CHAPTER LXIV

CRADLES AT COURT

QUEEN VICTORIA had now accepted all the obligations and liabilities incident to marriage. She was the wife of her husband and yet she was living every hour of every busy day in the fierce light that beats upon a throne. She visited the Duke of Devonshire:

December 13, 1843: . . . All the people who have been at the Royal progress say there never was anything so grand as Chatsworth; and the Duke, albeit he would have willingly dispensed with this visit, treated the Queen right royally. He met her at the station and brought her in his own coach and six, with a coach and four following, and eight outriders. The finest sight was the illumination of the garden and the fountains; and after seeing the whole place covered with innumerable lamps and all the material of the illuminations, the guests were astonished and delighted when they got up the following morning not to find a vestige of them left, and the whole garden as trim and neat as if nothing had occurred. This was accomplished by Paxton, who got 200 men, set them to work, and worked with them the whole night till they had cleared away everything belonging to the exhibition of the preceding night. This was a great exploit in its way and produced a great effect. At Belvoir the Prince went hunting, and to the surprise of everybody acquitted himself in the field very creditably. He was supposed to be a very poor performer in this line, and, as Englishmen love manliness and dexterity in field sports, it will have raised him considerably in public estimation to have rode well after the hounds in Leicestershire.

December 13, 1843: . . . I was told a thing the other day in reference to these junketings, which I never have heard a whisper of before, but whether there is anything in it or not, time will show. It was that the Queen has been in a restless state, always wanting to go somewhere, and do something,

and that it was thought advisable to let the excitement find a vent in these excursions. It is certainly remarkable that from the time Parliament broke up till now, she has been with only short intervals in a constant state of locomotion, first in France, then in Belgium, then at Cambridge (without any apparent reason), and now these recent visits.

January 14, 1844: Yesterday I heard that it is reported in the city that the Queen's mind is not in a right state. This is the same notion which Mrs. Drummond imparted to me, but which I have never heard of in any other quarter. It is curious, there are slight appearances, nothing in themselves very remarkable but which indicate restlessness, excitement, and nervousness.

February 26, 1840: . . . Adolphus Fitzclarence told me that at the Queen Dowager's party, when the Queen was going away, her shawl was not forthcoming and the Duchess of Bedford, her lady in waiting, could not find it. While she was looking, Lady Clinton did find it and went up with it, offering to put it on, but the Queen would not let her, and said it was for the Duchess of Bedford to do it, and when a moment later the latter returned, she said:

"Duchess of Bedford, I have been waiting some time for my shawl."

All this he saw and overheard. (Note: I rather doubt this being true, Adolphus Fitzclarence is rather a romancer.) . . . One day the Duchess was in the Queen's room with the Baroness, when the Queen said she knew that she was very wilful, when the Baroness (Lehzen) said:

"To know your faults is the first step toward correcting them."

This was honest, and it was well received, but her consciousness does not seem to produce amendment, and it was only the other day that Bedford says he is sure there was a battle between her and Melbourne. He overheard Melbourne say to her with great earnestness,

"No. For God's sake, don't do that."

Though he does not know what it was about; and he is sure there was one about the men's sitting after dinner, for he overheard her say to him rather angrily:

"It is a horrid custom."

But when the ladies left the room (he dined there) directions were given that the men should remain *five minutes* longer.

October 5, 1842: . . . The Baroness Lehzen has left Windsor Castle, and is gone abroad for her health (as she says), to stay five or six months, but it is supposed never to return. This lady, who is much beloved by the women and much esteemed and liked by all who frequent the Court, who is very intelligent, and has been a faithful and devoted servant to the Queen from her birth, has for some time been supposed to be obnoxious to the Prince, and as he is now all-powerful her retirement was not unexpected. I do not know the reason of it, nor how it has been brought about; Melbourne told me long ago that the Prince would acquire unbounded influence.

London, October 30, 1854: . . . Stockmar also told Granville a great deal about Conroy and the Baroness Lehzen. It was not without great difficulty that the Prince succeeded in getting rid of her. She was foolish enough to contest his influence and not to conform herself to the change in her position that the Queen's marriage necessarily occasioned. If she had done so, and conciliated the Prince, she might have remained in the Palace to the end of her life, for the Queen was attached to her and could not forget how she had assisted her in defending herself against the Duchess of Kent and Conroy.

There were signs that the Queen was responding to wise counsel:

March 12, 1840: . . . He [the Duke of Wellington] dined at the Palace on Monday, and was treated with the greatest civility by the Queen. Indeed, she has endeavoured to repair her former coldness by every sort of attention and graciousness, to which he is by no means insensible.

After all, the Queen was subject to sudden emergencies:

June 12, 1840: On Wednesday afternoon, as the Queen and Prince Albert were driving in a low carriage up Constitution Hill, about four or five in the afternoon, they were shot at by a lad of eighteen years old, who fired two pistols at them successively, neither shots taking effect. He was in the Green Park without the rails, and as he was only a few yards from the carriage, and, moreover, very cool and collected, it is marvellous

he should have missed his aim. In a few moments the young man was seized, without any attempt on his part to escape or to deny the deed, and was carried off to prison. The Queen, who appeared perfectly cool, and not the least alarmed, instantly drove to the Duchess of Kent's, to anticipate any report that might reach her mother, and, having done so, she continued her drive and went to the Park. By this time the attempt upon her life had become generally known, and she was received with the utmost enthusiasm by the immense crowd that was congregated in carriages, on horseback, and on foot. All the equestrians formed themselves into an escort and attended her back to the Palace, cheering vehemently, while she acknowledged, with great appearance of feeling, these loyal manifestations. She behaved on this occasion with perfect courage and self-possession, and exceeding propriety; and the assembled multitude, being a high-class mob, evinced a lively and spontaneous feeling for her—a depth of interest which, however natural under such circumstances, must be very gratifying to her, and was satisfactory to witness.

Yesterday morning the culprit was brought to the Home Office, when Normanby examined him, and a Council was summoned for a more personal examination at two o'clock. A question then arose as to the nature of the proceeding, and the conduct of the examination, whether it should be before the Privy Council or the Secretary of State. We search for precedents, and the result was this: The three last cases of high treason were those of Margaret Nicholson, in 1786; of Hatfield, in 1800 (both for attempts on the life of the Sovereign); and of Watson (the Cato Street affair), for an attempt on the Ministers in 1820. Margaret Nicholson was brought before the Privy Council, and the whole proceeding was set forth at great length in the Council Register. There appeared no entry of any sort or kind in the case of Hatfield; and in that of Watson there was a minute in the Home Office, setting forth that the examination had taken place *there* by Lord Sidmouth, assisted by certain Lords and others of the Privy Council. There was, therefore, no uniform course of precedents, and Ministers had to determine whether the culprit should be brought before the Privy Council, or whether he should be examined by the

Cabinet only—that is, by Normanby as Secretary of State, assisted by his colleagues, as had been done in Watson's case. After some discussion, they determined that the examination should be before the Cabinet only, and consequently I was not present at it, much to my disappointment, as I wished to hear what passed, and see the manner and bearing of the perpetrator of so strange and unaccountable an act. Up to the present time there is no appearance of insanity in the youth's behaviour, and he is said to have conducted himself during the examination with acuteness, and cross-examined the witnesses (a good many of whom were produced) with some talent. All this, however, is not incompatible with a lurking insanity. His answers to the questions put to him were mysterious, and calculated to produce the impression that he was instigated or employed by a society, with which the crime had originated, but I expect that it will turn out that he had no accomplices, and is only a crackbrained enthusiast, whose madness has taken the turn of vanity and desire for notoriety. No other conjecture presents any tolerable probability. However it may turn out—here is the strange fact—that a half-crazy potboy was on the point of influencing the destiny of the Empire, and of producing effects the magnitude and importance of which no human mind can guess at. It is remarkable how seldom attempts like these are successful, and yet the life of any individual is at the mercy of any other, provided this other is prepared to sacrifice his own life, which, in the present instance, the culprit evidently was.

August 13, 1840: . . . The danger, whether real or supposed, which the Queen ran from the attempt of the half-witted coxcomb who fired at her, elicited whatever there was of dormant loyalty in her lieges, and made her extremely popular. Nothing could be more enthusiastic than her reception at Ascot, where dense multitudes testified their attachment to her person, and their joy at her recent escape by more than usual demonstrations. Partly, perhaps from the universality of the interest evinced, and partly from a judicious influence or more impartial reflection, she began about this time to make her Court much less exclusive, and all these circumstances produced a better state of feeling between the Court and the Tories, and helped to soften the acrimony of political warfare.

It was not by any means the only attempt on the life of the Queen:

June 5, 1842: . . . Last week the Queen was shot at, very much in the same manner and in the same spot as two years ago. She was aware that the attempt had been meditated the day before, and that the perpetrator was at large, still she would go out, and without any additional precautions. This was very brave but imprudent. It would have been better to stay at home, or go to Claremont, and let the police look for the man, or to have taken some precautionary measures. It is certainly very extraordinary, for there is no semblance of insanity in the assassin, and no apparent motive or reason for the crime. This young Queen, who is an object of interest, and has made no enemies, has twice had attempts made on her life within two years. George III, a very popular King, was exposed to similar attempts, but in his case the perpetrators were really insane ; while George IV, a man neither beloved nor respected, and at different times very odious and unpopular, was never attacked by anyone.

The courage of Queen Victoria, thus tested, was characteristic of her family. It added, if that be possible, to the increasing esteem and to the affection with which, year by year, her person was regarded by the nation. It was during these years that Queen Victoria laid the foundations of that deep regard which has been extended, not less deservedly, to her successors on the throne.

To cleanse the Court was no easy task. "Uxbridge and Erroll [February 11, 1842] would be much surprised to hear that she dislikes them both, their intemperance and ill behaviour having disgusted her."

September 6, 1841: Melbourne said he thought the Prince must be at the bottom of these (appointments and exclusions at the Court), that he was extremely strait-laced, and a great stickler for morality, whereas she was rather the other way, and did not much care about such niceties of moral choice. He said that she could not bear Lady Exeter (though they wish to have *him*), thinks her a bore, and no doubt dislikes her on account of her odour of sanctity.

September 7, 1841: . . . I had some talk with him about the applicants, when he [the Duke of Wellington] told me in confirmation of what Melbourne had said, that it was the Prince who insisted on spotless character (the Queen not caring a straw about it) and who had put his veto upon Beaufort, etc. He said it was impossible to explain all this, and he was aware how mortified and angry these people are.

September 17, 1841: . . . The Duke of Beaufort has now applied for the Embassy at Vienna by letter to Peel, having discovered (as he believes) that his exclusion from Court is attributable to the Queen Dowager, who has set Prince Albert against him, she being his enemy partly from prudery, and partly because he never would join in the senseless Tory manifestations toward her, in a sort of opposition to the Queen.

Brighton, July 18, 1846: . . . I saw the Duke of Bedford repeatedly before I left town, who told me all that was going on. He had been principally occupied in corresponding with G. E. Anson about the Court appointments, and was very much dissatisfied with the conduct of the Palace about them. These are such trifling matters that they are totally unworthy of attention except just for this, that in their details they exhibit a good deal of want of candour and sincerity on the part of the Queen and Prince. As for example, after insisting on the dismissal of Arbuthnot and exposing John Russell to all the odium thereof, they had him down to Osborne to finish his wiring and loaded him with civilities, thereby confirming his belief that it was John's doing and not theirs.

There was also something very uncandid and unfair in Peel's conduct in the matter. *Il jeta les hauts airs*, and told old Arbuthnot that it was the hardest and most unjust case that ever was. I advised the Duke of Bedford to call on Peel, and tell him that before he censured it so strongly he had better know the real truth. He then told it him, when Peel said that it was just what he had imagined it to be, for the Queen was always pressing him to remove Arbuthnot. Knowing what he did he ought not to have said what he did say to the father or the son, it was not what a true, straightforward man would have done.

March 31, 1848: . . . There has been a wrangle (or nearly one) between Spencer and the Court about the place of Sergeant at Arms. The Queen and Prince have taken to seize everything in

the way of patronage they can lay their hands on. The Chamberlain formerly used to have it all even to the appointment of domestic servants. First they took Hampton Court, and the distribution of the apartments there. Spencer found matters thus and acquiesced, but on the vacancy made by Gosset's death they wanted to seize his place also. Spencer resisted, or *half* assented his right, he wrote to the Prince and said he proposed to appoint Charles Russell, and he told me he should resign if they refused their assent. On the course at Northampton a messenger arrived with the reply, which was an assent but not a very willing one, and giving him to understand that they considered the appointment their own.

The Royal Family was not yet inclined to be subservient to the young Sovereign:

February 21, 1840: . . . On Thursday morning I got a note from Arbuthnot, desiring I would call at Apsley House. When I got there, he told me that the Duke of Cambridge had sent for Lord Lyndhurst to consult him; that they were invited to meet the Queen on Friday at the Queen Dowager's, and he wanted to know what he was to do about giving precedence to Prince Albert. Lord Lyndhurst came to Apsley House and saw the Duke about it, and they agreed to report to the Duke of Cambridge their joint opinion that the Queen had an unquestionable right to give him any precedence she pleased, and that he had better concede it without making any difficulty. The Duke acquiesced, and accepted the invitation.

September 22, 1840: There has been a Court *tracasserie* and the Queen has been very angry with the Duke of Cambridge for what he said of her at the Mansion House the day Prince Albert received the freedom of the City. The day had long been fixed for his dining at the Mansion House, when in consequence of a bad account of Princess Augusta, Prince Albert wrote (on the day previous) and said he could not attend. The Lord Mayor posted down to Windsor and represented that after all the trouble and expense that had been incurred, it would be a grievous disappointment if he did not go, so (the account of the Princess being better) he agreed to attend. The Duke of Cambridge, who had been invited to meet him, wrote to him to say that if he liked it, he would meet him in the morning (wherever

it was he was to go) and that as he was not accustomed to these ceremonies he might be of some use to him. The Prince never answered his letter, but when they met, he said to the Duke that he had a favour to ask him which was that he would not stay and dine there, as he did not himself mean to do so. The Duke said he would do no such thing and asked why he did not.—On account of the Princess Augusta, he said, and he had promised the Queen to return. The Duke said the Princess Augusta was better than she had been for some time. He, Prince Albert, might do as he pleased, but that he, the Duke, could not now make an excuse to the Lord Mayor. When Prince Albert was gone, the Lord Mayor came to the Duke and said he really did not know what to do, but people were so indignant at his departure that if his health was proposed he was afraid they would turn down their glasses. On this the Duke said he would do the best he could to get him out of the scrape, and for this purpose he made the speech in which, in not very refined terms, and in somewhat too familiar phrase, he talked of his having married "a fine young girl," and that they were "very fond of each other's company." It took very well, and answered the purpose, but Her Majesty was very indignant at being called "a fine young girl," thought it very impertinent, and signified her displeasure in a letter to the Duchess of Gloucester which she desired her to show to the Duke. She is mighty tenacious of her dignity, and as she fancies everything is to bend her will, she was probably very angry that the Duke did not comply with Albert's request and go away when he did.

Queen Victoria did not approve of Prince George (afterward the Duke of Cambridge), who was her first cousin and then a young man:

February 26, 1840: . . . She had a dance at the Palace on Monday night (for they are always dancing or doing nothing) but did not ask Prince George of Cambridge to it. In the morning Prince George and Prince Ernest (Albert's brother) met at Uxbridge Heath and the latter said (about something they were to do together):

"I shall see you to-night, when we will settle it."

To which the other replied:

"Oh, no, I am not asked," to the great astonishment of

Ernest, who expressed it. These are all very trifling things, but they show the state and animus of the Court.

The Duke of Beaufort had a daughter:

November 7, 1842: . . . I have been engaged these last few days in devising the means of stifling the scandalous stories which have gone all over the world about Prince George of Cambridge and Lady Augusta Somerset. The story is that he got her with child, that he did not object, but that the Royal Marriage act stood in the way, and the Queen was indisposed to consent, and this story with many trifling variations has been in all the newspapers and been circulated with incredible success not only all over England, but over the Continent also. The whole is false from beginning to end, except that he did flirt with her and she with him last year at Kew, where she was staying while her father was abroad, flirtation such as is continually going on without any serious result between half the youths and girls in London. As soon as the parties became aware of the universal diffusion of the scandal they thought it necessary to take some measures for suppressing it and after a good deal of deliberation Adolphus Fitzclarence (on the part of Prince George) and I (on that of the Duke of Beaufort) went together to the *Times* office and asked them to put a formal contradiction into their paper, which they immediately consented to do, and did yesterday morning. If anything can correct the mischief which these reports have done, such a contradiction as this will do it, but the appetite for scandal is so general and insatiable, there is such a disposition to believe such stories, and such reluctance to renounce a belief once entertained, that it is very improbable that what has been done can be entirely undone, and this calumny will affect the lady more or less as long as she lives. Though it is totally false that she was ever with child, and Prince George certainly never thought of marrying her, it is probably true enough that she behaved with very little prudence, delicacy, or reserve, for she is a very ill-behaved girl, ready for anything that her caprice or passions excite her to do. Fortunately, he is a very timid, unenterprising youth, not unwilling to amuse himself, but by no means inclined to incur any serious risks, as he has abundantly shown on other occasions. His vanity prompts him to make love to the ladies whom he

meets in his country quarters, and as princes are scarce, his blood royal generally finds easy access to rural and provincial beauties, but when he finds these affairs growing serious and the objects of his admiration evince an embarrassing alacrity to meet his flame with corresponding ardour, I am told that he usually gets alarmed and backs out with much more prudence than gallantry.

The Duchess of Cambridge (mother of the indiscreet Prince) came to Windsor Castle with Lady Augusta Somerset:

February 7, 1843: . . . The visit passed off without anything remarkable, but shortly after, the Duchess of Gloucester went to the Castle, when the Queen broke out with great violence, said that she knew the stories about Lady Augusta were all true, and that she was only brought there for the purpose of getting rid of the scandal, and that it was very wrong of the Duchess of Cambridge to have brought her, with a great deal more in the same strain. The Duchess of Gloucester told her that this was a very serious charge, not only against the girl, but against the Duchess of Cambridge, herself, and asked her if she intended that she should tell the latter what the Queen had said. The Queen said she did, when she begged the Queen would write her a note, saying in it what she had already said verbally, in order that there might be no mistake. The Queen did so and the Duchess of Gloucester sent or gave the note to the Duchess of Cambridge. (Note: I made an alteration, because Lady Georgiana Bathurst corrected my statement so far, confirming its accuracy in every other particular. She told me besides, that when Lady Augusta Somerset was at Windsor none of the ladies would take the least notice of her, and evidently had been ordered not to do so.) Both the Duke and the Duchess of Cambridge immediately took the matter up in the warmest manner and one of them wrote to the Queen complaining of such an imputation having been cast on both the girl and on them, and that her Majesty could not suppose they would either bring her, if she had not been innocent, into her Majesty's presence, or allow her to continue at Kew as the associate of their own daughter. The Duke of Cambridge said that he considered himself bound to protect and defend her as much as if he were her father. To this expostulation a very unsatis-

factory answer came from Albert, in which he said that "as Prince George had given his word of honour that the story was untrue *he supposed* they *must* believe that *it was so.*" This letter by no means satisfied the Duke of Cambridge, and still less the Duke of Beaufort, who was by this time made acquainted with what had occurred and who was not at all disposed to submit to such an indignity. The Duke of Beaufort wrote to Sir Robert Peel on the subject, expressing what he felt, and announcing his determination to demand an audience of the Queen. Peel endeavoured to pacify him and represented to him that he would gain nothing by an audience, as the Queen would infallibly say nothing and bow him out, just as she formerly did Lord Hastings. The Duke, however, desired Peel to communicate with the Queen on the subject and to let her know what his feelings were. But the Duke of Wellington (who is always appealed to on these occasions) told the Beauforts, Peel was so afraid of the Queen he did not think he would venture to speak to her. Peel, however, had some communication with her, and after a great many pourparlers and much negotiation amongst them all, Peel wrote a letter to the Duke of Beaufort (or to the Duke of Cambridge, I forget which) in which he said that the Queen had desired him to say she was now entirely satisfied and she begged there might be no further discussion on the subject. This is a tolerably correct acçount of the incident, as the Duchess of Beaufort told it to me yesterday. They are, however, boiling with resentment and indignation, and anxious to show their sentiments, if they only knew how. It is not very creditable to the Queen or her husband, neither to their feelings nor to their sense, and it is really incredible that, after the Flora Hastings affair, and the deplorable catastrophe in which it ended, the Queen should not have shrunk instinctively from anything like another such scandal. Anybody would imagine that, after the grievous wrong she had done to one woman, she would have been especially cautious never to run the least risk of doing the same to another. But between the prudery of Albert, and her own love of gossip, and exceeding arrogance and heartlessness, this *tracasserie* arose.

August 6, 1843: Albert proposed to the Duke of Beaufort the other day to make Worcester his lord in waiting, but the Duke declined. The old affair of his daughter still rankles in his mind,

and he thinks besides that his boy had much better be aide-de-camp to the Duke of Wellington than a Lord in the Prince's Court. Indeed if the Prince was not infatuated with his own dignity, he would never have contemplated the possibility of a young soldier resigning his office of aide-de-camp to the Duke to go and wait upon him at his trumpery and tiresome court.

Lady Augusta Somerset was thus vindicated. But there was another Augusta, a Princess, and daughter of the Duke of Cambridge whose marriage to the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz had to be adjusted:

June 14, 1843: The Royal Family, who always fancy any trumpery matter relating to their rank and dignity of greater importance than the gravest affairs, have been making an absurd splutter about the Princess Augusta of Cambridge's designation. When the Queen gave her consent to the marriage, she was so styled in the instrument, but the Cambridges did not like this, complained of her being called "of Cambridge," and appealed to the Queen that she might at the marriage have some other style. The Queen referred to Sir Robert Peel, and he called to Council the Chancellor and Lord President, and these three ministers were occupied for three hours the other day (during which all their more serious affairs stood still), in devising some style and designation for this young lady that might be at the same time proper and palatable. At last they agreed that she should be Princess Augusta, daughter of the Duke of Cambridge! A grave piece of folly indeed. The Cambridges are very angry at the poor provision (as they consider it) which Peel proposes for her, and the Duchess complained to my brother Henry of the audacity of the Duke of Wellington which she thinks is proved by his not procuring a larger allowance for her daughter.

It was amid all this that the Queen had herself to bring up a family. "At Windsor for Council on Saturday," writes Greville on December 14, 1842, adding on one occasion, "Queen beginning to show her *grossesse*." Publicity was pitiless:

December 19, 1840: . . . I dined with Erroll yesterday who told me some gossiping details of the Queen's accouchement. Her health and strength through the operation seem to have been

marvellous. She desired that as few persons as possible should be present, and actually in the room there were only Locock (no other doctor) the Prince and Mrs. Lilly, the nurse. In the next room (with the door so open so that Erroll said he could see the Queen plainly the whole time and hear what she said) were the Cabinet ministers, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Bishop of London. When the child was born, Locock said:

"Oh, Madam, it is a Princess."

She said, "Never mind, the next will be a Prince."

The baby was then brought stark naked into the room where the Councillors were and laid on a table (already prepared) for their inspection and having thus verified the birth, they went away. The Queen's delivery was so little expected that the wet nurse was at her own home on the Isle of Wight, and Whiting the Page (and formerly private valet de chambre of George IV) went off for her, brought her over in an open boat from Cowes to Southampton and had her at the Palace by two in the morning.

So entered this world the Princess Royal of England, the future Empress Frederick of Germany, and mother of a Kaiser who was to abdicate his throne.

The next was a Prince.

King Edward VII was also cradled in etiquette. "We are occupied," writes Greville, "with the approaching delivery of the Queen and the probable death of the Queen Dowager (Adelaide)."

November 11, 1841: The Queen was delivered of a son at forty-eight minutes after ten on Tuesday morning the ninth. From some crotchet of Prince Albert's, they put off sending intelligence of her Majesty being in labour till so late that several of the Dignitaries, whose duty it was to assist at the birth, arrived after the event had occurred, particularly the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord President of the Council. At two o'clock a Council was held, and the usual thanksgiving ordered. Last year the Prince took the chair, which was all wrong; and this time I placed him at the top of the table on the left, the Archbishop next him. None of the Royal Dukes were summoned. "God save the Queen" was sung with great enthusiasm at all the theatres, and great joy manifested generally. The event came very opportunely for the Lord Mayor's dinner.

It was odd enough that the same day Peel had been engaged with two or three more to dine at the Palace, and had been forced to send excuses to the Lord Mayor, though the Queen must have known it was the Lord Mayor's Day. Melbourne under similar circumstances would have gone to the Mansion House, but these people are forced to stand rather more on ceremony than he was.

A curious point has arisen, interesting to the Guards. It has been the custom for the officer on guard at St. James's Palace to be promoted to a majority when a Royal Child is born. The guard is relieved at forty-five minutes after ten. At that hour the new guard marched into the Palace Yard, and at forty-eight minutes after ten the child was born. The question arises which officer is entitled to the promotion. The officer of the fresh guard claims it because the relief marched in before the birth, and the keys were delivered over to him; but the other officer claims it because the sentries had not been changed when the child was actually born, his men were still on guard, and he disputes the fact of the delivery of the keys, arguing that in all probability this had not occurred at the moment of the birth. The case is before Lord Hill for his decision.

It is odd enough that there is a similar case involving civic honours at Chester. The Prince being Earl of Chester by birth, the Mayor of Chester claims a Baronetcy. The old Mayor went out and the new Mayor came into office the same day and about the same hour, and it is doubtful which functionary is entitled to the honour. The ex-Mayor was a Whig banker, and the new one is a Tory linen draper.

December 5, 1841: The difficulties and trouble that may be caused by trifles may be well illustrated by a matter which is now pending. Peel sent for me the day before yesterday, to talk to me about the armorial bearings of the Prince of Wales, a matter apparently very simple and insignificant, but not at all so in fact. The Queen and Prince are very anxious to allot to this baby his armorial bearings, and they wish that he should quarter the arms of Saxony with the Royal arms of England, because Prince Albert is alleged to be *Duke of Saxony*. The Queen gave the Princess Royal armorial bearings last year by warrant, but it is conceived that more formal proceedings are necessary in the case of the Heir Apparent. The last precedent is

that of 1714, when George the First referred to the Privy Council the question of the Prince of Wales's arms, who reported to his Majesty thereupon. On that occasion the initiative was taken by the Deputy Earl Marshal, who transmitted to the Council a draft, which was afterward approved. Then, however, the case admitted of no doubt; but now the heralds, and others who have considered the matter, think that the Saxon arms ought not to be foisted upon the Royal arms of England. It is Her Majesty's predilection for everything German which makes her insist on this being done, and she wants it to be done offhand at the next Council without going through the usual forms of a reference and report. Peel, however, is not disposed to let the thing be thus hurried over; he thinks that it is a matter in which the dignity of the Crown is concerned, and that whatever is done should be done with deliberation, and that if the Privy Council are to advise, they ought to advise what is right and becoming, and not merely what she and the Prince wish. The difficulty, therefore, is, how to set the matter going. The Earl Marshal will not stir without an order to do so. If the Home Office order him to submit a draft of the armorial bearings of the Prince of Wales, they can only order him to make out what is right according to the rules and laws of heraldry, and the Earl Marshal is of opinion that what the Queen and Prince wish to be done is inconsistent with those rules. The matter therefore remains in suspense. I have sent to Lord Wharncliffe, by Peel's desire, to come up from Wortley to meet Graham, in order that they may put their heads together and settle this delicate and knotty affair. Melbourne would have made very light of it; he would have thought it did not signify a straw, which, in fact, it does not, and that any fancy the Queen had should be gratified in the most summary way.

December 8, 1841: This foolish business of the coat of arms has cost more trouble than many matters a thousand times more important. Peel has had to write at least a dozen long letters about that and the alteration in the Liturgy, and whether *His Royal Highness* should be inserted before Prince of Wales. Yesterday Wharncliffe, Graham, and I had a conference at the Home Office, when Graham produced a letter from Peel, with one from the Queen to him, pressing for the speedy arrangement of the affair and treating it as a thing settled. Graham said it

was not worth while to squabble about it, and better to gratify her, and he proposed to take it on himself, and let the Council have nothing to do with it, but, on his own responsibility, order the Earl Marshal to draw out a coat of arms, with the achievement according to her wishes, no matter whether right or wrong. We agreed this was the best way. Peel had written to me about the Liturgy, and I wrote him word that when Prince Albert's name was inserted, the Archbishop particularly desired there might be no "Royal Highness," and so it was left out.

December 9, 1841: I saw Graham again yesterday about this business. They have gazetted the child "Duke of Saxony," which is very absurd, and at Lady Holland's last night, the precedence given to that title over the English titles was much criticized. It was amusing to hear Lady Palmerston finding fault, and when I told her it was a particular fancy of the Queen's, to which she clung very tenaciously, she said "that it was the duty of the Ministers to tell her it was wrong, but they had not the courage to do so."

September 17, 1855: "He (Clarendon) told me a few things besides, of no great importance, and which I am not sure that I recollect: about Spain, that matters were going on better there, and the Government had contrived to get money. The Spaniards were very anxious to take part in the war, but he had discouraged it entirely: of Naples, that we were calling the Neapolitan Government to account for their recent impertinence to us, but that Palmerston and he had disagreed as to what should be done. Palmerston according to his old habit wanting to send ships of war to Naples, and to proceed to violence, while he was opposed to having another Pacifico affair on our hands, and proposed to proceed with caution and quietly. The Queen, he said, was going on better than formerly: not a bad hearted woman, and kept in order by fear of her husband, who she thought would poison her, of which he is very capable.