

65574

MATERIALS

FOR

THE TRUE HISTORY

OF

LORD PALMERSTON.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CASE OF ALLEGED BRIBERY. 2. INTRODUCTION TO THE FOREIGN OFFICE. 3. CONNEXION WITH THE PRINCESS LIEVEN. 4. CAREER OF FIFTY-EIGHT YEARS. 5. PARALLEL CASE OF CHATEAUBRIAND—
MINISTER OF FRANCE AND AGENT OF
RUSSIA. 6. CONNIVANCE OF SIR ROBERT PEEL. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CRIMES. 8. PROSTRATION OF PUBLIC CHARACTER
AND AUTHORITY. 9. CHARACTER AS DISPLAYED IN THE
CHANGE OF THE SUCCESSION TO DEN-
MARK. 10. CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING SIR JOHN
BOWRING.—(APPENDIX.) |
|---|--|

(REPRINTED FROM THE "FREE PRESS," FROM MAY TO NOVEMBER, 1865.)

LONDON:
ROBERT HARDWICKE, 192, PICCADILLY.

APRIL, 1866.

Price One Shilling.

Ma

ONE

CL

12-

W

Me

100

of

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

Materials for the True History of Lord Palmerston.

No. I.—Case of Bribery.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE FINANCIAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.

*Saint Pancras Foreign Affairs Committee,
June 21, 1865.*

SIR,—I recently, as Secretary to a Committee of Working Men in this Metropolis, signed a Memoir in reference to the conduct of Sir JOHN BOWRING, and to the recent connexion of the Financial Reform Association with that individual. To avoid placing that Association in the dilemma of having to justify its conduct, or confess its error, this Memoir was not addressed to it, but copies were sent to the office, and forwarded with or without private letters to every member of the Council in Liverpool, and to some leading members of the Association elsewhere. From the Association we have received no communication. A notice of our Memoir has, however, been inserted in its organ, which I enclose herewith, from the incapacity I feel to describe or characterise it. I have to request to know whether this insertion has been made with the knowledge and sanction of yourself, or of the Council of the Financial Reform Association.

Having discharged this duty, I have to address you, as President of the Association, on the subject of the statements thus put forward in its organ to its members and the world, as a matter perfectly distinct from the forms, usages, and courtesies of correspondence between individual men.

The origin of the Memoir, not published, but commented on in the *Financial Reformer* (and not published at the time in any newspaper), was the presence of Sir JOHN BOWRING at a meeting of the Financial Reform Association. The Foreign Affairs Committee, on whose behalf I write, being, like many others, composed of men whose object is not to advance any particular theory, but to in-

struct themselves by all requisite study, so that they may understand public affairs; having for years past applied themselves to the examination of transactions in China, and having ample means for such inquiry in the published official documents; had ascertained that Sir JOHN BOWRING had, in his public capacity at Canton, lent himself to the prosecution of a criminal and ruinous policy dictated from home; and in doing so, had had recourse to means so flagitious and disgraceful as to exclude him from the intercourse of all honest men.

Judging that the Financial Reform Association, through neglect of these sources of information, to which alone we look, had remained in ignorance of such conduct on the part of the individual referred to, and had been surprised into intercourse with him, we drew up the Memoir in question.

After an interval of six weeks—ample time for investigation and reflection—the organ of the Financial Reform Association published the notice, the subject of this letter.

We should have supposed that any notice of such charges must have been either a refutation or a justification. We are answered merely by scoffing iteration of disjointed words, coupled with a justification, not of the acts we charge on Sir JOHN BOWRING, but of Sir JOHN BOWRING himself, notwithstanding those acts, because he made “a capital free trade speech.”

What signifies it that the proof of deliberate falsehood stands in the Blue-book? That on the 11th of October, 1856, Sir JOHN BOWRING wrote to his subordinate that the *Arrow* had *no right* to carry the British flag, but that “*the Chinese had no knowledge of the expiry of the licence;*” that presuming on this ignorance, he wrote to the Chinese

Commissioner on the 14th of November, "There is no doubt the lorcha *Arrow* lawfully bore the British flag."?

What matters it that the end and aim of this falsehood, and these unjust demands, was to bring about the slaughter of helpless Chinese without just cause, and without a declaration of war, by military and naval forces, with which they were quite unable to contend, on the ground that Chinese subjects had been taken out of a Chinese boat in Chinese waters by a Chinese officer? What matters it that he should thus have "entailed upon every British subject the guilt of murder?"*

What matters it that a Hong-Kong jury should have found by their verdict that Sir JOHN BOWRING was the accomplice of Mr. CALDWELL, the Registrar-General of Hong-Kong, partner of pirates, and proprietor of houses of ill fame?† What matters it that this Apostle of Free-trade, Peace, and Financial Reform should break the peace between two great nations by hostilities founded on a false pretext and supported by an "acknowledged lie?" thereby injuring and fettering an important trade, and, by the consequent expenses, preventing reduction of expenditure and "Financial Reform?" What matter these things? says the organ of the Financial Reform Association — "Sir JOHN BOWRING has made a 'capital Free-trade speech.' "‡

* Sir James Graham, in the House of Commons, 17th of August, 1860, said, "If there were not a state of war with China, the aspect of the case was fearful indeed; for without a declaration of war, any man who put an end to the life of a Chinese was, by statute, guilty of murder."

† The following description of the administration of Sir John Bowring at Hong-Kong was given by his successor, Sir Hercules Robinson, after the conviction of Machow Wong for piracy:

"There is no doubt that Machow Wong had the power, through Mr. Caldwell, of directing the movements of ships of war against pirates, or alleged pirates, whenever he pleased."

"It was shown, during the progress of the investigation, that Mr. Caldwell was entrusted with the power of obtaining, on his own authority alone, the services of men-of-war to proceed in search of *alleged* pirates; that nothing further was required of him than that he should say he had received information of an act of piracy, and that, with no greater formality than this, he should apply personally to the senior naval officer for the assistance of one or more ships, or boats, embark himself in one of them, describe the place to which they should proceed, and there point out the vessels or place to be attacked."

"If the mere landing of cargo captured at sea would justify the firing of a town, I fear a similar pretext might be found daily for the bombardment of the capital of Hong-Kong."

‡ The expenditure of England at the time when the Financial Reform Association was formed for the purpose

This must be the impression of any unprejudiced person, after reading our Memoir and the article in the *Financial Reformer*.

Sir JOHN BOWRING has either been guilty of these things, or he has not. It is impossible to deny that he has, since the evidence is on record, and is supplied by himself. If he has, loss of character must surely ensue to any one who associates with him. Further, the extinction of its corporate purpose in an Association, having economy for its end, must follow its acceptance of the patronage of a man whose public acts have entailed "profligate expenditure," and who is also the servant of a Government whose extravagance that Association seeks to expose and correct. We submit that, under such circumstances, your Association must be suspected by the thoughtful, and must tend to mislead those who look to it as a guide.

We beg of you to consider the consequences that must ensue to all of us from this loss of the sense of justice and of right. AKENSIDE has said, "No nation ever lost its liberties at home till it had been made the tool of designing men against the liberties of others." If we make ourselves the accomplices of Sir J. BOWRING in destroying the Chinese, surely we shall deserve that as we have meted unto others, even so shall it be meted unto us. If we lay down the rule that might is right in respect to the Chinese, where shall we stop? We see some of the results in India and New Zealand, and we cannot suppose we shall end there, if those who should set an example of honour and consistency will give countenance to and take by the hand the men who, by breaking the law, involve us in these wasteful and disgraceful quarrels.

But it is not merely that such toleration is a participation in, and an encouragement to, cruelty and extravagance. Sir JOHN BOWRING is himself ashamed of his crimes, for he uses falsehood to justify them. Having used falsehood to carry out his purpose against the Chinese, he falsely declares at home that he bombarded Canton to protect the crew of the *Arrow*, the truth being, according to the statement sent home by himself, that he gave up the crew of the *Arrow* in order that he might have an excuse for bombarding Canton. Surely the sense of their position as gentlemen must forbid the Council of your Association to continue to

of controlling its extravagance was 54,000,000*l.* The expenditure of England is now 66,000,000*l.* This increase being almost wholly dependent upon the acts of the Foreign Department.

associate with a man who is now proved to be in the habit of telling falsehoods. Surely the most meagre capacity will be able to see that in an agitation in which a good speech is held to outweigh a bad action, there must at least be the presumption that such a speech is not insincere. Sir JOHN BOWRING made speeches for free trade and peace before, as well as after, his unprovoked bombardment of a "Commercial City." How can his speech be true whose life is a lie?

But there is another part of this singular article which has caused us the greatest surprise. It is as follows:—

"The London *Free Press*, the organ of Mr. DAVID URQUHART, has made a most remarkable discovery, one which may even match with the revelation that Lord PALMERSTON, being totally cleaned out of land and fortune by losses at a gaming-house, was then and there, or shortly afterwards, pounced upon by the Princess LIEVEN with a bribe of 30,000*l.*, and became thenceforth, what the *Free Press* believes him still, viz. the bond-slave and tool of Russia, working everywhere, even when fighting against her, as in the Crimea, in furtherance of Russian aggrandisement."

We fail to perceive what connexion there can be between this "revelation," whatever its value, and the charges we make against Sir J. BOWRING, founded on passages from his own despatches, published in the *Blue-books*. Still less can we perceive how such a "belief" in the mind of any journal or person can be adduced, either as controverting the avowal of Sir JOHN BOWRING that he made use of a falsehood to bring about the bombardment of Canton, or as showing that honest men can associate with a person who makes such an avowal otherwise than as a confession of guilt—for such is the matter at issue between the *Financial Reformer* and ourselves.

But what renders this passage still more extraordinary is that the newspaper referred to as the source of this extravagant belief has not a single word, either asserting, or implying, such a "belief." The *Free Press* in which the correspondence on this subject first appeared was published at Sheffield under a different management. We have searched the files of the *Free Press*, under its present management, from its first number in August, 1856, down to its last, and have found no original article or paragraph containing a trace of such belief. Two insertions from other journals we have indeed found, which mention the subject, one from the *Birmingham Journal*, the other from the *Sheffield Free Press*. Even these articles do not use the word "bribery" or make mention of any particular sum. With the

exception of these two insertions from other papers, there is no hint in the *Free Press* of bribery as connected with Lord PALMERSTON, and no mention of a sum of money paid to him or to any other Minister. Thus the *Financial Reformer* itself puts forward what it considers an atrocious calumny against the Premier, falsely charges another paper with putting it forward, and then uses its own assertion to justify the connexion of the Financial Reform Association with a disreputable subordinate.

Now, as to the belief that a bribe, not of 30,000*l.*, but of 20,000*l.*, was paid to Lord PALMERSTON; the members of this Committee do unquestionably entertain it, and the special grounds on which they do so have been furnished to them not by the *Free Press*, but through the agency of Mr. MACQUEEN, Secretary to the Financial Reform Association, and doubtless the author of the article in the *Financial Reformer*. The inquiry referred to took place because Mr. MACQUEEN, who now brings up the holding of this belief as a proof of extreme folly, actually gave, as a proof of inconsistency against the very same persons, that they never even alluded to any such belief.

During forty years there have, doubtless, been whisperings on the subject in diplomatic circles, but these would never have taken a substantial shape, far less would they have reached the knowledge of persons occupying so humble a station as ours. The Premier has been continually, during many years, openly and boldly charged with Treason, in the public journals, in the House of Commons, in a variety of published works, and even by the Financial Reform Association itself.

I.

CHARGES IN THE PUBLIC JOURNALS.

On the 15th December, 1837, the *Times* contained the following:—

"Our dissection of Lord PALMERSTON's speech has called forth a defence, at which, though unexpected, we are not astonished.

"We should not have thought it worth while to notice it, but for the painful consideration that we are replying to the individual who disgraces the station of Minister for Foreign Affairs. We are accused of having preferred charges against Lord PALMERSTON. That duty belongs not to us; and when the day of his impeachment arrives, his bitterest enemies could not wish him a more damning defence.

"The distinct accusations against Her Majesty's 'Foreign Secretary,' which we are stated 'to wish to establish,' are thus quoted:—

"1st Charge.—'That Lord PALMERSTON has given the sanction and assent of England to the augmentation of the Russian navy.'

"2nd Charge.—'That his Lordship has given the same sanction to the Treaty of UNKIAR SKELESSI.'

"3rd Charge.—'That his Lordship has relieved Russia from anxiety as to any intervention on the part of England in the Circassian war,'

"4th and 5th Charges.—'That his Lordship has exhibited a Minister of England supporting in the House of Commons the policy of the Russian Government, and avowing that co-operation and concert between the two Governments under circumstances which can only appear throughout Europe, and Asia, and India as the result of a necessity which Russia had influenced, and which England had not the power to resist.'

"We admit that our words are correctly extracted, and our meaning fairly represented."

On the 1st January, 1838, it wrote as follows:—

"Lord PALMERSTON actually supports Russia in her aggressions against Circassia, whilst in Greece, which his Lordship boasts of having raised to a state of freedom and independence, he has, during seven years, been the instrument of Russia in extinguishing those municipal and representative rights which the Ambassadors of England and France affirmed, during the Conference at Poros, that it would be cruel, unjust, and even dangerous, to deprive them of."

And again, on the same day:—

"What does Lord PALMERSTON mean by denying that he has interfered in the Circassian War? Has he not prostituted truth itself in favour of Russia and against Circassia? Has he not knowingly asserted an untruth in stating that Soudjouk Kalé was in *de facto* military possession of Russia when the testimony of his own countrymen proved the reverse?"

On the 20th April, 1838, the *Times* accused Lord PALMERSTON of garbling documents, a charge since brought home to him by Mr. DUNLOP and Mr. BRIGHT in the case of the Affghan Forgeries:—

"In exposing the general ruin of the interests of England in foreign countries, through the misconduct of our Foreign Minister, we have already entered at length into the question of the north-east boundary of the United States. The papers presented to Parliament, a part of which we published yesterday entire, and of which an analysed abstract will be found in another portion of our columns this day, not only go to confirm entirely the view we had previously expressed of Lord PALMERSTON's criminality, but exhibit his character in a point of view even more contemptible than that by which it has already become known and execrated. Not the least interesting feature in those papers is the art with which the particular documents on which the question turns have been transferred from the chronological order, in which they ought to have been placed, to the appendix, whereby the reader is led into the belief that the despatches and diplomatic notes, extending over a hundred folio pages, represent a *bonâ fide* negotiation, whereas they only conceal the fraud previously practised by Lord PALMERSTON on his colleagues and his country, in allowing the United States to violate the Convention to which both the President and the Senate, and, consequently, the State of Maine through its representatives, were solemnly pledged."

To save time and space, we refrain from

quoting similar passages from the *Herald* and the *Post*.

II.

CHARGES IN PARLIAMENT.

On the 23rd February, 1848, Mr. ANSTEY, in bringing forward a Motion for papers with a view to the impeachment suggested by the *Times* ten years before, said:—

"I charge the noble Lord with the wilful and deliberate betrayal of the Circassians, the ally of England, who had been encouraged by a recommendation to open trade with this country. I charge the noble Lord with their betrayal to the deadly foe of this country as well as their own; and I charge him further, with the deliberate betrayal and violation of the honour and safety of Great Britain, and of the rights of British merchants; whose losses remain uncompensated to this hour. I charge the noble Lord with having done this, with the design and with the effect of transferring to a foreign Power, the dominion of an independent territory, which it was necessary for that Power to possess in the prosecution of her designs against our Indian Empire. I further charge the noble Lord with having deceived the Parliament with *false statements and suppressions of fact* in reference to this matter. And I charge him with having practised the same deception upon his colleagues, and upon his Sovereign. Therefore, sir, combining these charges together, and as the necessary result thereof, I, in the last place charge the noble Lord with the superadded guilt of High Treason. And, sir, I undertake to prove all these charges to the very letter. When the noble Lord shall lay the papers I demand before this House, I will prove my charges before any tribunal this House may think fit to appoint."

And again:—

"I recall here an incident narrated by a gentleman whom I will name—for his authority for the statement has been cited in a printed document in 1841, with his full knowledge, and without the least protest or disapprobation on his part, and was never protested against—I refer to Mr. PORTER, of the Board of Trade. He was the gentleman who, in 1840, negotiated, with so much success, the Treaty of Commerce with France. Mr. PORTER, then of the Board of Trade, has been promoted to a higher office. I presume, therefore, that he enjoys the confidence of the colleagues of the noble Lord. Now, on this gentleman's being selected, in 1840—before the Treaty of July—by the then colleagues of the noble Lord, in consequence of his connexion with the Board of Trade, to negotiate a Treaty of Commerce with France, Mr. PORTER informed those Ministers that he was confident that, whatever treaty he might negotiate for such a purpose, would be interfered with by the noble Lord, and either brought to nothing, or, as in the case of the Turkish Treaty, perverted to the ruin of its objects. Mr. PORTER, therefore, demanded and obtained this condition from the then Ministry—that the Treaty should be kept out of the Foreign Office, and that he should not be called upon to report to, or receive any instructions whatever from, the noble Lord or his department, in the conduct of that negotiation. On the faith of that condition alone he undertook the mission. It is further stated, on the same gentleman's authority, and in the same document, that he brought the matter to a happy conclusion; that the French Government were quite ready to adopt, sign, and ratify the Treaty which he had framed;

that they were most willing to adopt it; that it was based upon the most perfect system of free trade and reciprocity; and that, in spite of the precautions he had taken, and the conditions he had exacted, that Treaty was, at length, set aside by the noble Lord. There is no doubt that the direct act of the noble Lord occasioned its failure. An insulting despatch on the subject was addressed by the noble Lord to the French Minister, which occasioned the utter shipwreck of that Treaty; and all chance of renewing the negotiations with respect to it was, in consequence of that event, as well as of those of July, 1840, made for ever afterwards impracticable. Sir, I state this on the authority of Mr. PORTER, and I refer to the fact of his recent appointment as showing that, notwithstanding that declaration was made in 1841, the noble Lord has not induced his colleagues to disgrace that gentleman."

In Lord PALMERSTON'S deliberate reply of five hours, which he made, holding in his hand the printed slips of Mr. ANSTAY'S speech, not only was no answer made upon this point, but no notice whatever was taken of the subject.

Subserviency to or rather collusion with Russia, betrayal of Russia's foes, the telling of falsehoods, and the garbling of documents; these are the charges made in the press and in Parliament.

We now come to

III.

CHARGES MADE BY THE FINANCIAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.

These charges are similar to the former ones. Their pamphlet on the Russo-Dutch Loan, published in 1855, accused Lord PALMERSTON of having saddled England with a debt she did not owe, by a falsehood concerted with the Russian Ambassador.

In 1857, the Annual Report of the Association referred to this pamphlet as showing how British interests and British money were sacrificed by diplomacy. Some years afterwards, this pamphlet being out of print, the Association published what professed to be its "substance." We extract two passages. The first charged upon England subserviency to Russia.

"IN THE REIGN OF THE SECOND CHARLES, AND OF THE SECOND JAMES, ENGLAND WAS THE PENSIONER OF FRANCE; IN OUR OWN DAYS SHE IS THE TRIBUTARY OF RUSSIA."—Page 8.

These, "our own days," namely, from 1830 to 1860, comprehend thirty years, during more than twenty of which the foreign relations of England have been in the hands of Lord PALMERSTON.

The second passage reiterates the charge of falsehood told in the service of Russia.

"A noticeable argument was pressed into the service in one of the Debates on this subject, by Lord PALMERSTON, who declared that, at the time of the Belgic-Dutch quarrel in 1830, Russia had offered to come to the assistance of Holland with

sixty thousand men, had therefore kept to the original Convention, and was therefore entitled, &c., &c. The argument is noticeable for this reason, that the Duke of WELLINGTON and Earl GREY, who were in office together with his Lordship, both averred that such offer had never reached their ears; and, whatever may have been the case with the Earl, the Duke's memory, it is well known, gripped like a vice."—Page 7.

In May, 1865, the *Financial Reformer* sneers, as the height of absurdity, at the belief of the *Free Press*, that Lord PALMERSTON has been "working every where, even when fighting against her, as in the Crimea, in furtherance of Russian aggrandisement."

But in May, 1855, when the fighting in the Crimea was actually going on; when Mr. URQUHART had declared that the "Four Points" were Russian, and that the Allies were doing all they could to destroy Turkey the Financial Reform Association was the only public body which gave utterance to similar views.

Their Tract No. IX, New Series, contains the following:—

"The independence of Europe was vitally assailed, its best bulwark against Muscovite invasion was struck down, and treaties were most grossly violated when Poland was incorporated in the Russian Empire. No hand was raised to help the noble, chivalric, and Christian Poles, who saved Austria from falling under the Turkish yoke; and Europe is now reaping the fruit of her acquiescence in that most iniquitous transaction; for the Poles, whom she abandoned and betrayed, are fighting compulsorily in the ranks of the aggressor. As to the independence of the Ottoman Empire, that is at an end, whether Russia triumphs or the Allies. It was substantially compromised and destroyed, both in the original Four Points, which the Allies were ready to force on the Sublime Porte, until the Russian interpretation of them showed the justice of the Turkish objection, that they conceded more to Russia than Russia had demanded; and also in the latest amended version of them, which has recently vanished *in fumo* at Vienna," page 8.

When the Secret Correspondence with the Emperor of RUSSIA was published, the public were shocked only at the ambition of the CZAR, but Mr. URQUHART declared that that correspondence proved the complicity of the British Government in his designs. This doctrine, held by the public opinion of the day to be insane and calumnious was, nevertheless, boldly put forward by the Financial Reform Association. The pamphlet already quoted from says:—

"Sir HAMILTON SEYMOUR discouraged these imperial schemes of spoliation, so far as he dared, and communicated them, with his own impressions, to his superiors at home. And what did our Ministers? Instead of protesting, in the name of threatened Europe, against the meditated aggression, and declaring that it would be opposed with all the power of Britain, they addressed him in terms of fulsome adulation, assuring him, indeed, that England would take no part of the spoil, but complimenting him on

his magnanimity, his generosity, and the services which he had rendered to Europe—most especially to the Christian population of Turkey. The CZAR having thus no reason to believe that Great Britain would oppose any substantial obstacle to his designs, sought an active accomplice in France; and though failing there also, he was undoubtedly encouraged to proceed, on the supposition, that by neither would he be opposed separately, and that an armed alliance between them was impossible. Hence he proceeded in his career of aggression, step by step, *with the concurrence or acquiescence of the Four Powers, until,*” &c, page 9.

This is a general charge against the Ministry. We go on therefore to page 15:—

“Passing from the Ministry to its head, what has Lord PALMERSTON done to justify the general expectation? Never was so entire a failure; never did man so completely disappoint the predictions of his friends, or justify the anticipations of his enemies. . . . Many of his appointments, both civil and military, might have been deliberately designed to insult, outrage, and defy the national feeling; in no instance has he put the right man in the right place; on the gravest and most melancholy subjects he has thought it befitting the dignity of his station to indulge in miserable jokes and evasions, and his whole conduct since his accession to the chief power of the State has been such, that it can only be accounted for on the supposition that *he has lost, or never had, the talent attributed to him*, or on Mr. DAVID URQUHART's startling theory that, in deliberate purpose as well as in practical effect, Lord PALMERSTON is, and has long been, playing the game of Russia.”

The alternative of incompetency is here put in such a light as to show its absurdity. This is, therefore, a charge of Treason. It is not the less so because it is extorted from the writer by his utter inability to explain in any other way the things which have been done.

If the Financial Reform Association has now become able to explain the secret of events by some other “theory,” a vindication of Lord PALMERSTON's character is due at their hands. Till that vindication appears, it is, to say the least, in very bad taste to sneer at others for holding views which they themselves once held, and which they still feel themselves unable to refute.

This charge of treason, made alike in the press, in Parliament, and in the publications of the Financial Reform Association, has invariably grown out of the several transactions examined; and, each presenting the same result, it is but natural that the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee which drew up the Memoir on Sir JOHN BOWRING, should have yielded their “belief” to the motive suggested by a payment of money alleged, on grounds apparently authoritative, commencing at a period antecedent to Lord PALMERSTON's entry into the Cabinet and coincident with a period of known extreme embarrassment in his circumstances.

The part of Mr. MACQUEEN in furnishing us with this key was as follows. It was submitted to the Financial Reform Association that the increase of expenditure against which they struggled, might be dependent on a general purpose prompted by a foreign Power, and that consequently it was desirable for the Association to institute a general inquiry into the source and effect of those diplomatic and military operations which had so vastly increased the public expenditure.

Mr. CRAWSHAY wrote in this sense to the Secretary of the Financial Reform Association on the 5th September, 1855:—

“I write to ask you whether you would think it of any use to have demonstration that the late Mr. PORTER, of the Board of Trade, lived and died in the conviction, derived from his own observation, whilst in office, that in commercial treaties due interests were systematically and wilfully sacrificed by Lord PALMERSTON to those of Russia?”

This proposition was met on the part of Mr. MACQUEEN, by denying that any such inquiry could be prosecuted unless it were “proved that Lord PALMERSTON was actuated by corrupt personal motive.”

Mr. MACQUEEN replied, September 21:—

“Supposing that you do prove not only that such was Mr. PORTER's conviction, but that that conviction was correct, you will give no additional weight to Mr. COLLET's charge of treason against Lord PALMERSTON, unless you can also prove that his Lordship was actuated by some corrupt personal motive in his subserviency to Russia.

“In this way he has blundered woefully; but thus to err is a very different thing to deliberate treason, which is the accusation brought by Mr. COLLET against his Lordship. To give the slightest colour of probability to this, corrupt motives must be shown, and if not proved, *it must at least be alleged* that Lord PALMERSTON is, in plain terms, THE BRIBED TOOL OF RUSSIA. This, so far as I am aware, has not been suggested by Mr. COLLET, or even by Mr. DAVID URQUHART, the most virulent and the most mysterious of his Lordship's assailants, whose hatred and suspicion seem almost to amount to monomania.”

This letter is in striking contrast with the article in the *Financial Reformer* for May last. The belief there held up to ridicule, namely, that Lord PALMERSTON was working for Russia in the Crimea, has been shown to have been put forward by the Financial Reform Association. The article further stigmatises us for believing that Lord PALMERSTON has received a sum of money from Russia. But in the letter just quoted Mr. MACQUEEN declares that without making such a charge no other can be of any avail. He further adds that it is not necessary to prove the charge, but only to allege it.

Doubtless Mr. MACQUEEN deemed his suggestion to be an effectual way to arrest inquiry. The effect, however, was different.

CASE OF BRIBERY.

The Committee to which this reply was given had already applied itself to collect evidence on the subject.

From the evidence then forwarded, the following are extracts :

ALLEGED BRIBERY OF LORD PALMERSTON.

REPORT OF THE NEWCASTLE COMMITTEE.

The Committee appointed to obtain evidence as to the fact of the charge having been made by the late Mr. PORTER, of the Board of Trade, against Lord PALMERSTON, of having received money from Russia in the form of a gambling debt, have to report:—

1. That Mr. PORTER, whilst in office at the Board of Trade, during the administration of Lord MELBOURNE, and whilst Lord PALMERSTON was Foreign Minister, formed and expressed the conviction, as the result of his own observation, and of facts within his own knowledge, that Lord PALMERSTON systematically sacrificed the interests of England to those of Russia, in matters relating to commercial treaties.

2. That Mr. PORTER did not conceal this conviction from his official chief, the President of the Board of Trade, Lord PALMERSTON's colleague; but that, on the contrary, when, in 1840, he was offered a mission to Paris, for the purpose of negotiating a commercial treaty with France, he declined to accept that mission, except on the express condition that he should have no communication to make to the Foreign Office, assigning, as a reason for this demand, his conviction that his endeavours to conclude such a treaty would be treacherously thwarted by the Chief of that department.

3. That this condition was submitted to; and Mr. PORTER, in consequence, withdrew his objections to and undertook the mission to Paris.

4. That whilst in office, under Mr. GLADSTONE, during Sir R. PEEL's administration, Mr. PORTER adhered to his former convictions, and, in addition, charged Lord PALMERSTON with having received Russian money; alleging that the agent in this transaction was a Jew, by name JACOB JAMES HART, who formerly kept a gambling-house, near St. James's-street, and who was subsequently appointed British Consul at Leipsic, by Lord PALMERSTON; and that he had ascertained this in consequence of inquiries made by the Government, with a view of cancelling the appointment of Hart.

5. That, independently of Mr. PORTER's evidence, it is an indubitable fact, to be ascertained by any who will take the trouble to inquire, as we have done, that JACOB JAMES HART did keep a gambling-house, and was appointed by Lord PALMERSTON to be British Consul at Leipsic, where he was universally shunned as a most disreputable character.

The committee subjoin evidence which they have taken:

G. CRAWSHAY.	WILLIAM STEWART.
F. CARR.	GEORGE STOBART.
ROBERT BAINBRIDGE.	JAMES WATSON.
JOHN YOUNGE.	JOHN JEWITT.

Newcastle, September 20, 1855.

STATEMENT OF MR. URQUHART BEFORE THE COMMITTEE.

Newcastle, June 2, 1855.

The communication respecting HART—the consular agent at Leipsic, was made to me (to the best of my recollection, in August, 1841), in Mr. MACGREGOR'S

room, adjoining that of Mr. GLADSTONE, who was there at the time, by Mr. MACGREGOR and Mr. PORTER, in presence of Col. TAYLOR, and in consequence of a note from Mr. PORTER to me, requesting my attendance at the Board of Trade to receive a communication of the gravest importance. I received this communication as from Mr. GLADSTONE, with a view of its being published, in order to enable the Government to cancel the appointment, and so to free them in that respect from the pressure that Lord PALMERSTON could apply to them. I immediately declined having anything to do with a charge of that description.

Q. What was the charge?

A. That this HART had been an agent employed by Princess LIEVEN for the payment of certain sums to Lord PALMERSTON, in the form of money lost at a gambling-table.

Q. What was the sum?

A. The sums mentioned were two sums of 10,000*l.* each.

Q. At what period?

A. In the year '25 or '26, but I cannot answer with precision on this point.

Q. Why did you decline?

A. *Because my charges against Lord PALMERSTON bore upon his acts, and I could have nothing to do with a matter such as this. Not only did I decline making use of the information so tendered, but during these thirteen years, I have never mentioned the incident, until recently called upon to state whether such and such a thing had taken place. I must add that the matter had not for us the importance which it seems to have now for you.*

Q. Had you heard of this charge before the communication from these gentlemen?

A. No.

Q. Are you prepared to make an affidavit of the above statements?

A. Certainly.

INQUIRY AT LEIPSIC.

September 20, 1855.

I have made inquiries in Leipsic, through a London solicitor, about HART. The answers represent HART as universally shunned in Leipsic, as disreputable. That the appointment was generally accounted for by the supposition that Lord PALMERSTON owed him money, and that there was a rumour of HART's having exhibited a complimentary letter to himself from Lord PALMERSTON.

G. CRAWSHAY.

QUESTIONS.

1. Who was the British Consul at Leipsic, during the years 1837, '38, '39, '40, and '41?

2. Was a Jew of the name of HART ever British Consul at Leipsic, during any of these years, or near that time?

3. If so, was not the appointment objected to by the British and other residents at Leipsic, as disreputable, and at last withdrawn?

4. Was it not pretty well known that HART exhibited to many persons at Leipsic a letter from Lord PALMERSTON, expressing regret that he had no better office to give him?

ANSWERS.

I received your favour of the 14th instant, and came to-day in the state to give you the following replies on your questions:—

1 and 2. The British Consul at Leipsic, during the named time, has been a person who was thought a Jew, of the name of HART.

3. Not officially, till a member of the House of Commons called attention of the Government to it. A more disreputable person, or one more unfit to fill a situation of British Consul, could scarcely have been found: it was generally believed that Lord PALMERSTON must have owed him money.

4. Such a report was in existence, but there is nobody to be found who has actually seen a letter of this kind.

A son of Dr. SOUTHWOOD SMITH, of the name of HERMAN SMITH, in London, was at one time doing the business of the Consulate here; he is most likely in London now, and may be a proper person to give information.

I shall keep a further look-out about this affair, and if I should hear anything more, I shall not fail to let you know.

Leipsic, May, 1855.

R. MONTEITH, ESQ., TO THE NEWCASTLE COMMITTEE.
(Extract.)

Carstairs House, Lanark, May 4, 1855.

My surprise was great at receiving a reply in terms and manner of the greatest respect, of more than respect, for the person referred to. Sir JOHN McNEIL declined, indeed, to adopt the great charge against PALMERSTON; but of Mr. URQUHART he spoke as a man of the highest capacity, the most minute knowledge of international affairs, and the most perfect integrity.

In Mr. PORTER I discovered the proof that, among the working officers of the State, among men of the highest standing, character, and experience, the conclusions of Mr. URQUHART were acknowledged as the secret of events, and accepted as the only clue to otherwise incomprehensible facts; others who had professed to know Mr. URQUHART to be in the right, and that they lived on in the anguish of their convictions, sustained by the hope that he who had a courage beyond their own, would yet succeed in awakening England.

C. ATTWOOD, ESQ. TO THE SAME.
(Extract.)

Tow Law, May 12, 1855.

I was told, in the Turkish Association rooms, last summer (but I am not sure by whom), that Mr. WALPOLE, a member of the Association, had said that his father, Lord ORFORD, had said, speaking to him about these charges, at breakfast, a few days before:—"Oh, as to Lord PALMERSTON having got Russian money, that is not only a fact, but I know the man by whom, and the occasion when it was paid to him."

Perhaps this may be the case you refer to. If so, this is all I know about it.

FROM STEWART ERSKINE ROLLAND, ESQ.

June 5, 1855.

Having read the above, I beg to state that I am the person referred to by Mr. ATTWOOD, as having given him the anecdote of Lord ORFORD and Mr. WALPOLE. Mr. WALPOLE's words to me were to this effect:—"My father said to me, 'Are you only beginning to find out that PALMERSTON sold himself? We have known all along when it was, and how much he got.'"

F. MARX, ESQ., TO THE NEWCASTLE COMMITTEE.
(Extract.)

Arlebury, Hants, Aug. 20, 1855.

Whether HART had been employed to lose 20,000*l.* of Russian money to PALMERSTON, at a gambling-house, and subsequently received his appointment, as a reward for this service, I know not; but I heard the statement made as one of positive fact, by Mr.

G. R. PORTER, of the Board of Trade, and also, to the best of my recollection, by Mr. J. MCGREGOR, M.P. for Glasgow, on the occasion of my calling at his house in Lowndes-square, with a friend, who was acquainted with him.

In reference to the very Neapolitan Treaty, of which Mr. MONTEITH speaks in his letter, I remember being in conversation with JOSEPH HUME, at his house in Bryanstone-square, when Lord PALMERSTON's character for untruthfulness was spoken of; and Mr. HUME exclaimed:—"Oh! we all know the value of Lord PALMERSTON's denials. I was in the House of Commons when he denied the existence of the Commercial Treaty with Naples, and I turned round to LABOUCHERE, and said, 'Why, LABOUCHERE, I know the drawer at the Board of Trade in which that Treaty lies.'"

DAVID ROSS OF BLADENSBURGH, TO THE NEWCASTLE COMMITTEE.

(Extract.)

Rostrevor, April 19, 1855.

The circumstances connected with Mr. PORTER's mission to Paris were as follows:—In 1840, the Board of Trade was anxious to conclude a commercial treaty with France, and the mission was offered to Mr. PORTER. He accepted it, on the condition that he should have no communication to make to the Foreign Office, as, to use his own words—"I know the chief of that department to be a liar, and I believe him to be a traitor." These words were spoken to his official chief and colleague of Lord PALMERSTON in the cabinet. But, as I before observed, this occurred before he had cognisance of the transaction with the Jew. The words had reference to previous transactions of commercial treaties, in which Mr. MCGREGOR was engaged, and which were thwarted by Lord PALMERSTON, particularly the Neapolitan, which Lord PALMERSTON falsely declared, in the House of Commons, had no existence.

THE SAME TO THE SAME.

Rostrevor, April 7, 1855.

The circumstances, as related by Mr. PORTER to me, are as follows:—

There was a Jew, a British Consul at Leipsic, who was considered, both by native and British merchants, as a most discreditable representative of England, particularly as it was ascertained that he had been the keeper of a gambling-house somewhere about St. James's-street. An attempt was made to get him removed, and the matter was brought before Sir R. PEEL's government. But that government experienced such fierce and violent opposition from Lord PALMERSTON, who had made the appointment originally, that they gave way. The secret of Lord PALMERSTON's adherence to such a disreputable character came then to be inquired into, and it was found that Lord PALMERSTON, at a time when he was in great pecuniary embarrassment, I think about 1825, was told by Princess LIEVEN to go to the gambling-house kept by this Jew, where a foreigner was instructed to lose to him 30,000*l.* in two nights.

Mr. PORTER spoke of this openly to many persons, amongst others to Mr. BRIGHT, as he confessed to me some time ago.

There is another person who can give evidence on this matter I am inclined to think, for I have never spoken to him on the subject, but whether he will is another matter, and that is Mr. MacGREGOR, M.P. for Glasgow. He was at the Board of Trade at the time, and most intimate with Mr. PORTER. He would know what Mr. PORTER believed. He should know

of his own knowledge. He knows also what Lord PALMERSTON did in respect to the Neapolitan treaty.

The same allegation had been openly made in Parliament, without denial, by Mr. THOMAS ATTWOOD, in the House of Commons, August 6, 1839.

"It has been thought and said that Russian gold has found its way into this House. I do not mean to accuse the noble Lord of having received Russian gold, but the idea has gone abroad that Russian gold has found its way into this House. The noble Lord cannot but be aware that charges involving criminality of a serious nature have been put forth against him—in print, too—not alone in the daily and weekly press, but in pamphlets and works, some of which I now hold in my hand—not the productions of obscure and unknown individuals, but respectable gentlemen, having filled high offices—secretaries of embassy—employés and protégés of the noble Lord himself. Mr. URQUHART and Mr. PARISH have brought forward these accusations, and supported them by documentary evidence. God forbid that I should say that they are true; but they are uncontradicted—they have gone forth to the country, and why is it that the noble Lord has not instituted legal proceedings against these gentlemen? I think it right to state to the noble Lord, that the country expected that he would have taken such a course, as a means of self-justification. Why have not the parties who bring forward such charges been prosecuted for libel? I have not brought this forward to the notice of the House from any unpleasant feeling to the noble Lord, but in fulfilment of a duty; I have a right to call attention to this subject."

After the receipt of the documents from which the above are extracts, the Financial Reform Association, published through their Secretary, a letter dated 27th November, 1855, to Mr. CRAWSHAY, purporting to be a refutation, on the authority of three members of Parliament, Mr. THORNELEY, Mr. MACGREGOR, and Mr. BRIGHT.

Mr. MACQUEEN says, respecting Mr. THORNELEY:—

"A third statement consists in the extract from the *Hamilton Gazette*, giving part of an alleged speech of Mr. T. ATTWOOD, which is said to have covered Lord PALMERSTON with confusion and dismay; to have brought Mr. THORNELEY to his rescue; and, *mirabile dictu!* to have been wholly suppressed by all the newspapers, with the exception of the *Sun*, which had only a slight and distant allusion to it. To begin with the last affair first:—*I have seen Mr. THORNELEY, and he denies, positively, that Mr. ATTWOOD ever made any such speech in his hearing, and ridicules the idea of its having been suppressed in all the English newspapers, supposing it to have been delivered, and finding its way into a colonial one*"

The Newcastle Committee, having submitted this statement respecting his brother to Mr. C. ATTWOOD, received the following reply:—

(Extract.)

"Now for Mr. THOMAS ATTWOOD's speech. He did make that speech, and it was not at all replied to; and he used the words that it appeared to him

'That Russian gold had found its way into the House.' I read that speech in the *Era* weekly newspaper; my eye having been caught by a placard at the door of one of the shops at which it was sold, on the Sunday following its publication, and which referred in large letters to that speech and charge. I was much struck with the fact that I had read no such report of that speech as made by him in any of the daily papers. The first time I saw him afterwards I adverted to it, and he told me that it was correct, and that he did use the above-quoted words, in the presence of Lord PALMERSTON, and as applied to him, and not a word was said in answer."

The report of Mr. T. ATTWOOD's speech will be found in Hansard's Debates.

The next witness called in disproof by Mr. MACQUEEN is the late Mr. MACGREGOR, M.P. for Glasgow, a Director of the British Bank, and formerly Under Secretary of the Board of Trade. The statement of Mr. MACQUEEN respecting his evidence is as follows:—

"There is no truth whatever (says Mr. MACGREGOR) with regard to what is said in the *Sheffield Free Press*, in asserting that I could corroborate the charges against Lord PALMERSTON; nor do I believe there is a single word of truth in the charges made against him by Mr. URQUHART and others. Why did not Mr. URQUHART bring forward these grave accusations against his Lordship in the House of Commons, and there state the sources of his information? I, admit hearing Mr. URQUHART state such charges fifteen years ago, on his calling on me and Mr. PORTER, at the Board of Trade; and I much regret that my late friend, Mr. PORTER, most credulously, and to me most unaccountably, believed them. They said they could prove the same; but I never saw a shadow of a proof. *I have seen, however, abundant proof, while I was with our ambassador at Vienna—then Sir FREDERICK LAMB—to the contrary.* Everything since then confirms me in this opinion. Believing these charges had no foundation, except in the feelings of a disappointed man, or that they were the offspring of a disordered mind, I ceased after 1841, to see or hear any one on this subject." "Mr. MACGREGOR (says Mr. MACQUEEN) denies that the treaty with France was circumvented by Lord PALMERSTON, and states that Mr. PORTER was recalled from Paris 'in consequence of a most indiscreet and improper letter written by him to the Foreign Office, refusing to follow Lord PALMERSTON's instructions,' and says of Mr. PORTER, 'He was a valuable public servant, and, on commercial policy, of correct judgment. He was, however, sometimes indiscreet, and at all times credulous in believing anything against Lord PALMERSTON. He perpetually endeavoured to impress his opinions on me; and he was like Mr. URQUHART, one of those who believed that, when his statements were not replied to, they were admitted as true.'"

In respect to Mr. MACGREGOR's imputation of credulity on Mr. PORTER, we will quote the words of Mr. GLADSTONE, in his letter (which we shall presently give at length) to Mr. CRAWSHAY, of the 14th of January, 1856. He speaks of Mr. PORTER's "scrupulous care and honour in all official relations."

The following extracts bear on Mr. MACGREGOR's assertion that he had never

stated or believed that the 20,000*l.* had been paid by HART to Lord PALMERSTON.

Mr. URQUHART writes to Mr. CRAWSHAY January 16, 1856 :—

“If you will turn back to my testimony, you will find that I put the name of Mr. MACGREGOR before that of Mr. PORTER, conveying the impression upon my mind, when for the first time I applied myself to recal the circumstances, of Mr. MACGREGOR having taken the lead. This impression is confirmed by the statement of Col. TAYLOR, who says emphatically, ‘The statement was made to me by Mr. MACGREGOR and not by Mr. PORTER.’”

Mr. URQUHART encloses a letter addressed to him by his short-hand writer :—

15, Moon-terrace, Walworth, Dec. 30, 1855.

Dear Sir,—Having seen in a correspondence with Mr. MACQUEEN, of Liverpool, various statements which I know to be untrue, I am anxious to place my testimony at your disposal.

First, as to your having been the promulgator, as asserted by Mr. MACGREGOR, of the story respecting the gambling transaction between Lord PALMERSTON and HART; during the whole course of the time I was with you, from 1839 to 1844, all your letters being dictated to me, and having been present, generally speaking, whilst conversations were going on, I never heard you once allude to that case; but I recollect your speaking of it as a matter beneath contempt, when called up by certain of your friends. Particularly I recollect this occurring in a conversation with Mr. ROSS of Bladensburg. At Glasgow, on several occasions, questions were put to you by the operatives, as to the motives of Lord PALMERSTON, and as to whether or not he had been paid by Russia. Your answer invariably was,—“I don’t accuse Lord PALMERSTON of having received money: that matter is totally beside the question. I here place facts before you, and it is your duty to see whether I am correct in my statements or not.”

Secondly, Mr. MACGREGOR says that he did not entertain the same convictions as Mr. PORTER and yourself. Now, I have a most distinct recollection of a fact which settles that matter.

Shortly after the Treaty of the 15th July, 1840, Mr. MACGREGOR and Mr. PORTER came to you one Sunday morning, in Mount-street, and a meeting took place of such extraordinary interest, and which I believe lasted three hours, that against your wont no one was admitted. I therefore was not present, but I am aware of the fact of the result of that meeting.

You dictated a letter to me to Lord MELBOURNE, in which, after laying down the case against Lord PALMERSTON, you stated that in making the allegation you acted in concurrence with, and supported by, gentlemen who had themselves been engaged in diplomatic transactions, and actually held office under the Government, and this letter was sent down to the Board of Trade for their approval before transmission, and it is my belief that I was myself the bearer of it.

I am perfectly ready to verify these facts, if necessary.

I remain, dear sir,

Your most obedient servant,

JAMES WHITE.

To D. Urquhart, Esq.

The letter of Mr. MACGREGOR, published by Mr. MACQUEEN, impugning Mr. UR-

QUHART’S veracity, that gentleman felt bound to call Mr. MACGREGOR to account. The correspondence which ensued brings out most clearly the tergiversations of Mr. MACGREGOR.

No. 1.

MR. URQUHART TO MR. MARX.

Castle Bromwich, Nov. 29, 1855.

My dear Sir,—You will learn from the enclosed all that is necessary. The extract is a wilful and deliberate falsehood. If Mr. MACGREGOR has written these words; if he does not retract them, and apologise for them, you have to tell him this on my behalf, and to obtain the name of his friend with whom to settle preliminaries.

Telegraph for me, and I shall be in Glasgow as soon as steam will carry me.

Believe me,

Most faithfully yours,

D. URQUHART.

F. Marx, Esq.

ENCLOSURE.

Castle Bromwich, Nov. 29, 1855.

My dear Sir,—I cannot assume that you could have written the subjoined extract, until I receive that knowledge from yourself.

The (*Sheffield Free Press*, containing the statement in question,* was at the time communicated to you by me, and must have been known to you from other sources.

This letter will be placed in your hands by a friend to whom I beg you to give your answer, and who is fully empowered to act on my behalf.

I address to Glasgow, not knowing where else to address you.

I am, my dear Sir,

Your faithful and obedient Servant,

D. URQUHART.

John Macgregor, Esq., M.P.

No. 2.

MEMORANDUM FROM MR. MARX TO MR. URQUHART.

London, Dec. 14, 1855, 10 P.M.

Mr. MACGREGOR refuses to submit the case to an arbiter. He admitted the truth of your statement, as to your having heard the story about the Leipsic Consul in his room from Mr. PORTER, he (Mr. MACGREGOR) and Colonel TAYLOR being present. But he utterly denied his having himself told a word of the story. He pleaded the fifteen years which had elapsed, and the number of occasions on which you were at his room in the Board of Trade. We were several times interrupted by other persons speaking to Mr. MACGREGOR, who took the first opportunity of saying that he was going to Paris to-morrow morning, and entered into long stories with them. He said he could swear that you had told him the story of the Leipsic Consul two months before the interview at the Board of Trade.

When I pointed out to him that this was a contradiction of his own statement, viz. that Mr. PORTER had told you the story, he again admitted that it was Mr. PORTER who told the story to you and to Colonel TAYLOR. He said Mr. MACQUEEN should have published the whole of his letter, and that he would write to him to do so—that the context would in some degree modify his assertion in the extract. But he afterwards adhered to the contradiction that he had told any part of the story about HART, not-

* Of September 29th, 1855.

withstanding my telling him that I was in possession of Colonel TAYLOR's statement to the contrary. I ended by telling him that he was going further and further from the truth—that there must be some redress in a case of this kind, and that he must expect to be exposed either in a court of justice or in some other manner. You know the man, and can appreciate the difficulty I had, as I had debarred myself from resorting to the old-fashioned methods of bringing to reason a person who has made a false statement.

No. 3.

MR. MARX TO MR. URQUHART.
Arle-Bury, near Alresford, Dec. 16, 1855.

My dear Sir,—I think you may dismiss from your mind all remembrance of Mr. JOHN MACGREGOR, and his contradiction of the statement made by you on the 2nd of June last before the Newcastle Committee, viz. that “The communication respecting HART, the consular agent at Leipsic, was made to me (to the best of my recollection in August, 1841) in Mr. MACGREGOR's room, adjoining that of Mr. GLADSTONE, who was there at the time, by Mr. MACGREGOR and Mr. PORTER, in presence of Colonel TAYLOR, and in consequence of a note from Mr. PORTER to me, requesting my attendance at the Board of Trade to receive a communication of the gravest importance.”

In the interview I had with Mr. MACGREGOR on the 14th, he admitted to me that your statement, which he had appeared so decidedly to contradict, was correct in every point save one—namely, that he had told you any part of the Hart story, and on that point your correctness is proved, and Mr. MACGREGOR's incorrectness is established by the evidence of Colonel TAYLOR, a witness of unimpeachable honour, who states in his letter of the 24th July, 1855, “My recollections are distinct as to Mr. MACGREGOR having told me of this matter.”

As far as the Newcastle Committee and the public are concerned, all the important part of your statement is confirmed by Mr. MACGREGOR himself, and it is of little public importance whether one or both of the Board of Trade Secretaries were speakers on the occasion referred to.

With regard to yourself the case is different, for of course nothing can be of greater importance than such a contradiction upon a matter of fact, as that publicly made by Mr. MACGREGOR; but from the moment you placed the affair in my hands, the responsibility rested with me. I have now carried the matter as far as I can, and I do not hesitate to assure you that in the minds of gentlemen no imputation can by possibility rest upon you. You have done all in your power to obtain redress from Mr. MACGREGOR, who has convicted himself of at least one false statement, for after publishing that you had told him the Hart story at the Board of Trade, he now states that Mr. PORTER told you the story on that occasion. He has shown that he is not to be reached by the process employed on such occasions between gentlemen. He has absolutely refused to retract his statement, or to allow it to be brought to the test of an arbitration. And as he has not thought proper to reply to your letter, it appears to me that the only course now left open for you, is, in case you deem it necessary, to appeal to a Court of Justice.

I am, my dear Sir,
Very faithfully yours,

F. MARX.

David Urquhart, Esq.

Having so disposed of Mr. MACQUEEN's second witness, we come to the third. This is Mr. MACQUEEN's statement as to Mr. BRIGHT:—

Mr. BRIGHT has marked his reply “*private*,” but I may inform you that he states, in substance, his belief that Mr. PORTER had a very bad opinion of Lord PALMERSTON in connexion with Russian affairs, but never heard him speak of any sum of money; that the Leipsic appointment was a discreditable one, but that he never heard Mr. PORTER connect it in any way with the other matter, and is not sure that Mr. PORTER ever alluded to the appointment in his hearing. Mr. BRIGHT adds, that he has heard that Mr. PORTER modified his opinions at a more recent period, but to what extent he says that he is not accurately informed.

On this the following correspondence ensued between Mr. CRAWSHAY and Mr. BRIGHT:—

No. 1.

MR. CRAWSHAY'S INQUIRY.

No. 2.

MR. BRIGHT'S REPLY.

Rochdale, September 25, 1855.

Dear Sir,—The fact is, that Mr. COBDEN and I know nothing of the matter, except the gossip of the day. I presume it to be notorious that the Leipsic Consul was a disreputable person, and that he was appointed by Lord PALMERSTON; but I suspect our system of appointments is not intended to exclude such. I know nothing whatever of the matter, and I think Mr. COBDEN knows nothing that will serve your object, or that you can publish.

With regard to the Prime Minister, he knows the ignorance and the foibles of the people, and suits himself to them. That he is an impostor is evident enough, but to expose him does nothing; he exactly suits the frothy politicians that are so numerous among our countrymen. He is to the middle classes what FEARGUS O'CONNOR was to the working classes, and I wish them joy of him.

Yours, very truly,

G. Crawshay, Esq.

JOHN BRIGHT.

No. 3.

MR. CRAWSHAY TO MR. BRIGHT.

Gateshead, October 2, 1855.

Dear Sir,—I duly received your reply of the 25th ult., with respect to which I feel called upon to make a remark.

You observe, with respect to the Prime Minister, “That he is an impostor is evident enough, but to expose him does nothing.”

May I beg of you to ask yourself the question, how far such a description may not be justly applied to a member of Parliament who can hold such language?

Yours truly,

J. Bright, Esq., M.P.

G. CRAWSHAY

No. 4.

MR. BRIGHT TO MR. CRAWSHAY.

Rochdale, October 3, 1855.

Dear Sir,—I hope I do not rightly understand your note; it seems intended as an insult to me, because I am unable to join in proceedings which I am not clever enough to comprehend. To expose the Minister is nothing, so long as the people are a prey to the delusions through which he practises upon them.

He is the proper ruler of a nation arrogant and intoxicated, and so long as the present temper of

the public is maintained, they have the Government they most deserve.

Lord PALMERSTON is Minister because he is supposed to be wishful to support the foreign policy you advocate. I am not sorry if he plays false to his credulous followers, for it is difficult to say whether his policy or theirs would be most pernicious to the country. Perhaps as we differ so much on these topics, it is better that our correspondence should cease.

I am, respectfully,
George Crawshaw, Esq. JOHN BRIGHT.

No. 5.
MR. CRAWSHAY TO MR. BRIGHT.
Gateshead, October 4, 1855.

Dear Sir,—What I intended by my note was not insult, but blame. I would not willingly insult any man.

In my first letter I only asked you to give me some facts. You could not. How could I insult or even blame you for that? But I could not pass over the doctrine repeated in your last, "that to expose the Minister is nothing," put forth with whatever qualification. This has nothing to do with our opinions. Suppose you had a friend in the position in which you yourself depict the nation, "a prey to delusions, and practised upon by an impostor." Would you consider it *nothing* to show him that he was made a fool of? Most certainly, if you see nothing wrong in the language I have complained of, our correspondence, at least upon this subject, *cannot* proceed.

Yours truly,
J. Bright, Esq., M.P. GEORGE CRAWSHAY.

Mr. BRIGHT is hardly the witness to character who would have been called had the defendant been consulted. His testimony appears to be to the effect that, although he had no knowledge of this particular case, yet he believed Lord PALMERSTON to be capable of acting in the manner imputed. On this subject we add two more testimonies. The first is a contemporaneous one:—

MR. RICHARD HART TO THE EDITOR OF THE
(SHEFFIELD) "FREE PRESS."
(Extract.)

Birmingham, January 9, 1856.

Shortly after the return of Lord JOHN RUSSELL from his mission to Vienna, I, as one of the members of a deputation, had an interview in the tea room of the House of Commons, with Messrs. COBDEN, BRIGHT, and MILNER GIBSON. After the business of the deputation had been concluded, a conversation arose respecting HART, the Leipsic Consul, in the course of which, Mr. COBDEN said that HART was a man of notoriously bad character; that when he (Mr. C.) went to Leipsic, he had letters of introduction to HART, but when he became acquainted with the reputation that person bore, he "would not be seen in the streets with him." On being asked what he knew about the appointment of HART, Mr. COBDEN replied—"I have heard that story about PALMERSTON, but I know it is not true, for—(here Mr. COBDEN mentioned, in a very familiar manner, a gentleman who was not present, and whose name I have no right to use), told me that he was under great obligations to HART, and that he got HART the appointment." Mr. COBDEN entered into some details as to the nature of the obligation which the gentleman referred to, and who has since held influential public positions, was under to the ex-gambling-

house keeper, but those I need not now allude to. There was, however, no doubt in the mind of Mr. COBDEN that Lord PALMERSTON was capable of what had been imputed to him, for in the course of the same conversation he remarked—"Oh, there is nothing of which I do not believe these men (the ministers) capable." Mr. BRIGHT, who was at his elbow, added energetically,—“They are not even gentlemen—they are a set of liars and scoundrels.”

I have a vivid remembrance of the expressions, which made a deep impression on me.

The second is an extract from a subsequent speech of Mr. BRIGHT, delivered March 19, 1861, on the subject of the Afghan forgeries:—

The noble Lord is on his trial in this case. (Hear, hear.) . . . After a few sentences the noble Lord went on to say that, after all, what was in or what was left out was unimportant. I should like, then, to ask the noble Lord what was the object of that minute, ingenious, and, I will say, unmatched care which was taken in mutilating the despatches of a gentleman whose opinions were of no importance, and whose despatches could not make the slightest difference to the actions or opinions of any person concerned? (Hear, hear.) The noble Lord, too, has stooped to conduct which, *if I were not in this House*, I would describe in language which, if I were to use in this House, I should possibly be told that I was transgressing the line usually observed in discussions in this assembly. . . . He tried to lead the House to believe that it was proposed to have a committee to dig up all questions regarding our supposed peril from the designs of Russia at that time; but the fact is, that my honourable and learned Friend has no such intention, and *no man was more cognizant of that fact than the noble Lord when he endeavoured so ingeniously to convey a contrary impression to the House. . . .* I say it is worth knowing whether there was a man in high position in the Government here or in India who had so low a sense of honour and of right that he could offer to this House mutilated, false, *forged* opinions of a public servant who lost his life in the public service. . . . It is admitted—the noble Lord himself has not flatly denied it; in fact, *he knows it perfectly well*—as well as the member for Greenock, *as well as the very man who did the evil* (a laugh)—the noble Lord knows that there have been garbling, mutilation, practically and essentially falsehood, and *forgery* in these despatches. . . . I say, then, avoiding all the long speech of the noble Lord, that the object of the committee is to find out who did this evil thing—who placed upon the table of the House information which was knowingly false, and despatches that were knowingly forged; because *if you add to, or detract from, or so change a coin, a note, or a deed as to make it bear a meaning contrary to the original meaning*, you are guilty of such an act as I have described, and that is precisely what somebody has done with the despatches we are now discussing. (Hear, hear.) I say, then, an odious offence has been committed against this House; and we want to know who did it. (Hear, hear.) The noble Lord does not think it is anything wrong. The letters, he says, are of very trifling importance, and Sir ALEXANDER BURNES's opinions are not worth much. But if this be a matter of such little importance, *will the noble Lord tell us who did it?* . . . Now, I do not think I am wrong in supposing that *this matter lies between the noble Lord the Prime Minister and Lord BROUGHTON.* (Hear, and a laugh.) The despatches

were not garbled by some subordinate who cannot be found out. My honourable and learned Friend told us of the marvellous care which has been taken, so that the guilty person must have been *not only a man of ability but a man of genius*. (A laugh.) Of course, there are *men of genius in very objectionable walks of life*—(laughter)—but we know that the noble Lord is a man of genius, or he would not have been on that bench for the last fifty years—(laughter)—and we know also that Lord Broughton is a man of many and varied accomplishments. I ask again, will the noble Lord tell us who did it? He knows who did it. Was it his own right hand, or Lord Broughton's right hand which did this work, or was it some clever secretary in his or in the India Office? The House has a right to know; we wish to know, because we want to drag the criminal before the public; we wish to deter other Ministers from ever committing a like offence.

Mr. BRIGHT's speech on the Affghan Forgeries was only a repetition of Mr. ANSTEY's on the same subject, February 23, 1848:—

"It is not by accident that frauds like these can have been committed. Sir, I think it eminently disgraceful to the character of the British Nation—and, let me add, of this House, too—that the charge should ever have been made, and should then have been suffered for so many years to remain without investigation. It has been pending ever since 1841; and yet no efforts have been made to vindicate the dignity of the law and the honour of the country. *No prosecution has been instituted to punish—if not the noble Lord and those who did the deed—then at least, those insolent libellers who had ventured to accuse them of it.* . . . I do not hesitate to maintain that every one of those unhappy persons who have, at any time since 1841, been transported from England to the shores of the South Pacific, for forgeries or crimes of the nature of forgery, has the right to say that he has been most unjustly dealt with, when he sees that perpetrators of iniquities, similar in kind, but far more monstrous in character, have been suffered to remain so long unscathed and unquestioned; nay, and to approach the person of Her Majesty, and to sit in Her Councils, and to lead the deliberations of Parliament.

In the Press, in Parliament, and in the Financial Reform Tracts, it is always the same story when Lord PALMERSTON's acts are examined. It is always forgery and falsehood, and to the detriment of England. No State is ever suggested as deriving benefit except Russia.

We have already alluded to a letter from Mr. GLADSTONE. It is as follows:—

MR. GLADSTONE TO MR. CRAWSHAY.

Hawarden, Chester, Jan. 14, 1856.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 11th; and in compliance with your request, I have adverted to several passages in the accompanying printed paper, No. 1, where it appears to be conveyed that the late Mr. PORTER, of the Board of Trade, made to Mr. URQUHART a statement, or imparted to him an understanding, to the effect that I had authorised Mr. PORTER to give certain information to Mr. URQUHART respecting Lord PALMERSTON and a Mr. HART.

I never had any communication whatever, to my knowledge, with Mr. PORTER, on the subject of Mr.

HART, and never gave Mr. PORTER any information respecting Lord PALMERSTON, or authorised him to carry any information of any kind to Mr. URQUHART. I am bound to add, from my recollection of Mr. PORTER's *scrupulous care and honour in all official relations*, that I am convinced the statements to which you have called my attention could not have been warranted by anything that had proceeded from him, and that, if Mr. URQUHART entertained a supposition to the contrary, he has been in total error.

I remain, Sir, your very obedient Servant,
W. E. GLADSTONE.

I do not trouble you with any remarks upon those portions of your inclosures in which I am not individually concerned.

G. Crawshay, Esq.

This letter was forwarded to Mr. URQUHART. The following was that gentleman's reply:—

MR. URQUHART TO MR. CRAWSHAY.

Jan. 16, 1856.

My dear Sir,—I have carefully weighed the careful letter of Mr. GLADSTONE, and I can perfectly conciliate every word therein contained with my recollection of what occurred. Mr. GLADSTONE says that he never made to Mr. PORTER any communication on the subject of HART to be conveyed to me. This I accept as unquestionable, as being his statement, and therefore as a point established. But you will observe that Mr. PORTER was not the only one concerned, and that of the two he occupied the inferior station. Now, I hold it to be impossible that that communication could be made in the Board of Trade, except at the instigation, or at least with the concurrence, of the chief of that department. If you will turn back to my testimony, you will find that I put the name of Mr. MACGREGOR before that of Mr. PORTER, conveying the impression upon my mind, when for the first time I applied myself to recall the circumstances, of Mr. MACGREGOR having taken the lead. This impression is confirmed by the statement of Col. TAYLOR, who says emphatically "The statement was made to me by Mr. MACGREGOR, and not by Mr. PORTER." The letter of Mr. WHITE shows that both were filled with sufficient zeal to have extorted, or even to have believed they had extorted the consent of Mr. GLADSTONE to such a step; nor in taking it was it necessary that my name should have been mentioned. Some such expression as "really, this is too bad, it ought to be brought out," was all that was required in the way of sanction.

Besides the general grounds of official subordination, I had others by which to connect Mr. GLADSTONE with the communication. First, when on the day in question I entered Mr. PORTER's room on the lower floor, instead of his ordinary manner he was abrupt, formal, and proceeding immediately to the door and begging me to follow him, I became alarmed, fearing some domestic disaster or some painful personal affair; not a word was said by him upon the subject; I was merely conducted to Mr. MACGREGOR's room. Secondly, my being taken to Mr. MACGREGOR's room, which I had never entered before. (Mr. MACGREGOR, you will observe, speaks of the frequency of my visits there as a reason for not recollecting particularly the circumstance.) Thirdly, the presence of Mr. GLADSTONE in Mr. MACGREGOR's room, which he quitted hurriedly, and though seeing me, without recognition. This struck me at the time as strange; afterwards, I

explained it by his knowledge of the purpose of my visit.

Your letter to Mr. GLADSTONE, put to him certain remarkable facts regarding which you requested an answer, *i.e.*, the creation of the consulship by Lord PALMERSTON for HART, and the getting rid of HART by the government of which Mr. GLADSTONE was a member, by the abolition of the post. To this Mr. GLADSTONE carefully avoids giving a reply.

Your letter did more than ask this question. It conveyed the whole of the correspondence as enclosures.

Mr. GLADSTONE, in answering, is aware that everything hinges on the truth or falsehood of the facts connected with HART,—that HART having been dismissed by his own government. Now the allegations thus publicly made, coupled with the fact of his dismissal, made it imperative upon Mr. GLADSTONE to vindicate the character of HART unjustly impugned, or at all events to say that these allegations did not constitute the grounds of his dismissal. Mr. GLADSTONE carefully avoids any such declaration. He speaks of "certain information" of "a Mr. HART." Every line is that of a man who is fearful of committing himself. And he even adds in a postscript that he "will not trouble you with any remarks on those portions of the enclosures in which he is not *individually* concerned." More than this negative testimony you had no right to expect from Mr. GLADSTONE, who has but recently been a member of the same Cabinet as Lord PALMERSTON.

But in fact, Mr. GLADSTONE gives you a great deal more. As if to meet the insinuations of Mr. MACGREGOR respecting Mr. PORTER's unfortunate "*credulity*" as to Lord PALMERSTON, Mr. GLADSTONE offers his testimony as "to Mr. PORTER's scrupulous care and honour in all official relations." Weigh well these words; "*scrupulous*," "*honour*," and that comprehensive monosyllable ALL. Now, as a hundred witnesses can be adduced to prove that Mr. PORTER made those statements which your committee have now brought to light, Mr. GLADSTONE's letter, being a voucher for the scrupulous care and comprehensive honour of Mr. PORTER, is an invaluable document, and a most important addition to your case.

As to your question respecting my belief in the same, I have difficulty in giving an answer. I rejected the evidence when tendered to me at the time, and therefore I have no means of knowing on what it rests. It could not awaken interest in my mind, because it proved to me nothing new. All I can now say is this; that I am persuaded of there being grounds for the charge, by the falsehood of Mr. MACGREGOR, and by the reserve of Mr. GLADSTONE, especially when taken in conjunction with the fact that no legal proceedings have been taken either by Lord PALMERSTON or by HART.

I would not venture on the suggestion I am about to make, had you not given me the liberty to do so. But I really do not think you would be justified in pressing Mr. GLADSTONE further. Your first letter was an invitation of testimony. In answering you he has taken a deliberate step, and he is not a man who will deviate from the course he has laid down by the words that you may put in a letter. You had a right to put the question that you have done; he has acknowledged it by his answer; beyond this you have none.

I remain, very faithfully yours,

D. URQUHART.

George Crawshaw, Esq.,
Chairman of Newcastle Committee.

And with no better evidence than this to rest on, Mr. MACQUEEN decides (for we believe he decided before consulting the Council) that the whole statement was a fabrication, and that consequently the Financial Reform Association should not examine into any diplomatic transaction.

Be it remembered that though Mr. MACQUEEN had declared Lord PALMERSTON not guilty of Treason, the body whose Secretary he was had published charges against him which amounted to that accusation.

On being remonstrated with and offered proof that a valued servant of the Crown did believe Lord PALMERSTON guilty of Treason, Mr. MACQUEEN says, "It is of no use; you must, if not prove, at least *allege* 'Corrupt personal motive.'" The accusation of corrupt personal motive, hitherto gossip, assumes a tangible shape at the bidding of Mr. MACQUEEN, only to be dismissed by him as a fiction. Nobody ever said it was proved. But it was proved that the accusation was made and believed by public servants of the Crown thirteen years before.

What could Mr. MACQUEEN mean by saying that "corrupt motive" must be, "if not proved, alleged?" What but this, that treason must have a motive; that such motive would be rumoured about, but that there would be no direct evidence on the subject. What was produced was exactly what Mr. MACQUEEN had called for: evidence of a rumour believed by influential persons; but no categorical proof.

It is not our intention here, Sir, to speak of the vulgarity and insolence with which Mr. MACQUEEN scatters imputations against the veracity and honour of those whose statements he is unable to controvert. But we desire to call your attention to this, that the gentlemen involved by him in this correspondence, were not the first to introduce the topic of "corrupt personal motive;" their charges embrace the acts of a life, in which this, though an explanation, is but an incident. It was in the endeavour to urge your Association into an investigation of these acts, that they were brought up short against this difficulty started by your Secretary, which he declared was the obstacle to that investigation. From the attempt to overcome it, sprang this laborious inquiry. Again, we repeat, it has slumbered from that time to this, and it is again the organ of your Association that brings the matter forward.

The fact that this allegation, previously concealed from him, was communicated to Mr. MACQUEEN on the ground that he had

declared it to be important, is given as an answer to us, who had nothing to do with that allegation. And what is it which is thus answered? We have quoted not alleged rumours, but despatches and speeches of Sir JOHN BOWRING, which prove that he is in the habitual practice of falsehood. These charges nobody has so much as attempted to deny. The only question at issue therefore is, whether the habit of falsehood is or is not, at this present day, a disqualification for the society of gentlemen? Mr. MACQUEEN, by implication, declares that it is not. We cannot conceive it possible, Sir, that you will acquiesce in such a decision.

Such a decision acquiesced in by a body of persons professedly united for the good of their country, would be a lamentable fulfilment of the words of Mr. CANNING'S Secretary, Mr. STAPLETON, when, in 1857, he concluded his "Hostilities at Canton," with these words:—

"If such dishonourable practices are to be adopted by the British people, and to be applauded by British statesmen, the public men of Great Britain, henceforth, will only resemble public women, without honour, and without shame."

With this brief *resumé* of the case, Sir, we leave the matter in your hands.

We also beg to say that our belief as to all the acts of Lord PALMERSTON being for the advantage of Russia rests on the evidence we possess on each special case; each one at the same time being connected with and strengthening the other.

But, in addition to this, we possess evidence which far transcends any other in importance and authority. We possess the words of the QUEEN herself, in her letter to Lord JOHN RUSSELL, of August, 1850, read by that Minister in the House of Commons, on the occasion of the dismissal of Lord PALMERSTON from the office of Foreign Minister, because he had renewed the offences which, by that letter of the QUEEN, he was required to abstain from. This letter, although published in such a remarkable manner, is so strangely omitted on all occasions when either the conduct of England in respect to any Foreign Power is considered, or the character of Lord PALMERSTON himself is called in question, that we insert it here, entreating you to weigh well each word, and to consider what the conduct and the circumstances would have been that could have given rise to it; what the source from which such influence must have sprung; and what the consequences for your country

when such things can be, and remain unknown, or be published even by the Sovereign herself, and remain unavenged and unchecked.

THE QUEEN'S LETTER.

"The Queen requests—First, that Lord Palmerston will distinctly state what he proposes in a given case, in order that the Queen may know as distinctly to what she is giving Her royal sanction. Second, that having once given Her sanction to a measure, it be not arbitrarily altered or modified by the Minister. Such an act she must consider as failing in sincerity towards the Crown, and justly to be visited by the exercise of her constitutional right of dismissing that Minister. She expects to be kept informed of what passes between him and Foreign Ministers, before important decisions are taken based upon such intercourse; to receive the foreign despatches in good time, and to have the draughts for her perusal sent to her in sufficient time to make herself acquainted with the contents before they are sent off. The Queen thinks it better that Lord John Russell should show this letter to Lord Palmerston."

There are three points here which we must further call your attention to:—

1st. This is but a *part* of the QUEEN'S original letter, as is shown by these words of Lord J. RUSSELL:—

"I shall refer only to that part of the document which has reference to the immediate subject."

2nd. The date of the letter. It is August, 1850. You will see that it corresponds with a most important diplomatic transaction, which at the time was carried on by Lord PALMERSTON in secret, which was denied by him in the House of Commons, and is now known; namely, the Treaty of London of 1852, which altered the succession to the Danish Crown, so as, by the cutting out of heirs, to secure that kingdom to the Russian line. It now being universally acknowledged that that Treaty was for the interests of Russia, there can remain no doubt as to the Foreign Power in whose interests the "insincerity" of Lord PALMERSTON towards the British Crown was practised.

3rd. That Lord PALMERSTON accepted, as Lord JOHN RUSSELL took care to let the Parliament know, every word of the allegations of the QUEEN. For he added, quoting them, these words of Lord PALMERSTON:—

"I have taken a copy of this Memorandum of the Queen, and will not fail to attend to the directions it contains."

When, now, we consider that three years afterwards the Minister so charged and so

dismissed, became the QUEEN'S Prime Minister, and that soon afterwards Lord JOHN RUSSELL, who had dismissed him, and had laid the QUEEN'S letter as the grounds before Parliament, accepted office as his subordinate, it becomes utterly impossible to resist the conclusion that Lord PALMERSTON is backed by some Power and Influence, secret, but supreme, which cannot belong to his personal character or position, and which has evidently no internal British source.

The writer of the article in the *Financial Reformer*, casts ridicule on the Committee at Bolton, because of the bad spelling of one of its members. We are glad that the Bolton Committee have been exerting themselves in this matter; and for our part, must confess that we entertain a higher feeling of respect for those men, because of that unfamiliarity with literary composition, which does not deter them from dealing with the highest matters of policy and of moral character, who strive to arrest their country in its course of crime, and to save their countrymen from the pollution of intercourse with its immediate perpetrators.

There are two considerations to which I particularly implore your attention. The first is the character of the motives which alone could have influenced so many gentlemen in endeavouring to bring this transaction to light. The second, the absence of any steps taken on the part of the accused to defend his character; nor have his private or public friends shown the least desire to have his character cleared.

The matter is not one which belongs to speculation. Nor is it one affecting the circumstances of any particular person. It is the affairs of England that are so disposed of; her fortunes and her fate. The humblest and poorest family in the land is as much, and as directly involved in it as the wealthiest and the noblest.

I have the honour to remain,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,
C. F. JONES, Secretary.*

* This letter was posted on the 23rd of June, but up to the present time no answer has been received.

No. 2.

Lord Palmerston's Introduction to the Foreign Office.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Free Press*.

July 25, 1865.

SIR,—In the leader in the last number of the *Free Press*, which number will be justly designated the anticipation of the judgment of future times of the man who has at present England, and, through England the world, in his hands, there is a passage of which I venture to offer you a rectification. It bears upon a critical turn of events, his entrance into the Foreign Office, and appears to offer an explanation, which is far from being a true one. You say, "Lord PALMERSTON, being practically acquainted with the method of proceeding (in the Foreign Office), was a godsend to the Whigs in Downing-street." The Whigs, that is to say the colleagues of Lord GREY, had no opportunity of expressing any opinion as to Lord PALMERSTON'S administration at the moment of his appointment. And if his claims were discussed at all on the first draft of the Cabinet, that discussion was unfavourable to him, since that first draft did not contain Lord PALMERSTON'S name. On the forenoon of the day when the change of Ministry took place, and whilst Lord GREY was in the act of writing down the list of the new Ministry for the Evening Papers, he was interrupted by a visit, which must have been of the highest importance, since at that moment it was prolonged an hour and a half; and at its close, and without the presence or intervention of any of his new colleagues, a new list was furnished to the person in waiting for insertion in the papers. This statement I make on the authority of the very person then in waiting, who preserved the evidence of it in the slip of paper, which on the one side contained the first list of the Cabinet, the same slip of paper having been inadvertently used for the final list on its back. The person who visited Lord GREY, and who detained him this momentous hour and a half, was the Princess LIEVEN.

That Lord GREY considered this nomination his own particular act is confirmed by an incident which took place shortly before his death. He wrote to Prince ADAM CZARTORYSKI, urgently requesting him to come down to Howick. Sending the other persons who were there out of the way, he said to him, "I have before my death to implore and obtain your forgiveness. I am the assassin of Poland." In reply to the Prince's look of

amazement, he added, "It was I who placed that man in the Foreign Office." I have heard this mentioned between Mr. URQUHART, to whom it was related by Prince CZARTORYSKI himself, and another person, still alive, who was present at the time at Howick Castle, and to whom it was related by Prince CZARTORYSKI immediately after its occurrence.

As these circumstances are generally known to those who have been so long endeavouring to rescue their country from the hands of this man, I am surprised that the writer of the article in the last number was not acquainted with them. I can see no reason why a truth so important as this should be concealed.

There is nothing unlikely in the circumstances as I have mentioned them, of Lord PALMERSTON's appointment. That at a subsequent period Princess LIEVEN had "the nominations" in France is notorious. That Lord PALMERSTON was a person for Russia to push into the Foreign Office it did not require to wait for results to ascertain. He was her man before he was Minister. The moment also was of the utmost importance for Russia, alike as regards Turkey and Poland. So completely were those supposed to be the best informed, perplexed and puzzled by his words and conduct in opposition, that on one occasion Sir ROBERT PEEL indignantly asked whose representative the noble Lord was in that House?

The passage will be found, if looked for, in Hansard's Debates. It seems to me you cannot render a greater service than by disinterring the words of Lord PALMERSTON at that period, the words which awoke the suspicions of Sir ROBERT PEEL, and merited the applause of the Russian Ambassador. Words which can be rendered intelligible by the parallel expressions in the Secret Russian Despatches of the same period, and which made him Minister without the concurrence of his colleagues, the sanction of his Sovereign, or the knowledge of his country. It must be remembered that Lord GREY had, at that moment, everything in his hands. So that this case serves to illustrate the position you have so often laid down in reference to so many other countries; that Russia's aim always is to concentrate the affairs of each country in the hands of one man. As we see in this case, that man need not be her Agent. The result of the Reform Agitation and triumph in England was to make Lord GREY for a moment Dictator. The effect of that Dictatorship has been to transfer the world to Russia. Your obedient Servant,

H. A.

NOTE SUBJOINED BY THE EDITOR OF THE
"FREE PRESS."

By a hasty perusal of the authorities referred to by our correspondent, we are enabled to vouch for the accuracy of the collateral points connected with the remarkable disclosures contained in this letter. We subjoin a few extracts:—

On the 13th of June, 1829, the Russian Ambassadors in London wrote to Count NESSELRODE:—

"Your Excellency will have remarked that the Ministry has not dared to answer either to that part of the observations of Sir JAMES MACINTOSH relative to the DANGER of any guarantee in favour of the Ottoman Territory, nor to the speech in which Lord PALMERSTON, whose name is henceforward associated with those of the first orators of the Parliament of England, has insisted on the preservation of the general peace, and proved that an Austro-Turkish policy would only serve to disturb it."*

On June 1, 1829, Viscount PALMERSTON had said:—

"I said that the delay in executing the Treaty of July, 1827, had brought upon us that very evil of a war in the East of Europe, which that Treaty was calculated to prevent. In that war, my opinion is, that the Turks were the aggressors. I am pronouncing no opinion whether Russia has or has not ambitious views upon Turkey. It might, indeed, be thought that the Russian Empire is sufficiently extensive to satisfy the most ambitious sovereign, or to find employment for the most enlightened; but on that point I give no opinion. I will not decide, either, on which side may be the balance of that general account of reciprocal grievances, which has so long been standing between the two parties; but in that particular transaction Turkey was the aggressor; she seized Russian ships and cargoes, expelled Russian subjects from Turkey, and shut the Bosphorus against Russian commerce, all in violation of Treaties, and declared her intention not to fulfil the Treaty of Akerman; and all this upon no other pretence than certain things which Russia had done in conjunction with her allies England and France, to prevail upon Turkey to accede to some arrangement about Greece."

The concessions of the Treaty of Akerman (which with the Treaty of Bucharest, the British Government omitted when it published, in 1855, the other Treaties between Russia and Turkey) were made on the distinct agreement that Russia was not, collectively or separately, to interfere in the affairs of Greece. The "certain things which Russia had done" were an open breach of this agreement, and therefore a sufficient reason for considering the Treaty of Akerman as null and void.

The speech which excited the suspicion of Sir ROBERT PEEL, was on the settlement of Greece.

* *Portfolio*, Second Series, vol. i. p. 24. *Free Press* vol. viii. p. 81.

On February 16, 1830, Viscount PALMERSTON said:—

"The natural defence of Greece on the South would be Candia, for with that island left in the possession of the Turks, the means of aggression would be continually in their hands. . . . He believed he should be borne out in this assertion, that if the wishes of England were decisively made known upon this subject, the Allies would accede to them, and that it rested with the Cabinet of England to decide whether or not the new State was to be rendered secure or insecure."

In his reply, Sir R. PEEL said:—

"My noble Friend has stated that if England would consent to enlarge the limits of Greece, he was pretty sure that the other Powers who have joined in the Treaty would not be opposed to such extension. Certainly this is a statement which I did not expect to hear from my noble Friend. I do not, however, know *in whose confidence he may be, or whom he may undertake to represent in making that statement*, unless he comes to that conclusion from having been in office at the time of the execution of the Treaty."

Viscount PALMERSTON said in answer:—

"I am sure the House could not imagine, when I was stating my opinion as to the boundaries of Greece, after having been two years out of office, that I was taking upon myself to ensure what were the sentiments of Russia or France."

It is also in this speech that is to be found an argument which is identical with one used in the Secret Russian Despatch of June 1, 1829; namely, that what England had to do in the interests of Turkey was to prevent her from expecting any help from England, so that she might not be encouraged to resist.

FROM THE RUSSIAN DESPATCH, JUNE 1, 1829.

"I took advantage of this opportunity to remark to Lord ABERDEEN, that from the moment that justice was rendered to our policy, it would be right to manifest it publicly, and to abstain from all the direct and indirect measures which make people *believe in too favourable a disposition* on his part towards the Porte, and which thereby encouraged its resistance."*

FROM LORD PALMERSTON'S SPEECH, FEBRUARY, 16, 1830.

"I should like to see, that, whilst England adopted a firm resolution—almost the only course she could adopt—upon no consideration, and in no event to take part with Turkey in that war; that that decision was fairly and frankly communicated to the Turk, and that he was made acquainted from the beginning, that he was in no possible contingency to look to England for assistance."†

* For this Despatch see *Portfolio*, New Series, vol. i. p. 3; also *Free Press*, vol. iii. p. 81.

† "Opinions and Policy of Lord Palmerston," p. 137.

No. 3.

Lord Palmerston and Princess Lieven.

*Mount Pleasant, Gateshead,
August 19, 1865.*

SIR,—In a letter in the *Free Press* of this month a statement is made regarding the introduction of Lord PALMERSTON into the Foreign Office, in which your name is mentioned as an authority for the following statement: that "Lord GREY wrote to Prince ADAM CZARTORYSKI urgently requesting him to come to Howick. Sending the other persons out of the room, he said to him, 'I have, before my death, to implore and obtain your forgiveness. I am the assassin of Poland.' In reply to the Prince's look of amazement he added: 'It was I who placed that man in the Foreign Office.'"

Not having heard any statement from you of this circumstance, and as the letter is anonymous, it has occurred to me to ask you to state what you know relative to this matter? I should also wish to know whether you are aware of the circumstances mentioned in the same letter about the appointment of Lord PALMERSTON?

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

D. Urquhart, Esq.

D. RULE.

REPLY.

*Chalet des Mèlèzes, St. Gervais,
August 31, 1865.*

SIR,—The statement you quote from the letter in the *Free Press* is perfectly conformable to the account given me by Prince CZARTORYSKI himself of his last interview with Lord GREY. I may further add, that Lord GREY's fall from office arose out of that very nomination, as it was in consequence of Lord PALMERSTON's showing to the King a letter of Lord GREY to Princess LIEVEN, the possession of which was explained by its having been opened and copied at the Post-office.

As to Princess LIEVEN's part in obtaining from Lord GREY Lord PALMERSTON's appointment as Foreign Minister, the details given in the above-quoted letter agree with what was told me by Mr. SCANLON, at that time Editor of the *Courier*, who was the person who received from Lord GREY the sheet of note-paper, on the two sides of which were the two different lists of the Ministry, and who was waiting in the ante-room whilst Princess LIEVEN was with Lord GREY.

Your obedient servant,

DAVID URQUHART.

No. 4.

The Fifty-eight Years of Lord Palmerston's Career.

IN the course of nature only a short time can now be expected to elapse before the career of Lord PALMERSTON will have to be examined as a closed chapter. The correspondence which we publish this day between the Financial Reform Association and one of the Foreign Affairs Committees may almost be considered as the anticipation of a posthumous revelation.

Never before has a minister, during his life-time, been charged with the crimes alleged against Lord PALMERSTON without having to undergo or to fly from legal proceedings. For nearly thirty years has he been accused of collusion with a Foreign Power, to the detriment of his own country, but to this charge have been added the more vulgar accessories of falsehood and forgery used to deceive Parliament. Moreover, these latter charges have produced events unparalleled, at least in English history, for when accused on three separate occasions, and by three different members, of falsehood, he answered the first, Lord R. MONTAGU, by counting out the House; the second, Mr. COBDEN, by renewed equivocation, and the third, Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE, by total silence. When accused, by Messrs. DUNLOP and BRIGHT, of altering the terms and sense of the despatches of Sir ALEXANDER BURNES in such a manner as to amount to forgery, he justified the forgery, and did not deny that he was the author of it.

The man thus accused and thus convicted has now, with a few short intermissions, been in the public service since 1807, that is to say, for fifty-eight years. In 1828, he was admitted into the Cabinet. Since 1830, he has generally been either Foreign Minister or Prime Minister. During these thirty-five years every convulsion has been traced to him, yet he is still a mystery. But so long a career requires a summary from an authoritative source. We turn to that invaluable publication, the *Foreign Office List*, and find the following narrative, to which we have to prefix that the subject of it was born October 20, 1784.

"PALMERSTON (HENRY JOHN TEMPLE) Viscount, K.G., G.C.B., M.P., is M.A. of St. John's, Cambridge. Succeeded as third Viscount, April 17, 1802. Was elected an Honorary Burgess of the Corporation of Southampton, August 7, 1807. Was appointed Secretary at War, October 27, 1809, which office he held till May 31, 1828. Was made a Privy Councillor,

November 1, 1809. Upon the formation of a Cabinet by the late Earl GREY, was appointed Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, November 22, 1830; he held the seals of that office till November 21, 1834, when he was succeeded by the late Duke of WILINGTON. Was appointed a G.C.B. June 6, 1832. Was appointed one of the Commissioners for the Affairs of India, December 13, 1832. Was again appointed Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, April 18, 1835, and resigned, September, 1841. Was appointed one of the Commissioners for the purpose of enquiry whether advantage might not be taken of the rebuilding of the Houses of Parliament, for promoting and encouraging the Fine Arts, November 22, 1841. Was for the third time appointed Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, July 6, 1846, which post he held till December, 1851. Was appointed Secretary of State for the Home Department, December 28, 1852, and one of the Committee of Council to superintend the application of any sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting Public Education, January 4, 1853. Was appointed First Lord of the Treasury, February 10, 1855. Was M.P. for the University of Cambridge from 1806 till 1831;* for Bletchingley from July 1831 till 1832; for South Hants, from 1832 to December, 1834; and has sat for Tiverton since June 5, 1835. Was made a K.G. July 12, 1856. He resigned office, February 19, 1858. Was appointed, July 9, 1858, one of Her Majesty's Commissioners for the purpose of inquiring into the establishment, organisation, government, and direction of the Militia Force of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Was appointed First Lord of the Treasury, June 24, 1859; was appointed July 6, 1859, one of the Committee of Council to superintend the application of any sums of money voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting Public Education. Was granted March 27, 1860, the office of Constable of Her Majesty's Castle of Dover, and also the office of Warden and Keeper of Her Majesty's Cinque Ports, and the office of Admiralty within the said Cinque Ports. Was appointed April 14, 1862, one of Her Majesty's Commissioners for opening the International Exhibition of 1862. Was elected Master of the Corporation of the Trinity House, June 16, 1862."†

The first thing remarkable in this narrative is its reticence and its inaccuracy. Lord PALMERSTON'S public services are made to commence in 1809. Yet we learn, from the well-known work of Mr. GEORGE HENRY FRANCIS, "Opinions and Policy of Lord PALMERSTON," that he was made a Lord of the Admiralty in 1807, on the formation of the Duke of PORTLAND'S Administration. Consequently, it was in that capacity that, in 1808, he made a speech in favour of refusing the papers connected with the lawless attack

* Dodd, on the contrary, says that Lord Palmerston "was an unsuccessful candidate for the University of Cambridge in 1806 and 1807; and sat for Newport, Isle of Wight, from 1807 to March, 1811, when he was returned for the University of Cambridge, and sat till 1831."

† "The Foreign Office List for January, 1863, compiled from official documents by Francis W. H. Cavendish and Edward Hertslet, of the Foreign Office. London: Harrison, 59, Pall-mall, Bookseller to the Queen," p. 128.

on Copenhagen. Not a word is said, either, in the Foreign Office List, of his being four times defeated as a parliamentary candidate: at Cambridge University in 1806, 1807, and 1831; and at South Hants in December, 1834. Mr. FRANCIS, though he records the Cambridge defeats, makes no mention of his sitting for Newport from 1807 to 1811, but says that during that time he represented Bletchingley, a rotten borough, in which he took refuge only during the Reform agitation of 1831, and which was disfranchised by the Reform Act.

Other Ministers ascend to or descend from office in compliance with the oscillations of party, but every occasion on which Lord PALMERSTON has quitted office presents some suspicious circumstance. His resignation May 31, 1828, ostensibly on the ground that Mr. HUSKISSON's complimentary offer to resign was accepted by the Duke of WELLINGTON, received its explanation when, in November, 1830, he became Foreign Minister in an Administration formed entirely from his former political opponents. In the interim, he made the speech against Turkey which obtained the commendation of the Russian Ambassador, and that Motion in favour of taking a part in the civil war in Portugal, which pointed him out as the proper agent for a "policy of non-intervention."

The Whigs had been excluded from office, with very short intervals, for two generations or more. The Foreign Office, shrouded in secrecy, was a mystery to them. Lord PALMERSTON, having already disentangled himself from the Duke of WELLINGTON's Administration, and being practically acquainted with the method of proceeding, was a god-send to the Whigs in Downing-street.

During his short term of office Poland disappeared from the map of Europe, and England was saddled with the expense of the transaction, in the shape of a renewal of the expired Russo-Dutch Loan, the method of this achievement being a falsehood concerted between Lord PALMERSTON and the Russian Ambassador.

Lord PALMERSTON's departure from office in November, 1834, was not caused by any act of his own. WILLIAM IV. dismissed the administration on the grounds of the succession of Lord ALTHORP, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, to the House of Lords. The interval between November, 1834, and April, 1835, was, however, signalised by the arrival at the Foreign Office of despatches from China, addressed as private letters to Lord PALMERSTON, and which proved that he had, as regards that country, given instructions to

Lord NAPIER, in direct opposition to those of his Sovereign, instructions which led to the troubles in China, and to the Opium War.*

In September, 1841, Lord PALMERSTON resigned with the rest of the Whig administration, their majority having been gradually worn out. But the act was well timed; for on the 2nd of November occurred the outbreak at Caubul, and the expulsion of the British. The brunt of this disaster was thus removed from the Author of the war.

In December, 1851, Lord PALMERSTON was dismissed by the QUEEN for conspiring with LOUIS NAPOLEON to put down Constitutional Government in France. This signal act is veiled in the Foreign Office account by the use of the words, "which post he held till December, 1851."

Lord PALMERSTON's next dismissal was by the people, in February, 1858, for conspiring with LOUIS NAPOLEON to change the laws of England. Whether this was a real blow to him or whether, as we have always contended, it was contrived by himself, need not now be discussed. Suffice it to say that the event was predicted in these columns more than three months beforehand.†

Whatever the sincerity of his dismissal in 1858, there is now no question of the fraud by which he induced Mr. BRIGHT to restore him to place in 1859. The history of the WILLIS's Rooms Compact, the fancy franchises of Mr. DISRAELI, and the open violation of the Reform pledges of Lord PALMERSTON are among the very few things the memory of which has survived the six intervening years. In an age like this, scandal survives, while nations pass away and are forgotten.‡

The few years which preceded the death of Mr. CANNING, saw the Holy Alliance nearly paralysed by the opposition of England, and the New World resisting successfully the attempts to entangle it in the diplomacy of the old.

* See "China A Narrative," *Free Press*, September, 1859.

† See the *Free Press* for November, 25, 1857, and February 24, 1858.

‡ Mr. Bright writes to his constituents, June 29, 1865:—"The Administration which in 1859 climbed into office under the pretence of its devotion to the question of Parliamentary Reform, has violated its solemn pledges. Its chief men purposely betrayed the cause they undertook to defend, and the less eminent members of it have tamely acquiesced in that betrayal. The Ministry have, for six years, held office, which but for promises they made, and which they have broken, they could not have obtained possession of even for a day."

With Lord PALMERSTON's accession to the Foreign Office the attacks of Russia on the independence of States were made effective by an Anglo-French League for imposing Constitutional Government, so that the nations were torn to pieces by this double intrigue. Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Denmark, have thus been made the prey of contending factions, as well as the Republics of Central and South America. In two cases alone where the naval power of England made her word omnipotent, this pretence was laid aside for a naked partnership with Russia. In Poland the rights of the CZAR were declared to be "incontestable," and the independence of Circassia was destroyed by permitting Russia piratically to seize English merchant ships trading to her coasts. Denmark and the Duchies Lord PALMERSTON gave to Russia by a European Treaty; India he first endangered by the Affghan War, and then subverted by the Greased Cartridges; China, which he found in perfect peace with us, he first made an enemy by violating its laws, and then convulsed by the weakness thus caused, so that Russia is able to make use of Circassia in the west, and China in the east for facilitating the invasion of our Indian Empire. The Ottoman Empire has indeed resisted his material attacks, but he has seduced it into an imitation of English finance, which, if persevered in, will bring it to ruin. Finally, he has betrayed Hungary as well as Poland to Russia, and has engaged in a war with her in which he sacrificed a hundred millions sterling, and fifty thousand Englishmen, by conducting it in the way in which Russia prescribed. In 1801 the English cruisers humbled Russia in a few months and, without any attack upon her territory, compelled her to sue for peace. In 1856 this easy method having been abandoned during the war, to the great loss of this country in blood and treasure, Lord PALMERSTON, in a document unauthorised, and still unratified by the QUEEN, undertook that England would never resume it. While thus abandoning the right of seizing enemies' goods in neutral vessels, as if in order to show that he is not a visionary, but a man with a purpose, he refuses to agree to the entire abolition of the capture of merchant vessels and merchandise at sea, so that in the event of a war he has deprived England not only of her naval power, but of her commercial marine.

Such are the achievements of LORD PALMERSTON, such the triumphs of civilisation and progress since he first held the seals of the Foreign Office, in an administration

pledged to Reform, Retrenchment and Non-intervention. Under the administration of the DUKE of WELLINGTON, a movement for retrenchment did commence, which continued till 1835. How much was effected will be seen from the following tables:—

EXPENDITURE.		
<i>(Exclusive of Cost of Collection and Interest of National Debt.)</i>		
	1827*	1835†
Army, Navy, and Ordnance	£16,205,812	£11,657,486
Permanent Civil Service charged on the Consolidated Fund		
Miscellaneous, chargeable upon annual Parliamentary Grants	2,103,105	2,082,817
	3,226,759	2,144,345
Total.....	£21,535,676	15,884,648

A reduction of nearly six millions per annum was thus effected in eight years. But when Lord PALMERSTON returned to office in 1835, "Reform" had done its work, not that of promoting retrenchment, but that of securing the Reform Ministry in office. We go forward at once a quarter of a century, during which Lord PALMERSTON, whether in office or in opposition, managed the foreign affairs of the country, and we find an increase exceeding 26,000,000*l.*

EXPENDITURE IN 1860.‡		
Army, Navy, and Ordnance, including a special vote for the China War....	£32,415,342	2,296,430
Permanent Civil Service charged on the Consolidated Fund		
Miscellaneous, chargeable upon annual Parliamentary Grants.....	7,411,820	
Total.....	£42,123,592	

The expenses of the country have nearly tripled under Lord PALMERSTON. Since 1860 there has been a reduction; the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, Earl RUSSELL and his other colleagues who submitted to the disgrace of participating in that assault on China, which they had so eloquently deprecated, have evidently required some compensation in diminished activity for mischief; which only shows what they might have done had they, by refusing to act under Lord PALMERSTON, left him without colleagues.

This unwillingness to act against Lord PALMERSTON in any way more effective than a speech on a particular case, is the most mysterious part of the whole matter. His accusers tremble before him, not because they

* Sir Henry Parnell "On Financial Reform," p. 102.

† *Parliamentary Papers*, No. 147, of 1836.

‡ *Parliamentary Papers*, No. 526, of 1861.

are confounded by his innocence, but because they are confounded by his guilt. When Lord ROBERT MONTAGU charged him with falsehood, in that he had denied the existence of any negotiations for changing the succession to the Crown of Denmark, Lord PALMERSTON avoided reply by counting out the House. Lord ROBERT MONTAGU has never since opened his mouth on the subject. When Mr. DUNLOP moved for an inquiry into the Affghan forgeries, he had no idea that the forger was Lord PALMERSTON. That discovery was forced upon him by Lord PALMERSTON's justification of the act, unaccompanied by any denial of his being its author. From the time of his making this discovery, Mr. DUNLOP has been mute. Mr. DUNLOP has neither been bribed nor menaced; he is appalled by his conviction of the Premier's guilt. This mystery, however, loses some of its darkness when we find that it was predicted a quarter of a century ago, and an explanation given of that which, though it is before our eyes, seems incredible. In 1839, when Lord PALMERSTON was comparatively an obscure man, when the disasters in India were not, in general, laid to his charge, Mr. URQUHART, accusing him of being the author of the Affghan war, predicted his approaching uncontrolled supremacy. He explained his prevision in this manner: "Lord PALMERSTON's connexion with Russia will afford him field and scope for action; the character of crime involved in each act will confer impunity, and *therefore supremacy at home.*"

Here is one of the passages written at that time, viz. in 1839:—

The few leading men who have been the channels through which this bewilderment has been poured out upon the land, have unconsciously yielded themselves up for this purpose. It is not by conviction that they have been gained, it is by fascination that they have been subdued; the eye is caught, and is fixed by varying images and indistinct forms, and their convictions are taken by surprise, while they are endeavouring to understand the thoughts presented to them, and which are only not rejected because incomprehensible. While too preposterous for conscious admission, they are also too insidious for unconscious rejection; and so artfully are they linked together that all find entrance if one is admitted, and no one is safe against them, but he who grasps them as a whole, and detects them at a glance.

"These statements are made public long after the facts have occurred, and a few hours at best are given to examine transactions which years have been employed to arrange and to disguise. They are presented to men who only seek to be informed *how* things have happened; who are doubly hopeless by the ignorance which admits falsehood, and the diffidence that excludes judgment, who now, unconscious of ignorance, accept every

statement, and now quell suspicion or doubt, attributing them to their own ignorance of policy or of facts; who have no idea of an international crime; and, if such is forced upon them—who have so much honesty and courage as to make up their minds to avoid the responsibility of having convictions. The few men moreover who control Great Britain, and in whose individual thoughts lie her political destinies as her moral character, occupy stations of responsibility. They are not spectators merely—they are actors. If they do not expose that which is reprehensible, they yield to it their support, and how can they expose what they do not comprehend? When that occurs which they do not comprehend, they array themselves against inquiry, joining from opposite sides in an arch to cavern darkness and to shelter crime. A small transgression which can be explained by a motive within their reach, they will seize and convert into a brand of party warfare. But if there be found in the State a bad man who understands them, he will subdue them and use them by doing what they cannot conceive. He has but to commit a great crime to convert the antagonists of his party, and the judges of his acts into advocates and partisans. Then will faction subside, antagonism disappear, *and the traitor, because he is a traitor,* and by that alone, stand surrounded by the united power of a people, among whom the very traditions of sense and custom have been effaced, though, unhappily for mankind and for itself, a tongue is in its brainless head, and arms are in its cruel hands."^{*}

We now come to the allegation of bribery. The career, the success of which was predicted in 1839, has been followed from 1826 up to the present time.

That for the entrance on this career there must have been some motives either of seduction or coercion no one can doubt. What these motives have been may be interesting as a speculation, but cannot be of the slightest real importance. These things are not managed on an exchange, and even if the motive alleged should be the true one (or one of the true ones), this much is nevertheless certain, that it has not become known or suspected, through the imbecility of those engaged. If the sum stated did come from the source specified, through the agent designated and to the person in question, no living being would have known anything of the matter, unless in so far as the briber distrusted the bribed, and was resolved to hold a check over him.

This, at all events, comes out, that it was believed and spoken of in, and promulgated from, a Government office in 1841, and that the then head of that office is now Lord PALMERSTON'S CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.

For once we have, in this affair, Lord PALMERSTON and Mr. URQUHART on the same line, both concurring to suppress this charge. The charge thus suppressed is brought to light by the intervention of the Secretary of the Financial Reform Association. That

* Transactions in Central Asia, p. 223.

body had just published a most important pamphlet (on the Russo-Dutch Loan) proving the betrayal of the interests of England to a Foreign Power by Lord PALMERSTON. The Chairman of one of the Foreign Affairs Committees (Mr. CRAWSHAY) urges the Society to follow up this branch of diplomatic investigation on which the Association had commenced to enter. Mr. MACQUEEN answers, "The proposition involves treason, therefore you must either prove or allege corrupt motives." This is the first stage. When a *prima facie* case is presented, corroborated by testimony as to the conviction of a highly-esteemed public officer, and the allegations, made in Parliament without contradiction, of a well-known public character; instead of dealing with the evidence, and concluding thereon, he writes letters to other persons, and thereon pretends to conclude that the speech in question had never been delivered, and that the opinions in question had never been entertained.

When, in reply, the proof is furnished to him that the speech was delivered, and the opinions were entertained he simply drops the matter. His object, however, having been obtained—that of preventing the Association of which he had recently been appointed the Secretary from prosecuting the inquiries which it had already commenced.

But in all this, what part does the Financial Reform Association play? The communications are made to Mr. MACQUEEN, not as an individual, but as Secretary of the Association, Mr. MACQUEEN utterly effaces that body, and puts himself in its place.

What has happened to England is this, that a clerk has got possession of it by being dexterous and unscrupulous, and by being employed for the prosecution of designs which the nation does not comprehend and, dares not investigate. This position being so established, it is easier for minor instruments to do the like for minor bodies. In such a case neither capacity nor design is required: baseness is alone sufficient.

After all, no one cares whether the Prime Minister is bribed or not. The only feeling is that of anger at the accusation. Were he to confess that he had been, they would only laugh.

"Anger if they are accused; laughter if they confess." These are the words which DEMOSTHENES uses in reference to the orators purchased in his day by Macedonian gold.

Such is the story of the first intervention

of the Financial Reform Association in this matter, by means of which it made known to the public, or at least placed within the reach of the public the knowledge, that in 1841, the Board of Trade believed itself to be in possession of evidence to prove that Lord PALMERSTON had in 1826 received a sum of 20,000*l.* from Princess LIEVEN, and sought to publish that belief to the world.

The matter is now again brought up, after slumbering for ten years, by Mr. MACQUEEN, in order to meet the charge brought against the Financial Reform Association that it had "renounced its principles and abdicated its character."

It may be entirely false that the Premier has been bribed. But it is undoubtedly true that the public, the parliament, and his own personal friends are perfectly indifferent whether he has been bribed or not. This is the point of importance, and not the former one. There may be a question whether, as Mr. THOMAS ARTWOOD said more than twenty years ago, "Russian gold has found its way into this House." But there can be no question of the receipt by British Ministers in former times of Russian gold; nor as to contemporaneous practices of a like nature in other countries. Nor must it be forgotten that the present Premier of England has repeatedly expressed convictions identical with these, and has during thirty years been in the habit of charging persons who opposed him with being the "creatures," "tools," and "paid agents" of Russia. Notably this charge has been by him brought against Mr. URQUHART. When called upon by his colleagues to prosecute that gentleman; that is to say, to clear himself in reference to those charges so publicly and perseveringly made; and on other occasions besides, he has privately and confidentially said: "He attacks me because I am for England; he being the paid agent of Russia."

No. 5.

Parallel Case of M. de Chateaubriand—Minister of France and Agent of Russia.

In the present number of the *Free Press*, in the course of an historical elucidation of the connexion between the events in the New World, and the Secret System which rules the Old, a French Minister, who held office

but for a few months, is shown to have played a most important and fatal part in bringing about this result. This comes out of his own Confession. A Confession not made on a death-bed and to a Priest, but to the World, in a work published by him, in which he justifies his conduct, and glories in it. Representing it as patriotic, whilst at the same time he professes his personal and exclusive devotion to the Emperor of RUSSIA.

This Minister—M. DE CHATEAUBRIAND—in this work of his, "The Congress of Verona," explains with painfully elaborate detail how, acting under the instructions of the Emperor ALEXANDER, when he was the Representative of France at the Congress of Verona, he deceived the French Premier, M. DE VILLELE, as to the views of Austria and Prussia, and deceived the Ministers of Austria and Prussia as to the views of M. DE VILLELE. So that while severally the Cabinets of Austria and Prussia were opposed to Intervention in Spain, he brought about the French Invasion of Spain in 1823, by making Prussia and Austria believe that France had concerted that measure with Russia, so that it would be impossible for them to oppose it; and by making M. DE VILLELE believe that Austria and Prussia were so resolved to put down the Revolution in Spain, that they would invade France if France did not invade Spain. So the army of the Duke d'ANGOULEME marched, and the explanation and justification given by M. DE VILLELE in the Chamber was, that France had sent an army across the Pyrenees to avoid having to send one to the Rhine.

Now, this was the turning-point for Europe, which, being passed, consigned it to an endless course of Revolutions. And this was the turning-point for the New World, involving it ultimately in the fate of Europe. This was managed, having got a Congress to assemble, at the expense, for Russia, of a journey of the Emperor to Verona, some private walks of that Emperor in a garden with a French Poet, and a pension to that Poet of 25,000 francs.

But M. DE CHATEAUBRIAND was not alone. He had a colleague at Verona. The colleague was M. DE LA FERRONAIS. His assent was not withheld from the plan, and he also received a pension of 25,000 francs.

This treachery, which ultimately brought the fall of the Dynasty in France, so far from being detected or suspected at the time, made CHATEAUBRIAND Foreign Minister at Paris. There never was a whisper against his private honour, or his public loyalty, and it is in consequence of the perfect immunity

which he enjoyed, that at an after time his Confession was made. Seeing no danger, his vanity indulged itself by appearing to be the originator and prime motor of magnificent schemes.

The Confession, however ample it may appear, is still but partial. The third volume of the "Congress of Verona" was suppressed, and has never appeared. On the appearance of the two first volumes, other persons took alarm, and measures were taken to stop such indiscretions. He was sought by those interested in his retirement in Switzerland. It is said that M. DE LA FERRONAIS went down on his knees before him to obtain the suppression of the third volume.*

This has happened in France. Why should not the same thing have happened in England?

Twenty-five years ago, when the connexion of Lord PALMERSTON with Russia was first detected and proclaimed, a deputation from Glasgow waited on Sir ROBERT PEEL to demand a parliamentary inquiry. In the course of the interview Sir ROBERT said:—

"Treason is a word which I do not understand as applied to a Minister. A man may be guilty of Impolicy, of Neglect, but that does not constitute Treason. These are words which may place the individual bringing them forward in great personal peril."

Did the use of these words place the persons who employed them in any personal peril? Has any one ever been prosecuted for applying to Lord PALMERSTON in any possible shape the terms "Traitor," "Forger," and the like? No doubt there would have been great personal peril, as there must have followed condign punishment, for those who did use those terms, had they been incorrectly applied.

Again, Sir ROBERT PEEL does not understand Treason as applied to a Minister. Understand the word he must. It is the application that he denies. But he does not say, like Lord JOHN RUSSELL, "British Minister." Sir R. PEEL says, "a Minister," any Minister. He could not have drawn a distinction thus, and have said, "I can understand Treason as applied to a French, but I cannot understand Treason as applied to a British Minister." Therefore again we say, If such things happen in France, why not in England?

What constitutes Treason? Open any

* The Author's Preface commences as follows:—"The following work must not be confounded with the Memoirs that are intended to appear after my death. I now put forth that which I may utter while living; the rest will be revealed from the tomb."

law book and it will give you the definition ; which in plain language amounts to this : The doing, or suffering, that which is conducive to the interests of an extrinsic Power, and injurious to the honour or interests of the British Crown. The crime has no more to do with the motives or considerations of the criminal than any act of private murder. Lord BOLINGBROKE was impeached, and had to fly, not because he was accused of having received money from France, but because he was accused of negotiating a Treaty in which the honour and interest of his Sovereign had been compromised ; or, rather, not sufficiently vindicated.

What is there in the word "Minister"—a word un-English, and a post unconstitutional—which shall confer on the individual holding it immunity from temptation ? That it confers, in the eyes of our age, and in the practice of our times, immunity from consequences, we know : to the horror of those who are conscious, and to the suffering of all. But far different from this brazen declaration of immorality, "*we will not punish crime in high places,*" is the insinuated maxim of Sir R. PEEL, that the post of Minister effaces in the individual all the weaknesses of humanity, and throws law and constitution into abeyance, by rendering the official innocent in intention, and only liable to faults of judgment.

Coming closer to the point, and down to the very case itself, how could Sir R. PEEL predicate impeccability of the man in respect to whom he had to ask the question in the House of Commons, without obtaining an answer, or being able to furnish a solution, "Whose interest does the noble Lord represent in this House ?" And to whom, eleven years later, he addressed this menace : "Let the noble Lord beware—let the noble Lord beware !" Telling him that, unless he ceased his taunts and his gibes, he would quit the House, and thereby leave the House to deal with the man at that time charged with the criminal invasion of Afghanistan, and the loss of 25,000 British lives ?

Sir R. PEEL was not so innocent and ignorant of human nature, British history, and the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. But between the alternative of leading the Impeachment and quashing the inquiry, for him there was no escape. He preferred the latter.

In the case of CHATEAUBRIAND, we have a Minister avowing that he had been playing false. Had been, for he had ceased to be Minister the moment the particular work was accomplished for which he was retained.

But if Russia requires tools for particular purposes, far more does she require them for general ones. If she requires tools in the Government of France, she must require them in every other Government. In the avowed case of CHATEAUBRIAND we shall find indications of what she wants in every similar case.

The object of a Cabinet in having a secret agent in another Cabinet is to get its own plans carried out by another State, and cause the results subsequently to appear as if they were its own projects. What Russia wanted in the case of M. DE CHATEAUBRIAND was the unsettlement of Spain and of Spanish America. Such an object could not have been effected by Russia in her own person, and, the event brought about, it could be believed that the Bourbon King of FRANCE objected to the enforcing of a Constitution on the Bourbon King of SPAIN.

In discussing the Invasion of Spain, the mind of everybody was turned towards France and away from Russia. The effect was that everybody was confused. Mr. CANNING, who could not understand the word Treason as applied to a French Minister, believed that the French Government really were afraid of the Spanish Revolution, and thought that a modification of the Constitution of 1812 would satisfy them.

Such is the history of every important movement in which England has been engaged since Lord PALMERSTON has come into office. The ostensible meddlers in each case have gained nothing for themselves. Take the Danish case. Denmark wanted to retain the Duchies. Where are the Duchies now ?

By this process, everywhere repeated since 1830, affairs have been rendered so confused, and the subject has consequently become so abstruse, that it is out of the question that the public should be enlightened upon it. In the conversation already alluded to, Sir ROBERT PEEL said that the Glasgow Memorial contained questions of so comprehensive a character, that days and weeks would not suffice to examine them. This was in 1840, a quarter of a century ago, and the process has continued ever since. But if the process cannot be taken in, this, at least, may be taken in—that the individual Minister is playing false. Then, indeed, does the mystery and unintelligibility of every particular transaction turn to light and confirmation.

It is the anticipation of the consequences to follow, that has inspired energy, resolution, and perseverance in those few who from the beginning, or nearly from the beginning,

have understood the character of the man, and therein the danger of the Empire. Hence those efforts which they have made, and continue to make, and the testimony they have accumulated, awaiting the hour when England may seek to understand her position, in order to find a way of escape from its consequences.

One of the means employed was Deputations from Towns and Public Bodies to Public men, to lay grounds before them for this charge of collusion with a Foreign Power. Whilst no means could be so efficacious for counteracting the secret designs of the Minister, at that time only Foreign Secretary, so also was this the most effectual for testing the accuracy of their conclusions. For, had these been baseless, of course they would have been upset in a moment. Out of hundreds of such interviews, extending over twenty-seven years—that is, from 1838 down to the present time, there is not a single instance of a Deputation, or the Member of a Deputation returning shaken. But, on the contrary, they acquired in many cases that certitude, from the inability of the Colleague of the Minister, or the Antagonist of the Minister—for it amounts to the same thing—to disprove the charges against him, or to explain his acts in any other intelligible fashion, which they had not acquired from the documents themselves.

The extracts which we have already given are from a conversation between Sir ROBERT PEEL and a Deputation sent to him in the year 1840 by the City of Glasgow, headed by Mr. WILLIAM BROWN, then Dean of Guild.

We give in another column, *in extenso*, the Report of a similar Deputation sent at the same time to Sir JAMES GRAHAM.

Unlike Sir R. PEEL, he did not refuse to accept the idea, or the possibility of Treason. He did indeed refuse to accept the statement as particularly applied, but simply on the grounds that it was repulsive to his self-love. He did not so much as apply himself to the subject-matter of the Interview—*i. e.* the acts of the Minister. He neither controverted the statements of the Deputation, nor justified the conduct of Lord PALMERSTON. He merely said, *If the case is as you have stated it to be, I, who have been the Colleague of that Minister, have been either a dupe or an accomplice. I will not examine such a case. You cannot expect me to do so.* This is the substance of his reply.

The Documents contained in our last Number show that in the year following these Interviews, the Government which had

come into office (for we cannot suppose that the Department of the Board of Trade acted independently), made an attempt, though an abortive one, to have Lord PALMERSTON publicly denounced as having received a bribe of 20,000*l.* from Princess LIEVEN. In a letter which appears in our columns of this day, from a source in which we have the most entire confidence, the circumstances of Lord PALMERSTON'S introduction into the Foreign Office, are for the first time revealed. From which it appears that it was owing to no home party combination; but that the appointment was suddenly extorted from Lord GREY by Princess LIEVEN. Now, in the two Interviews to which we have above referred, both Sir ROBERT PEEL and Sir JAMES GRAHAM admit that in the conduct of Lord PALMERSTON there is a mystery to them insoluble. A mystery may exist for the Public, without the necessity of crime being involved. Not so when the mystery is with reference to Colleagues in office; or to successors or predecessors, who take up or leave the thread of affairs, and yet do not understand what has been done, or what they have got to continue.

During the quarter of a century that has since elapsed no new solution has been offered, not a single attempt has been made in that direction even by a solitary individual.

Since that time, the many deputations that have waited on public men, Ministers or Members of Parliament, as our columns abundantly testify, have brought back from these occasions of testing the character and knowledge of public men, only the conviction that it was on their own efforts alone that depended the safety of their country.

On the other hand, how much has occurred to confirm the solution originally offered.

First. Everybody now knows Lord PALMERSTON to be guilty of acts which at the commencement of these discussions would have been considered shameful and absurd even to suppose. The argument then was, *the honour of an English gentleman.*

Secondly. The predictions that were made on this hypothesis are all either accomplished or in visible course of accomplishment. Poland is gone; Circassia is gone; the Right of Search is gone; India is shaken, expenditure doubled; foreign affairs everywhere so complicated that there is scarcely a country in the world with which we have not one or more standing quarrels that might at any time be the cause of war.

A Lord Chancellor, despite the manœuvres of the Premier, retiring because of corrup-

tion; a general election, in which the question has been, not whether Lord PALMERSTON and his policy should be supported, but whether they should be supported by "Liberals" or "Conservatives."

Is not this "supremacy?" Was not this supremacy predicted in the clearest and most emphatic terms twenty-six years ago, and was not the condition of that supremacy explained by treason? Here are the memorable words which resume the past, describe the present, and contain the future fate of England, Europe, and the world:—

"Then will faction subside, antagonism disappear, and the traitor, *because he is a traitor*, and by that alone, stand surrounded by the united power of a people, among whom the very traditions of sense and custom have been effaced, though, unhappily for mankind and for itself, a tongue is in its brainless head, and arms are in its cruel hands.*"

SIR JAMES GRAHAM ON LORD PALMERSTON.

(From the *Portfolio, Second Series, Vol. II. p. 212.*)

London, April 29, 1840.

WE have just returned from an interview with Sir JAMES GRAHAM. He had already, through Sir ROBERT PEEL's letter, and Mr. R——'s interview in Wales, become fully apprised of the magnitude of the question, and of the awfulness of the charge. It had sunk into his mind, and it transpired in the conversation that he felt he might have been a dupe of Lord PALMERSTON's, at all events. He said, "I am to understand either that I have wilfully participated in this man's acts, or that I have been a dupe, and that this is the least of the imputations to which I am liable." He did not at all seem to think the charge impossible of proof, but he said, "Situated as I am, having been a member of the Cabinet, and colleague of Lord PALMERSTON during the affair of the Boundary and on the Eastern Question, it is utterly impossible for me to be his accuser, nor should I be willing even to vote for a Committee of Inquiry except on strong evidence laid before me. I cannot, after having lived on terms of intimacy and friendship with Lord PALMERSTON, come to the belief of so awful a charge as that which has been advanced; nor can I, although entirely opposed to the Government, consent to array the whole power of the Conservative Party against one solitary individual, singled out from a Cabinet of so many members, with the view of crushing him as an individual." He said Sir ROBERT PEEL's position may be different.

It is impossible for me to go over the whole of what passed. But reflecting on the earnest attention he paid, and his pertinacious refusal to be interrupted by the announcement of visitors, &c., we have felt that his mind is agitated and oppressed with the belief that this movement is of historical

importance as the commencement of a new order of things, which may emancipate our National affairs from the recognised danger of foreign complications felt by the leaders of every party, but which cannot be effected by the Legislature until a new selection of members can take place throughout the kingdom. He emphatically pointed to the nation itself as the only channel through which those abuses could be rectified. If they were contented with the Government of Parliament as at present constituted, they would allow their Representatives to remain. If, on the other hand, they are discontented, it remains with them to request their Members to resign the trust which has been misplaced in their hands. Nothing could be done without the commercial constituencies and the electors of the kingdom, as four attempts had been made to rectify the infringement of Foreign Treaties, and each result had notified to foreign nations, by a majority of the House, that the Ministers had the confidence of the Parliament, although it was evident from appearances throughout the kingdom that they had not the confidence of the nation. A false position, which made our danger appalling to contemplate, and most difficult to rectify.

No. 6.

Connivance of Sir Robert Peel.

A SENTENCE of Sir R. PEEL, which we quoted and commented on in our last, is so full of meaning, and has been so pregnant with disastrous results for England and the world, since the hour when it was uttered, that we must revert to it.

"A Minister may be guilty of Impolicy, or Neglect, but that does not constitute Treason."

These words were not spoken in the House of Commons: They were used privately to a Deputation of persons of influence sent from the second city of the Empire, and who appealed to him to obtain a parliamentary inquiry into the acts of the Foreign Office. They were spoken with a view of arresting the impulse which had in that year manifested itself in the Commercial Towns to obtain light as to the proceedings of the Foreign Department.

Sir ROBERT PEEL either believed that there were justifiable grounds for such a demand, or that there were none. In the first case he should have hailed the awakening of the Nation, and acted thereon in the sense of his words in Parliament at a subsequent period: "I wish the people of England would take their affairs into their own hands."

* Transactions in Central Asia, 1839.

In the second case he would have relieved the minds of the Deputation by telling them that they were mistaken, and satisfied their scruples by giving them the proof of his words, which no man was better able to do, seeing that he had returned to office in the middle of the period over which the transactions complained of extended. He would not have had recourse to a generality, whether one of ancient date, or of new invention, nor would he have offered hitherto unheard-of distinctions and qualifications, as to the nature of offences, of which a Minister could, or could not be guilty.

If, then, Sir R. PEEL adopted the latter course, and not the former, it is clear to demonstration that he was at once conscious of the truth of the averments of the Deputation, and resolved to prevent that truth from becoming generally known and acted upon.

The Truth urged by the Deputation, and evaded by Sir ROBERT PEEL, was, that the Nation was betrayed. This comes out from the circumstances of the case.

It further comes out cumulatively from the plea of Sir ROBERT PEEL. He says, "Treason is a word which I do not understand as applied to a Minister." He does not say, "Treason has not been committed." He then says, "A Minister may be guilty of Impolicy, or Neglect, but that does not constitute Treason." What the Deputation had alleged was not capable of definition as Impolicy, or Neglect. It was contrivance, it was suppression, it was Forgery, it was War levied without the authority of the Sovereign, it was guilt of every form, and of every dye. It was violation of municipal law, of criminal law, and of international law. The whole with the purpose and the effect of High Treason, as defined by Blackstone, *i. e.* to advance the interests of an extrinsic Power. The false definition of the allegations of the Deputation was therefore employed to arrive at the conclusion, "This does not constitute Treason." But this conclusion was superfluous, since the very sentence itself commenced with a denial in general terms that a Minister could be guilty of Treason. Thus the words of Sir ROBERT PEEL themselves convey the perfect consciousness on his part that the described condition of things did exist for England.

The form of the phrase, "A Minister may be guilty of Impolicy or Neglect; but that does not constitute Treason," conveys the admission of the acts urged on the other side. Exception is only taken to their legal qualification. What does this amount to? Everything and nothing. To support the

Russian Pretender to the Throne of Persia, and to call him an English Partisan, may no doubt be called "Impolicy." But it may also be called "Treason." To abrogate the defensive Treaty with Persia, to paralyse the efforts of the East India Company to support Herat, to suppress the Despatches of the English Envoy which represented DOST MOHAMMED as appealing to England against Russia, and then to invade his country on the grounds that he was a Partisan of Russia; to send Orders in defiance of the orders in Council, to violate the municipal laws of China, and then to wage a lawless war on the Chinese Empire, may all be called by Sir R. PEEL, if he chooses it, "Impolicy," without the slightest derogation to their qualification as "Treason." In the meantime they are, all of them, violations of the laws, the punishment for which is duly consigned in our Statute-books. The sense, therefore, that can apply to the epithet "Impolicy," must have reference to detection not to perpetration. So in private life, if people were accustomed to use amphibology, which they would do, if the pursuit of Crime depended solely on arrangements of partisanship, it might be said that Poisoning was inaccuracy, not murder, and breaking into a house, impolicy but not burglary.

After all, what did the word "Treason" matter in the Case? What the Deputation said was this, "The examination of such Documents as are within our reach, and the consideration of such acts and facts as are public, leave us no doubt of great injury, great wrong, great expenditure, and great crimes. We further suspect that these are not accidental, but are connected with a general system, directed to the advancement of the interests of a Foreign Power, and the sacrifice of the honour and interest of the British People and Crown, and the prostitution of their resources to that end. We, therefore, demand a Parliamentary investigation into these transactions, that the Truth may be known; so that on the one hand the evil may be arrested if it exists, and on the other that suspicion and anxiety may be allayed, if there be none." In other words, and adopting the phraseology of Sir R. PEEL, the inquiry they sought for was, as to whether there had been "Impolicy and Neglect." This is the inquiry which Sir R. PEEL refuses, and the refusal rests on the phrase, "Impolicy and neglect are not subjects of inquiry." As the term applying to anything beyond, is not to be understood as applying to a Minister, it follows that a Minister was by the maxim of Sir R. PEEL

in 1840, placed absolutely beyond the Law. The history of the World since that period illustrates the practical working out of the position.

In this case, the mind of Sir R. PEEL was severely taxed. He had a great effort to make and he made it. He had to find an epithet for acts that were illegal, which would cause them to pass free of legal consequences, and so confuse or dishearten the persons he was addressing, and send them home brow-beaten and discomfited. Thus, while shielding the Minister under a subterfuge, he used threats towards those who demanded protection and justice, telling them that they incurred great personal peril by the course they were taking.

At that moment the destinies of the Nation hung upon the character of a single man; that man was Sir R. PEEL. His own character hung upon the decision of the moment. He was upon a sudden brought up to the adoption of one of two alternatives: "Am I to lead the Impeachment?" "Am I to suppress the inquiry?" The latter was the easiest; the result of the Glasgow Deputation was to hand over Sir R. PEEL as an Accessory to Lord PALMERSTON.

The state of things existing as the Deputation presented it, it would be clear to any man who examined the matter as a past historical event, that the fate of the Empire depended upon the success of the efforts made under the impulse of the first suspicion. For the suspicion arising, and the charges being made, and nothing ensuing thereon, it was clear that the Nation was alike destitute of the instincts of self-preservation and of indignation against calumny, for the charges would be henceforth treated as calumny. The self-love of the nation—the only powerful motive remaining—would be enlisted on the side of the Minister, and arrayed against all inquiry, which it would treat as an offence against itself and an aspersion cast on its own sagacity. So that the whole matter would remain buried in oblivion, until the progress of the scheme had arrived at the point when the awakening of the People would be profitless for its own security, and only available as exasperating the catastrophe, by superadding internal violence to external decay.

From that hour the work of Sir ROBERT PEEL, on this higher field, began. A variety of terse and poisonous sophisms emanating from his practised mind were cast from time to time into the public thoughts, to pervert any healthy impulse manifesting itself in the Parliament or the People. One of these alone

will we quote, from its singular efficacy, and from its presenting the counterpart of the sentence on which we are commenting:—

"I am afraid there is some great principle at work where civilisation and refinement come in contact with barbarism, which makes it impossible to apply the rules observed towards more advanced nations."

We have underlined some of the co-efficient terms to evoke the attention of the reader to the anxiety of mind under which Sir R. PEEL must have laboured in concocting and arranging this sentence. It was uttered in the House of Commons, in reference to an Event of the most signal importance, which had taken place out of the House, in despite of all the sophisms of the man, and all the influence of the Minister exerted to prevent it.

There existed in the England of that day, 1844, a body which held the administration and the guardianship of India to a certain degree independently of the Government. That body—the Court of Directors of the East India Company—alarmed at the course of encroachment, usurpation, and invasion dictated to them by the Board of Control, whose secret communications they were coerced to carry into effect under threat of being sent to prison, resolved to take their stand upon an authority which had not yet been withdrawn from them by the Parliament—that of dismissing the Governor-General. They therefore did dismiss Lord ELLENBOROUGH on the ground of his aggression in Scinde. There were not wanting those in Parliament inclined to follow up this blow, struck at that course of lawlessness, which half a century before had been arrested in India by the Impeachment of WARREN HASTINGS; so restoring in the practice of India that same respect for the Laws which at that time it was supposed continued to exist in Europe. Sir R. PEEL had no more interest in the protection of Indian Crime than he had in the shielding of British Treason. But the measures in India were mere corollaries of those in Europe. The Foreign Department had decided on the Wars in Afghanistan, in China, and in Scinde, just as it had on the betrayal of Poland in 1831, on the Spanish Quadruple Treaty of 1834, on the rupture with France of 1840. Having protected the acts of the Foreign Department against Inquiry, it followed that Sir R. PEEL had to resist inquiry whenever demanded and to protect wrong whenever committed. The importance of his position as the leader of the Party opposed to the Minister did not, however, suffice for this end. A fallacy was required, and a fallacy was found. "We are civilised, and these

People are barbarians. There is a different law for the civilised and the barbarians. It is by no means a thing that I commend. But still the thing is there, and it is at work. We must let it go on, for we cannot stop it." The fallacy triumphed. Nobody questioned the civilisation of the one, or the want of refinement of the other. Nobody saw that if there was any meaning in these words, it was that the civilised were under a law superior to that of the barbarians, and that as it was the acts of the civilised and not those of the barbarians that the speaker was defending, his own proposition did not apply. For in that case the Civilised had to say to the Barbarians, "It may be right for you, as barbarians, to break faith and commit violence. But we, as civilised men, cannot do so." Nobody said to himself, "A people that disregards the laws is not refined and not advanced." Least of all, did anybody say to himself that these acts were *ipso facto* arrested by the act of the East India Company, and that it was by his own acceptance of this sentence of Sir R. PEEL's that the portals of impunity were again thrown open to the Indian Administration.

Yet nothing is simpler than the Rule by which to judge of such matters. We have only to appeal to our own daily practice in the things with which we are familiar.

No private individual would say, "I may rob and murder those who are not so rich or so clever as myself." If he did say so, and acted upon the maxim, he would find himself in the hands of the Police.

If a servant were detected in a system of false accounts, he would not be borne harmless by saying, "I have not embezzled, but only neglected to pay over the sums of money which I have received on my master's account." He would find that the Magistrate, the Judge, and the Jury would not excuse him because he was his master's "minister."

Seeing that so great a difference exists between the mode of treating affairs that are public and those that are private; that the former are removed from the control of the law, while the latter are still subject to it, it cannot be a waste of time to consider in what this control of the law really consists.

Let us take a case: an habitual drunkard walks into your garden, you see him from your window repeatedly stagger and fall, and on going out to look after him, find him deprived of sense or motion. You *can* do but one thing: send for the nearest medical man. He comes, and pronounces the patient dead. Again you have no alternative. You send for the Beadle. He has no more choice than

you had. He sends a shell, in which the body is conveyed to the dead house; he orders the parish surgeon to hold a *post mortem* examination of the body; he summons the Coroner, the Jury, and the witnesses. The attendance of these is not optional. In the case supposed, the inquisition will not be long or the evidence elaborate, but if the dead man had been a sober person, if traces of poison had been found in the body, neither the Coroner nor the Jury *could* separate till every witness whose testimony could be expected to throw light on the matter had been examined. With the witnesses it is the same. Unless involved in the guilt of murder, they *cannot* but tell what they know. If they are so involved, the discrepancy of their evidence with that of the innocent witnesses tends to the discovery of the crime, and the punishment of the criminal. Till the Jury is satisfied of the cause of death, the Coroner *cannot* give his warrant of interment, and without that warrant no custodian of a cemetery *can* bury the body.

Whence arises this universal *non-possumus*? How is this vast and intricate machinery put in motion? Its security lies in the number of its parts, every one necessary to the action of the whole, but each separate until combined by particular circumstances. The motive power is the sense of law in the breast of every man. Every one of the persons concerned has, in the first place, the conscientious sense of the one thing it is his duty to do, and, in the second, the feeling that, if he neglect his duty, he may be punished for his neglect, and even lie under suspicion of complicity. The co-operation of every one of these persons scattered in different parts of a district is necessary to obtain the required result; namely, the decision as to the cause of death. The failure of any one person to perform his duty would draw upon him the responsibility of the failure of justice. He cannot venture to incur this responsibility; he cannot foresee its amount; he cannot tell even the names of all the persons who may be concerned to exact it from him. On the other hand, his own prescribed duty being performed, he is perfectly free from all further consequences.

But this sense of law is not always to be found in mankind. It is not like the pulsation of the heart, or the operation of the gastric juice. Where it has been brought into operation it is quite possible to destroy it. Suppose that some philosopher were to discover that the inquiry into the cause of death required from every person concerned therein a special training, and that some

political economist were to announce that it was a shameful burthen upon respectable householders to have to undergo so much trouble for the sake of being quite sure whether or not a drunken vagrant had committed an involuntary suicide; suppose that in the "Progress of Civilisation" it were determined that this matter should be given up to a special class of officials created *ad hoc*, and under the guidance of a Board sitting in London, with a gentleman at the head of it to answer questions in Parliament, and a medical man well skilled in chemistry as permanent secretary; suppose that, on the occurrence of any sudden death, an Act of Parliament should prescribe that an officer should be sent for from the branch office of the Central Board, and that the warrant of that officer should be sufficient authority for burial—it would then be an impertinence for any private individual to inquire into the circumstances. If the official chose to content himself with a mere view of the body, as he very probably would do, there would be but small security against death by poison.

Some few individuals might still be found more vigilant than the rest. They might select some medical man high in his profession, and laying before him such details of suspicious cases of death as had come to their knowledge, might call on him to put himself at their head, and demand the suspension from office of the permanent Secretary, and a judicial investigation into his conduct. Then would this ornament to the medical profession, that is if he were a proficient in the doctrines of intelligence and civilisation, reply as follows:—

"Murder is a word I do not understand as applied to a medical man. A Doctor may be guilty of Impolicy, of Neglect, but that does not constitute Murder."

We are not, however, left to induction or analogy, to discover what such a person would say or do. In a recent trial for murder, a medical man, who had no interest or desire to promote murder, who was sufficiently conscientious to refuse to give a false certificate, nevertheless became a silent witness of a case of slow poisoning. He prescribed medicines to avert the fatal result, but he did not even insist on his prescriptions being carried out, and he did not reveal to the Magistrates the crime which was being committed under his very eyes. We extract from the *Times* report, in order to place it on record, a portion of the evidence of Dr. PATERSON, on the recent trial of Dr. PRITCHARD at Edinburgh:—

"While attending to Mrs. TAYLOR, in the bedroom, I was very much struck at the same time with the

appearance of Mrs. PRITCHARD. I must say I could not banish from my mind the conviction that her symptoms betokened that she was under the depressing influence of antimony. . . . On the 3rd of March I received, through the post-office, a schedule from the Registrar, in which I was requested to tell him the cause of Mrs. TAYLOR's death, and the duration of her disease. I refused to do so, and sent the schedule back to the Registrar on the Saturday, with a note accompanying it, and directing his attention to the circumstance. . . .

"It was my impression, on seeing Mrs. PRITCHARD, that she was poisoned, or being poisoned, with antimony. I did not go back to see her because she was not my patient. I had nothing to do with her. It was not my duty to do so.

"Question. You saw a person being poisoned with antimony, and you did not think it your duty to interfere?

"Answer. I did the best I could to prevent her being further injured by apprising the Registrar of the fact.

"Q. Did you tell Dr. PRITCHARD?

"A. I did not.

"Q. You were surely under an obligation to go back again, when you saw a person being poisoned by antimony?

"A. I took what steps I could to prevent any further administration of the drug. I refused to certify the death of Mrs. TAYLOR, and *if there had been a post mortem examination of Mrs. Taylor's body, I believe that the drugging with antimony would have gone no further at that time.* I observed that she was suffering under the same symptoms as those formerly observed when I was called in on the 2nd of March. I still believed her (Mrs. PRITCHARD) to be suffering from antimony, and prescribed for her accordingly. . . . It was Dr. PRITCHARD who asked me to visit his wife on the occasion. I did not mention to him what I thought. It would not have been a very safe matter to have done. I did not go back because it was none of my business. I did not consider it my duty. *She had her husband, who was a medical man.* I had discharged my duty.

"Q. By prescribing certain things, and not going to see that your prescription was followed?

"A. In the case of a consultation, the consultant has no right to go back.

"Q. The dignity of your profession, then, prevented you?

"A. The etiquette of the profession."

This is the necessary result of the Propositions, uttered so long ago by Sir R. PEEL. There is no alternative between bringing back into public affairs the practice still preserved in private affairs, and the introduction into private affairs of the lawlessness practised in public affairs. Sir R. PEEL himself pointed out the analogy between the Minister and the medical man, when he said, "I will not give advice until I am regularly called in." Yet, unlike the physician, he took on himself the responsibility of the case when not regularly called in, by saying, "We (the Opposition) are strong enough to support the Government when it is right, and to break it when it is wrong."

Thus can we see with our eyes, hear with our ears, and handle with our hands those

causes of the decay of States which, in the past, at once excite our imagination and baffle our grasp. Those causes are fallacious sentences, and amphibological terms which darken the understanding, to reconcile the conscience with evil. So combining in one end the intelligent and active guilt of a few, with the inert and cowardly indifference of all.

No. 7.

Public and Private Crimes.

WE resume the weighty subject of our last: the words of Sir ROBERT PEEL, and their effect on the character and destinies of the nation.

We had come down in point of date to the time when Sir ROBERT PEEL was engaged in warding off inquiry, prompted only by internal doubts and anxieties. Another phase, whether foreseen or not by him, was of necessity to follow. That of the disasters entailed by the crimes which he condoned, and the schemes which he concealed. At the period to which we refer, the idea of danger to the Minister was involved in that of disaster to the nation. It was the corollary to that conjunction which had hitherto prevailed amongst mankind, more or less distinctly, of doubt and inquiry. Since there was to be no inquiry where there was doubt, so there was to be no danger where there was disaster. This, also, was the achievement of the fallacious sentences of Sir ROBERT PEEL.

The first of these disasters was that in Afghanistan. The nation had not been consulted about the expedition across the Indus; it had exulted in its success.

All at once came the news that Sir W. MACNAGHTEN and Sir ALEXANDER BURNES had been killed, the British force expelled from Caubul, and that one solitary horseman had escaped to join his countrymen at Jellalabad. The Whig Ministry, kept alive for a twelvemonth by a majority of two, had been dismissed from office by an adverse vote of the House of Commons. Close on the appointment of the new Ministry came the terrible news.

But the Afghan War did not stand alone. It was accompanied by an assault upon Persia, and by the Opium War. The contemporaneous proceedings in Europe included the

sacrifice of the *Vixen*, the setting up of MEHEMET ALI, and the Treaty of 1840, which all but produced a war, and did break up the supposed great European Policy—the Alliance between England and France. The Opium War had called forth the warmest reprobation from the Conservative party. The Afghan War had been disapproved, but not formally opposed. Yet Sir ROBERT PEEL had declared that “he was strong enough to resist the Government when wrong, and to support it when right.” The acts of the Whig Government had destroyed their majority in Parliament, and seated their opponents in office. It was expected that a change of men would bring a reversal of measures. But these measures, though they had disgusted the nation, had not been condemned by Parliament; they stood supported by the active concurrence of a former majority, and the silent acquiescence of the rest. To reverse them they had first to be condemned. But they could not be condemned without being explained. It was necessary to know who gave the order to cross the Indus. The instructions to do so have not even yet been published. On the occurrence of the disaster the war was attributed by the public to the East India Company. The East India Company declared that they had no hand in it, and themselves demanded inquiry, they further required the reimbursement of the expenditure which had been imposed upon them. Again everything was in the hands of Sir ROBERT PEEL.

Now there were no longer doubts as to the consequences of the system of secret and mysterious crime. Now there were the effects of the disaster upon the public to support and justify him, had he been prompted either by awakened conscience or aroused fears, to crush this conspiracy; for which not even an impeachment was requisite, but simply a committee of the House of Commons to report upon the causes of the Afghan Invasion.

On a Motion by Mr. ROEBUCK in the House of Commons on the 1st of March, 1843, for a Committee of Inquiry, Sir ROBERT PEEL said:

“There are two questions which have been brought under the consideration of the House in the course of the present discussion. The one, whether or no the expedition undertaken by the Governor-General of India into Afghanistan was consistent with sound policy; and the other, whether it is fitting for the House of Commons to appoint a Select Committee for the purpose of inquiring into the policy of that expedition. These two questions, I consider, to be not necessarily connected with each other. . . . I consider that question (the expedition) to be perfectly distinct from the question, whether as a mem-

ber of the Government, possessing the confidence of Her Majesty, I should think it expedient to lend the influence, which a Government naturally exercises, to appoint a Select Committee for the purpose of inquiring into the policy and justice of a great operation undertaken four years ago."

Now let us revert to the recent trial for murder, which we used as an illustration in our former article, altering in imagination the circumstances so as to present a parallel between the High Court of Judiciary at Edinburgh and the High Court of Parliament at Westminster. To do this, we must suppose the judge, the counsel, and the jury, instead of proceeding to try the case, debating whether there should be any trial at all. We must suppose the counsel for the Crown saying:

"There are two considerations under our discussion; the first is whether the death of the deceased is to be attributed to other than natural causes; the second, whether any inquiries should take place on the subject. These questions I consider to be not necessarily connected with each other."

The law of England in respect to sudden death reverses, as regards the fact, the rule which it applies towards the person. It regards every man as innocent till he is proved guilty; it regards every sudden death as violent till it is proved natural. The proposal here is that every death shall be treated as natural, even when it is known to be violent.

But to make our analogy complete, we must suppose that the Advocate for the Crown went on to give his reasons for abolishing trials for murder. He must have said:

"This is not the only case in which the cause of death is questionable. There is the case of MARY WINDSOR, who appears to have been in the habit of, at least, disposing of dead bodies for money, in a mysterious and questionable manner. There are also many cases which, if pursued to inquiry, would show that infanticide is becoming a common practice. Now if this Court should take cognisance of the case of Mrs. PRITCHARD, it must take cognisance of a great many other cases, and the result will be that the management of the private affairs of every family in the country will be transferred to this Court."

Now hear Sir ROBERT PEEL.

"Where are the limits to such inquiries? Shall I inquire as to the policy of the Syrian war; as to the effect of our bombardment of St. Jean d'Acre; and as to the effect our conduct on that occasion had upon France? (Mr. HUME, you ought.) Yes, the Hon. Member for Montrose says, truly enough, that if I grant one Committee I ought to grant another. Because, observe, if on every point of *questionable policy* this House is to have a Committee of Inquiry, another member will come down and say, that the arrangements under the American Treaty are prejudicial to our interests, and that we must have a Committee of Inquiry on that subject. Having granted the first two Committees, I could not refuse the third; and of consequence I must hand over the

Executive Government to the Committee of the House of Commons."

What are the consequences of this decision? We quote from among many prophetic passages in a contemporary publication the following, which gives the history of the twenty-two years that have since elapsed;—

"What are the consequences of this decision? Firstly: Ministers and men placed in authority now know that power may be enjoyed without responsibility, and that malversation of any kind may be indulged in without fear of any consequences. Secondly: Foreign Powers will now know that consequences by them are not to be apprehended from a nation whose servants, by being faithless, have become its masters.

"Sir ROBERT PEEL has pronounced sentence of acquittal upon every crime within, of approval on every injury from without; he has linked together extreme danger and internal treason, and conferred upon them a charter of immunity. Assuming inquiry into home delinquency and foreign designs to be interference with the functions of the executive Government, he shows us that the present Government is but a continuation of the past system. *He has connected the Afghan War with the other transactions in which England has been involved in all other quarters of the globe. He has connected the acts of the late Government and the projects of Russia.* He has then stood up to resist all disturbance of this conspiracy by inquiry or by punishment.

"Surely a more unconstitutional and a more un-English speech was never uttered in the House of Commons. In it were given first the propositions, only insinuated by Lord PALMERSTON, that Prerogative of the Crown, Duty of Parliament, and Law of the Land, may be made matter of accommodation between successive Cabinets.

"Formerly there was a struggle between Privilege and Prerogative, or between the Crown and the Country; then came a struggle in the House between Whigs and Tories; now it is a struggle of Cabinets on one side, Crown, Parliament, Law, and Nation on the other. A struggle? No, there is no struggle. *Whoever holds the Foreign Office may dispose of England as of a wardrobe. He may keep it, sell it, cheat with it, or be cheated out of it;* and supposing that public indignation is at length aroused, there is a sluice now constructed to let it flow harmlessly away.

"The Ministry is not to lend the influence of its position to inquire into mal-administration by the preceding Ministry. But guilt not repudiated is accepted, and thus, by a CHANGE OF MEN, THE CONTINUANCE OF THE MEASURES WHICH HAVE DRIVEN THEM FROM OFFICE IS SECURED."*

Has not this prediction been accomplished to the letter? What have been the events which have happened, or rather the things which have been done, since 1843, in pursuance of this "conspiracy against the human race?" We have the Invasion of Sindh, the Annexation of Oude, the Abolition of the right of Adoption, the Canton Massacre, the Invasion of Persia, the Greased Cartridge Mutiny, the Destruction of the Summer Palace at Peking, the Bombardment in Japan,

* "Appeal against Faction," by David Urquhart, 1843, pp. 18-19.

the Wars of Extermination in New Zealand, the Syrian Massacres, the Annexation of Savoy, the Destruction of every native Government in Italy, the Invasion of Mexico, the Sacrifice of Schleswig-Holstein, the American Struggle, the Suppression of Poland; and in this list, we have omitted the Convulsion of the Continent in 1848, the Betrayal of Hungary, the *Coup d'Etat* at Paris, the burying of our army at Sebastopol, the Surrender of the Right of Search, and the consummation of the sacrifice of the Circassians, after their public appeal to our QUEEN for help.

These are the consequences of Sir ROBERT PEEL's maxim, that for the House of Commons to inquire into the conduct of the Executive Government, would be for it to usurp the functions of that Government.

It was on a subsequent occasion when Sir ROBERT PEEL had repeated in Sindh the crime first committed at Caubul, that the compact between the two factions was openly ratified in the House of Commons, and their mutual criminality referred, by Sir ROBERT PEEL to a law of nature, a law, however, so mysterious that it could only be hinted at and could not be specified:—

“We may lay down what positions we please with respect to the propriety of observing in our Indian policy the same rules and principles which are observed between European States; we may pass Acts of Parliament interdicting the Governor-General from extending his territories by conquest; but I am afraid there is some great principle at work, where civilisation and refinement come in contact with barbarism, which makes it impossible to apply the rules observed towards more advanced nations; more especially when civilisation and refinement come in contact with barbarism, in an immensely extended country.”

There is no difference, between the rules observed by us in Asia and in Europe; the difference is between the acts of private individuals, and those of individuals acting in the name of the State. In the former, as in the latter case, we may lay down what moral positions, we may pass what Acts of Parliament, we please, but there are, and always have been, men who will set at naught moral positions and Acts of Parliament, unless the penalties attached to the latter are enforced. The whole case resides in this, that the possession of office does *not* make the holder exempt from the temptations incident to humanity, and that this certainty of impunity *does* lead to the commission of crime.

The work done by Sir ROBERT PEEL has been continued by those who, as leaders of the opposition, may be considered as his natural successors. The Author of the work already quoted predicted that this acqui-

escence in the crimes of his predecessors would lead to his own expulsion from office.* The prediction was accomplished. The Conservative Party have since then twice held the reins of power. In each case they carried out the crimes of their predecessors, and in each case their term of office endured only for about a year. Since the fall of Sir ROBERT PEEL, in 1846, nineteen years have elapsed, out of which not more than two years and two months have been occupied by a Conservative Administration.

There have been, from either side of the two Houses of Parliament, isolated endeavours, if not to restore the State, at least to resist the progress of evil. In these endeavours, at least three of the present subordinates of Lord PALMERSTON, have taken part. On one occasion, indeed, Lord JOHN RUSSELL, eschewing the formula of Sir ROBERT PEEL, accused the Foreign Minister of, not “Neglect” or “Impolicy,” but Treason in its gravest aspects; of “having passed by the Crown, and put himself in the place of the Crown.” These words did not form part of a charge, they were not followed by a Motion that Lord PALMERSTON should be committed to the custody of Black Rod, and sent to the Tower. They formed part of a speech in which Lord JOHN RUSSELL, had to defend himself by explaining the reasons for the dismissal of his insubordinate Colleague, these reasons being that the offence of putting himself in the place of the Crown had been repeated after a *promise* not to do so again had been extorted by the QUEEN.

We have thus two opposite practices in private and in public life. In the former we have a sense of law, by which every individual is made to perform his separate functions in ascertaining the existence of crimes, the combination of these separate functions securing against private offenders the safety of the community. In the latter, the commission of a known crime awakes no sense of duty in any individual or corporate body. The Court Leet, whose duty it was to present such crimes is gone; the Municipal bodies avoid this duty as “political;” the House of Commons, which has usurped the prerogative of the Crown of nominating the Ministers, accepts the doctrine that to control the men they have nominated is to usurp the functions of the Crown. A Minister of

* “The House or Commons will sink into that bed that the speech of Sir Robert Peel has made for it; and the time is hastened for the return to power of the men who now stand accused, by the degradation of their antagonists for having basely screened them.”—*Appeal against Faction*, p. 19.

the Crown, himself not engaged in designing mischief, gravely suggests that the office itself is a guarantee for the purity of the intentions of the holder, whilst, after a quarter of a century of such practices on the most gigantic scale, the public hold mal-administration in public affairs — “an anachronism.”*

We have now to make a step forward or backward. We must adapt the maxim to private life and declare that all crime is anachronism and all punishment superfluous; or we must reduce public measures to the simple and prosaic rule of our daily life and position, and say to each other “The days of impeachment are *not* gone by.”

M. A. REMUSAT ON “CIVILISATION” AND “BARBARISM.”

As throwing light on the two several existences, the subject matter of Sir R. PEEL’s “Great Principle,” we quote from M. ABEL REMUSAT the following passage:—

“One striking feature amongst all varieties of Eastern Governments is, to find nowhere, and scarcely at any period, that odious despotism of degrading servitude, the dark genius of which, we imagined, towered over all Asia. Except in the Mussulman States, the springs of which require a peculiar study, the sovereign authority, surrounded with imposing exteriors, is not the less subject to restrictions the most inconvenient, I had almost said, the only ones which are really effective. An Indian king, it is true, burns like the sun, and no human creature can contemplate him. But that superior being cannot raise a tax on a Brahmin, were he himself to die of hunger; convert a field labourer into a merchant, or infringe the slightest enactment of the civil and religious code. An Emperor of China is the Son of Heaven, but he cannot choose a sub-prefect, except from the list of candidates presented by the Colleges; and if he himself neglected to fast on a day of eclipse, or to acknowledge publicly the faults of his Government, ten thousand pamphlets, sanctioned by law, would trace to him his duties, and recal the observance of ancient rule. Who dare in Europe oppose such barriers to the power of Princes?

“I have spoken of institutions, and this word, quite modern and quite European, may appear pompous and sonorous when applied to a people which knows neither budgets, nor reports, nor bills of indemnity. It certainly is not here applied to those

* The *Times* of last Monday writes of the taking possession of Lauenburg by Prussia. “We wonder if it ever occurred to the King of Prussia, or to Count Bismarck, or to any of those engaged in this remarkable scene that the whole proceeding was an anachronism.”

sudden notifications to a nation to change its habits on a given day. I avow that in this sense throughout the greatest portion of Asia, there is nothing that can be called Institutions. The rules and principles which control the powerful and protect the weak, are customs and national character based upon prejudices, beliefs, or errors These impose upon authority more effectual checks than any written stipulations, and from which tyranny can only emancipate itself by running the risk of perishing by violence. I see but some isolated points where nothing is respected, where consideration is unknown, and where power rules free from obstacle. These are the spots where the weakness or improvidence of Asiatics has allowed strangers to establish themselves, moved by the sole desire of amassing riches; people without pity for men of another race, neither understanding their language, nor sharing in their tastes, their habits, their faith, or their prejudices. Force alone can maintain for a time that absolute despotism which is necessary to a handful of dominators, who will grasp all in the midst of a multitude which believes itself bound by no right to give anything. The effects of such a struggle are to be observed in the Colonial establishments of Asia, and the strangers of whom I speak are the Europeans.

“A singular race is this European race. The opinions with which it is armed, the reasonings upon which it rests, would astonish an impartial judge, if such a one could be at present found on earth. They walk the globe, showing themselves to the humiliated nations as the type of beauty in their faces, as the basis of reason in their ideas, the perfection of understanding in their imaginations. That is their unique measure. They judge all things by that rule. In their own quarrels they are agreed upon certain principles by which to assassinate one another with method and regularity. But the Law of Nations is superfluous in dealing with Orientals.”

It was in 1829 that M. ABEL REMUSAT wrote these words.

CONTRADICTIONS OF THE “TIMES.”

<p>FROM THE “TIMES” OF SEPTEMBER 28, 1865. “THIS immense mass (the Russian Empire) is the product of acquisition and attraction perpetually going on. Towards the west, conquest and diplomacy have been employed; towards the east, conquest and <i>civilisation</i>. Say what we will, or pro-</p>	<p>FROM THE “TIMES” OF SEPTEMBER 28, 1865. “IT is not a paradox to say that if Russia became more enlightened she would become less powerful. Something of the <i>barbarian</i> element is required in a conquering race. To make the people</p>
--	--

phesy as we may, it is not to be denied that all the progress of Russia in the east is mainly that progress which, as we have found, is almost inevitably forced upon a superior race in contact with semi-savages or barbarians."

"The Turkish Empire was formed in a comparatively short period, by an overwhelming torrent of armed fanatics, and it represents at this day only an aggregate of regions on which the descendants of the conquerors are encamped."

a perfect instrument in the hands of their ruler, they must be partly fanatics or partly slaves. The conquests of more civilised nations may be more rapid, but they are less durable. The brave stolid, passive, superstitious Russian has been the true unit of that power which has created the Empire. Make him a reasoning, independent or capricious thinker, and the power is gone."

No. 8.

Prostration before him of all public Authority and Character.

The relationship of the aphorisms of Sir ROBERT PEEL to the acts of Lord PALMERSTON, which we have been tracing in our last two numbers, offers an historical deduction which supersedes all the rest of contemporary municipal history. It is this: That the public measures which the English Government and nation have adopted, and the acts which they have performed during a quarter of a century, have proceeded from no will or purpose of the Crown, of the nation, or of the factions; that they have had their origin in the will of a single member of one of the parties, and have been rendered practicable by the co-operation of the leader of the other party.

The abolition of the Corn Laws by Sir ROBERT PEEL dispelled in an instant a belief previously existing, and which was universal. It was believed by the trivial talker, it was believed by the profound thinker, and that not only within the three kingdoms, but throughout the whole of Europe, that England was an aristocratic country, and that the landed interests were predominant. This experience might be sufficient to satisfy any man that nothing is less likely to be true than any belief or opinion which he may entertain respecting any of the circumstances in which he is placed, the motives of measures which he sees, the sources of acts in which he is engaged, the secret of the influences which rule.

It is not alone the event of the Corn

Laws which might have suggested such reflections. There is not a measure, there is not an opinion, which comes into being—each of these being a change upon that which has previously been done or thought—which does not equally afford to each individual the opportunity of informing himself with regard to himself, and of discovering that he has been all his life talking about things which he did not understand. Such a conclusion will, however, be considered humiliating. It is, or it is not, according to the application. It is humiliating to a man if he says, "Henceforth I must cease to talk;" it is anything but humiliating if he says, "Henceforth I must know the truth." The condition of a nation is hopeless, however vast its dominions and great its wealth and power, if, being in doubt, it has not the idea of inquiry. But the germs of greatness exist in a community, however small; or even in a fragment, however insignificant, of an enervated community, wherever there exists in men the simple and upright thought of understanding what they speak about.

Let us go a step further. If the matter with regard to which the nation is in doubt, is merely speculative, its doubt may be very beneficial, as preventing it from acting. But if the doubt is in reference to conduct, to measures, to things that are being done for it and by it; if these things involve changes which have to be examined into as matters of account; if they involve acts to be decided upon on legal grounds—and these include all that man can do, and man can suffer—then, to be in doubt, and thereby to remain inert, is to submit, that is to say is to suffer. It is to suffer that money shall be taken from it wrongfully; it is to suffer that acts shall be committed against it wrongfully; it is to suffer that its own means shall be employed to inflict the same evils upon others. Being at the same time honourable, upright and conscientious—that is to say, each individual having no intention of doing wrong, it must go on to justify. So it has to suffer in its heart and in its understanding to a far greater degree than in its circumstances and its person.

But in the condition which we suppose, and which is at the same time that around us, for any particular individual to adopt the contrary line to suffering, is an impossibility. Consider what would be required in the way of strength of character, powers of mind, alertness of spirit. There must be a comprehensive knowledge of all circumstances (which by the conditions of the case are

concealed and perverted), a perfect knowledge of the men who manage, not in England only, but everywhere. There must be the devotion and consecration of the whole mind, and of every moment of existence to the enterprise. There must be an integrity to resist all seduction, a courage to defy all opposition, an endurance to meet all persecution and reproach, with the faculty, so rare as to be wonderful, of retort. Not to fall into the trough, but to emerge from doubt upon the high bank of action, it requires that a man should take upon himself the whole State, assume to himself to be its protector and saviour, and experience the consciousness of this in his own breast.

Now the historical deduction with which we have to do, goes much further than that which had to be drawn from the Repeal of the Corn Laws. "Aristocracy," "Landed Interest," are vague generalities, and to displace them is a small matter. Not so the terms—Crown, Executive, High Court of Parliament, Grand Inquest of the Nation, or even the terms, Whig and Tory, as representing the Factions. These have to disappear so soon as it is known that the vast measures carried on through the world, by this great Empire, proceed from the private will and unavowed purpose of one individual; through the aid of three or four insidiously constructed sentences, uttered at intervals of years by another individual, not acting in concert with him, and belonging to the opposite political party.

If this question be put to any individual taken at random from the streets: "Do you believe that Lord PALMERSTON could have carried the invasion of Afghanistan against the resistance of Sir R. PEEL? Do you believe that he could have invaded China against the resistance of Sir R. PEEL?" the answer would undoubtedly be in the negative. Nor did Lord PALMERSTON question in Parliament the assertion of Sir R. PEEL himself that he was strong enough to resist the Government when it was wrong. We have gone beyond this point, and have shown that he could not have carried his measures without the co-operation of Sir R. PEEL. That co-operation could not have been obtained had Sir R. PEEL been his confederate, and it would have been ineffectual unless Sir R. PEEL had been his antagonist.

As Lord PALMERSTON could do for Russia what no Russian could do for her, so Sir R. PEEL could do for Lord PALMERSTON what no Whig could have done for him. When there are among a people beliefs that are unfounded, the dexterous are able to work their

way to ends beyond all relation to the means of execution. They are relieved from every counteracting agency, screened from all scrutiny during the prosecution of their design, and protected from all retribution or its accomplishment. This is what is called "Public Opinion."

At a given point a man may be suddenly startled into a transitory perception of the truth, and exclaim, as once did M. THIERS, "We (England and France) have mistaken the interests of Russia for our own, that is all." But having given utterance to this sentence, nothing follows upon it. M. THIERS did not go on to say "We must therefore institute an inquiry with a view to the reversal of this state of things. This effort, however great, is imposed upon us by every consideration of honour and of safety." M. THIERS said the very reverse. He continued, "Therefore there remains for us nothing to do," and the France of that day was swept away, and another nine-pin set up.

England has been thus disposed of through two false beliefs. The first was that England and Russia were opposed. This, again, arose from two generalities—"England" and "Russia." England at the time was one man, whom England herself knew by name only. Russia was one woman in the Russian service, who was at that time in London, and held all the leading men in the hollow of her hand. The second false belief was, that Whigs and Tories (Liberals and Conservatives) entertained opposite opinions on public matters. But here, again, men were entangled in a generality. They included under one head *opinions* in reference to measures to be introduced into Parliament, and *measures* in respect to the employment of armies, navies, and despatches. These measures being concealed from the Parliament, concealed in their inception from the Sovereign under whose prerogative they are masked, concealed from the colleagues of the Minister, whose apparent responsibility enables him to dispose of all things at his own pleasure and caprice.

This corruption and these elements of decay might have existed in a somnolent state for ages and centuries, had they not been quickened by particular circumstances. Even Russia might have been there with all her own organised means, having yet centuries to wait for a satisfactory fruition. But the avalanche has been hastened for our times by the conjunction of two such men contemporaneously existing in the bosom of the British State.

Of these, one has already disappeared,

without any loss to Russia; his peculiar work had been accomplished, and his successors have continued to do the small businesses that were required. The other must soon follow in the course of nature. He too will have done his work, and his death, when it comes, will have secured her in respect to the most powerful instrument she has ever possessed, from the only danger she has to fear, namely, that her tools be detected and broken. The succeeding Ministers of England, in continuing the line laid out for them, will not even have to be initiated, and will all unconsciously carry into execution, the Will of PETER THE GREAT.

However, as there must have been some mysterious and nefarious part connected with the bringing of a man not then in office, and so not compromised by his own acts, into collusion with the enemy of his country; and as from highly authoritative quarters the suspicion had emanated of a positive money transaction, we had judged it desirable whilst he was still alive, still in the possession of his faculties, still in the exercise of his functions as Premier, to bring forward these allegations. To print them in full, with all the collateral circumstances within our reach, in order that he might have the opportunity of vindicating his character, if in this particular circumstance—capable of vindication—whether by a statement that should carry weight, whether by a prosecution in a Court of Justice. We have done so in order that these charges which required to be solemnly dealt with during his life time, if not by him, then by others, should not be disposed of as posthumous calumnies when brought forward at a subsequent time. This exposition which has now occupied a large portion of the *Free Press* for the last four Numbers, will be reprinted under the title of MATERIALS for the Posthumous history of Lord PALMERSTON.

POSTSCRIPT.

Nov. 1, 1865.

Fate has followed fast on the traces of our pen, but has allowed us time to accomplish our purpose, as stated at the close of this review.*

* Lord Palmerston died on the 18th of October, 1865.

No. 9.

Character displayed in the Change of the Succession to Denmark.

(From the *Free Press*, Nov. 1, 1865.)

IF we refer in a particular manner to the death of Lord PALMERSTON, it is only because we find that it is so much expected that we should do so, that not only disappointment but misconception might arise from our passing it by in silence.

The death of Lord PALMERSTON will undo none of the things that he has done. The prolongation of his life would have facilitated the doing of other things which may not be so easily done by his successors. But these are not under discussion, not having existence.

Journals have an article upon public men when they die, and that is generally the beginning, the middle, and the end of all they have to say respecting them. As Public Men are known only through Public Measures, what is said of them during their lifetime is said upon the measures, and not upon the men. Here, in reference to the man and the journal, the case is the very reverse. The *Free Press* occupies itself with Lord PALMERSTON, and with Lord PALMERSTON alone; that is to say, with results which he has brought about. These results not coming as measures presented, and argued, and discussed on public grounds; but brought about secretly, coming without the foreknowledge of any one, presenting themselves without the appreciation of any one, and springing, therefore, entirely out of his private purposes; that is to say, his character. The *Free Press*, therefore, exists in and by Lord PALMERSTON; and if it does not disappear at his death, it is because of him, pre-eminently amongst the human race, it has to be said, "The evil that men do lives after them."

To some it may not at once be apparent that the statement we have just made is correct in its comprehensiveness. There are those who will perceive at once that the many columns and numbers of the *Free Press* devoted to the Right of Search, to the Danish Succession, to the Government of India, and the like, are in fact occupied with the character of Lord PALMERSTON; knowing that it is he as a man, and not as the

organ of an English Party, or the representative of a known system, that has brought about the sacrifice of our Maritime Rights, the sacrifice of an European Crown, and the convulsion, with the view to its ultimate sacrifice, of our Indian Empire. But they may not perceive that it is the treatment of the same theme that has brought into these columns the history of machinations, whether in the New World or in the Old, whether in the Italian or the Iberian Peninsula; whether as to the extinction of public rights, the absorption of political existences, the perversion of political judgment, or the amphibologies, which have rendered men and nations food for deception, and active instruments in their own undoing. All which, extending over past periods of history, give to this Journal the character rather of antiquarian research, than of daily comment.

This is, therefore, the very occasion to point out how and in what the two are connected; how in travelling back to past periods, however remote, and in searching out the origin of things, we have been still engaged solely in the task of elucidating the individual character of this one man.

In the series of Articles which we have recently finished on the fallacious aphorisms of Sir R. PEEL, concocted to screen himself from censure, in his screening Lord PALMERSTON from inquiry, we have shown that these sentences could not have been uttered, far less have been successful, had the public judgment in England at the time been less obscured. In other words, that these sentences would not have been spoken by a judicious man in the course of the last generation, because the effect at that time would have been to arouse scorn and indignation. The fallacies of the times were, therefore, the very instruments with which Lord PALMERSTON effected his ends. To deal with him, we had to deal with those fallacies. There would have been no necessity to show that there was no such thing as "a great principle at work" when more refined or less refined races came into contact, unless it had so happened that Lord PALMERSTON, in order to throw Central Asia into the arms of Russia, caused Afghanistan to be treacherously attacked by an English Army; that the English Nation, not being ready to accept such an attack from mere delight in bloodshed, had to be reasoned into acceptance of the deed; and that the reasoning found and put forward had not been "The Great Principle." These words, it is true, were used in reference to Sindh, and not in reference to Afghanistan. But the Sindh

affair was the corollary of the Afghan affair, and such an argument was in the mind of the Nation before it could have been used.

It is impossible that a nation should fall into the hands of a Traitor unless it be corrupt. It is impossible, therefore, that any effort should be made in the sense of counter-acting Treason except in so far as it tends to, and is effectual in, restoring integrity to the hearts of at least some of the men composing that nation. This can be done only by convicting them of their guilt. A picture must be held up to them of what they are, and that picture can be drawn only by contrasts. It must be shown to them what their fathers were; those fathers who made the Laws which still exist, but the use of which they have abandoned. The successive steps of decline and decay must be traced. And this field, spreading so wide and extending so far, has to be trodden of necessity by us, who propose to ourselves to rescue the State; because it is in consequence of this universal ignorance, disregard, and indifference, that its betrayal has been planned and carried into effect.

The tranquillity, the security, the permanency of States depend, and only can depend, upon the obstructions that lie in the way of innovation. There are always some individuals who, by the activity of their passions, seek to disturb; that is to say, to gain unduly. They are unsuccessful according as they find sense in their neighbours to detect imposition, and courage to resist violence. The old strophe preserved to us by ARISTOTLE, weakly paraphrased by Sir WILLIAM JONES, tells the whole story of human disturbance, or of human tranquillity.

"Men equal to save themselves constitute a Free State."

Rendered by Sir W. JONES:—

"Men who know their rights,
And knowing, dare maintain."

When it comes to be a question no longer of individual, but public Acts, when it is not a man acting by his own means for himself, but a man with delegated authority using the powers of others, the public tranquillity can be secured against his undue activity, only in so far as he is prevented from acting unless after deliberation. This restraint exists in so far only as the moorings of Law and Custom guarantee the public life.

Suppose the case of a nation that consents to acts being done by its Executive without previous deliberation; and at the same time declares to itself, and prides itself on the declaration, that it will never call its Ministers to account for their acts after they have been

committed; then it is evident that that Nation is cast about upon the waves of chance. That chance must depend upon the character of the Minister. He may be a good and great man, he may be a mean and a base one. The Nation will be equally filled with gratitude and admiration for the one who confers upon it prosperity, or the other who leads it to destruction. If it be elaborately organised in detail, if it possess wealth and armies and navies, it passes from an intellectual to a material existence, and becomes a machine, moved by a spring. Such is England at the present hour. LORD PALMERSTON has fashioned her fortunes as they now stand. But he himself was a chance. So there may be chances on the other side. All that England has become was locked in the breast of one man thirty years ago.

Let it not be supposed that those who have struggled on the one hand to open the eyes of the nation, and on the other to arrest the career of this man, and to bring him to condign punishment, rejoice in his death. As they have looked upon his retirement from office as the gravest of disasters, in like manner must they consider as such his disappearance from the scene. Their aim has been that he should be known. They have had to show in respect to his colleagues that his was the active hand, and that thus his colleagues were but masks. This was the great difficulty at the beginning, as he was considered an insignificant person. Then it had to be shown that the other party came in merely to do his work, and to be compromised thereby. So in respect to his death, not having paid the penalty of his misdeeds, he withdraws the means of conviction in his own person, and leaves a course of conduct established and a tradition for others obtusely and unconsciously to follow. Whilst LORD PALMERSTON lived, acts could be brought home to the man. Whilst he was here, and acting, he could be forced into speech, and dragged into explanations. His words always furnished, for those who knew how to use them, the most important of all events. His mind was so full of his subject, that he could not speak but to the point, whether in regard to denial or explanation. When he denied, there were his own words at another time, there were his own acts to establish the evidence of falsehood, which at least was within the comprehension of the meanest capacity. All these means of bringing the truth to light have disappeared. What remains but chaos, when explanations have to be furnished by others?

Besides, there was his conscience. This

may appear a strange word in these columns. Nothing can be more sure and certain. LORD PALMERSTON had a conscience, as we will prove. It may be explained by another word; it may be called "fear." But, however designated or qualified, it is certain that confessions could be extorted from him through the emotions of his own mind. This was reckoned on, and acted on, by those who have succeeded in collecting a mass of evidence, which, if unavailable for the security of present times, will remain for the amazement of future generations. We give an instance.

When the question was put, *Are you altering the Succession to the Crown of Denmark?* LORD PALMERSTON staggered, as if he had received a blow. When he had recovered, the answer was an emphatic denial. That denial, which soon became a damning evidence, was attributable only to the emotions of his mind. Nothing would have been easier for a cool man than to have answered the question without compromising himself, and his peculiar parliamentary dexterity consisted in baffling questioners.

In *terms* the question was insignificant; the effect of it came from the common knowledge in the mind of the questioner and the questioned, that these, then secret negotiations, were carried on with a purpose of transferring the Crown of Denmark to Russia. This, of course, would not have happened had he been prepared for the question. And as Ministers are not held bound to answer questions of which notice has not been given, it will appear impossible that a Minister should thus have been taken by surprise. But the matter was managed in this way. Notice was given only of a question about the War in the Duchies, and when that question was put and answered, the questioner suddenly got up and put the other.

This occurred on the 20th of March, 1851.

On the 18th of June, 1861, another Member of the House of Commons introduced a Motion on Denmark. That Motion excited no alarm. So the House was suffered to be made, and the Member allowed to proceed with his speech, which produced no emotion on the Treasury Bench, until he arrived at a certain point, used certain words, and held up a certain paper. Then there was emotion; the signal was given; the Members from both sides slipped from their places; then one arose, requesting the Speaker to Count the House, and the House was Counted out!*

* Some time was, of course, requisite for accomplishing the Count-out, so that Lord R. Montagu had got on to another matter, and was uttering this sen-

The cause of this emotion was the citation by Lord ROBERT MONTAGU of the answer given by Lord PALMERSTON on the 20th of March, 1851, namely, that "Her Majesty's Government had studiously and systematically held themselves aloof from taking any share in these negotiations," namely, negotiations having for their object the alteration of the "Succession to the Crown of Denmark." After having done so he produced a Document, read it, and held it up to the House, stating that it was the original notes of a Protocol of a Conference held at the Foreign Office in Downing-street, and presided over by Lord PALMERSTON, for the alteration of the Danish Succession, dated June 2, 1850, that is to say nine months before the occasion on which he had answered a question, by denying that the English Government had participated in any such negotiations.

The Parliament or the Nation might be little capable of appreciating the operation itself. But there could have been no ambiguity in the minds of either, respecting this monstrous falsehood on the part of the Minister; and it was easy for the meanest capacity to infer from that falsehood, the nature of the transaction. A Count-out was immediately had recourse to, as the only means by which Lord PALMERSTON could escape from having to rise and give an answer, which must have been a humiliating confession, or a ridiculous excuse.

But again this confession—for the Count-out amounted to a confession—was only brought about by a surprise, to which no successor can now be exposed. This Danish Debate had been promoted and carried into effect through the efforts of the Foreign Affairs Committees. A Deputation from them had waited upon the leading members of both Houses of Parliament, and a Memoir by them had been largely distributed, and extensively read. When Lord PALMERSTON was in possession of this Document he had the notes for his reply; and doubtless had thereupon prepared one which would have been triumphant, as in the case of his reply in the DON PACIFICO Debate, to Sir JAMES GRAHAM, who had sent him, the night before, the notes of his Speech. But somehow, in the Memoir of the Foreign Affairs Committees, all mention had been omitted of his answer of March 30, 1851, and the Memoir was likewise unconscious of the existence of

such a Document as the Protocol of June 2, 1850.

The Protocol of August, 1850 (which was the completion of the Draft dated June, 1850), did indeed appear in the list of Documents to be moved for. But then, when the Treaty itself had become a matter of past history, and the whole case as regards the Succession had been so ingeniously swamped in an interminable correspondence about the internal affairs of Schleswig-Holstein, this could cause no alarm to Lord PALMERSTON. The only thing he had to dread was the conviction of falsehood, brought home to him by his denial, of March 1851, being connected with the existence of that Protocol.

Had the Memoir contained the remotest reference to the one or to the other, the Speech of Lord R. MONTAGU would never have been made. For either a House would not have been made, or it would have been counted out as soon as he rose. A Count-out can indeed only be managed by the concurrence of the leaders of both parties. But the Opposition was in this case as much concerned as the Government, or indeed more so, as it was the signature of Lord MALMESBURY and not of Lord PALMERSTON that was appended to the Treaty of the 8th of May, 1852.

The two incidents, whilst they establish that Lord PALMERSTON had a conscience, connect that conscience with his secret services to Russia. They contain in themselves the whole history of the Danish case, and show whence it emanated, by what means it was executed, and whom it was to benefit. We publish in another column a Despatch which will corroborate these words to the letter. That Despatch, signed PALMERSTON, goes beyond the Treaty of May, 1852, whilst dated not only before the question referred to, but even before the Protocol—namely, February 19, 1850.

The Protocol and the subsequent Treaty only effected such an alteration in the Succession as removed obstacles in the way of the ultimate heirship of Russia; and this is covered under the assumption of keeping her out. But the prior Despatch of Lord PALMERSTON addressed to the Danish Government, is a simple proposal of handing over to her at once both Denmark and the Duchies by a testamentary act of the King. The name of the Duke of OLDENBURG is, indeed, inserted. But the Duke of OLDENBURG is only a tenant at will of Russia, who is the real Proprietor of the Grand Duchy, and he is, besides, a *Junior* Member of the House of Russia. It was only because of

tence, when he was stopped: "It is a still more extraordinary discovery, that the abolition of the *Lex Regia* should also have been due to the Noble Viscount."

the resistance of the King, that there was any necessity for having recourse to the London Protocol, the Warsaw Protocol, and the London Treaty. That is to say, to those Negotiations from which the English Government had kept carefully aloof.

In the case of Denmark, we have every other case. Lord PALMERSTON did not yield Russia his services in simple gaiety of heart; there must have been constraint used; such constraint must have equally determined every act of his Stewardship, and weighed upon every moment of his life. "The key that opens one box, opens every box; and there is no other key that opens any box. That key is Treason." Such was the description of the state of England given in 1842 by Sir FRANCIS BURDETT.

We have said that the death of Lord PALMERSTON will become no loss to Russia. We may even go further, and say, it may be a great gain to her. It may be in her mind to cause the apparent policy of England to alter in an important respect, wherein the line hitherto apparently assumed by Lord PALMERSTON might have been a great inconvenience, whether as keeping him at the head of affairs, or removing him thence.

Whilst Lord PALMERSTON's success and security depended upon his being considered the enemy and antagonist of Russia, his fame and reputation have been made out of that antagonism.* This enmity to her was accounted for by his being the "Friend of Poland," and the "Friend of Turkey." Now that Poland is gone, and that the competing supply of grain from the Western States of America has been arrested, Turkey has to be considered by the Russian Government. Considered, not in the sense of projects of aggrandisement to be carried out, but dangers to be averted. What signify her Danish Treaties, what signifies her domination in Europe, what signifies her advance in Central Asia and on the Amoor, unless the old Ottoman Lion be bridled? To insert the bit her own arm is utterly powerless. With Lord PALMERSTON, the "friend of Turkey," it was possible to combine a War of Collusion, and to bring the Armies of Europe on the soil of Turkey, to save her, Russia, from destruction. That game cannot be played twice. The Turks will not forget in a hurry the lesson they have learned. If, then, she be under the necessity of having recourse to exterior aid to break down that growing prosperity of the Ottoman Empire, which of

itself, and without external movement, must cause her resources to fail and her strength to decay, it must be in the guise of enemies and not of friends that she must draw again the Armies of Europe on the Ottoman soil. And then, as distinctly foreshown by her, in her communications with the PORTÉ during the last Collusive War, she will step in as Mediator and Protector. Here we touch the pivot, upon which must revolve the events of the future. For a project of this nature Lord PALMERSTON was wholly disqualified by his antecedents.

Nor can we omit, on such an occasion, to commemorate the change effected in the material condition of the great majority of the human race during the last thirty-five years. This change, which has diminished the value of labour and of life, has been effected by a double process, the first the shutting up of the sources of supply of those articles of first necessity on the sale of which Russia depends; the second, the continual state of dread of war and convulsion; whence, increase of charges—that is, of taxes. The charges of government (independent of interest of debt) have been multiplied in England nearly threefold.* France is not better off, whilst in Italy the augmentation bears in the same proportion on the whole amount of the taxes.† Such is the fine we have paid for neglecting our affairs, for had the method, followed of necessity in the smallest matters, been observed in the gravest, that system which we owe to the introduction of the name of Lord PALMERSTON into the list of Lord GREY's cabinet, and which was immediately followed by the betrayal of Poland, could never have commenced to run its course.

There is, however, one consideration of an opposite character. There is one point on

* In 1835 these amounted to 15,884,648*l.*; in 1860, to 38,322,592*l.*, exclusive of 3,800,000*l.* for the China War.—See *Free Press* for July, 1865, p. 58.

† Taking the middle term of the increase between 1835 and the present year at 10,000,000*l.*, we shall have the sum expended of 300,000,000*l.* This is to prove a permanent charge at the present increased rate, that is 20,000,000*l.*, which would represent a redeemable charge, at 5 per cent., of 400,000,000*l.* This does not include the extra charges of actual warfare, whether as paid by England or other countries. The cost to England of Lord Palmerston cannot, therefore, be set down at much less than a thousand millions sterling. When he commenced, and before the Reform Bill, the country was in the way of reducing Expenditure. He is, therefore, an enormous loss, and the lamentations that have been printed upon his death may be thus fully accounted for. The interest of the Press is exactly the reverse of that of the Nation, its importance and prosperity depends on the amount of expenditure; that is to say, on the News which gives rise to it.

* "We could scarcely keep him decently civil to the Russian Ambassador," said Lord Brougham, on the Affairs of Poland.

which the mind may rest without trouble, and from which even hope may arise. It is that the death of Lord PALMERSTON has preceded that of the QUEEN. The QUEEN, while yet in the enjoyment of her faculties and power, now at length relieved and emancipated,* may exert herself, and not without effect, in discharging those anxious duties which even at this hour have only to be discharged with a discriminating knowledge of individuals, and a just appreciation of circumstances, to redeem the State from the perils which threaten it.

PROPOSAL BY LORD PALMERSTON IN 1850 OF THE DUKE OF OLDEN- BURG FOR DENMARK.

THE Despatch on Denmark referred to in the Article on the death of Lord PALMERSTON requires, for its bearing to be understood, that it be known, or rather remembered, that the Treaty of 1852, and the negotiations which led to it, are placed before the world as if originating with the King of DENMARK. This Despatch shows that the terms of the Treaty conveying this impression are deceptive and false, and that the proposal for altering the Succession originated with Lord PALMERSTON.

The Despatch is not written in reply to any proposition from the Danish Government. It is not an interchange of communications on the subject with other Powers. It is an original proposition from the English Minister, made absolutely and vehemently. The instruction is "*to press strongly on the Danish Government.*" This is at a moment when a war of the most exhausting and exasperating character was being carried on between Denmark and the Duchies, and in which the English Government had undertaken to arbitrate.

The particular alteration of the Succession which Lord PALMERSTON undertakes to force on the Danish Government disappears from view from that time (the King of DENMARK having refused to accept of it) until quite recently. After a lapse of fifteen years, and after all the course of these negotiations, convulsions, partitions, wars, and occupations has been run through, does it come out again, as *the proposal of Russia*. At the Conference of London in June, 1864, Russia announced that she had resigned her claims in favour of the Grand-Duke of OLDENBURG. On the 19th of February, 1850, Lord PALMERSTON pressed strongly on the Danish Government

the choice of the son of the Grand-Duke of OLDENBURG as the successor to the Crown of Denmark, as the means of settling a matter in which there was nothing to settle, beyond pretensions of the Emperor of RUSSIA.

It will be seen in this Despatch that Lord PALMERSTON speaks as being in the confidence of the Emperor of RUSSIA, for he says that he would renounce his claims in favour of the Prince of OLDENBURG, "*if that Prince were to succeed to the Crown of Denmark;*" and "might not be equally disposed to do so in any other case." It is a repetition, even to the selection of the terms, of the language he used in reference to Greece in 1830, which led Sir R. PEEL to ask whose Representative he was, and in whose interest he acted.

That Lord PALMERSTON was in this case coercing Denmark at the instigation of Russia, appears not merely from this Document, but also from the declaration of the President of the Council, Lord LANSDOWNE, who in 1850 innocently explained to the House of Lords the reciprocal position of the two Governments of England and Russia in regard to these very affairs. He said, "The most intimate communications with respect to everything that occurs *affecting the Powers of the North, and more particularly affecting them at this moment*, are constantly taking place between the Russian and the British Governments, WE AVAILING OURSELVES OF THE SUGGESTIONS OF RUSSIA, and Russia expressing her confidence and reliance in our views, and advising other Powers to follow the course and adopt the sentiments SUGGESTED BY US."

That Denmark needed coercing appears not only in the words, "press strongly on the Danish Government," but also in the reference to the Danish King's "personal feelings," which are to be overridden because "this is a matter *which affects great European interests.*"

From the statement of Lord LANSDOWNE, it may be supposed that the Colleagues of Lord PALMERSTON were at the time cognisant of these transactions, that this Despatch was written after deliberation in Council, and that the decision was taken with the consent, as it could only be executed by the authority of the QUEEN. In this case Lord PALMERSTON might have influenced the judgment of his Colleagues and the QUEEN, but he would not have been secretly coercing a Foreign Power in the name of England, and compromising his country and Sovereign to a course with which both were unacquainted. This inference would, however, be incorrect.

* "The noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs has passed by the Crown and put himself in the place of the Crown."—Lord John Russell, Feb. 3, 1852.

The explanation of the words of Lord LANS-DOWNE is to be found in a subsequent confidence made to him, to prepare him for the speech he had to deliver. That the QUEEN and his Colleagues were, at the time that this Despatch was written, and long afterwards, kept in ignorance of its existence, is put beyond question by two incidents. The one, the answer given by Lord PALMERSTON in the March of the following year in the House of Commons; the other, the Memorandum of the QUEEN read by Lord JOHN RUSSELL in February, 1852. In March, 1851, Lord PALMERSTON said "that Her Majesty's Government had *studiously and systematically* kept themselves aloof from any negotiations, &c."

The terms here selected are most remarkable, and could only have been fallen upon under some strong necessity. What that necessity could be does not appear from any known circumstances belonging to the month of March, 1851. But when, in February, 1852, the Queen's Memorandum appeared, and when it became known that the date of that document was August, 1850, then that necessity at once appears. It was that of concealing from the QUEEN what he was doing in Denmark.

The occasion of the Memorandum was the discovery made by the QUEEN that Lord PALMERSTON had been obtaining her sanction to measures she did not comprehend, from the indistinct manner in which he had stated them; that he had arbitrarily altered or modified measures to which her sanction had been given; further, that she was not kept informed of what passed between him and foreign Ministers.

The event which preceded the Memorandum, and upon which consequently it bore, was the Assemblage of a Conference in the Foreign Office in Downing-street to alter the Succession to the Crown of Denmark. The QUEEN did not confine herself to mere words. She announced the intention of expelling the Minister. Of course the execution of that threat at that moment would have disturbed an operation at once of the greatest magnitude and the greatest delicacy. No less than the escape from Russia of that European Crown on which she had almost closed her grasp, might have been the result. The threat of dismissal was contingent, for its execution, on the engagement of the Minister to change his conduct. It was of course implied that he should renounce his projects. So that at the moment that he rose to answer the question suddenly put to him in March, 1851, "Are you disturbing

the Succession to the Crown of Denmark?" his answer had to be made conformable to the engagement that he had taken towards the QUEEN in the previous August; the terms of which were conveyed by Lord J. RUSSELL to the House at the same time that he read the Memorandum, and are these. "I have taken a copy of the Memorandum of the QUEEN; and will not fail to attend to the directions it contains."

THE PROPOSITION OF 1850.

LORD PALMERSTON TO SIR H. WYNNE.

Foreign Office, Feb. 19, 1850.

SIR,—I have to instruct you to *press strongly on the Danish Government the great importance of settling without delay the question as to the succession to the Crown of Denmark, which is the key to the whole of the questions pending between Denmark and Germany.*

If the Danish Government could so settle the succession to the Danish Crown as to *insure the continuance of the sovereignty of Denmark, and of both the Duchies in one and the same person*, it is manifest that all the other questions connected with the future government and organisation of the Duchies would become of secondary importance, and the solution of them would be rendered much more easy. As long as there is a likelihood that in consequence of the difference which now exists between the Law of Succession in Denmark and the Law of Succession in Holstein, Holstein will, after the termination of the present reign in Denmark, be separated from the Danish Crown, and become a purely German Duchy, so long will the Germans strive to the utmost to attach as firmly as possible to Holstein as large a portion as possible of the Duchy of Schleswig; in order that some portion of Schleswig may on the dismemberment of the Danish monarchy, follow the fortunes of Holstein, and become essentially German; and as long as there shall be foreseen a likelihood of such a result, so long will the Danish party at Copenhagen not only strive to make the separation between Schleswig and Holstein as complete and firm as possible, even to the injury of the material interests of the two Duchies, but so long will they also endeavour to escape from the plain meaning of the basis adopted by the preliminary Treaty for the final arrangement of these matters, and try to connect Schleswig with Denmark as intimately and closely as possible.

But if once the continuance of the political union between both Duchies and Denmark were secured by a settlement of the Crown of Denmark in favour of some Prince who would equally succeed to Holstein and to Schleswig, then motives for such conflicting endeavours would cease, and the contending parties would become more reasonable and more likely to concur in some equitable arrangement.

Her Majesty's Government have hitherto purposely declined to make any suggestion in regard to a matter which involves so many considerations peculiarly regarding Denmark and His Danish Majesty's personal feelings; but nevertheless, *as this is a matter which affects also great European interests, you should confidentially ask the Danish Minister whether any, and if any, what objections are felt by the King of DENMARK to choose the son of the Duke of OLDENBURG as successor to the Crown of Denmark.*

There seem to be many circumstances which

would point out that Prince as an eligible choice for such a purpose. He would, *it is understood*, succeed equally to Holstein, and of course also to Schleswig, and the private possessions of the House of Oldenburg would enable him to make arrangements which would provide eventual compensation to other parties for any disappointment which such an arrangement might produce for them.

The Imperial family of Russia would, as is well known, have claims upon certain portions of Holstein in the event of the *extinction of the male line in Denmark*, and *it is understood* that the Emperor of Russia would be disposed to renounce those claims in favour of the Prince of Oldenburg, *if that Prince were to succeed to the Crown of Denmark*; whereas *the Emperor might not be equally disposed to do so in any other case*. Her Majesty's Government have heard that the King of Denmark rather inclines to settle the Danish Crown upon a younger son of the King of Sweden, and Her Majesty's Government would be glad to be confidentially informed whether this is so, and what are supposed to be the relative advantages which would arise from such a choice, as compared with the choice of the Prince of Oldenburg, both as regards the feelings of the Danes and as regards the facilities which such a choice would give for the present settlement of pending questions, and for keeping the Danish Monarchy together for the future.

I am, &c.,
PALMERSTON.*

* Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Denmark, 1850-53, pp. 1, 2, presented to Parliament 1864.

THE DENIAL OF 1851.

House of Commons, March 20, 1851.

Mr. URQUHART "begged then to ask, further, whether in this correspondence there had been any negotiation as to the succession to the Crown of Denmark, or in respect to the succession in the Duchies?"

Viscount PALMERSTON: "A good deal had passed in regard to these points, that was to say, in regard to the *succession to the Crown of Denmark*; and, as connected with that, in regard to the arrangements for the *order of succession in Schleswig and Holstein*. But *Her Majesty's Government had studiously and systematically held themselves aloof from taking any share in these negotiations*. Her Majesty's Government have confined themselves strictly to the Mediation which they undertook, which was a Mediation for the purpose of bringing about a restoration of peace between Denmark and the German Confederation."*

* Hansard. See also the *Free Press* for July 3, 1861, p. 87.

Appendix.

No. 1.

Sayings and Doings of Sir John Bowring.

MEMOIR OF THE ST. PANCRAS FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.

SIR JOHN BOWRING, presiding at a meeting for Financial Reform and Free Trade, at Exeter, January 20, said :—

“He believed that the Divine Being, when He made the Zodiac; when He gave the different lands different powers and different productions, taught and wrote in letters of light this as a beneficent Christian law: ‘What they have in excess, let them give to you; and what you have in excess, give to them in payment.’ (Applause.) It was the duty of all nations to aid, serve, and bless their neighbours, for all were bound together in the common links of brotherhood. Each should look on the face of a foreigner as on the face of a friend—prosperity and peace would then stand upon foundations which would never be shaken. (Cheers.)”*

Sir JOHN BOWRING is notorious chiefly as Superintendent of Trade in China. Could the Chinese look on his face as on that of a friend? He interfered with their Government, and, when they objected, he bombarded their City of Canton. Governor YEH has given to the world the impressions thus created among his countrymen.

“The Englishmen, this race of dogs and bears, unpolite, and destitute of proper manners in society, who, like wolves and tigers, are greedy, intemperate, bloodthirsty, and beastly, and human and divine justice despising, incessantly wander from one place to another, and settle like a swarm of carcase-crows, have come forward from their infernal dwellings to us; they treat our heavenly imperial throne with contempt, and took, in a moment when our troops were not prepared for it, possession of our fortifications, burnt the houses and shops of our merchants, and carried on their hellish malice to the utmost.”†

The speech given above is not the first that Sir JOHN BOWRING has made since his return

to this country. On the 23rd of November, 1859, he read a paper before the Society of Arts on “China and its relations to British Commerce.” In acknowledging a vote of thanks, he accounted for the Canton Massacre as follows :—

“The honour of the British Flag was confided to me, and I certainly had a strong opinion that where such vast interests were concerned, where such multitudes of human beings looked to that flag as their protection, it did not become me to deliver up a single individual who believed himself to be protected by that flag to that Commissioner, who, at that period, was decapitating six hundred or seven hundred human beings a day. I do say that if I had done what I was told I ought to have done, I should have allowed these men to be victimised by the tender mercies of that cruel tyrant who has poured out more human blood on the scaffold than any man that ever existed in human history. I do repeat that if I had delivered up these Chinese, who, under the British flag, believed they were entitled to my protection, and had waited for instructions from home before I menaced Commissioner YEH for a violation of the Treaty, I should have had no bed of repose, and I do not believe that any Englishman in my position would have acted differently.”*

Here are three grounds of defence brought forward :—

1. That the bombardment of Canton was undertaken in defence of the British flag.

2. That this bombardment was necessary, in order to protect certain Chinese, namely, the crew of the lorcha *Arrow*.

3. That none of these men were delivered to the “cruel tyrant” Governor YEH.

Every one of these statements is false.

1. The lorcha *Arrow* had no right to use the British flag, consequently the honour of that flag could not be tarnished by the disregard of it by the Chinese Government. For this the authority is Sir JOHN BOWRING himself. He wrote to Sir HARRY SMITH

* Financial Reformer, February, 1865.

† Free Press, vol. iv., p. 284.

* Journal of the Society of Arts, 25th of November, 1859.

PARKES a few days before the bombardment, namely, on the 11th October, 1856.

"It appears, on examination, that the *Arrow* had no right to hoist the British flag."^{*}

Nevertheless, on the 14th, Sir JOHN BOWRING wrote to Governor YEH :—

"There is no doubt that the lorch *Arrow* lawfully bore the British flag."[†]

On this General THOMPSON remarked, in a letter to the Sheffield Foreign Affairs Committee, April 4, 1857 :—

"Diplomacy has had the character of being tortuous and insincere; but it is the first time it ever began by saying, 'We lied, and we knew we lied.'"[‡]

MR. STAPLETON, Secretary to Mr. CANNING, emerged from his long retirement, to brand this transaction with the infamy it deserved, saying :—

"They (the British authorities) drew the sword, and the justification which they put forth was an acknowledged lie."[§]

2. The Bombardment could not have been necessary for the protection of the men, since they were all given up before the Bombardment. A full account of the matter is to be found in the letters of Sir H. S. PARKES in the Blue Book. Sir JOHN BOWRING is secure in the ignorance of his hearers of the contents of this Blue Book. The Chinese sent back ten men who were innocent. Had the object been to protect British subjects, Sir H. S. PARKES would have kept them, and demanded the other two. He sent them back again, and asked for the twelve. The twelve were then sent. If force was allowable, this was the time to exercise it, by retaining the men. They were sent back! The statement would be incredible were it not made by the person incriminated. Sir H. S. PARKES wrote, October 22, 1856 :—

"As to the surrender of the men, his Excellency offered early this morning to give up ten of them, but twelve having been seized, I declined to receive a smaller number. *He then forwarded the twelve*, but not in the manner required in my letter of the 8th, and demanded that I should at once return two of them, without any 'proper officer' being deputed to conduct with me the necessary examination. *I again declined to receive them* on these conditions, or in any other manner than that described in my letter of the 8th, and THE MEN WERE AGAIN TAKEN AWAY. Finally, no apology of any kind has been tendered."^{||}

3. The men *were all* delivered up to the Chinese.

This is clear from the letter just quoted. At some future time we shall probably be told that, after all, the men were sent back to the British authorities. Considering the facility of speech shown by Sir JOHN BOWRING, it is remarkable that this statement was not made in the Blue Book. The frank

avowal therein contained that the men were given up to the Chinese, demonstrates that no consideration for their safety had even entered the minds of Sir JOHN BOWRING and Sir H. S. PARKES.

It was not the men who were wanted, but the quarrel.*

In his speech at the Society of Arts, however, Sir JOHN BOWRING did not state the points we have just refuted, he only insinuated them. He carefully avoided positively saying either that the crew of the *Arrow* had a right to his protection, or that he did not give them up to the Chinese.

We have been led to this subject by the connection which Sir JOHN BOWRING has established between himself and the Liverpool Financial Reform Association. It was at a meeting convened to hear an address from a Member of their Council that he made the speech of which an extract is given at the commencement of this Memoir.

The Liverpool Financial Reform Association has for seventeen years demanded a return to one of the ancient customs by which the Government was controlled, namely, the directness of taxation. Nay, more, though this has been specially proposed as a necessary part of freedom of trade, as it undoubtedly is, the still more important object of obtaining good government has not been lost sight of, and it has been very clearly explained that if the people had to pay their taxes directly, they would not pay for the piratical proceedings which, from Central America to China, have in late years covered with infamy the British name.

It is therefore with extreme concern that we learn that this Association, by a vote of thanks to Sir JOHN BOWRING for his speech at Exeter, has renounced its principles and abdicated its character.

Sir JOHN BOWRING did not act in China of his own mere motion. He did not invent the Massacre at Canton. He acted on orders from home. The first despatch announcing that hostilities had taken place, or were expected, reached London January 3, 1857.[†]

On the 23rd January, 1857, Sir MICHAEL SEYMOUR wrote :—

"In about a month I may begin to look for the

* The diplomatic history of the Canton Massacre will be found in the *Free Press* for September 28, 1859, pages 90-1, beginning with the words in the second column of p. 90, "On the 3rd of March, 1855," and ending in the first column of p. 91, with the words, "Commerce, Christianity, and civilisation."

† Papers relating to the proceedings of Her Majesty's Forces at Canton, p. 19.

^{*} Canton Papers, p. 10.

[†] *Ibid*, p. 89.

[‡] *Free Press*, vol. iv., p. 287.

[§] *Ibid*, p. 217.

^{||} Canton Papers, p. 32.

arrival of some of my expected steamers and gunboats.*

These gunboats and steamers had to go round the Cape of Good Hope.

On the 3rd February, 1857, in the debate on the Address, Mr. DISRAELI said:—

“The question of China appears to be in the same category as that of Persia; and I cannot resist the conviction that what has taken place in China has not been in consequence of the alleged protest, but is, in fact, in consequence of *instructions received from home* some considerable time ago. If that be the case, I think the time has arrived when this House would not be doing its duty unless it earnestly considered whether it has any means for checking and controlling a system, which, if pursued, will be one, in my mind, fatal to the interests of this country.”

Lord PALMERSTON replied:—

“Now, as to Persia and China, the right honourable Gentleman (Mr. DISRAELI) says, the course of events there appeared to be the result of *some system predetermined by the Government at home*. Undoubtedly it was.”

Sir JOHN BOWRING was therefore selected for this work. But that work is not confined to foreign parts. In destroying, by his patronage, one of the very few organisations of resistance at home, he is equally useful to his employers. He claims, indeed, to be a veteran reformer. The following extract from the Foreign Office List for 1863 shows that he is a veteran placeman:

BOWRING, Sir JOHN, Knt., was nominated by the Government to proceed to the Low Countries, in 1828, to examine into the manner of keeping the public accounts. Was engaged in a similar mission to France, in 1830, with the late Sir HENRY PARNELL (afterwards Lord CONGLETON). Served in 1831 with Mr. VILLIERS (now Earl of CLARENDON), as Commercial Commissioner in France, to arrange the basis of a Treaty of Commerce with that country. Unsuccessfully contested Blackburn in 1832 and 1835. Was appointed one of His MAJESTY'S Commissioners for inquiring into the state of registers of births, deaths, and marriages, not being parochial registers, in England and Wales, September, 13, 1836. Was returned M.P. for Kilmarnock in 1835, and for Bolton in 1841 and 1847. Was appointed Consul in the city of Canton, in the province of Kwangtung, January 10, 1849; acted as HER MAJESTY'S Plenipotentiary and Chief Superintendent of British Trade in China from April, 1852, till February, 1853; was appointed to that post December 24, 1853, and Governor and Commander in and over the colony of Hong Kong, January 10, 1854. Retired upon a superannuation allowance, July 17, 1859, and was awarded a special allowance, by a Treasury Minute, dated August 17, 1859. Is a Knight of the Order of Christ of Portugal. Was accredited to the King of the NETHERLANDS, and to the Emperor of the FRENCH by King KAMEHAMEHA of the Hawaiian Islands, in 1862.

How this unfortunate conjuncture of Patriot and Placeman has been brought about, can only be inferred.

Some months ago the Chancellor of the

Exchequer visited Liverpool. An address from the Financial Reform Association was read to him, in which he was roundly taken to task for reducing the Income Tax, and was exhorted to retrace his steps, and abolish indirect taxation. The reply of Mr. GLADSTONE was that he would not discuss the subject unless the reader of the address would guarantee him a majority in the House of Commons in favour of his views.

The Association had to be looked to—like Buenos Ayres—and it has been looked to accordingly. The same gentleman who read the lecture to Mr. GLADSTONE, and who is one of the most respected, earnest, and energetic citizens of Liverpool, is the same who at Exeter has been prevailed on to associate his name with that of Sir JOHN BOWRING.

Signed by order of the Committee and on their behalf,

C. D. COLLET, *Chairman.*

C. F. JONES, *Secretary.*

March 31, 1865.

No. 2.

The Financial Reform Association and Mr. Urquhart.

[From the *Free Press* of June 7, 1865.]

THE *Financial Reformer* for May, 1865, contained the following remarks on the Memoir of the St. Pancras Foreign Affairs Committee on Sir JOHN BOWRING, which was inserted in the last number of this paper:—

“RENUNCIATION AND ABDICATION EXTRAORDINARY.—The London *Free Press*, the organ of Mr. DAVID URQUHART, has made a most remarkable discovery, one which may even match with the revelation that Lord PALMERSTON, being totally cleaned out of land and fortune, by losses at a gaming-house, was then and there, or shortly afterwards, pounced upon by the PRINCESS LIEVEN with a bribe of 30,000*l.*, and became thenceforth, what the *Free Press* believes him still, viz. the bond slave and tool of Russia, working everywhere, even when fighting against her, as in the Crimea, in furtherance of Russian aggrandisement. The discovery is, that, albeit we have hitherto done good service in advocating direct taxation as the means of securing both economical government and freedom of trade, the Financial Reform Association has now, ‘by a vote of thanks to Sir JOHN BOWRING for his speech at Exeter, renounced its principles, and abdicated its character!’ And all on account of Sir JOHN’S ‘sayings and doings’ in China! There, it seems, Sir JOHN only ‘acted on orders from home;’ and now he has been called from his retirement to emmesh us in Palmerstonian toils! ‘In destroying, by his patronage,’ says Mr. C. D. COLLET, as Chairman of the St. Pancras Foreign Affairs Committee, ‘one of the very few organisa-

* Further Papers, p. 32.

tions of resistance at home, he (Sir JOHN to wit) is equally useful to his employers. But the vote of thanks is not the only *premiss* on which this most astute of plot finders and logicians founds his conclusions that our principles are gone, and our character lost beyond redemption. After stating that, some months ago, we presented an address to the CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, he winds up with this awfully mysterious, and tremendously impressive announcement: 'The Association had to be looked to—like Buenos Ayres—and it has been looked to accordingly. The same gentleman who read the lecture to Ms. GLADSTONE, and who is one of the most respected, earnest, and energetic citizens of Liverpool, is the same who, at Exeter, has been prevailed on to associate his name with that of Sir JOHN BOWRING.' Where shall we hide ourselves, or what will become of us, when the detective who can spy, or smell mischief through half a dozen millstones, discovers that we have been 'looked to' a second time by Sir JOHN, acting, no doubt, as the agent of Lord PALMERSTON, in furtherance of some deep scheme, or villanous machination of the Emperor of all the RUSSIAS? These Urquhartine or Collettian phantoms hight 'Foreign Affairs Committees, have their eyes upon us, and our betrayers. One proof of this is afforded by the St. Pancras manifesto, and we have another in private letters addressed by a deputy-secretary of the Bolton Committee to some of our best friends there, calling upon them to protest against our 'connexion with Sir JOHN BOWRING, formally member of' Bolton; and to ask us how we can reconcile the 'bombardment' of Canton with the objects we have in view? We really don't see the necessity for any such reconciliation, or by what species of reasoning, other than Urquhartine, a vote of thanks for a capital free trade speech can be twisted into an approval of said 'bombardment.' We know not 'wether' we shall be forgiven if we recommend a tolerable knowledge of the art of spelling as a desirable qualification for the secretary of a 'Foreign Affairs Committee;' but we venture to submit the recommendation, notwithstanding."

As a correspondence is now pending in reference to this article, we abstain from remarking upon it, further than to say, that it is not true that the *Free Press* has put forward the allegations against Lord PALMERSTON referred to. With two exceptions, the *Free Press*, as published in London at present, and for the last nine years, does not contain a line upon the subject. One of these exceptions is an article quoted in 1858 from the *Birmingham Journal* on the appointment of Lord CLANRICARDE.* The other is a reprint in the same year of an article from the *Free Press*, as published at Sheffield nearly three years before, entitled "The Bright Imposture."†

We are authorised by Mr. URQUHART to state, that it is not true that he is the originator of any such allegations. That so far from such being the case, he has used his influence to prevent the story from being spread or dwelt upon. But that it is true

that the Government which succeeded that of which Lord PALMERSTON was a member, did, through one of its departments, make a communication to him, in the presence of witnesses, of a charge of bribery against Lord PALMERSTON, intending him to publish it, which he refused to do.

In confirmation of the above, we add the answer given by Mr. URQUHART to the question of the Newcastle Foreign Affairs Committee, when they asked him why he had suppressed the charge, which answer appears in the course of a correspondence between that Committee and the Financial Reform Association in 1855.

"Q. Why did you decline?"

"A. Because my charges against Lord PALMERSTON bore upon his acts, and I could have nothing to do with a matter such as this. Not only did I decline making use of the information so tendered, but during these thirteen years, I have never mentioned the incident, until recently called upon to state whether such and such a thing had taken place. I must add that the matter had not for us the importance which it seems to have now for you."

In a subsequent letter to the Chairman of the Newcastle Committee, dated January 16, 1856, Mr. URQUHART says:—

"As to your question respecting my belief in the same (the charge), I have difficulty in giving an answer. I rejected the evidence when tendered to me at the time, and therefore I have no means of knowing on what it rests. It could not awaken interest in my mind, because it proved to me nothing new. All I can now say is this: that I am persuaded of there being grounds for the charge, by the falsehood of Mr. MCGREGOR, and by the reserve of Mr. GLADSTONE, especially when taken in conjunction with the fact that no legal proceedings have been taken, either by Lord PALMERSTON or by HART."

The sum alleged to have been given was not 30,000*l.*, as stated in the *Reformer*, but 20,000*l.* We propose in our next number to reproduce the former correspondence on this subject with the Financial Reform Association.

No. 3.

The Financial Reform Association and the Foreign Affairs Committees.

[From the *Free Press* of October 4, 1865.]

No answer has been received from the President of the Financial Reform Association to the letter already published in this journal from the St. Pancras Committee. But the following notice appeared, as if addressed to a correspondent, in its organ, the *Financial Reformer*:—

* Vol. VI. p. 16.

† Vol. VI. p. 208.

"NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Mr. C. D. Collet.—This gentleman must excuse us for declining to discuss with him the questions to which he has devoted upwards of twenty-three columns of his paper, in the shape of a letter signed by another person, and seven columns more in the form of a leader. We are content to let his absurdly illogical assumption,—that the Association has 'renounced its principles and abdicated its character' by accepting the co-operation of Sir JOHN BOWRING, in furtherance of free-trade principles,—go for what it is worth, which must be just nothing in the estimation of all rational beings. And as to the rest of his minutely laboured lucubrations, epistolary or editorial, touching the alleged bribery of Lord PALMERSTON, and the opinions of Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. DAVID URQUHART, or anybody else thereabout, we attach to them equal value, and nothing more. We wish him, and his leader, and the mythical 'Committees on Foreign Affairs,' joy of all the mares' nests they have discovered, and doubt not that there are many more in store for their fertile and somewhat diseased imaginations. But as to discussing their merits with a gentleman who writes under a feigned signature, in order that he may quote largely from a pamphlet of his own composition, for which he was handsomely paid by the Association, and who, moreover, holds himself at liberty to quote from private letters never intended for publication, we should deem it worse than useless to enter into any controversy with such a disputant, even if there were no matters of importance pressing upon our attention and absorbing our space."—*Financial Reformer*, August, 1865.

Upon this the following letter was addressed to the President:—

MR. CRAWSHAY TO MR. HOLLAND.

Houghton Castle, Hexham, September 9, 1865.

SIR,—Having seen the paragraph in the *Financial Reformer* of August 1, addressed to Mr. COLLET, under the head of "Notices to Correspondents," I consider it my duty as one of the members of the "Committees on Foreign Affairs," mentioned in the same paragraph, to protest against the conduct of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association in thus wantonly insulting a body of men who have attempted much, and have accomplished something, for the common good.

As to Mr. COLLET himself, falsely and calumniously accused of writing under a feigned signature in order that he might quote largely from a pamphlet of his own composition for which he had been handsomely paid, &c. &c., I must first speak. The signature to the documents which you have received is not a feigned one. Mr. JONES is the Secretary of the Committee which addressed you. The quotations are not from the pamphlet "Black Mail to Russia," a pamphlet issued by the Liverpool Financial Reform Association, but from another pamphlet, called "The Substance of Black Mail to Russia," as stated in the letter of the Committee. But suppose the original pamphlet had been quoted, what could be the object of alleging that Mr. COLLET had been "handsomely paid" by your Association for writing it? Is this pamphlet not to be quoted because your Association paid for it? Is this not a reason on the contrary why it should be quoted as expressing your views? But it was not quoted. What is this, sir, but the invention of irrelevant circumstances for the purpose of personal insult as a means of escape from the discussion of important matters?

Is it your object to hold up Mr. COLLET to scorn

as a mercenary? Or do you mean that having once received your money, he ought not now to speak when in his judgment you are betraying the cause in the furtherance of which he served you? I know nothing, Sir, of Mr. COLLET's dealings with your Association. I do know of his dealings with ours. I know, and you know, of his labours in connexion with "The Association for the Repeal of the Tax on Newspapers and the Excise on Paper."

Mr. COLLET's public life has been a life of sacrifice. Mr. COLLET has given to his country everything that he had to give. Because he had not fortune to give you have insulted him.

But there is something more in question here. A personal insult to Mr. COLLET is your mode of dealing with an official communication from one of our Committees, addressed to the Liverpool Financial Reform Association through yourself as Chairman. You thus insult us at the same time. You besides call us "mythical." Now, sir, in judging of the claims of any voluntary association, such as ours or yours, to be treated, on the one hand, with respect, or on the other hand with contempt as an imposture, I think you cannot complain, if I propose as the grounds of such judgment, not the numbers, or the wealth, or the station of the individuals composing such an association; not even the sacrifices of time, of money, health, and of feelings, that such individuals may have made; but simply and solely the positive results that such an association may have attained. Taking my stand on this, out of many circumstances in the ten years history of the Foreign Affairs Associations, I will mention two only; the production of the unutilized Afghan despatches, and the abstinence of this country from going to war with Germany last year. As to the former case I refer you to Mr. HADFIELD, Mr. HADFIELD, and KAYE the historian; as to the latter, Mr. KINGLAKE and Mr. OSBORNE.

All that we claim is industry in diffusing information on these subjects. To those best able to speak, we refer you as to the value and the effect of our efforts. And in case you should make such inquiries, I beg particularly that you will couple Mr. URQUHART's name with the Committees. But I have no expectation that you will take such a course. The Liverpool Financial Reform Association had at one time an appreciation of the self-evident truth, that a nation which did not control what are called its "Foreign Affairs," could by no possibility control its finances. This was evinced by your denunciation of "Permanent Embassies," and the publication of Mr. COLLET's pamphlet "Black Mail to Russia." But now that the Association is ready to open its arms to the unscrupulous instrument in the commission of the crimes by which a "Permanent Embassy" was forced upon China, and has nothing but insult for the men who have stood in the gap against the principal contriver of these and other similar crimes, I feel but too well assured that my protest against your conduct may indeed be of use to others, but can be of no possible use to you, and that nothing can now save the Liverpool Financial Reform Association from concluding its history without having attained any one of the objects to attain which it was established.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

GEORGE CRAWSHAY.

The President of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association.

To the above letter no answer has, we understand, been received.