complained of the extraordinary licence used by the Queen's counsel. Mr. Rush has remarked of this time, when the most daring words were written and spoken with impunity, not only that every day produced its fiery libels against the King and his adherents, but that Mr. Denman, addressing himself to the assembled Peerage of the realm, denounced in thundering tones one of the brothers of the King. Perhaps more remarkable was the boldness of the same counsel, which compared the proceedings against the Queen to circumstances in the history of Imperial Rome described by Tacitus—how Octavia, the wife of Nero, in consequence of an unjust aversion which existed in the mind of her husband, was dismissed, and a mistress taken in her place; how she was banished by means of a conspiracy, in which slaves were produced as evidence against her, although the greater part of her servants protested her innocence; how Nero persevered, although she was hailed as in triumph by a generous people—and how, on a second conspiracy, she was convicted, condemned, and banished to an island in the Mediterranean. Not so bold, but equally cutting, was the application by Mr. Brougham of the passage from Milton. Having asked John Allen Powell, the solicitor employed on the Milan Commission,—who is your client or employer in this case? and being debarred from putting this question, the Queen's Attorney-General exclaimed, "Up to this moment I have never been able to trace the local habitation or the name of the unknown being who is the plaintiff in this proceeding. I know not but it may vanish into thin air. I know not under what shape it exists—

'If shape it might be called that shape had none,
Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb,—
Or substance might be call'd that shadow seem'd,
For each seem'd either—what seem'd his head
The likeness of a kingly crown had on.' †

* "Residence at the Court of London," second series, vol. i. p. 339.

† The orator dovetailed with great skill inconsecutive lines of the famous passage in "Paradise Lost." The allusion might have been too strong for his audience if he had given the entire passage:—

'Or substance might be call'd that shadow seem'd,
For each seem'd either; black it stood as Night,
Fierce as ten Furies, terrible as Hell,
And shook a dreadful dart; what seem'd his head
The likeness of a kingly crown had on.'

It is not our intention to furnish even the very briefest abstract of the evidence that was brought forward to sustain, or to rebut, the charge against the Queen upon which the Bill of Pains and Penalties was founded,—namely, that her royal highness conducted herself towards Bartolomeo Bergami, a foreigner engaged in her service in a menial situation, both in public and private, "with indecent and offensive familiarity and freedom, and carried on with him a licentious, disgraceful, and adulterous intercourse." The impression of the character of the Queen, produced upon all impartial persons by the publication of the evidence, was pretty much the same as that expressed by Sydney Smith after the proceedings had closed:—"The style of manners she has adopted does not exactly tally with that of holy women in the days that are gone, but let us be charitable and hope for the best."* The evidence and the arguments of counsel having been concluded, the peers, on the 2nd of November, came to the question of the second reading of the Bill of Pains and Penalties. The question was debated for five nights; when the motion for the second reading of the Bill was carried by 123 against 95. The majority was smaller than the Government had expected. It was thought by many that this was "too small a majority for such a Bill to be sent into such a place as the House of Commons." † But the majority was still more reduced when the Divorce clause came under consideration. Some peers were willing to pass the Bill if this clause were removed. In the course of the proceedings lord Harrowby had intimated that the Divorce clause might be withdrawn. Mr. Canning, watching the progress of these proceedings from Paris, at the beginning of October, had written to lord Liverpool that though he thought the omission of the Divorce clause was likely enough to facilitate the passing of the Bill in the House of Lords, that omission would furnish an argument against it in the House of Commons. The Bill would become "a pure penal enactment for immorality; and when, from the beginning of time, did such an enactment take place? And where, if it take place now, is this new species of legislation to end?" ‡ The Opposition saw clearly that the way to defeat the Bill was to press for retaining the Divorce clause; and that it should be retained was carried by a majority of 129 to 62. On the 10th of November, on the motion that the Bill be read a third time, the majority was only nine—108 to 99. After the division, lord Dacre was about to present a petition from the Queen,

* "Memoir," vol. ii. p. 206.

† "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. iii. p. 179—Letter of Mr. Bootle Wilbraham.

‡ Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," p. 298.

praying to be heard by counsel against the passing of the Bill. Lord Liverpool rose and said that such a course would not now be necessary:—"Had the third reading been carried by as considerable a number of peers as the second had been, he and his noble colleagues would have felt it their duty to persevere in the Bill, and to send it down to the other branch of the legislature. In the present state of the country, however, and with the division of sentiment so nearly balanced, just evinced by their lordships, they had come to the determination not to proceed further with it. It was his intention, accordingly, to move 'That the further consideration of the Bill be adjourned to this day six months.'"

There was a general joy throughout the country at the termination of these proceedings. Those who looked carefully into the matter did not think with the excited multitude that the result was an acquittal of the queen; but all rejoiced that the time was come when the heads of decent families would not be obliged to hide the newspaper from the eyes of their daughters, and when the legislature would have some better work before it than the discussion of a measure whose only fruits had been—"a Government brought into contempt and detestation; a kingdom thrown into such ferment and convulsion, as no other kingdom or Government ever recovered from without a revolution."* There was one advantage to the Government and to the country, which Mr. Canning could not so well see as those who at home were watching the course of public opinion. What the Ministers at the end of 1819 were dreading as symptoms of revolution, were put an end to at the end of 1820 by the very "ferment and convulsion" about the Queen. Mr. Wilbraham writes from Latham House to lord Colchester, during the extremest violence of the popular feeling, "Radicalism has taken the shape of affection for the Queen, and has deserted its old form; for we are all as quiet as lambs in this part of England, and you would not imagine that this could have been a disturbed country twelve months ago."†

On the 23rd of November Parliament was prorogued. On the 29th the Queen went in procession to St. Paul's to return thanks for her deliverance from a great peril and affliction. In the next session of Parliament there were violent discussions on her Majesty's affairs, particularly on her continued exclusion from the Liturgy. An annuity of fifty thousand pounds was provided for her by Act of Parliament. Her popularity gradually declined, and in April, 1821, it was written—"The Queen is gone by as a topic of inflammation; and her taking quietly the fifty-thousand pounds a year,

* Stapleton, "George Canning and his Times," p. 299.

† "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. iii. p. 164.

after her protest and declaration that she would not till her right was acknowledged was a *coup de grace* to her. It is said that an attempt is making by lady Jersey, who patronises her, to procure a drawing room at Brandenburgh House, but it will undoubtedly fail. She is now hardly named in society or in the newspapers."* Cobbett, who had addressed the most violent letters to the Queen, stimulating her to resist every attempt at compromise, says that after the abandonment of the bill, when the Whig faction flocked about her, the people, who hated this faction more than the other, troubled her with no more addresses. "The faction agitated questions about her in Parliament, concerning which the people cared not a straw: what she was doing soon became as indifferent to them as what any other person of the royal family was doing. The people began again to occupy themselves with the business of obtaining a parliamentary reform; and her way of life, and her final fate, soon became objects of curiosity much more than of interest with the people."†

It is scarcely necessary, after the lapse of more than forty years, to enter upon any detail of the discussions upon questions connected with the Queen, agitated in Parliament after the great investigation was concluded—questions about which the arch-demagogue declared "the people cared not a straw." These discussions occupied many hundred columns of Hansard's Debates during the Second Session of the Seventh Imperial Parliament. On the 11th of July, the last day of the session, and only eight days before the time appointed for the king's coronation, Mr. Hume moved that an address be presented to his Majesty, praying that he would issue his proclamation for the coronation of the Queen, "thereby consulting the true dignity of the crown, the tranquillity of the metropolis, and the general expectations of the people." At the moment when Mr. Hume was proposing his resolution the usher of the black rod summoned the Commons to attend in the House of Peers, where Commissioners were assembled to prorogue the Parliament. The motion necessarily fell to the ground. The Coronation took place on the 19th of July. The Queen was destined to a more bitter humiliation than any that she had previously endured. The Privy Council, on the 10th of July, had decided against a claim of her right to be crowned at the same time as the King. The next day she wrote to lord Sidmouth to declare her intention to be present at the ceremony. In this injudicious and undignified intention her Majesty persisted. Between six and seven o'clock in the morning she presented herself at every en-

* "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. iii. p. 218—Wilbraham to Lord Colchester.

† Cobbett's "History of George IV.," § 454.

trance to the Abbey, and at each was denied admission. The same refusal attended her demand to enter Westminster Hall. A few of the populace huzzaed, and a few hissed, but the prevailing sentiment was indifference. At the beginning of August the Queen was attacked with internal inflammation, and she died on the night of the 7th. The king had sailed for Dublin on the 1st, and he received at Holyhead the intelligence of this sudden termination of a domestic trouble which had long been a source of public anxiety. Before this close of the unhappy lady's life, the people had very generally begun to feel that in their compassion for the desolate and oppressed, they had somewhat overstepped the safe line of a constitutional respect for the chief magistrate. There was a riot at the funeral procession of the Queen's remains from Brandenburgh House. They were to be conveyed to Harwich, and there put on board a government sloop, which was to sail for Stade for the purpose of conveying them for interment at Brunswick. The mourning cavalcade was to avoid the crowded streets; but a mob had determined to force it through the city. The Life Guards having been rudely assaulted at Cumberland gate, leading out of Hyde Park to Tyburn, a serious conflict ensued, when two of the assailants of the soldiers were shot. The procession went through the city with the lord mayor at its head. From this time there was an end of all excitement about the Queen.

There was one result, however, which was of more political importance than the continued struggles of a few demagogues for notoriety. Mr. Canning, on the 12th of December, 1820, resigned his office of Secretary of the Board of Control, on the ground that the discussions respecting the Queen in the session of 1821 would be so intermixed with the general business that a minister could not absent himself without appearing to abandon the parliamentary duties of his station, nor could he be present taking no part in such discussions, without producing embarrassment to himself and perplexity to his colleagues. The King accepted his resignation, but with a smothered displeasure at the course Mr. Canning and his immediate friends had taken. Upon the death of the Queen lord Liverpool strongly pressed the readmission of Mr. Canning to the Cabinet, and the King as stoutly resisted it. His Majesty was not unsupported by some of his official advisers, who disliked the presence amongst them of the most eloquent of the advocates of Catholic Emancipation, and who, upon this and most other questions, dreaded "the flexible innovator" more than they admired "the eloquent conservative."*

* Guizot, "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 23.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Death of Napoleon Bonaparte.—Parliamentary strictures on the measures adopted for his secure detention.—Circular of the Congress at Laybach.—Parliament.—Irish outrages.—Agricultural Distress.—New Corn Law.—The King's visit to Scotland.—Death of Lord Londonderry.—His foreign Administration.—Mr. Canning Secretary for Foreign Affairs.—His instructions to the duke of Wellington in his mission to Verona.—French invasion of Spain.—Mr. Canning's remonstrances.—The Spanish American separated States.—Consuls appointed.—Opposition to Mr. Canning's decree to recognize their independence.—Their recognition by the conclusion of commercial treaties.—Circumstances which give to a neutral power the right of recognizing States which have effectually asserted their independence.—Discussions with the minister of the United States of North America.—Spanish aggression upon Portugal.—Promptitude in sending troops for her defence.—Important changes in our Commercial Policy.—Mr. Huskisson and his defamers.—The transfer of England to "the camp of Progress and Liberty."—The Present and the Past.

ON the 5th of May, 1821, died Napoleon Bonaparte. Six years had passed since, in the great festival of the Champ de Mai, he had announced that the people who had called him to the throne must prepare for war. The issue to himself was his imprisonment in this lonely island of the Atlantic, long suffering under a chronic disease, and suffering more from his total want of power to endure his fate with equanimity. A hurricane swept over the island as Napoleon was dying, shaking houses to their foundation, and tearing up the largest trees. We cannot avoid thinking of the similar phenomenon that attended the death of Cromwell. The faithful followers who were around his bed might have felt the sentiment, if they did not know the lines, of Waller:

"He must resign! Heaven his great soul does claim:
In storms, as loud as his immortal fame:
His dying groan, his last breath, shakes our isle,
And trees uncut fall for his funeral pile."*

But the last thoughts of the dying men were essentially different. To Napoleon the war of the elements seemed as if "the noise of battle hurtled in the air," and he died muttering the words, *L'Élé d'Armée*. Cromwell, also a great soldier, passed away with thoughts of peace in his mind, praying that God would give His people "consistency of judgment, one heart, and mutual love." The

* "Ode on the Death of the Lord Protector."