

Queen herself wrote to Lord Aberdeen. In attacking the Prince, who is one and "the same with the Queen herself, the throne is assailed, and she must say she little expected that any portion of her subjects would thus requite the unceasing labours of the Prince." Writing to Baron Stockmar, Her Majesty said: "That you should be absent when we are tried in 'the basest and most disgraceful manner, and when the Prince has been badgered for four weeks by the ultras of both parties, is very unfortunate.' It is known now to those who have read the life of the Prince Consort that these attacks were truly designated at the time by Lord Aberdeen as 'contemptible exhibitions of malevolence and faction,' and that every English statesman, including Lord Palmerston, concurred with Lord Aberdeen in considering it 'as an inestimable blessing that your Majesty should possess so able, so zealous and so disinterested an adviser.' But even say 'Verax' is constrained to admit that 'the Prince was a noble character, pure in his life 'unselish in his aims, and of an integrity 'which I for one believe to have been 'almost perfect.' Had there been 'three or six months delay' in issuing volume 3, all would have been right, but 'its appearance just now excites a suspicion that it was intended to bear 'heavily on the scale of opinion which is 'most adverse to Russia and most favourable to war.' Hinc ille lachrymæ. The Prince's character 'seems wholly changed.' 'He appears to be borne 'away on the wings of impetuous passion. 'and of almost personal antipathies.' * * 'If there is one of the virtues of the 'Prince which I should feel a difficulty in 'defending against censorious critics, I 'am bound to say it would be his 'modesty.' * * 'They (the ministers) 'were obliged to be civil to the Prince 'but in their hearts they must have often 'wished him back at Coburg.' * * *

Referring to a letter from the Queen to Lord Aberdeen, in which Her Majesty expresses a hope that His Lordship "will not undertake the ungrateful and injurious task of vindicating the Emperor of Russia," "Verax" says: "I make no comment on these remarks, my loyalty forbids." "The Prince is almost always 'in hot water, and he has a strange fatality 'for creating dislikes." * * * "In reading 'the story of the Prince Consort's interference with the machinery of the government as told in these volumes, I am 'amazed at the forbearance of our public 'men. I wonder that one cabinet after 'another did not fling up their places in 'disgust, and bid the Queen and the

"Prince conduct the affairs of the country 'themselves. Bothered with long-winded 'memoranda, and badgered with letters 'of expostulation, their lives must at 'times have been a torment to them."

Now, after all, "the encyclopedic dissertations" during the critical years of 1854 to 1856 could be read by any one in a shorter time than the six penny pamphlet of "Verax." Our public men were certainly as competent as "Verax" to judge whether they had just ground of complaint, and we find that they professed gratitude and did not disgust for the valuable assistance rendered to them by the Prince Consort. "Verax" indeed would have us believe that such professions were insincere. "Flattery alas, is the bane of princes."

It may not be uninteresting to consider the subjects of these long-winded memoranda. They were: "On the State of Europe," a letter to Lord Aberdeen "On Reinforcements for the Army," "On the Negotiations for Peace," a letter to M. Sidney Herbert "On Reinforcements for the Army," "On Army Organization" and on "Hospitals for the Wounded," and "A Letter to the King of Prussia" in the name of the Queen, and which, though condemned by "Verax," was read by Lord Clarendon, the Foreign Secretary, "with sincere pleasure and admiration," as we have no doubt it has been by thousands of Her Majesty's faithful subjects in the Life of the Prince Consort. For our own part, believing as we sincerely do that neither our beloved Queen nor her lamented consort were open to the charge of endeavoring to establish "personal rule," we have read the letters of "Verax" with intense disgust, and we rejoice that they were subjected to the criticism of the *London Quarterly*, whose able article we fear that we shall be compelled to notice much more briefly than we could wish. We own that we consider the following remark of "Verax" on Baron Stockmar's essay as much more applicable to his own pamphlet: "I trust I know my readers better than to insult their understandings by stooping to criticize this solemn trash." No better refutation of the charge preferred by "Verax" can be given than a brief extract from the Queen's letter to the Emperor Napoleon, dated 26th November, 1855, on the subject of peace negotiations. After pointing out to the Emperor that he was "answerable to nobody" and could do what he pleased, Her Majesty proceeds to define her own position in language that ought to make her assailants blush for shame:

"I, on the other hand, am bound by certain rules and usages; I have no controlled power of decision; I must adopt

"the advice of a council of responsible ministers, and these ministers have to meet, and to agree on a course of action 'after having arrived at a joint conviction 'of its justice and utility. They have at 'the same time to take care that the steps 'which they wish to take are not only in 'accordance with the best interests of 'the country but also such that they can 'be explained to and defended in Parliament and that their fitness may be 'brought home to the conviction of the 'nation."

The *Quarterly Review*, when he commenced his criticism on "Verax," used language not very inapplicable to Canadian politicians: "The English politician who seeks to acquire popularity by 'turning the whole community upside 'down may be tolerably sure of success if 'he can but represent some public act to 'be 'unconstitutional.'" The word, he goes on to say, is "used always in one sense and for one purpose, namely, to bring discredit on the Crown." It is convenient "to ignore the fact that the constitution consists of several parts, and 'that the encroachment of any one part 'on the liberties of the others is in the 'eye of the law an unconstitutional act." As applied to the crown in the reign of Queen Victoria most people will be inclined to consider the phrase "unconstitutional," to speak mildly—inappropriate.

The *Quarterly Review* treats at great length and with great ability the subject of our foreign policy. His object is to prove how dangerous to the best interests of the nation are the occasional outbursts of an excited but uninformed populace, and how wise it would be to leave to the Crown and its responsible ministers the guidance of our foreign policy. After dwelling on the "electric current" that passed over the kingdom on the announcement of the Bulgarian atrocities, he proceeds:

"Meantime the great autocratic power representing force in Europe 'showed that it understood perfectly well 'how to take advantage of this paroxysm 'of opinion. Russia had avoided the 'error she committed in 1853 of showing 'her hand too soon, and during the early 'stages of the insurrection had kept herself well in the back ground. More 'than suspected of having fomented the 'rising in the slav provinces, and of having 'suggested to the Porte the military 'arrangements which occasioned the 'Bulgarian massacre, she had observed a 'studious moderation till she perceived 'that she might safely appear in the 'character she had designed. Then with