1888

Tuesday 1 May (London)

Dined with the Jeunes and met Buckle[1109] with whom I had a long talk as to my intended explanation in the House on Parnell's allegations and also as to my public statement in the form of a letter.[1110]

Friday 11 May (London)

My letter in *The Times* in answer to Parnell and on Home Rule and Irish affairs appeared with a fairly friendly article. It has I think made an impression and I think it will make somewhat more stir before all is over.[1111] I hardly know how far it is unacceptable to the Government and the rank and file of the Party. Salisbury said to me at the Levée that he liked it, but that does not prove much. But taking everything into account I think that the effect is on the whole good.

Attended the Levée. The Prince of Wales very civil, also the Duke of Cambridge who begged me to come and talk to him.

An extraordinary attack by Salisbury in the House of Lords on Wolseley, my impression being that he had not given Wolseley notice of it.[1112] It began by Hardinge asking a question of the Duke of Cambridge, and this, Hardinge told me, he had done at Salisbury's request.[1113]

[1109] George Earl Buckle (1854–1935), assistant editor of *The Times* (1880–1884), editor (1884–1912).

[1110] During Carnarvon's absence in Australia, the Parnellites insisted that Carnarvon had, at his interview with Parnell, offered a statutory parliament. Balfour, now Chief Secretary for Ireland, had publicly denied this. Parnell, in a recent speech at the Eighty Club, had once more repeated this statement.

[1111] 'Lord Carnarvon on Irish policy', *The Times*, 11 May 1888, p. 12. He wrote to Salisbury, 'I have been obliged to reply to Parnell's speech. You will see my letter in *The Times*, and I hope that you will like it. I have endeavoured to make it so complete that it may finally dispose of the controversy, which has lasted so long' (Carnarvon to Salisbury, 12 May 1888: Hatfield House Papers, 3M/E).

[1112] The National Defence: *Hansard*, CCCXXVI, 11 May 1888, Salisbury, cols 4–7. Wolseley had that day published an article in the *Daily Telegraph* entitled 'England in danger: our army without arms: worst guns in the world'.

[1113] Ibid., cols 1–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Saturday 12 May (London)

My letter in *The Times* appeared yesterday and reads satisfactorily and almost everyone whom I have seen seems pleased with it. Anyhow it puts an end, I hope, to the ambiguous and false position in which I have been through no fault of mine so long placed.

We had a breakfast party consisting among others of Lowell,[1114] Froude and Arthur Gordon. Lady D. Nevill told me that R. Churchill is spending an immense amount of money and no one knows whence it comes. He is very bitter at Goschen's success.

Friday 10 August (London)

The Parnell Commission bill read second time,[1115] a not crowded but a very attentive House. Salisbury's introductory speech was to my mind not quite up to his level. Herschell, who followed, extremely good; he handled a very difficult task with great skill. I followed him and said my say, I hope, fairly well. The Chancellor[1116] was very lawyer-like. Kimberley not very good.[1117]

Friday 12 October (Highclere)

General Hastings[1118] and Sir George Russell came.

Sir G.R. told me a curious story about Randolph Churchill. Randolph, walked with him through the Park from the Carlton and expounded to him all his wishes and aspirations, the latter being concentrated in being reinstated in the Cabinet. A few days afterwards

[1114]James Russell Lowell (1819–1891), American poet and diplomat, Minister to Great Britain (1880–1885).

[1115]On 18 April 1887, *The Times* had printed a letter purporting to have been written by Parnell, apologizing to a friend for denouncing the Phoenix Park murders in the Commons. Parnell demanded the paper withdrew the letter, which he claimed was a forgery. Buckle, the editor, refused to do so. Parnell's request for a Select Committee was not granted but he was offered in its place a bill appointing a Special Commission to inquire into the allegations. W.H. Smith introduced the Member of Parliament (Charges and Allegations Bill) in the Commons on 16 July 1888: *Hansard*, CCCXXX.

[1116]Hardinge Stanley Giffard (1823–1921), Baron Halsbury (1885), 1st Earl of Halsbury (1898), Lord Chancellor (1885–1886, 1886–1892, 1895–1905).

[1117]Ibid., Salisbury, cols 255–262, Herschell, cols 262–282, Carnarvon, cols 282–286, Halsbury, cols 286–291, Kimberley cols 291–296. Kimberley wrote in his journal for that day, 'A good deal of damage was done to them [Parnell and supporters] in the discussions on the bill, but on the whole, the advantage remains, I think, on their side. The further progress in the game will be interesting to watch, but in no case can any good result to the country' (Hawkins and Powell, *Journal of John Wodehouse, First Earl of Kimberley*, p. 383).

[1118]Lieut.-Gen. Francis William Hastings (1825–1914) had served in the Crimea.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he again took the opportunity to repeat all this, whereupon Sir George, understanding that this had been said for the sake of being carried on to Salisbury, told it all to Sir J. Ferguson at the Foreign Office. Sir James, being greatly excited at it, wrote it all down and sent it to Salisbury – who, however, made no reply! The fact is S. is heartily sick of Randolph and not at all disposed to take him back. Randolph on the other hand is determined if he is not readmitted to the Downing Street Olympus, according to G. Russell, to scuttle the ship from outside if he cannot do it from within!!

Sir G.R. said to me that the story that I heard the other day that Randolph when lately in Russia had told the Emperor that he could take Constantinople when he liked, provided that he left India alone, was quite correct. Randolph apparently had told him so himself.

Since writing this G. Russell has told me more of the details. Randolph hates, as he has for a long time, Edward Stanhope; and he wants the War Office. He said there were only two offices he cared to take – the War Office[1119] and Admiralty – that he could not for family reasons take the Admiralty – but that E. Stanhope was a complete failure, that he wanted the office and that Hartington desired he should have it. G. Russell was struck with this last statement and enquired from H. James[1120] whether Hartington did really wish this without giving him his reason for asking the question. H. James was much surprised but said it was perfectly true. All this was told to Salisbury who however made no reply.

It is the old case of intrigues going on right and left.

Friday 21 December (Porto Fino)

Our days slip away here peacefully and pleasantly, nothing to disturb or break the even tenour [*sic*] of the time. If it were on a river and not on the sea that my eyes so often rest with satisfaction I might write up the Prince de Ligne's[1121] pretty couplet, which he wrote on his retreat near Vienna overlooking the Danube:

Sans remords, sans regrets, sans crainte, sans envie,
Je vois couler ce fleuve, et s'écouler ma vie.

[1119] Stanhope had been appointed to the War Office in 1887.

[1120] Sir Henry James (1828–1911), Lib. MP for Taunton (1869–1885) and for Bury (1885–1895), Solicitor-General (1873), Attorney-General (1873–1874, 1880–1885), Chancellor, Duchy of Lancaster (1895–1902), created Baron James of Hereford (1895).

[1121] Field Marshal Prince Charles-Joseph de Ligne (1735–1812), soldier-poet, who settled in Vienna in 1794. See P. Mansel, *Prince of Europe: the life of Charles-Joseph de Ligne* (London, 2003), pp. 130–131.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990340 Published online by Cambridge University Press