

tion for the Berlin and Milan decrees. Brougham conducted the lengthened inquiry which took place at the bar of the House, and he displayed on this occasion a mastery over the true principles of political economy and international law which at that time no one else possessed. It seems incredible (though even now the delusion is not entirely dissipated) that the Government of a great commercial nation should ever have thought that one of the most effectual and essential modes of carrying on war and destroying an enemy is to shut out the trade of neutrals, not perceiving that such measures react with at least equal force against ourselves, and destroy the very sinews by which the burden of war can be sustained. The trade of the country was in truth suffering more from these fatal restrictions than from the war itself; and nothing in the whole collection of Lord Brougham's harangues is more forcible or more ably reasoned than the speeches in which he described those sufferings, and denounced the cause of them.

Nevertheless, in 1808, he was unsuccessful. Neither the evidence taken during a six months' inquiry nor the eloquence of the impassioned advocate prevailed. It was not until 1812, when Brougham was himself in Parliament, that he resumed his attack on the Orders in Council with increased authority and vigour, aided by Mr Baring, and still more, perhaps, by the peril and disgrace of the quarrel with America, and he ultimately conquered. No answer was made to his great speech on that occasion, except an intimation from the Treasury bench that the Orders in Council would be revoked. Of this great triumph Brougham afterwards said: "It was second to none of the efforts made by me, and not altogether without success, to ameliorate the condition of my fellow-men. In these I had the sympathy and aid of others, but in the battle against the Orders in Council I fought alone."

It was considered imprudent and impossible that a man so gifted and so popular as Brougham had now become should remain out of Parliament, and by the influence of Lord Holland, the duke of Bedford was induced to return him to the House of Commons for the borough of Camelford. He took his seat early in 1810, having made a vow that he would not open his mouth for a month. The vow was kept, but kept for that month only. He spoke on the fifth March in condemnation of the conduct of Lord Chatham at Walcheren, and he went on speaking for the rest of his life. In four months, such was the position he had acquired in the House that he was regarded as a candidate for the leadership of the Liberal party, then in the feeble hands of George Ponsonby. Some little time before a squib of infinite drollery was published in the *New Whig Guide*, by Lord Palmerston, under the significant title of "Trial of Harry Brougham for Mutiny." The mutiny consisted in his calling the Right Honourable George Ponsonby an "old woman." When the negotiation took place in 1812 between the Prince Regent and Lords Grey and Grenville for the formation of a Whig Government, it was expected that the presidency of the Board of Trade would be accepted by Brougham, who was not unwilling to quit the bar altogether for political office. But this gleam of parliamentary success and official anticipation soon vanished. The Tories continued in power. Parliament was dissolved. Camelford had passed into other hands. Brougham was induced to stand for Liverpool with Mr Creevy against Canning and General Gascoyne. The Liberals were defeated by a large majority, and what made the sting of defeat more keen was, that another seat was speedily provided for Creevy, whilst Brougham was left out in the cold. He remained out of Parliament during the four eventful years, from 1812 to 1816, which witnessed the termination of the war, and he did not conceal his resentment against the Whigs.

Brougham's position at this time was difficult and anomalous. Burning with political ambition, and conscious that he had no superior in the arena of the House of Commons, he had lost his seat in Parliament; he was distrusted and feared by some of the leading members of the Liberal party, and, as he said himself in a letter to Lord Grey, "it is their pleasure to consider me as flung overboard to lighten the ship." Yet he stood aloof, not only from the extreme views of demagogues like Hunt and Cobbett, but also from the milder radicalism of Hobhouse and Burdett. Indeed, it deserves to be remarked, that fond as Brougham was of popular applause, and deeply imbued as he was with Liberal opinions, he never condescended to flatter the Radical party or to ally himself with them;

but, on the contrary, when in later years differences arose between himself and the Whigs, he leaned rather to the Conservative side, and he was uniformly opposed to any measure which might overthrow the balance of the constitution.

But in the years he spent out of Parliament occurrences took place which gave ample employment to his bustling activity, and led the way to one of the most important passages in his life. He had been introduced in 1809 by Lord Dudley and Sir William Drummond to the society of the Princess of Wales, whose house at Kensington, and afterwards at Blackheath, was the resort of the most agreeable society in London. Canning, Granville Leveson, Dudley, Rogers, and Luttrell were constantly there. But it was not till 1812 that the princess consulted him on her private affairs, after the rupture between the Prince and the Whigs had become more decided. From that time Brougham, in conjunction with Mr Whitbread, became one of the princess's chief advisers; he was attached to her service, not so much from any great liking or respect for herself, as from an indignant sense of the wrongs and insults inflicted upon her by her husband. We shall not attempt to follow the details of these deplorable transactions, which are fully related elsewhere, but one memorable scene, as related by Lord Brougham, cannot be passed over in silence. The Princess Charlotte, irritated and alarmed by her father's threats to break up her household and to marry her to the Prince of Orange, escaped in July 1814 from Warwick House, flung herself into a hackney coach in Cockspur Street, and drove to her mother's residence in Connaught Place. Mr Brougham, who was dining with a friend, was immediately sent for, and on his arrival, half asleep from fatigue, found with extreme surprise what had occurred. The duke of Sussex, the duke of York, Lord Chancellor Eldon, the bishop of Salisbury, and others subsequently arrived, but except the royal dukes, none of these personages were admitted to an audience. Brougham, a young barrister of thirty-six, became and remained the chief adviser of this young princess of eighteen, the heiress to the crown. His advice to her was,—"Return at once to Warwick House or Carlton House, and on no account pass a night elsewhere." The debate was long and painful; the grievances of the princess were numerous. At length, as day began to dawn, Brougham took her to the window, and pointing to the empty street and park, said, "In a few hours these thoroughfares will be crowded. I have only to show you from this window to these multitudes, they will rise in your behalf; Carlton House will be attacked; troops will be called out; blood will be shed; and whatever be the result, it will be known that your running away was the cause of this mischief. You would never get over it." This remonstrance prevailed, and the princess returned to Carlton House with her uncle the duke of York at five in the morning. This anecdote is so graphically told by Lord Brougham in several places that we preserve it. But it has not been corroborated by any of the other persons present; and in a letter written by Brougham himself to Earl Grey on the following day, he said nothing of this touching appeal, but relates that the princess went back because the duke of York came, armed with full powers from the Regent to fetch her away. It is not improbable that the scene thus described is apocryphal, or at least embellished by Lord Brougham's imagination, for in his later years he was apt to mistake for actual occurrences the creations of his own fancy.

In 1814, the Princess of Wales, having been prohibited by Queen Charlotte from attending the drawing-rooms given to the allied sovereigns on their visit to England, resolved to go abroad. This unfortunate scheme was strongly opposed by the Princess Charlotte, and not less so by Mr Whitbread and Mr Brougham. The latter addressed a letter to the Princess of Wales on the eve of her departure, in which he pointed out with great sagacity and good sense the fatal consequences of her withdrawal from England. "As long as you remain in this country," he said, "I will answer for it that no plot can succeed against you. But if you are living abroad, surrounded by the base spies and tools who will always be planted about you, ready to invent and swear as they may be directed, who can pretend to say what may happen? I declare, I do not see how a proposition hostile to your Royal Highness's marriage could be resisted if you continued living abroad." How completely these predictions were fulfilled is sufficiently known. Brougham appears to have had but little correspondence with the princess during her residence in Italy. But in 1820, when she resolved to return to England on the accession of George IV., he was sent by the Government conjointly with Lord Hutchinson, to dissuade her from that step and to offer her terms. Brougham certainly disapproved of her return; but for some mysterious reason he withheld the proposed terms of compromise until it was too late, and when they were laid before the queen at St Omer she rejected them with scorn. The death of Mr Whitbread and of the Princess Charlotte, which had occurred in the interval, had removed two important checks on the rashness of the queen; and Brougham, who had failed to prevent her from going away, was equally unable to prevent her return. It has even been surmised that, from a love of mischief and of power, he desired it.

Meanwhile Brougham had at length, in 1816, been again returned

to Parliament for Winchelsea, a borough of the earl of Darlington, and he instantly resumed a commanding position in the House of Commons. He succeeded in defeating the continuance of the income tax; he distinguished himself as an advocate for the education of the people; and on the death of Romilly he took up with ardour the great work of the reform of the law. It has taken half a century to work out the plans of these early law reformers, and the last year or two have given us a national system of education and a new judicature with an entirely new form of procedure. But not the less glorious and valuable were the services of those who first engaged in these great tasks. Nothing exasperated the Tory party more than the select committee which sat, with Mr Brougham in the chair, in 1816 and the three following years, to investigate the state of education of the poor in the metropolis. The inquiry was extended so far as to include the great collegiate foundations of Eton, Winchester, and the Charter House; and the report of the committee was attacked with great virulence by Bishop Monk in the *Quarterly Review* and by Sir Robert Peel in the House of Commons. In time, however, the exposure of abuses bore fruit, and we owe to it some of the most important improvements of the age. Brougham, however, was as far as ever from obtaining the leadership of the party to which he aspired. Indeed, as was judiciously pointed out by Lord Lansdowne in 1817, the opposition had no recognised efficient leaders; their warfare was carried on in separate courses, indulging their own tastes and tempers, without combined action. Nor was Brougham much more successful at the bar. The death of George III. suddenly changed this state of things. Queen Caroline at once, in April 1820, appointed Mr Brougham to be Her Majesty's attorney-general, and Mr Denman her solicitor-general. They immediately took their rank in court accordingly; and, indeed, this was the sole act of royal authority which marked the queen's brief and unhappy reign. In July Her Majesty came from St Omer to England; ministers sent down to both Houses of Parliament the secret evidence which they had long been collecting against her; and a bill was brought into the House of Lords for the deposition of the queen and the dissolution of the king's marriage. The long repressed spirit of opposition in the nation against a bigoted and tyrannical Government was inflamed to a conflagration by the sense of the queen's wrongs. Guilty or innocent (and no one could dispute the excessive levity of her conduct), she was regarded by the people of England as a persecuted woman, a deserted wife, an outraged mother; and these charges were brought against her by those who were guilty of far greater offences. "My mother would not have been so bad," the Princess Charlotte is reported to have said, "if my father had not been much worse." Themes such as these, worked upon by the eloquence of Brougham and the activity of the queen's friends, produced a popular commotion, which in any other country would have caused bloodshed, and perhaps revolution.

The defence of the queen was conducted by Brougham, assisted by Denman, Lushington, and Wilde, with equal courage and ability. He hurled back defiance on the prosecutors, and threatened, if driven to the last extremity, to retaliate on the person of the sovereign; though if he had set up the marriage of the Prince with Mrs Fitzherbert as a valid marriage (which it certainly was not), he would thereby have annulled the subsequent marriage of his royal client. He demolished piece by piece with merciless severity the whole fabric and tissue of Italian evidence, raked together and paid for by the Milan commission; and he wound up the proceedings by a speech of extraordinary power and effort. The peroration was said to have been written and rewritten by him seventeen times. At moments of great excitement such declamation may be of value, and in 1820 it was both heard and read with enthusiasm. But to the calmer judgment of another generation this celebrated oration seems turgid and overstrained. The truth is, that there were moments in the course of the trial when the evidence pressed so hardly on the queen that her counsel were on the point of throwing up the case. But a generous feeling, impelled by an immense popular sympathy, prevailed. It was certain the bill could never pass the House of Commons, where the same appeals might be made to a less judicial assembly. The final majority in the Lords dwindled to nine; and Lord Liverpool announced that he should not proceed with the bill.

This victory over the court and the ministry raised Henry Brougham at once to the pinnacle of fame. He shared the triumph of the queen. His portrait was in every shop window. A piece of plate was presented to him, paid for by a penny subscription of peasants and mechanics. With his wonted disinterestedness in money matters, he refused to accept a sum of £4000 which the queen herself placed at his disposal. He took no more than the usual fees of counsel, while his salary as Her Majesty's attorney-general remained unpaid, and was discharged by the Treasury after her death. But from that moment his fortune was made at the bar. His practice on the northern circuit instantly quintupled. One of his finest speeches was a defence of a Durham newspaper which had attacked the clergy for refusing to allow the bells of the churches in Durham to be tolled on the queen's death: and by the admis-

sion of Lord Campbell, a rival advocate and an unfriendly critic, he rose suddenly to a position which no man has before or since attained to in the profession. The meanness of George IV. and Lord Eldon refused him the silk gown to which his position at the bar entitled him, and for some years he led the circuit as an outer barrister, to the great loss of the senior members of the circuit, who could only be employed against him. His practice rose to about £7000 a year, but it was again falling off before he became Chancellor.

The death of Lord Castlereagh in 1822, and the advancement of Canning to the office of Foreign Secretary, materially changed the character of Lord Liverpool's Government. Canning and Brougham sat on opposite benches—the one a follower of Pitt, the other of Fox; and they were constantly pitted against each other. Sometimes their rhetorical conflicts assumed an intense violence, as when Brougham accused the minister of "the most monstrous truckling for the purpose of obtaining office that the whole history of political tergiversation could furnish." Canning indignantly exclaimed, "It is false;" and the quarrel was with some difficulty appeased, though Brougham was not supposed to be very ready to employ any weapon sharper than his tongue. But Canning and Brougham were in truth rivals rather than antagonists; and the more liberal influence of the former in the ministry had almost brought them into union upon the leading questions of the day, always excepting that of parliamentary reform. Had Canning lived and maintained himself in power, it might have fallen to his lot to carry Catholic Emancipation and a more moderate measure of parliamentary reform. But if, as is believed, Earl Grey was excluded from Mr Canning's Government by an express stipulation of the king, it follows *a fortiori* that the attorney-general of Queen Caroline could never be a minister of George IV. That sovereign had shown on several occasions that the attacks made on him by Brougham were never forgotten or forgiven; and Canning, whose own position at court was difficult enough, had certainly not the power to overcome the king's resentment. Brougham, however, promised and gave his shortlived administration an independent support—unlike Lord Grey, who fiercely and ungenerously attacked it.

To this period of his life belong two occurrences which cannot be passed over in silence. In 1825 the first steps were taken, under the auspices of Brougham, for the establishment of a university in London, absolutely free from all religious or sectarian distinctions, a scheme which has grown and ripened in half a century into no unworthy rival of the other universities of northern and southern Britain. In 1827 Brougham contributed to found the "Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge,"—an association which gave an immense impulsion to sound popular literature. Its first publication was an essay on the "Pleasures and Advantages of Science," written by himself. One can hardly imagine at the present time with what avidity this paper was read, for it had no novelty of substance and no great merit of style. But a thirst for knowledge seemed suddenly to have seized the nation. It broke forth in mechanics' institutes and every form of instruction. To use his own language on a celebrated occasion—"the schoolmaster was abroad;" and the excitement he had contrived to kindle on these subjects tended to hasten a great crisis in our political life. In the following year (1828) he delivered his great speech on "Law Reform," which lasted six hours in the delivery in a thin and exhausted House,—a marvellous effort,—which embraced every part of the existing system of judicature, and concluded with one of his noblest perorations. "It was the boast of Augustus," he said, "and it formed part of the glory in which his early perfidies were lost, that he found Rome of brick and left it of marble,—a praise not unworthy of a great prince, and to which the present reign  
LV. — 48

also has its claims. But how much nobler will be the sovereign's boast, when he shall have it to say that he found law dear and left it cheap; found it a sealed book, left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich, left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression, left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence!"

The death of Canning, the failure of Lord Goderich, and the accession of the duke of Wellington to power, again changed the aspect of affairs; but the resolution of ministers to carry Catholic Emancipation disarmed the Opposition, whilst it split the Tory party. Graver events were impending. The French Revolution of 1830, following close upon the death of George IV., awakened a passionate excitement throughout Europe, and especially in this country. The days of Tory government were numbered. The cry of "Reform" was raised; and the leader to "ride the whirlwind and direct the storm" was Henry Brougham. Then it was that the united county of York spontaneously returned him to the new House of Commons as their representative. It was the proudest moment of his life, for he was literally not only the representative of the county of York, but of the people of England. A stranger by birth to that great province, and without an acre of land in it, he, by his talents, eloquence, public services, and love of freedom alone, triumphed over the proud Yorkshire families, and took his seat in the House of Commons with a power no Englishman of this age has possessed. The Parliament met in November. Brougham's first act was to move for leave to bring in a bill to amend the representation of the people; but before the debate came on the Government was defeated on another question; the duke resigned, and Earl Grey was commanded by William IV. to form an administration.

Whig  
ministry.

Amongst the difficulties the new premier and the Whig party had to encounter and to surmount, none was greater than that arising from the position, the attitude, and the talents of Mr Brougham. He was not the leader of any party; he had no personal following in the House of Commons; he was distrusted by the Whigs, who looked up to Lord Althorp as their chief; he was dreaded alike by friends and foes; but there stood, in solitary might, the formidable member for the county of York, armed with invincible eloquence, and backed by the suffrages of the people. He himself had repeatedly declared that nothing would induce him to exchange his position as an independent member of Parliament for any office, however great; and, no doubt, as an independent member of Parliament he exercised at that moment a power greater than any office could give. On the day following the resignation of the Government, he reluctantly consented, in low and angry tones, to postpone for one week his motion on parliamentary reform. The attorney-generalship was offered to him by Lord Grey; it was indignantly rejected. Brougham himself affirms that he desired to be master of the rolls, which would have secured him a large income for life, and left him free to sit in the House of Commons. But this was positively interdicted by the king, and objected to by Lord Althorp, who declared that he could not undertake to lead the House with so insubordinate a follower behind him. Meanwhile Brougham had discovered, at a meeting of several leading members of his party at Holland House, that he was not taken freely into their counsels; he came home exasperated and vowing vengeance against them. Lord Grey, personally, would have preferred to retain Lord Lyndhurst as his chancellor; but it was impossible to leave Brougham out, and he was only to be brought into the ministry by the offer of the great seal. When the question was considered at the first meeting of the inchoate ministry at Lansdowne House, Lord

Holland said to his colleagues, "I suppose it must be so, but this is the last time we shall meet in peace within these walls." Brougham himself hesitated, or affected to hesitate. He was undoubtedly reluctant to quit the House of Commons and his seat for Yorkshire. His mother, with great wisdom, dissuaded him from accepting these treacherous gifts and honours. He alleged that, as the ministry might be of short duration, he was making a large sacrifice in giving up his professional income for a pension of £4000 a year and a peerage which he had no other means to support. But he yielded to the representations of Lord Grey and Lord Althorp, that without him as Chancellor the Government could not be formed. On the 22d November 1830 the great seal was delivered to him by the king, and he took his seat on the Woolsack that evening, as speaker of the House of Lords, being still a commoner. On the following day, after he had sat to hear a Scotch appeal, the patent of his peerage as Baron Brougham and Vaux was brought down. The Lord chancellor then quitted the woolsack, robed, and was introduced as a baron by the Marquis Wellesley and Lord Durham.

The mind of man can conceive nothing more vivid and more various than the chancellorship of Lord Brougham. It lasted in all exactly four years—no more; but the times were burning with excitement, and the chancellor embodied and expressed the fervour of the times. To rival Lord Bacon in the philosophy of the closet and Lord Hardwicke in the courts of equity, to declaim like Chatham in the House of Lords, and jest like Sheridan at Lord Sefton's dinners, seemed alike easy tasks to Brougham. He never doubted of his own capacity to play every part in turn,—judge, statesman, orator, philosopher, buffoon; and he did play them all with as much success as an imitation can bear to a reality. Unhappily the verdict of time has proved that there was nothing of permanence, and little of originality, in the prodigious efforts of his genius—He affected at first to treat the business of the Court of Chancery as a light affair, though in truth he had to work hard to master the principles of equity, of which he had no experience. His manner in court was desultory and dictatorial. Sometimes he would crouch in his chair, muffled in his wig and robes, like a man asleep; at other times he would burst into restless activity, writing letters, working problems, interrupting counsel. Mortal offence he gave to Sugden; then the leader of the Equity bar, who detested his person and despised his law. But upon the whole Brougham was a just and able judge; and if few of his decisions are cited as landmarks of the law, still fewer of them have been overruled. His wonderful powers of despatch enabled him to work off the arrears of the court in ten months, a thing which had never before occurred in human memory, and in September 1831 he boasted that not a cause remained for hearing before the Lord Chancellor. Yet towards the close of his tenure of office in the spring of 1834, he complained to his colleagues of the tremendous drudgery he had undergone; he had sat up all the nights of winter, he said, to write seventy elaborate judgments, and he conceived that he was ill requited for the sacrifices he had made.

His duties as a judge, however, ranked second in his eyes to his duties as a politician and a legislator; and he took a most active and prominent part in the defence of all the great measures of Lord Grey's Government. We say in the defence of them, for he had less hand in the preparation of them than he wished it to be believed. His own statement that he had called his friends together and submitted to them a complete scheme of parliamentary reform is entirely unsupported, and, indeed, formally contradicted. The draft of the Reform Bill was prepared by a committee of four other members of the Cabinet, and accepted with some hesitation by Brougham. But once launched in the contest,

especially in the House of Peers, it owed a great deal to the vigour with which he defended it. The king, William IV., appears at first to have been amused and flattered by the attentions of his chancellor, who made infinite exertions to ingratiate himself with the court. But his manner, which was at first obsequious, became dictatorial; his restless eccentricity and his passion for interfering with every department of state, alarmed and irritated the king, and at last the former liking was turned into bitter aversion.

It would be superfluous in this place to follow the fortunes of the Reform Bill of 1832, and we shall confine ourselves to a brief notice of the part which Lord Brougham took in promoting it. The first grand crisis in the contest occurred in April 1831, when General Gascoyne's amendment was carried against the Government. A cabinet was held, and ministers agreed to advise the king to dissolve Parliament. The king not only assented, but expressed his readiness to go down to Westminster in a hackney coach if necessary. The elaborate narrative communicated by Lord Brougham to Mr Roebuck, and adopted by Mr Molesworth in his *History of the Reform Bill*,—by which it would appear that Lord Grey and the Lord Chancellor resorted to *management* and a species of mild compulsion in making this proposal to William IV., Lord Brougham having taken upon himself to order out the royal carriages and the guards,—is found on more exact inquiry to be unfounded. Unquestionably it was the duty of the prime minister to take the king's pleasure on such an occasion, though the chancellor, contrary to the usual practice, did accompany him, but the whole correspondence of the king on the subject of reform is addressed to Earl Grey alone. The second great crisis in the passage of the bill was in May 1832, when it became necessary to obtain from the king his consent to make peers in sufficient number to carry the bill, if the majority in the Upper House persevered in the attempt to defeat it. It has been stated, apparently on Lord Brougham's authority, that in the course of an audience granted to Lord Grey and himself, he succeeded in extorting from the king, in writing, the following paper:—

"The king grants permission to Earl Grey, and to his chancellor Lord Brougham, to create such a number of peers as will be sufficient to ensure the passing of the Reform Bill,—first calling up eldest sons.

(Signed) WILLIAM R.

\* WINDSOR, May 17, 1832.

It is enough to say that this extraordinary document has never been seen by any one, and is not known to exist, therefore its exact tenor must be a mystery. The king was not at Windsor on the 17th May, but at St James's; and the Cabinet asked for an assurance of His Majesty's intentions on the following day (the 18th), which they would not have done if a written promise had been given the day before. This story, therefore, is incredible, and in Lord Brougham's autobiography nothing is said of this written paper. Lord Grey and Lord Brougham were both of them strongly averse to the creation of peers, which was fiercely urged on them by some of their colleagues, such as Lord Durham and Sir John Hobhouse. Lord Brougham has even intimated a doubt whether at the last extremity they should have used the power the king had at one time most reluctantly given them. But they both knew that their honour, and possibly their lives, were staked on carrying the bill; and, fortunately, they were relieved from the dire necessity of swamping the House of Lords by the influence of the king and the duke of Wellington over the Tory majority.

It is surprising that Lord Grey's administration, which had achieved so great a work in passing the Reform Bill, and was supported by an immense majority in the reformed Parliament, should so soon have come to an end. But

Lord Grey was perpetually threatening to resign office; Lord Althorp longed for retirement; the question of the Irish Church led to the secession of four important members of the Cabinet; the queen was hostile; and the king was alarmed and dissatisfied with the Whig ministers. In July 1834 the crisis arrived, and having carried on the government for three years and 231 days, Lord Grey resigned. Lord Brougham had contrived to monopolize the authority and popularity of the Government, and no doubt his insatiable activity contributed to this result; and there were those who accused him of having intrigued to bring it about, with a view to superseding Lord Grey himself. But this imputation is unjust. Brougham, however, had caused Mr Littleton, the Irish secretary, to suggest to Lord Wellesley, the lord-lieutenant, that some of the clauses in the Irish Coercion Bill might be withdrawn on its renewal, with a view to conciliate O'Connell. Lord Althorp was of the same opinion; but Lord Grey refused to entertain the proposal, and on this rock the ship struck. Brougham declared with great vehemence that it was madness to resign, and that for his own part he had not tendered his resignation. Very much by his exertions the Cabinet was reconstructed under Lord Melbourne, and without Lord Grey; and he appeared to think that his own influence in it would be increased. He laboured at the time under extreme mental excitement, and in this state he unfortunately proceeded to make a journey or progress to Scotland, where his behaviour was so extravagant that it gave the final stroke to the confidence of the king. At Lancaster he joined the bar-mess, and spent the night in an orgy. In a country house he lost the great seal, and found it again in a game of blindman's-buff. At Edinburgh, in spite of the coldness which had sprung up between himself and the Grey family, he was present at a banquet given to the late premier, and delivered a harangue on his own services and his public virtue. All this time he continued to correspond with the king in a strain which created the utmost irritation and amazement at Windsor. He seemed totally unconscious of the abyss which was opening at his feet. He was not the Bacon but the Wolsey of the 19th century.

The term opened in November with the usual formalities. But on the 16th of that month the king dismissed his ministers. The chancellor, who had dined at Holland House, called on Lord Melbourne in his way home, and learned the intelligence. Melbourne made him promise that he would keep it a secret till the morrow; but the moment he quitted the ex-premier, he sent a paragraph to the *Times* relating the occurrence, and adding that "the queen had done it all." That statement, which was totally unfounded, was the last act of his official life. The Peel ministry, prematurely and rashly summoned to power, was of no long duration, and Brougham naturally took an active part in overthrowing it. Lord Melbourne was called upon in April 1835 to reconstruct the Whig Government with his former colleagues. But, formidable as he might be as an opponent, the Whigs had learned by experience that Brougham was even more dangerous to them as an ally, and with one accord they resolved that he should not hold the great seal or any other office. The great seal was put in commission, to divert for a time his resentment, and leave him, if he chose, to entertain hopes of recovering it. These hopes, however, were soon dissipated; and although the late chancellor assumed an independent position in the House of Lords, and even affected to protect the Government, his resentment against his "noble friends"

\* Mr Greville records in his Journal a conversation with Lord Melbourne of the 23d September in this year, from which it is clear that Melbourne was perfectly aware of the state the chancellor was in, and that he hardly thought him of sound mind. He added, "The king can't bear these exhibitions in Scotland."