

was still an effective Reform of Municipal Institutions, the House should agree to it as it then stood, reserving the right of introducing whatever improvements the working of it might hereafter show to be necessary. The Bill for Municipal Reform received the royal assent on the 9th of September.

Lord Eldon, in this perilous crisis of a contest between the Peers and the Commons, lamented that his infirmities prevented him from going down to the House of Lords—not to conciliate, not to reconcile the differences between the two Houses,—but to grapple with the proceedings altogether, and persuade the Lords utterly to reject the Bill. Sitting “pale as a marble statue,” and seeing terrible changes gradually darkening over all he had loved and venerated in corporate institutions,\* we may venture to inquire if the outward glories of municipal power thus departing were as dear to his troubled soul as their ancient charters? What wonderful manifestations of grandeur were presented to the admiring eyes of the people by the majority of corporations as they existed in 1835! What processions were there on every possible occasion, of red gowns and blue, with mace-bearer and beadle! To walk in togged state to church, or to proclaim an election writ, or to open a ginger-bread fair;—to be adorned with golden chains as mayor and aldermen sitting on high in their tribunals at quarter sessions; to look venerable, clothed in scarlet and fur, at solemn supper in open hall like the Tudor and Stuart kings, on Fair-nights, holding the Pie-powder Court, where the “dustifoot” might go for justice,—these were indeed gorgeous displays. Magnificent pageants on the Mayor’s day existed in a few provincial cities and boroughs: Norwich had its “Whiffers” and its “Dragon.” All the ancient and modern glories were to depart; even the Mayor’s feast was to be an inexpensive banquet, not defrayed out of the corporate funds. The Mansion Houses were to be let for warehouses. Well might the good ex-Chancellor weep, having only one poor consolation, that the City of London was to be spared; that its Lord Mayor would still have the glorious privilege of interrupting for one day in the year the real business of three millions of people, to assert by his men-in-armour, and his pasteboard Gog and Magog, his pretended rule over a community of which only one-thirtieth would be subject to his jurisdiction.

\* See Twiss, vol. iii. p. 247.

## CHAPTER IX.

Parliament.—Session of 1836.—Opposition of the Lords to the Irish Corporations’ Bill.—Lord Lyndhurst.—Alleged Lichfield House Compact.—Tithe-Commutation Act.—Act for allowing Counsel to Prisoners.—Act for Regulation of Prisons and for appointing Inspectors.—General Registration Act.—Reduction of Stamp on Newspapers.—Reduction of Paper Duty.—Foreign Politics.—Belgium.—Spain.—France.—Conspiracies against Louis Philippe.—Enterprise of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte at Strasbourg.—Parliament.—Illness of King William IV.—His death.—His character.—Accession of Queen Victoria.—Ministry at Her Majesty’s Accession.—Table of Treaties.—Table of National Debt.

THE disposition which had been manifested in the Session of 1835 by the majority of the House of Lords, threatening something beyond a passing difference with the majority of the House of Commons, became stronger and more confirmed in the Session of 1836. The compromise upon the English Municipal Reform Bill had averted, in some degree, the apprehension of a perilous conflict between the two branches of the legislature. The question of Corporation Reform in Ireland was to be disposed of in the session of 1836, with an absolute indifference to the opinions of the Commons. In 1835, on the reading of that Bill a third time in the Lower House at so late a period of the Session as the 13th of August, Mr. Sinclair, a Scotch member, anticipating the probable course that would be taken by the Lords, when in the next Session it should be sent to the Upper House, said that it must pass through the ordeal of an assembly in which the laws of truth and justice would not be set at nought,—in which vested rights would not be invaded,—in which no bill would pass for the destruction of the Protestant Establishment in Ireland, by transferring the influence from property, which in a preponderating ratio was in the hands of Protestants, to Roman Catholics, who in point of numbers would in most cases obtain the pre-eminence.\* It is easy to judge from this declaration how sustained and bitter would be the controversy upon the subject of Irish Corporations in the Session of 1836, in which a new bill was brought in and passed by the House of Commons on the 28th of March. On the 18th of August of that year, just previous to the prorogation, lord Lyndhurst, who had with infinite courage and ability directed the

\* Hansard, vol. xxx. col. 615.

triumphant strategy of the Tory Peers, took a review of the business of the Session, in which, with unmeasured sarcasm, he taunted the government with its failure in carrying certain measures which had been recommended in the Speech from the throne on the 4th of February. "And this, my lords, is a government! Was there ever, in the history of this country, a body of men who would have condescended so low as to attempt to carry on the government under such circumstances? In this House they are utterly powerless; they can effect nothing." \* Sir Robert Peel, in a dinner-speech at the Merchant Taylors' Hall, had warned his hearers not to depend upon the prerogative of the Crown, or the influence or authority of the House of Lords, as bulwarks against the storm and struggle of events. The royal prerogative, the authority of the House of Lords were most useful, nay, necessary, in our mixed and balanced Constitution; "but you must not strain those powers." The dangerous opinion was gradually gaining ground that the House of Lords, was an obstructive body, and that their policy was determined by the will of some one peer who dominated over their general inertness. "It has generally yielded," says Mr. May, "with an indolent facility, to the domination of one or two of its own members, gifted with the strongest wills. Lord Thurlow, lord Eldon, the duke of Wellington, and lord Lyndhurst, have swayed it, at different times, almost with the power of a dictator." † Mr. Hume, in the House of Commons on the day of prorogation, had his own review of the business of parliament during the twenty-eight weeks of its sitting. He was not alone in the expression of his opinion when he asked whether it were possible that the Commons could allow the lords any longer to continue their opposition to all measures of real reform. They had lost nearly a Session. "If he lamented one thing more than another, it was to see the high-minded noblemen of England led by such a man as was now at their head." Such personalities were not confined to attacks in one House upon the members of the other House. The bitterness of lord Lyndhurst's invective stimulated even the placability of viscount Melbourne, to "refer him to what was once said by the earl of Bristol, of another great statesman of former times (the earl of Strafford) to whom the noble lord might, I think, be not inapplicably compared; and of whom it was said, 'the malignity of his practices was hugely aggravated by his vast talents, whereof God had given him the use, but the Devil had the application.'" ‡ The experience of the Session of 1836 had pro-

\* Hansard, vol. xxxv. col. 1293.

† "Constitutional History," vol. i. p. 268.

‡ Hansard, vol. xxxv. col. 1304.

duced amongst men of moderate opinions a very unwilling conviction of the necessity for remodelling the Upper House. The altered circumstances of the succeeding year had a sensible influence in assuaging this dangerous access of fever in our constitutional system. But an equally beneficial change in public opinion was produced by the calm conviction that this had not been "a lost Session." Several measures of real utility had struggled into life amidst the rivalries, the jealousies, the political hatreds of the opposing parties of each House. It is with these measures, and with their permanent effects, that the historian of the progress of a nation is best satisfied to deal, leaving the course of party struggle to the annalists of the immediate Present.

Before we altogether escape from the bitterness of party conflicts in the sessions of 1835 and 1836, chiefly excited by Irish questions, we may remark that a great deal of the heat of the Conservative party is to be attributed to the very general belief that the Whig party had made a compact with Mr. O'Connell and his followers, by which their hostility was to be averted on the distinct understanding that they were fully to participate in the sweets of office. Upon lord Melbourne's announcement in April, 1835, that he had been appointed to the Premiership, Lord Alvanley asked him on what terms he had negotiated with Mr. O'Connell. Lord Melbourne answered that he had made no terms with Mr. O'Connell. Nevertheless in debate after debate it was affirmed, or implied, that a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, between the Whig government and the Irish Repealers, had been concluded on the last accession of the Whigs to power. The locality where this negotiation was completed was as distinctly pointed out as the house at Uxbridge which was the seat of the treaty between Charles the First and his parliament, or the Orchard at Hal where Boufflers and Portland settled the terms of the peace of Ryswick. A careful topographer does not hesitate to tell us, speaking of St. James's Square, and of No. 13, Lichfield House, built by Athenian Stuart, and so called from Anson, earl of Lichfield, "that here the Whigs and O'Connell often met, and the 'Lichfield House Compact,' with O'Connell was formed by the Whigs in 1835." \* Mr. John O'Connell says, "stupid affairs enough were those meetings in the dusty unfurnished drawing-rooms of that dingy-fronted mansion." They got lectures on propriety and moderation, and vague promises of great things to be done at some future period, and some glimpses of a want of cordial feeling toward them and their English associates. Of the compact, he says, "it was an utter and unredeemed

\* Cunningham, "Hand-Book of London."

calumny. No such compact ever was made. No engagement, no stipulation, no barter, no compromise of any kind, species or description, took place then, or at any time." \* Enough, however, was admitted to give point to the virulence of Lyndhurst and the gentler sarcasms of Peel.

During the short administration of Sir Robert Peel he submitted to a Committee of the House of Commons the details of a measure for facilitating the settlement of the vexatious Tithe-question in England and Wales. He proposed to establish a commission to superintend the voluntary commutation of tithe in parishes, and to remove the impediments in the way of an easy accomplishment of such voluntary principle. The Committee agreed to the proposed resolution for a payment in money in substitution for tithe, to be charged upon the titheable land in each parish, such payment subject to variation at stated periods according to the prices of corn. On the 9th of February, in the session of 1836, lord John Russell introduced the Government plan, which was founded upon the same principle as that of Sir Robert Peel, of a money payment instead of a payment in kind, but differing from it as establishing something more effective than a mere voluntary commutation. By the measure of lord John Russell, a voluntary commutation was in the first instance to be promoted; but in case of no such agreement a compulsory commutation was to be effected by commissioners. The object of the Tithe Commutation Act which was finally passed was to assimilate tithes as much as possible to a rent-charge upon the land. That charge was to be determined by taking the averages of the corn returns during seven preceding years; and a fixed quantity of corn having been previously determined as a proper portion for the tithe-owner, the amount of money payment was to be settled by a septennial average of the price of corn. The opposition to this measure assumed no party character. The clergy did not feel their interests to be invaded. The land owner and farmer had for years complained that no institution was more adverse to cultivation and improvement than tithes, as Dr. Paley had long before declared. The clergy were disposed to believe that the plan of the same sagacious political philosopher to convert tithes into corn-rents would secure the tithe-holder a complete and perpetual equivalent for his interest. This measure, with subsequent statutory improvements, has worked successfully under the management of three Commissioners. To one of the most wise and energetic of these Commissioners, the late Rev. Richard Jones, may be ascribed many of the early triumphs over the difficulties of

\* "Recollections," vol. i. p. 133.

carrying this measure into practice, and the subsequent general conviction that it is calculated to remove all grounds of discord and jealousy between the clergy and their parishioners, and thus add security and permanence to the property of the church.

Another measure of the Session of 1836, which amply refuted the opinion that legislators in either House could only look at great social questions through the mists of party, was the passing of the Bill for allowing Counsel to Prisoners. The final debate upon the Bill in the House of Lords was remarkable for a most honourable declaration of lord Lyndhurst, that his former opposition to the measure had been converted into a hearty approval of it. In an interesting volume by Mr. Matthew Davenport Hill \* we have a succinct and very complete history of the course of public opinion on the question of counsel to prisoners. He shows that even Judge Jeffreys had told a jury that he thought it a hard case that a man should have counsel to defend himself for a twopenny trespass, but that he should be denied counsel where life, estate, honour, and all were concerned. It was not until 1824 that any attempt was made in parliament to remove this disability under which prisoners laboured. In that year Mr. George Lamb, the brother of lord Melbourne, brought the subject before the House of Commons. He was supported by sir James Mackintosh, Dr. Lushington, and Mr. Denman. Mr. Canning was favourable to the change, but the speech of Mr. Attorney-General Copley had converted him into an opponent of the measure. Sydney Smith in 1826 drew a picture of the cruel oppression involved in the disability of the prisoner's counsel to address a jury: "It is a most affecting moment in a court of justice when the evidence has all been heard, and the judge asks the prisoner what he has to say in his defence. The prisoner, who has (by great exertions, perhaps, of his friends) saved up money enough to procure counsel, says to the judge, 'that he leaves his defence to his counsel.' We have often blushed for English humanity to hear the reply, 'Your counsel cannot speak for you; you must speak for yourself.' And this is the reply given to a poor girl of eighteen—to a foreigner—to a deaf man—to a stammerer—to the sick—to the feeble—to the old—to the most abject and ignorant of human beings!" † In 1834 the Prisoners' Counsel Bill was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Ewart. The debate was on the second reading, when Mr. Hill, then member for Hull, seconded Mr. Ewart's

\* "Suggestions for the Repression of Crime, contained in Charges delivered to Grand Juries of Birmingham."

† "Edinburgh Review," vol. xiv. p. 5, quoted by Mr. Hill.

motion. The measure was passed by the House of Commons without a division, but was rejected by the Lords. It was brought forward again by Mr. Ewart in 1835—when it dropped on account of the late period of the Session—and in 1836. In the latter year it was carried by a majority of forty-four. It was then introduced to the House of Lords by lord Lyndhurst. It was on that occasion that he made his honest recantation of his former opinion. He had come to a conviction that the evils and inconveniences of allowing counsel to prisoners had been greatly exaggerated, and ought not to be put for a moment in competition with that which the obvious justice of the case so clearly demanded. Twice did the House of Lords debate this question, but the measure passed without a division. Lord Abinger, formerly Mr. Scarlett, might have great doubts as to the policy of the Bill, and be afraid of their lordships becoming too much in love with theory; but no expression of doubt, no plea for delay, could stand up against the united opinions of such men as lord Denman, lord Cottenham, then Chancellor, and lord Lyndhurst. It is a remnant, said lord Lyndhurst, of a barbarous practice. The continuance of it is against the great current of authority. It is contrary to the practice of all civilized nations. An alteration was essential to the due investigation of truth.

We have incidentally referred to the important Act that was passed in the session of 1835 for effecting greater uniformity of practice in the government of prisons in England and Wales, and for appointing Inspectors of Prisons in Great Britain. This most salutary statute was founded upon Reports of a Select Committee of the House of Lords. The duke of Richmond, who was the promoter of this inquiry, laboured most assiduously in the collection of the evidence upon which the measure of reform was to be founded, himself with other peers visiting many of the ill-regulated dens where the old criminal became more hardened in his iniquity, and the youthful offender was systematically trained to a maturity in guilt. The Report of the Lords' Committee proposed that entire separation between the prisoners should be enforced, except during the hours of labour and of religious worship and instruction. Many persons out of the large number examined by the Committee were governors or chaplains of gaols in the country, and they all, without a dissentient voice, concurred in opinion as to the contaminating influence of prisons as they were then conducted. They held that the associations of prisons were destructive to every casual offender. The county gaols, especially those under corporate management, could only be regarded as great nurseries

of crime. There was no religious instruction, no education of juvenile prisoners, no employment. The county gaols and houses of correction were better managed, some system of discipline being observed. But none of the gaols in corporate towns could present a more disgusting example of the contaminating influence of an ill-managed prison than the great gaol of Newgate, under the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London. In the session of 1836, when the Inspectors appointed under the Act of 1835 had made their first Report, the management of prisons again came under the consideration of Parliament. This Report drew attention to what the duke of Richmond described as "the dreadful state of the City gaols." The visits of the Inspectors had produced a correction of some of the most striking evils of the country gaols, and he trusted that before the next session they would find the great gaol of the City of London not in a worse condition than the prisons in other parts of the country. It was on this occasion that an earnest conviction of the horrors of the gaol-system with regard to juvenile offenders was manifested in a manner which promised at no distant time the establishment of Reformatories. The marquis of Lansdowne acknowledged that although this country abounded with the means of juvenile employment, yet the number of juvenile offenders exceeded that of any country in Europe. He announced that lord John Russell, the Secretary for the Home Department, was preparing, at least as a matter of experiment, the means of establishing a place of detention having the character of an asylum or refuge, where children yet young in crime, but who were the victims of ignorance, of abandonment, of desertion by their parents, or were totally incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong, should be saved from condemnation to any prison whatever.\* The Act for the Government of Prisons was not as yet extended to Scotland, except as regarded the appointment of Inspectors. The first Inspector of the Scotch prisons was Mr. Frederick Hill. From his early Reports there is no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that they were absolutely worse than the worst in England. Dirt, idleness, drinking, gambling, fighting, and stealing were their distinguishing characteristics. Prisoners of different ages, tried and untried,—thieves, deserters, persons convicted of petty assaults,—all were herded together, almost secure from observation, and wholly unprovided with useful employment. It was, says Mr. F. Hill in his Report of 1838-39, "a system under which the smuggling of forbidden articles into the prisons, smoking, drinking, gambling, swearing, the use of

\* Hansard, vol. xxxv. Debate of August 12th.

obscene language, stealing from each other, cheating, quarrelling, fighting, and various acts of tyranny, are of common occurrence; and under which robberies are planned to be executed after the offenders shall have left prison.\*

One of the most important measures towards a more complete system of national statistics was brought forward by lord John Russell in the session of 1836. On the 12th of February he introduced the Bill for the General Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages. At the same time he brought forward a Bill for amending the law regulating the Marriages of Dissenters, which regulation was connected with the establishment of a General Civil Registration. With regard to the second Bill it was shrewdly anticipated by sir Robert Peel that, when no point of honour was concerned, many of the Dissenters, particularly the female portion of them, would prefer being married in church. There were no intolerant prejudices opposed in the legislature to the passing of the Bill which permitted Marriages to be solemnized in the presence of the district-registrar. To the other Bill no stickler for antiquity could prefer the parochial registry established by Secretary Cromwell exactly three hundred years before this measure was to come into operation, to one general system which under responsible officers should supersede the variable entries of sixteen thousand parishes, so often lost or mutilated, and so difficult to be referred to even when properly preserved. The important office of Superintendent-Registrar was created by this statute. The Poor-Law Unions were divided into districts for which Registrars were appointed, with a Superintendent-Registrar in each Union. The regulations by which a complete registration of births and deaths is accomplished are now familiar to every father and mother, and every occupier of a house in which any birth or death may happen, who are bound to furnish information of the fact to the Registrar. Mr. Porter, in his valuable "Progress of the Nation," says, "The establishing of a department for the systematic registration of births, marriages, and deaths, in England and Wales, has been of great use in the examination of questions depending upon various contingencies connected with human life." Certified copies of the entries of births and deaths are sent quarterly by the Registrar to the Superintendent-Registrar, and by him to the Registrar-General. It is from this source that we derive the knowledge of many most interesting facts connected with the progress of the population—facts which the scientific knowledge and the literary skill of the

\* "Crime: its Amount, Causes, and Remedies," by Frederic Hill, p. 180.

heads of the Registrar-General's department have redeemed from the ordinary dulness of statistics to constitute some of the most attractive reading of the public journals. The Registrar-General's Annual Report enables the legislature to form a tolerably accurate estimate of the increment of the population in the decennial intervals of a census.

In this session there were two most important changes proposed by the Government with reference to journalism and the general commerce of literature. On the 20th of June the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved "that the duty payable on every sheet whereon a newspaper is printed shall in future be one penny." The newspaper stamp for many years had been fourpence. Amongst the opponents of this measure one county member complained that already the mails were so heavily laden on a Saturday night with newspapers that it was hardly safe to travel by them. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had anticipated that the penny stamp would produce quite as much as the fourpenny stamp. "If he is right," said sir Charles Knightley, "then the quantity of newspapers must be more than trebled, and if so, there must be a tax raised for their conveyance." The proposition of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was carried by a majority only of thirty-three, and with some alterations finally passed the House of Lords. The other measure was a reduction of the duty on paper. Lord Francis Egerton, himself a man of letters, in presenting a petition before the government proposition was introduced, claimed for this subject the best attention of the House on account of the effect which the state of the law produced on literature, especially upon cheap literature. By the Act to repeal the existing duties on Paper, which received the royal assent on the 13th of August, the varying duties according to the class or denomination were merged in one uniform duty upon all paper of three halfpence per pound. The relief to the publishers of cheap works was as timely as it was important. We may instance that it came to save the "Penny Cyclopædia" from extinction in the fourth year of its struggle against heavy loss, under the opposing conditions of paying at the highest rate for literary labour, and selling at as low a rate as that of works in which the quality of the authorship was a secondary consideration.

The great interest of events at home after the French Revolution of 1830, has precluded us from giving even a passing notice of foreign politics. Since that time, indeed, the peace of Europe had not been materially disturbed so as to influence the political action of the British Government. Belgium had quietly settled

down into a Constitutional Monarchy, subsequently to the fortunate period for that country when prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg was chosen king in 1831. In that year the boundaries of the new kingdom were defined, and the peaceable possession of his territory was guaranteed by the five great Powers to this most sagacious and discreet of sovereigns. The stability of the Belgian monarchy appeared to be still more effectually secured by the marriage of king Leopold in 1832 to the eldest daughter of Louis Philippe, king of the French. At the close of the parliamentary session of 1836, it was lamented in the king's speech that Spain was the only exception to the general tranquillity of Europe; that the hopes entertained of the termination of the civil war in that country had not been realized. Under the treaty of Quadruple Alliance, whose object was the restoration of internal peace in Spain, Great Britain had afforded to the queen of that country the co-operation of a naval force. Ferdinand the Seventh, who died in 1833, had left by his will his infant daughter Isabel as heir to his throne. The queen-mother, Christina, was appointed queen-regent. The brother of Ferdinand, Don Carlos, immediately disputed the title of Isabel, maintaining that by the Salic law females were excluded from the sovereignty of Spain. The civil war which ensued lasted till 1840. The partisans of Don Carlos were then finally defeated; but the contest was attended with so many circumstances of bitter and cruel animosity, that the Spanish nation became greatly demoralized, and the old glories and prosperity of the country appeared to be altogether passing away. The intervention of our government, and the whole scope of the Quadruple Treaty of 1834, were the objects of severe parliamentary censure. The British Legion, under the command of lieutenant-general sir De Lacy Evans, which acted with the consent of our government in aid of the queen of Spain, accomplished some brilliant exploits, and was generally successful against the Carlist troops; but these triumphs were bought with severe losses. The intervention of Great Britain, whether direct or indirect, excited little sympathy at home; for popular opinion was gradually reaching the conviction that the safety and prosperity of our country were best maintained by leaving foreigners to fight out their own quarrels, always provided that the honour of the nation should not be compromised by apathy or inertness.

During the six years in which Louis Philippe had been king of the French, his reign had not been exempted from solitudes of a more painful nature than the ordinary cares of monarchs. In the first two years of his rule events had been in some degree pro-

pitious to him. The duke of Reichstadt, the son of Napoleon, died in 1832. His presence in France might at any time have raised up a host of Bonapartists, whose movements might have been exceedingly dangerous to the Citizen King. The attempts of the duchess of Berri to excite an insurrection in favour of her son, the duke of Bordeaux, had signally failed. Freedom of debate in the Chambers, and the liberty of the press, appeared the best guarantees for the security of the constitutional government. But the unrestricted power of speaking and writing was not used with moderation. The licence of the press, and the occasional hostility of the Chambers, produced a counter-disposition on the part of the king to struggle against what he believed to be the evils of the representative system. There were constant changes of administration since Lafitte took the reins of government in November, 1830. In 1831 Lafitte was succeeded by Casimir Perier, who had a premiership of something more than a year and a half. From October, 1832, to September, 1836, there had been nine changes of ministry—Soul, Guizot: Soul, Broglie; Soul, Thiers; Gérard; Bassano; Mortier; Broglie, Humann; Broglie, d'Argout; Thiers. In September, 1836, the heads of the cabinet were Molé and Guizot. During these changes, and the consequent excitement of parliamentary conflicts, there had been more than one conspiracy of which the great object was to assassinate the king. The 28th of July, 1835, was the second day of the fêtes to commemorate the Revolution of 1830. Louis Philippe, with his three sons and a splendid suite of military officers, was riding through the line of the National Guard, drawn up on the Boulevard du Temple, when an explosion resembling a discharge of musketry took place from the window of a house overlooking the road. Fourteen persons, amongst whom were marshal Mortier and general De Virigny, were killed upon the spot. A shower of bullets had been discharged by a machine consisting of twenty-five barrels, which, arranged horizontally side by side upon a frame, could be fired at once by a train of gunpowder. The king was unhurt. The police rushed into the house and seized the assassin, who was wounded by the bursting of one of the barrels. He proved to be a Corsican named Fieschi, who maintained that he had no object in this wholesale massacre but his desire to destroy the king. Another attempt upon the life of Louis Philippe was made in 1836, by a man of the name of Alibaud, who fired into the king's carriage, the queen and his sister being with him. A third attempt was made in the same year by another desperado, named Meunier. In the history of such fearful manifestations of wickedness or madness, there

is nothing more remarkable than the extraordinary escapes of Louis Philippe as if he bore a charmed life.

More interesting at the present day than these brutal attempts at assassination was the failure of an enterprise which contemplated, without any apparent organization, the overthrow of a strong government by a young man of twenty-five, who relied only upon his name, his abilities, and his daring. Charles Louis Napoleon, the youngest son of Louis Bonaparte, king of Holland, and of Hortense Eugénie, daughter of the empress Josephine by her first husband, had so dwelt upon his boyish remembrances of his illustrious uncle, that when in 1832 the duke of Reichstadt died, and he became, according to a decree of 1804, heir to the throne, the natural course of his ambition was to assert his claim against one whom he regarded as a usurper. Louis Philippe was always apprehensive of the rivalry of this young man. He had refused him permission to return to France in 1830. He had farther influenced the government of Rome to order him to quit the Papal territory. Escaping from Italy, he resided with his mother in the Chateau Arenenberg in Switzerland, where he devoted himself to the study of politics and of military science, and became known in Europe as a writer of diligent research and unquestionable ability. Whatever study he pursued and whatever ideas he promulgated had evidently some bearing upon what he implicitly believed would be his great future.

The ordinary relations of the attempt of Louis Napoleon—availing himself of the general unpopularity of the king of the French, to risk the result of a popular commotion to overthrow the Orleans dynasty—have recently received a new interest from the official revelations of M. Guizot. He relates that on the evening of the 31st of October the Minister of the Interior brought to him a telegraphic despatch received from Strasbourg, dated on the evening of the 30th, which announced that about six o'clock that morning Louis Napoleon "traversed the streets of Strasbourg with a party of . . . ." A mist which enveloped the line of telegraph had left the remainder of the despatch uncertain. Guizot and the Minister of the Interior repaired instantly to the Tuileries, where they found the whole Cabinet assembled. All was conjecture. Instructions were drawn up founded upon many possible contingencies. The ministers remained with the king nearly the whole night, expecting news which came not. During those hours of suspense, the queen, the king's sister, the princes, entered again and again to ask if anything had transpired. "I was struck," says M. Guizot, "by the sadness of the king, not that he seemed uneasy or

subdued, but uncertainty as to the seriousness of the event occupied his thoughts; and these reiterated conspiracies, these attempts at civil war, republican, legitimist, and Bonapartist, this continual necessity of contending, repressing, and punishing, weighed on him as a hateful burden. Despite his long experience and all that it had taught him of man's passions and the vicissitudes of life, he was and continued to be naturally easy, confiding, benevolent, and hopeful. He grew tired of having incessantly to watch, to defend himself, and of finding so many enemies on his steps." \*

The next morning, the 1st of November, an aide-de-camp of the commandant at Strasbourg brought to the perplexed king and his ministers a solution of the telegraphic mystery. Louis Napoleon, having the support of a colonel who commanded a battalion, had presented himself at the barrack of a regiment of artillery, and was received with shouts of "Long live the Emperor." At another barrack the attempts of the prince upon the fidelity of the troops was repulsed; and he and his followers were arrested by the colonel and other officers of the forty-sixth regiment of infantry. The affair was over in a few hours without bloodshed. One only of the known adherents of Louis Napoleon, M. de Persigny, his intimate friend, effected his escape. On ascertaining the result of this rash enterprise, queen Hortense, whose affection for her son was most devoted, hurried to France to intercede for him with the government. From Viry, near Paris, she addressed her supplications to the king and M. Molé. M. Guizot says, "She might have spared them. The resolution of not bringing prince Louis to trial, and of sending him to the United States of America, was already taken. This was the decided inclination of the king, and the unanimous advice of the cabinet." The adventurer was brought from the citadel of Strasbourg to Paris, where he stayed only a few hours. He was then taken to L'Orient, where he embarked on the 14th of November in a frigate which was to touch at New York. The sub-prefect of L'Orient waited on the prince when he was on board, inquired whether he would find any resources when he arrived in the United States, and being told that none were at first to be expected, the prefect placed in his hands a casket containing fifteen thousand francs in gold, which the king had ordered him thus to appropriate. Louis Napoleon remained in the United States till October, 1837, when, hearing of the illness of his mother, he encountered the risks of a return to Europe, and was with Hortense at her death. The French government demanded his extradition from Switzerland. The Cantons refused to comply; but Louis Philippe enforced his

\* "Memoirs to illustrate the History of My Time," vol. iv. p. 197; 1861.