1867

Thursday 10 January (London)

Cabinet at 3. J. Manners and Northcote absent.

We began on Reform.[171] Lord Derby recapitulated all our previous steps and stated the position of the Cave declaring that the more he considered it the more clear he was that resolutions and a Commission offered the best and only chance. He then read over the resolutions which he and Disraeli had amended in some parts, and which were much improved, having acquired a more distinctive character. These were fully discussed and finally agreed to, various contingencies being considered. The plan of operations determined being this Reform to be mentioned in the Queen's Speech but so as to cover the bill, or Commission or resolution, no explanations to be given on the Address but on the following Monday. Then course to be explained and resolutions to be laid on table. Some interval must ensue and various large bills (Confederation *inter alia*) to be brought forward.

Pakington reported a commission received from A. Anson[172] on behalf of the Cave to the effect that they would have nearly as many men as last year, that they were quite staunch and ready to support us in anything, provided *that we do not attempt a strong reform bill*. This if correct is very important.

Some discussion on Canadian matters. France and Russia willing to support a scheme of local autonomy with a tribute if we join.

Friday 11 January

Had a conference at the Colonial Office with Sir E. Head on the H.B. Co. affairs [. . .].

Later saw Northcote and talked to him about the Reform resolutions. Subsequently I went over to the India Office and discussed them with Cranborne. With him I drew up some criticisms, some of

[171] Derby had written to Disraeli on 22 December 1866, 'Of all possible hares to start, I do not know a better one than the extension of household suffrage, coupled with plurality of voting' (Buckle, *Disraeli*, IV, p. 484).

[172] Augustus Henry Archibald Anson (1835–1877), son of the 1st Earl of Lichfield.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which he adopted, some of which I adopted, forwarding on the box with our comments.

Tuesday 15 January

Cabinet at 3

Walpole assigned reasons for delaying all attempts at a reform of the Metropolis on the ground that a Committee was sitting in the House of Commons [. . .].

Some dismay was occasioned by its being discovered that the resolutions on reform were circulating in a box without an envelope. It is clear that what I hear that Naas was one of the guilty persons.[173]

Friday 18 January (London)

At 12, Lord Monck came and for two hours we discussed Reilly's draft of Confederation bill.[174] Agreed that he should settle with Macdonald that I should meet the delegates next Wednesday.

Tuesday 22 January

Still very poorly.

In the afternoon at 5 p.m. Cartier and Langevin[175] came to discuss Confederation as regards Lower Canada. Sir F. Rogers,[176] Lord Monck, Adderley and Reilly (the draftsman) were present.

I explained the scheme but found unqualified opposition

1. On my proposal for the Legislative Council

2. On my distribution of these powers between the Central and Provincial Legislatures

3. On my proposal to place "civil right and property" open to concurrent legislation by Government and local legislatures, and

[173]Naas sent a memorandum the following day to Disraeli stating that he preferred to keep the franchise question beyond the competence of the Commission: F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 145.

[174]F.S. Reilly (1825–1883), professional legal expert, had produced the first draft of the bill.

[175]Sir Hector-Louis Langevin (1828–1906), Solicitor-General, Quebec Parliament (1864–1866), Postmaster-General (1866–1867).

[176]Sir Frederic Rogers (1817–1889), Permanent Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office (1860–1871), Baron Blachford (1871).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. On Lord Monck's suggestion to put a check upon undue action of the General Legislature by passing all bills of a local character through a Committee composed of all the members of the Province affected.

The result of this is that I shall have certainly to withdraw my Committee plan, to leave the civil right to the exclusive action of the local legislatures and perhaps to make other changes.

Saturday 26 January

At 11 o'clock the British North American Association delegates came to me in Grosvenor St. to discuss Federation. Lord Monck, Adderley, Sir F.R. and Reilly present.

I commenced by explaining the bill of which I had sent a copy to each and pointing out the differences made in it from the Quebec Resolutions. Macdonald was in the main the spokesman for the rest.

The real point at which we were at issue was the constitution of the Legislative Council, they urging the nomination for life principle, I desiring to modify it. I was very firm about it, but we broke up to meet again at 3.30 at the C.O., but meanwhile to consider the matter.

The pardoning clauses were a matter of controversy [. . .].

On the whole, I am better today though I mend rather slowly.

Sunday 27 January (London)

In the afternoon Disraeli came to me, to talk over the Intercontinental Railway Guarantee. He had been in hope that somehow it might be possible to escape it but I undermined him. He is to receive from me early tomorrow the necessary papers and probably he, Stanley, Northcote and I shall have to settle everything as it is doubtful whether Lord Derby will be fit for any disruption that is not absolutely necessary [. . .].

We talked a good deal on the campaign now before us. He was in good spirits and even sanguine, anticipated a fight on the resolutions, but not before the beginning of March, and thought it probable that we should win then.

Monday 28 January

Meeting with the Delegates in the afternoon at the C.O.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I announced that I could not admit pardoning power in the bill and that I would consent to the Administrators of the Provinces being called Lieutenant-Governors, that there must be some guarantee that the first members of the Legislative Council should be fairly and impartially chosen. Lastly that I could not accept the life nomination principle for the Legislative Council.

A sort of sham fight than ensued between Macdonald and me which ended in his proposing that they should retire to consider the question.

Received an invitation from Osborne for tomorrow but decided not to go as I am not well enough.[177]

Tuesday 29 January (London)

Cabinet at Lord Derby's. He is better but still obliged to keep within doors.

We went through the Queen's Speech, discussing at great length the sentence on Reform. I suggested a slight amendment which was adopted.

Met the Delegates at the C.O. They gave in as to the constitution of the Legislative Council, suggesting a complicated but still an improved plan. I promised to consider it.

Gave Disraeli the memorandum drawn up by the Delegates on the Guarantee.

Friday 1 February

In the afternoon I went to Disraeli (in Downing Street) to talk to him about the Intercolonial Railway guarantee. He however soon threw aside the railway papers and opened the question of Reform. He told me that Baxter had calculated that household franchise would only give 820,000 persons and that a residential qualification of three years and a payment of rates would of course reduce this by about one third.[178] I discussed the question of a bill with him, subsequently reducing to writing in a letter to him my opinion on the matter.[179]

[177]Carnarvon was recovering from a severe attack of gout and was unable to walk: see Carnarvon to Gen. Grey, 20 January 1867: CP, TNA, PRO 30/6/144, fo. 126.

[178]The scheme, devised by Dudley Baxter, was based on the system of plural voting in parochial elections.

[179]Carnarvon to Disraeli, 2 February 1867: Hughenden Papers, 100/1. Reflecting on the letter in the light of subsequent events, Carnarvon stated, 'The system of separate and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Saturday 2 February

In afternoon received the Delegates' proposal on the Senate and circulated it amongst the Cabinet.[180]

A very bad influenza cold began.

In the evening we had a large dinner party – some of the Delegates, the Cranbornes, Lord and Lady Grey, the Cairns, Gathorne Hardy, etc. Afterwards to the astonishment of our guests Gladstone walked in. Hardy looked as if he would have fallen down in a fit.

Gladstone looked much aged and very ill.

Monday 4 February

Confined to the house during the day by a bad cold, but in the evening dined at Lord Derby's in Downing Street.

There were about 45 Peers – everyone in good humour at the Party being in office.

Speech[181] was much cheered when read, especially the part which alluded to Reform. The D. of Rutland asked whether "it was intended to pass the measure" to which Lord Derby said that "that must rest with the House of Commons", to which he added that no Government could hope to pass a reform measure without the co-operation of some opponents and that it did not rest entirely with us. This was much cheered.

The D. of Cambridge and the D. of Wellington[182] were both present. The D. of Buccleuch[183] told me that he had come there on purpose to give whatever support he could to the Government.

confidential communications which Mr Disraeli had carried on with each member of the Cabinet from whom he had anticipated opposition had divided them and lulled their suspicions whilst the pre-arranged decision of the interior Cabinet had so strengthened Mr Disraeli's hand that the individual in question stood in an isolated and therefore powerless position' ('Memorandum on Reform 1867', CP, BL 60831, fos 152–153).

[180]The Cabinet wished to alter the constitution of the Canadian Senate. The delegates accepted the principle, but proposed six additional members to the existing seventy-two and that the appointments should be approved by the Crown. Ten members of the Cabinet stated their options at the end of Carnarvon's memorandum on the subject. See Carnarvon, 'Confederation of the British North American Provinces', 2 February 1867: CP, TNA, PRO 30/6/109, fos 162–163.

[181]The Queen's Speech, to be read when Parliament assembled the following day.

[182]Major-Gen. Arthur Richard Wellesley (1807–1884), 2nd Duke of Wellington (1852). MP for Aldeburgh (1829–1832) and for Norwich (1837–1852).

[183]Walter Francis Scott (1806–1884), 5th Duke of Buccleuch and 7th Duke of Queensberry (1819). Lord Privy Seal (1842–1846), Lord President of the Council (1846).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wednesday 6 February

Cabinet

[. . .] We next discussed Reform. Considerable divisions of opinion for the first time showed themselves on the question whether we should attempt actual legislation.[184]

Saturday 9 February

Cabinet at 3.

Discussed Reform Resolutions. The Resolution which alluded to Household suffrage was struck out to meet General Peel's very strong objection who had communicated with Lord Derby and evidently communicated his intention not to stay in the Government if the words were adhered to. I am inclined to think that it is for the best.[185]

Friday 15 February

Lowe came here in the afternoon and talked to Evelyn about our reform move.[186] He says that we have betrayed the country and the Constitution. But I still do not well see what else we could have done.

Saturday 16 February

Cabinet at which we discussed Reform. Disraeli began with a long speech congratulating us on being a "homogenous" and effective Cabinet, and then stated that the general feeling appeared to be against our resolution in favour of "plurality of votes", such plurality being understood to mean the gift of one vote to voters being £4 or £5 rating to £10, and two votes to all above £10. And he then proposed to submit his alternative plan of a plurality of votes in virtue of different franchises. He proposed 1. a £5 rating, 2. an educational franchise, 3.

[184]After a long discussion it was decided not to delay but to proceed by resolutions, prior to a bill.

[185]General Peel had threatened resignation on 6 February if the resolutions were not amended. Disraeli saw Peel two days later, telling Derby, 'I soothed him and it is all right' (Buckle, *Disraeli*, IV, p. 492).

[186]Disraeli had announced in the Commons on 11 February that the Government proposed to proceed by resolutions; the motion was agreed to (*Hansard*, CLXXXV, 11 February 1867, cols 214–219).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one for savings banks investments, 4. one in virtue of all payments of direct taxes. He showed by figures that the admission of artisans would be considerable – about 330,000 but that there would be an excess of about 60,000 on the other franchises. We all accepted this after some discussion as a very conservative measure: but Peel then announced his unconquerable aversion to all reform, for it amounted to this, and his virtual determination to leave us. A long and rather painful conversation ensued, but I am afraid he will go.[187]

Monday 18 February

In the morning called at the War Office and had some talk with General Peel as to his position with regard to the reform question.[188] He was evidently very unhappy at the alternative before him. He said on the day following to that at which the resolutions were read he wrote to Lord Derby stating insurmountable difficulty he felt.

Tuesday 19 February

Cabinet at 1.

Lord Derby began by saying that he approached the question of reform more hopefully than on any former occasion because

1. General Peel had in the handsomest manner waived his objections to the plurality of votes paragraph[189]

2. there was evidently in the House of Commons an intention not to oppose the resolutions as such. The Queen was prepared to do anything in her power to assist us and that she had expressed herself as believing that "the security of her throne was involved in the settlement of this question and if possible by her present advisers."

[187]After the meeting, Derby and Disraeli saw the Queen to seek her support and learn her attitude towards possible Cabinet changes. She agreed that the reform was more important than the loss of Peel (see Jones, *Lord Derby and Victorian Conservatism*, p. 304). Neither Cranborne nor Carnarvon had raised any objections to the scheme at the Cabinet meetings of 15 and 16 February (M. Cowling, *1867: Disraeli, Gladstone and revolution: the passing of the second Reform Bill* (London, 1967), p. 141).

[188]In a draft letter to the Queen, written possibly on that day, Disraeli stated that, besides the possible resignation of General Peel, there were more rumours that Cranborne might join him.

[189]Peel had called on Derby before the meeting and agreed to support Disraeli.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lord Derby said that she had appealed to him in such terms that he felt bound to make every sacrifice and effort to stand by her.

We went into the question of plurality of franchises, residential qualification, amount of payment of direct taxes, which Disraeli proposed at 40/-s but Cranborne wished to stand at 20/-s.

In the evening I brought on the British North America Confederation bill for 2nd Reading. Spoke for 1¾ hours. My speech was, though long, generally liked in the House, but my voice was so weak I could hardly get through my task.[190]

Wednesday 20 February

The newspapers complimentary on my speech last night. Delegates who were present seem also entirely satisfied. Afterwards saw Macdonald. We had a nice dinner party. Club afterwards, talked much as to reform. It appears that the idea of our proposing household suffrage is afloat, that Gladstone is much alarmed by it and says that it ought not to be proposed by the Treasury Bench as it is an irrevocable step.

Thursday 21 February

Had a long talk with Cranborne in the gloom of the evening at the far end of the House of Lords library on the subject of the Reform question in the Cabinet. He is firmly convinced now that Disraeli has played us false, that he is attempting to hustle us into his measures, that Lord Derby is in his hands and that the present form which the question has now assumed has been long planned by him. On comparing notes it certainly looks suspicious. My own suspicions have for some time been roused in this direction though I hardly perhaps admitted them as fully as he did.[191]

The conclusion was a sort of offensive and defensive alliance on this question in the Cabinet, because if we are decided upon acting together we can almost beyond doubt prevent the Cabinet adopting any very fatal course. Constant communication resolved upon.

It is much to be regretted that we did not decide upon this before.

[190] *Hansard*, CLXXXV, 19 February 1867, cols 157–182.

[191] Cranborne sent the memoranda from Baxter, setting out the respective figures for likely borough householders and direct taxpayers. Cranborne was alarmed at Baxter's calculations for the immense increase in numbers in the latter category alone to 200,000 (Cranborne to Carnarvon, 22 February 1867: CP, BL 60758, fos 32–34.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Saturday 23 February

A Cabinet in which Lord Derby brought forward Reform immediately. Disraeli recapitulated his figures which he assured us had been drawn up and tested by the "ablest statistician of the age". Lord Derby said that he must leave early and the business was hurried through. Then a bribery bill was introduced, barely read, and scrambled over, and lastly the scheme for the redistribution of seats was proposed.

The limit of disenfranchisement in boroughs is to be 7000 population and the limit of enfranchisement in counties to be 200,000. The four delinquent boroughs, Totnes, Reigate, Lancaster and Yarmouth to be absolutely disenfranchised which gives seven seats – twenty three seats to be gained from the boroughs in all thirty – of which fifteen to go to counties, fourteen to boroughs of 18,000 population by last census and one to University of London.

I objected to these enormous changes being thus introduced at the eleventh hour when it was impossible to consider them and Cranborne muttered his discontent in very audible tones. Excuses were made, the Cabinet generally was afraid to interfere and the various subjects were held to be settled.[192]

In the evening I met Hardy and told him that though I had submitted once I would not submit twice to such treatment.

Sunday 24 February

In the evening Cranborne came to me with some alarming calculations as to our reform scheme. It appeared that Baxter had only taken the totals and that the distribution of the new voters in the boroughs made 20,000 population would be such as to have the counterpoise (i.e. the direct taxpayers) not quite equal to the net additions made to each constituency. Thus a complete revolution would be effected in the boroughs. It seemed hardly possible to conceive an answer. We went over the figures repeatedly but always came to the same result.[193]

Cranborne then said he intended to send the figures to Lord Derby with his resignation. I persuaded him to give this up and to write to state the case and to request a Cabinet.[194] I undertook to concur with him.

[192]Nevertheless, Derby reported to the Queen that the scheme had been accepted by the Cabinet (Harris, *Memoirs of an Ex-Minister*, p. 627).

[193]See also Cranborne to Carnarvon, 24 February 1867: CP, BL 60758, fo. 36.

[194]For Cranborne's letter to Derby, see Cecil, I, pp. 233–234.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

He returned home and I after a few mouthfuls of dinner drove down to Hardy's, laid the case before him and after arguing it some time persuaded him to come with me to Cranborne's where we again discussed the matter till nearly 11.[195] I then drove to General Peel's, found him in bed but begged that he should be awakened. He came down bare-legged and dressing-gowned, heard with unmistakable satisfaction my statement and declared that if either Cranborne or I left the Government he should at once resign.

Monday 25 February

By 8.30 I wrote to Lord Derby saying that I thought an explanation was necessary and that I concurred in asking for a Cabinet.

A Cabinet was in answer summoned to St. James's Square for 12.30. When I arrived there I found about eight or nine but Cranborne who had not received the summons did not arrive till past one o'clock. The stress of the controversy therefore fell upon me.

Lord Derby opened by saying that he had this morning received letters from Cranborne and me saying that on consideration we were unable to concur in the reform plan.[196] I then replied by stating the facts and by explaining that I did not dissent from the plan to which I had agreed but that the figures which had been produced required explanation. Till that was given I could not in conscience agree to a measure of which the whole character was altered.

Then ensued a very angry discussion. Disraeli did not attempt to deny the figures – he only said that there would be great variance in the boroughs in question and that the influence of land and wealth would be supreme. He at length went so far as to say that the bill had been assassinated. I immediately said that I objected to the use of such a word and others then interposed.

No attempt however was made to controvert the accuracy of our case. Whilst Disraeli was white as a sheet, Lord Derby was very angry, broke in repeatedly, using the strongest expressions of regret and dismay, etc.

Pakington seemed to lose his self-possession. He advised the Cabinet to go to the House and to announce the "unprecedented resignation of three Cabinet ministers at the last moment" and to throw themselves

[195]Carnarvon told Hardy 'that both he and Cranborne would resign if our measure went on' (Johnson, p. 31).

[196]Derby received Cranborne's letter early in the morning. He quickly sent it to Disraeli with a note: 'The enclosed, just received, is utter ruin. What on earth do we do?' Disraeli replied, 'This is stabbing in the back.' (See Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, p. 155.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

upon the House. On this Peel (who had by this time openly joined me, Cranborne not having yet appeared) said, "By all means but that we should reserve to ourselves the right to tell our own story." On this the rest interposed. Finally Cranborne came and the discussion was renewed. At last when we had come to within half an hour of Lord Derby's meeting and the Cabinet had in fact dissolved, Stanley proposed as a compromise a £6 rating, but without any duality of voting.

Vehement discussion followed on this and it was only within five minutes of Lord Derby's meeting that it was finally decided to take the £6 rating so proposed!

I proposed to abide by the original proposal – household rating and plurality of votes and direct tax! but only to apply it to the larger boroughs. This would have been the best course I believe, but the Cabinet were naturally not much disposed to accept anything coming from me, and it was overruled.

None of the Cabinet stood by us. Peel, Cranborne and I were alone. Walpole sat in a corner of the room speechless. Naas who came late into the room could not make out what we were discussing and thought that we were considering the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.

It was altogether a very painful scene.[197]

Tuesday 26 February

A Cabinet at 2.

Great gloom and personal irritation prevailed. Cranborne and I said very little, General Peel nothing. Decided on Disraeli's proposal to withdraw the Resolutions and to undertake to introduce a bill in about a week's time.

Wednesday 27 February

Presented five of the delegates, Macdonald, Galt, Cartier, Tupper, Tilley[198] to the Queen. She was very gracious to them.[199] Lord Derby

[197]Carnarvon wrote to Derby, 'The position in which we are placed is almost desperate. I have no time to vary any proposed course of action and hardly even time to consult calmly upon what should be done.' For Derby's account of the meeting, see Derby to Queen Victoria, 25 February 1867: Royal Archives, F15/31. For Carnarvon's own version, see Carnarvon to Malmesbury, 25 February 1867: CP, BL 60831, fo. 88.

[198]Sir Samuel Tilley (1819–1896), Lib. leader, New Brunswick (1866), office-holder in Macdonald's ministries (1868–1873, 1878–1885).

[199]The British North America Bill had passed through the House of Lords the previous night.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

had, I found, an audience with her before I had mine and his brougham was waiting there when I went away. The Queen said nothing to me as to the recent differences in the Cabinet and so on the whole I thought it best to say nothing myself.

At 3 there was a Court to which I also went. An obvious coldness on the part of almost all the members of the Cabinet towards me. There is I see plainly the greatest irritation.

Thursday 28 February

Saw Cranborne in the morning. It is clear that a strong pressure is to be put upon us. The papers are writing in this sense. Settled with him to consider terms of a letter to Lord Derby putting the causes of all our recent action on record.

In the afternoon in the House of Lords, the Duke of Buckingham[200] sought me out. He said that he could not agree in the present bill any more than I could in the former plan and that the only alternative was for Lord Derby to reconstruct his Cabinet. I said that I was perfectly willing and that I should be very glad to go and that I advised him to see Lord Derby and to tell him so.

Dined tête-à-tête with Evelyn. In the evening Lady Salisbury came in and talked over the state of affairs. To do her justice I think that she penetrated Disraeli's scheme in the latter part of the autumn.

Saturday 2 March

Replied to Lord Derby's letter[201] and said frankly that without an explanation to my objections I could not proceed with the Reform scheme. Saw Cranborne, talked matters over with him and sent off the letter.

Cabinet at 3 – a most painful scene. Lord Derby opened by a solemn speech recapitulating what had passed, declaring that the £6 rating plan was in his opinion impossible and inviting us to reconsider the original plan abandoned on Monday last. Cranborne, Peel and I then followed, stating that we could not accept the plan with the objections as to the smaller boroughs unanswered. I offered the alternative of a household franchise in boroughs over 25,000 population and a £6

[200]Richard Plantagenet Grenville (1823–1889), 3rd Duke of Buckingham and Chandos (1861). Lord President of the Council (1866–1867), Colonial Secretary (1867–1868).

[201]Carnarvon to Derby, 2 March 1867: Derby Papers 920 DER (14) 143/6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rating in boroughs under that population. I argued this and proposed it more than once, but it was definitively negatived.

Then ensued a desultory discussion and at the end of this, it having been unanimously decided that the £6 rating scheme was impracticable, the question was formally put to each member of the Cabinet and Peel, Cranborne and I separately replied that we could not accept the plan. Lord Derby closed a red box with a heavy sigh and said, "The Party is ruined" and Disraeli added rather cynically "Poor Tory Party!" Peel, Cranborne and I left the room and so ended a most painful scene.[202]

Sunday 3 March

Lovaine[203] called in the afternoon to "congratulate" me on my resignation. He expressed himself ready to do anything and offers Northumberland House as a central place of meeting in case anything can be done to keep the Adullamites together.

Bagehot lunched here.

Monday 4 March

The morning papers were full of the schism in the Cabinet. I went down in the afternoon to the Office and a little before 5 received a note from Lord Derby asking me to come to him. I went there. He said that he had not been able to get the Queen's consent to my explaining the grounds of my retirement but that he proposed to deal very generally with the question and hoped that I should do so.[204] I said I had no wish to revive the past circumstances which could be of little satisfaction to anybody and that I should be general if it was necessary for me to speak.

[202]Derby wrote to the Queen afterwards that it had been impossible at the Cabinet meeting to obtain Cranborne's withdrawal of his intention to resign: 'If he had given way, both Carnarvon and General Peel would have waived their objections. Lord Carnarvon most reluctantly followed Lord Cranborne and General Peel, finding that unanimity was hopeless and felt that he was absolved from his undertaking to sacrifice his own personal feelings and opinions' (Buckle, *Letters*, I, p. 404).

[203]Algernon George Percy (1810–1899), Lord Lovaine (1830), 6th Duke of Northumberland (1867), Lord Privy Seal (1878).

[204]Carnarvon had written to Lord Grey the previous day on whether to take his place in the Lords 'when I am no longer, as I consider, a member of the Government' (Carnarvon to Grey, 3 March 1867: Grey Papers, 80/3). Grey advised him to be in the House 'whether I get the Queen's permission or not' (Carnarvon to Cranborne, 4 March 1867: Hatfield House Papers, 3M/E).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the House Lord Derby made a *very* long statement. In his recapitulation of the past history he sailed very near the wind, especially when he said that the principles of the measure had been decided in the autumn by the Cabinet.[205] He did not say anything directly reflecting upon Cranborne and me and so in replying I said nothing. I spoke under great discomfort and embarrassment, and thought that I had made a terrible failure, but apparently not so to judge from the papers.[206]

Tuesday 5 March

Saw the Duke of Buckingham at the Colonial Office who succeeds me there and gave him some information on Colonial matters.

I took leave of all the heads of the different departments, who are apparently sorry to lose me. On the whole my tenure of office has been a satisfactory one.

Wednesday 6 March

Cranborne's speech was an excellent one – moderate and in good taste, a sufficient justification for us who seceded and yet no disclosure of the frequent change of policy in the Cabinet [. . .].[207]

Went down to the C.O. and explained to the D. of Buckingham all the leading questions with which he will have to deal. I gave him every information, not even withholding from him the amount of dependence he might place on Adderley.

In the evening Lady Salisbury looked in for an hour.

Friday 8 March (London)

Delivered up the Seals of the Colonial Office to the Queen at Buckingham Palace. She was smiling and gracious, said that she

[205] *Hansard*, CLXXXV, 4 March 1867, cols 1284–1289 and 1298–1300.

[206] Ibid., cols 1289–1291. Carnarvon wrote to Cranborne, 'Read in *The Times*, what happened last night in the Lords and let me know whether you think I went too far' (Carnarvon to Cranborne, 5 March 1867: Hatfield House Papers, 3M/E). Derby wrote the next day to the Queen, 'Lord Carnarvon went rather fuller in his personal explanations last night than he was warranted in doing: and by doing placed Lord Cranborne and General Peel in a difficult position' (Derby to Queen Victoria, 5 March 1867: Royal Archives, A35/45).

[207] *Hansard*, CLXXXV, 5 March 1867, Cranborne, cols 1347–1351. Carnarvon called it a 'masterpiece' (Carnarvon to Cranborne (copy), 6 March 1867: CP, BL 60761, fo. 24).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was sorry to receive them and hoped to have my services again on some future occasion. I expressed my great regret and sorrow and said I hoped that she was aware of the causes of my resignation. To this she assented. I said that I could not with credit to myself remain in the Cabinet and when that was the case I felt I could not serve her properly or be of use to my colleagues. She replied warmly to this that I was quite right. I then said that I trusted she had been made aware of my feelings and motives. She said yes but gave me no further encouragement to explain, so I made my bow and retired.

Horsman called to congratulate me on my resignation. Dined in the evening at the Stanhopes.[208] Met amongst others young De Grey.[209] He is a most promising fellow.

Saturday 9 March (London)

Horsman called on me to speak about Reform[210] and the present position of affairs. He was very eager and hot to do something. He said that Gladstone was dismayed at the prospect of household suffrage being proposed from the Treasury Bench, but that if ordered he would be obliged to adopt it.[211] The Whips he said feared that if the Government were allowed to dissolve on household franchise they would carry the Election and would probably go on for 4 or 5 years on "sensational legislation" with the support of Bright.

His object is 1st. to get a vote of want of confidence moved, which he said would be taken up immediately by the Liberals 2nd. not to allow if possible a dissolution. He wished me to collect two or three men of position on our side of the House to consult as to the state of affairs.

Afterwards I saw Sir W. Heathcote and Cranborne on the same subject. Very little comfort from either of them.

[208] Philip Henry Stanhope (1805–1875), 5th Earl Stanhope (1855). Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (1834–1835), Con. MP for Hertford (1835–1852).

[209] George Frederick Samuel Robinson (1827–1909), Viscount Goderich (1833), 2nd Earl of Ripon and Earl de Grey (1859), 1st Marquess of Ripon (1871). Secretary of State for War (1863–1866) and for India (1866), Lord President of the Council (1868–1873), Governor-General of India (1880–1884), First Lord of the Admiralty (1886), Colonial Secretary (1892–1895), Lord Privy Seal and Liberal Leader, House of Lords (1905–1908).

[210] On 4 March, Disraeli had announced that a Reform Bill would be introduced on 18 March.

[211] See Shannon, *Gladstone*, II, pp. 32–33.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Monday 11 March (London)

Lord Russell brought on his motion in the House of Lords[212] but very poorly.

Had some talk with the Duke of Richmond upon his joining the Government[213] and the present state of affairs. He is not happy I think but he said that he trusted in Lord Derby. I said that Lord Derby was entirely in Disraeli's hands. Afterwards wrote to him.[214]

Afterwards saw Sir W. Heathcote for a short time. It seems clear that nothing can be done till the Government state their views.

Wednesday 13 March (London)

Went to Gladstone's after dining at the Salisburys. Gladstone was evidently very anxious as to Reform. He said that he was not afraid of a low suffrage in the sense of redistribution because he had great confidence in the good sense of the people, but that a household suffrage would be a very serious, because inevitable, step.

Friday 15 March (London)

Lord Derby's meeting of his House of Commons supporters took place. The majority of the Party evidently swallowed the proposed measure with reluctance and disgust, but they did not fail in discipline.[215] Sir W. Heathcote was the only man of mark who expressed an unfavourable opinion. Lord Derby seems to have expounded his whole scheme which was much the same as that on which we seceded from the Government.

Sunday 17 March (London)

Bagehot lunched with us [. . .]. Phillimore called and walked for half an hour with him. Afterwards saw Sir W. Heathcote.

[212]Relating to electors in cities and boroughs: *Hansard*, CLXXXV, 11 March 1867, cols 1633–1643.

[213]Richmond was appointed President of the Board of Trade on 8 March.

[214]Carnarvon stated, 'I do not desire to make mischief or even give way to bitterness which I can hardly help feeling when I see the ruin to which he [Disraeli] brought a great Party' (Carnarvon to Richmond, 11 March 1867: Goodwood Papers, 822.7).

[215]The meeting, held in Downing Street to explain the Reform Bill to be introduced in the Commons in three days time, attracted 195 MPs (Buckle, *Disraeli*, IV, pp. 518–519).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Phillimore, when speaking of Gladstone, told me in confidence that so far from being a democrat in real sentiment he was staking out a "majorat" for his son with (as he believed) the prospect of a peerage. Curious!

Wednesday 20 March (London)

Dined at Northumberland House and had long conversation with Cairns who is very much alarmed at Reform prospects.

His scheme is £6 rating, a lodger franchise, a large redistribution of seats making 43 additional three-cornered constituencies (in all with the existing seven 50) and cumulative vote. He would make up his numbers by the 4 delinquent boroughs 12 new seats to the House of Commons and the remainder by political disfranchisements up to 16,000 population boroughs. His notion is that if such a scheme as this could be proposed to Gladstone, perhaps G. would accept it and that it might be carried by the Liberal Party on each side. I promised to try to see Cranborne on it.

Thursday 21 March (London)

Saw Cranborne early and talked whole question over. He sees no alternative but to turn out the Government if possible, to see Gladstone and communicate with him. He generally concurred with Cairns' plan.

I went to the National Gallery and spent 1½ hours with Cardwell and Boxall[216] over the pictures. Afterwards walked back to the Athenaeum with Cardwell and had a long and confidential talk with him on reform.

I broached Cairns' plan. Individually he had no objections to offer. He said that the bill to which he was a party last year of £7 rental went beyond what he liked, but he feared that the Liberals as a Party would not accept £6. They might perhaps take £5 rating with 3 cornered constituencies, voting papers, cumulative vote, etc. I said that it would be more difficult to obtain a considerable Conservative support on these terms. I gave him leave to mention all that I had said to Gladstone but to no one else. I distinctly said that it must be understood that in any such communication there was no intention on our part, i.e. Cranborne and mine, to intrigue and that office formed no part of our plans.

[216]Sir William Boxall (1800–1879), Director, National Gallery (1865–1874).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Saturday 23 March (London)

In the evening we had a large dinner party – Binghams,[217] Kimberleys,[218] General and Lady A. Peel,[219] Sir R. Peel,[220] Delane, young De Grey and some others.

Delane volunteered to tell me that I had "acted most wisely in resigning, that I had placed myself on a pedestal etc." It is disagreeable now that general opinion has declared itself in favour of our secession that the way in which people seem inclined to attribute it to great sagacity and appreciation of interests, when in fact it was a very disagreeable act which I certainly should not have done had I seen my way to any other course.

Reports flying about as to the possible retirement of G. Hardy and Walpole.[221] Both of them make no secret of their wish to be turned out.

Monday 1 April (Torquay)

Called on Cairns who is staying here and walked with him.[222] Talked much on Reform. He agrees with me in my estimate of persons and things except that he attributes Disraeli's conduct to his inveterate habit of deferring all decision to the last moment rather than to predetermined deception. He is quite aware that Disraeli did not forgive him for leaving the House of Commons but he equally clearly intimated that one cause why he left it was his disinclination to be obliged to defend a Reform bill which he foresaw would not be one of which he could approve.

He anticipates an evil fate for the Irish Church from a reformed House of Commons and he believes that the destruction of the Irish Church will be the first blow inflicted on the Church of England.

Wednesday 15 May (London)

Spent the afternoon at the Athenaeum at work.

Met Lowe in the afternoon. He is in despair at the Reform bill and the consequences which he says are inevitable. Everyone who has

[217]The Earl and Countess of Lucan.

[218]John Wodehouse (1826–1902), 1st Earl of Kimberley (1866), Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1864–1868), Lord Privy Seal (1868–1870), Colonial Secretary (1870–1874, 1880–1882), India Office (1882–1885, 1886, 1892–1894).

[219]Lady Alicia Peel.

[220]Sir Robert Peel (1822–1895), 3rd Baronet (1850), Chief Secretary for Ireland (1861, 1865).

[221]In the event neither resigned, though, on 17 May, Hardy replaced Walpole as the Home Secretary.

[222]Cairns resigned as Attorney-General in October 1866 when he became Justice of Appeal.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

money in his opinion ought to find some foreign investment for it. Here in England when once the working classes are in the ascendant taxation of the rich and a compulsory division of landed property will soon become the law.

On the other hand when dining at the Shaftesbury I met Delane and talked to him on the same subject. He is far more sanguine, says Lowe is in great danger of playing Croker's part in the Reform bill of 1832[223] and that he can well remember how only two years after that bill the Duke of Wellington was in power holding all the Offices, sending for Sir R. Peel out of Italy and receiving addresses of support from the great merchants of London. He anticipates in this case the disappearance of the Whigs (as a party) and the formation of an advanced Liberal and of a Tory party. I hope he is right.

Friday 24 May (London)

The Government have made a fresh surrender last night in Committee on the Reform bill. They have given 60 years leaseholders at a rent of £5 per annum votes in the Counties, swamping I imagine all property influences in many parts of the country.[224]

It is very alarming to see how thoroughly frightened at last are men of all parties – Whigs, Conservatives, Liberals. Nevertheless the Party still support the wretched impostor who is running them and the Country.

Tuesday 2 July (London)

Walked home from the House with Kimberley and had a curious conversation. He admitted that there was not a man on his side who liked Gladstone and who yet was prepared to follow any one else. He said that failing Gladstone there was absolutely no one capable of leading on their side. He looked forward with great apprehension to the meeting of a new Parliament and the advent of so many new and inexperienced members with such a leader as Gladstone, and he contemplated the probability that Disraeli might remain on in office for several years to come. Formerly he was one of the extremist Liberals in the House of Lords now he has become sobered into

[223]John Wilson Croker (1780–1857), friend of Peel, resigned as Secretary of the Admiralty in 1830; opposed the Reform Bill and resigned as MP on its passing. See M. Brock, *The Great Reform Act* (London, 1973), p. 216.

[224]*Hansard*, CLXXXVII, 23 May 1867, cols 991–1011.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Conservatism. He fears for the House, and is alarmed for the existence of the Church. He dreads a wild spirit of change taking possession of every one and destroying Lords, and Church and Monarchy all together.

Wednesday 10 July (London)

The Reform bill passed last night through Committee in the House of Commons. It passed in furious haste with hardly any debate.[225]

Had some talk with Cranborne and Sir W. Heathcote on the subject, but I am not sanguine of amending it much. Lord Stanhope today used as an argument against attempting any amendment that it would be well not to offend the new constituencies. It is altogether very sad.

Rode down to Holland House in the afternoon for a large party at which Royalties were as thick as blackberries from the Pasha of Egypt to the Princess Mary.[226]

Thursday 11 July (London)

Had a long talk with Lord Grey at his house on the course to be adopted in the House of Lords with regard to the Reform bill.[227] He showed me a long memorandum which he had drawn up containing proposals for amendments in favour of the cumulative vote in two-membered constituencies, of an increase of members for the University and Inns of Court which were to be obtained by grouping small boroughs, non-vacation of seats upon acceptance of office, and lastly to enable a peer on the death of his father to retain his seat in the House of Commons if he should so choose.

I objected to the two-membered constituencies and raised some objections as to the last; but as he said he should move it on the report which would avoid interference with the Committee I said no more. But I am certain that it is idle to attempt the cumulative vote except for the three-cornered constituencies and I do not think that the House

[225]Ibid., CLXXXVIII, 9 July 1867, cols 1264–1292.

[226]See *The Times*, 11 July 1867, p. 9.

[227]Earl Grey, during the debate on the second reading of the bill in the House of Lords on 16 July, sought to obtain more time for discussion (*Hansard*, CLXXXVIII, 16 July 1867, col. 1616).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Lords are ripe for such a change as Lord Grey contemplates with regard to charities.

Saturday 13 July (Hatfield)

Spent the morning with Cranborne going through the Reform bill. Wrote afterwards to Lord Grey to urge him not to move the cumulative vote in *two*-membered constituencies.

In the afternoon, we went down to Hatfield.[228]

Tuesday 16 July (London)

Canvassed privately a good many peers on the Reform bill[229] and arranged a meeting at Lord Harrowby's[230] for Saturday next at 11 a.m.

Lord Grey gave up his plan for two-membered constituencies in favour of three-cornered ones.

Friday 19 July (London)

Lord Derby's meeting of Peers in Downing Street. He commenced by a long recapitulation of the history of Reform in which he dextrously but deliberately misrepresented Cranborne and myself on three points.

1. He said the Cabinet had been with the exception of General Peel unanimous in favour of household suffrage guarded by residence and personal payment of rates.

2. That when Cranborne and I wrote to him on the Sunday night we said that we were not ready to accept household suffrage.[231]

3. He expressed surprise at the shortness of our notice.

I followed him and replied to the 1st. by saying the Cabinet had not been unanimous, that they had only accepted household suffrage when accompanied by many other safeguards on the faith of certain explanations.

[228]He wrote the following day to Cranborne, 'Lord Salisbury is very anxious we should get together a meeting. I am not very sanguine: but the attempt is worth making and I have written to Percy to ask for Northumberland House' (Carnarvon to Cranborne, 14 July 1867: Hatfield House Papers, 3M/E).

[229]First reading of the Reform Bill in the Lords.

[230]Dudley Ryder (1797–1882), 2nd Earl of Harrowby (1847), Lord of the Admiralty (1827–1828), Secretary, India Board (1830–1831), Chancellor, Duchy of Lancaster (1855).

[231]See entry for 2 March 1867.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I replied to the 2nd by stating what had happened, that figures had been given us at the last moment and that they turned out to be untrustworthy and the counterpoises founded on them illusory.

I replied to the 3rd. by saying that we only had the scheme before us on Saturday night and therefore had but 24 hours in which to decide.

I stated what I thought of the bill and said that I should not debar myself from the honour of adopting any amendments. Proceeded to say in my own name and in that of any who agreed with me, whether present or absent, that attendance in that room was not to be held as any evidence of approval of any part of the bill and that we claimed absolute freedom of action in every stage of the measure.

Bath who was there said that I had made everything perfectly clear, but I am not sure myself whether I could not have done it better.

Lord Derby did not look very well pleased, especially at my concluding remarks.[232]

Saturday 20 July (London)

A meeting of Peers at Lord Harrowby's which I had organised for the purpose of considering the Reform bill – Lords Grey, Shaftesbury, Selkirk,[233] Bath, Hardinge,[234] Zetland,[235] Rivers,[236] Southampton,[237] Warwick,[238] Romney,[239] Amherst,[240] De Vesci,[241] Duke of Buccleuch,

[232]When Grey laid an amendment on the table in the Lords on 22 July, Derby remarked to Disraeli, 'I have immediately sent out as strong a Whip as possible, against it. But I learn that the whole of the Opposition will support him and he has been tampering, with the aid of Carnarvon, not unsuccessfully with our people' (Jones, *Lord Derby and Victorian Conservatism*, p. 316).

[233]Dunbar James Douglas Hamilton (1809–1885), 6th Earl of Selkirk (1820), Keeper of the Great Seal (1852, 1858–1859).

[234]Charles Stewart Hardinge (1822–1894), 2nd Viscount Hardinge (1856), MP for Downpatrick (1852–1856).

[235]Thomas Dundas (1795–1873), 2nd Earl of Zetland (1839), Grand Master of the Freemasons (1844–1870).

[236]Horace Pitt-Rivers (1814–1880), 6th Baron Rivers (1867).

[237]Charles Fitzroy Wriothesley (1804–1872), 3rd Baron Southampton (1810).

[238]George Guy Greville (1818–1893), 4th Earl of Warwick (1853), ADC to Queen Victoria (1878–1893). Warwick, described by Carnarvon as 'a very uncompromising opponent of the bill', was pessimistic about the wisdom of Grey pressing for amendment of the Reform Bill: 'In any event, he will be in a small minority, and unless the Whigs take it up as a party question to turn Lord Derby out, that minority will be small' (Warwick to Carnarvon, 21 July 1867: Grey Papers, 80/3).

[239]Charles Marsham (1804–1874), 3rd Earl of Romney (1845), Con. MP for Kent West (1844–1845).

[240]William Amhurst Tyssen-Amherst (1835–1909), 1st Baron Amherst (1892), Con. MP for Norfolk West (1880–1885) and for Norfolk South-west (1885–1892).

[241]Thomas Veasey de Vesci (1803–1875), 3rd Viscount of Abbeyleix (1855).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lord Harrowby and myself. We talked the matter over and on the whole separated with something like a general understanding. Another meeting was fixed for Friday at 11 a.m., and a sub-committee appointed of the Duke of Buccleuch, Lord Harrowby, Lord Grey, Romney, Hardinge and myself to consider amendments and to meet at Lord Grey's on Tuesday at 11 a.m.

Had an interview with the Sultan[242] at Buckingham Palace, with some 40 or 50 others. His face is handsome and his eye good. Nothing passed beyond a bow and a shake of hand and a few words in Turkish which Fuad[243] who was with him always translated into *"enchanté de faire votre connaissance"*.

Monday 22 July (London)

Debate on 2nd Reading of the Reform bill in the House of Lords. Lord Grey broke down, partly from exhaustion, partly from a strange sort of confusion of mind as it seemed. I spoke about ten o'clock to a House that rapidly filled and which soon grew excited as I went on. It was altogether perhaps the most telling speech that I ever made in the House, though I do not think my best.[244]

Tuesday 23 July (London)

Debate resumed.[245] Lord Derby made a rather sharp attack upon me. He was obviously very angry at what had passed.[246] Every one else however seems to be pleased and a great many people have come or written to me to thank me for what I said.

Lord Shaftesbury made a very fine speech late and one which was even finer for its fearlessness.[247] He stated exactly what he knew of the working class and predicted the use which they would make of the power now transferred to them. In that speech he jeopardised the popularity of a life time but he rose incalculably in the opinion of every honest man. I can hardly say how much I respected him for it.

[242] Abdul Aziz I (1830–1876), Sultan, Ottoman Empire (1861–1876).

[243] Fuad Pasha (1814–1869), Grand Interpreter for the Porte (1852, 1855), Grand Vizier (1861–1866).

[244] *Hansard*, CLXXXVIII, 22 July 1867, cols 1838ff. Kimberley noted, 'Carnarvon was admirable' (A. Hawkins and J. Powell (eds), *The Journal of John Wodehouse, First Earl of Kimberley, for 1862 to 1912*, Camden 5th series 9 (Cambridge, 1997), p. 206.

[245] *Hansard*, CLXXXVIII, 23 July 1867, cols 1916–2033.

[246] Ibid., Derby, cols 2023–2031.

[247] Ibid., Shaftesbury, cols 1917–1934.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Friday 26 July (London)

My life is one ceaseless running to and fro consulting about this Reform bill, discussing amendments, and explaining to some stupid peer the meaning of some very simple proposition.

Monday 29 July (London)

House of Lords in Committee on Reform bill. I spoke in favour of the general principle of extending the redistribution scheme, but in opposition to Lord Halifax's motion.[248]

The spectacle of weakness and incompetency exhibited by the Government was pitiable. Lord Derby's absence, from gout, left them absolutely without the power of expressing an opinion upon any subject. They surrendered different points without one word of discussion and when asked once how they intended to vote the Earl of Malmesbury foolishly announced that the House would see when the division should take place. This raised such a storm that Malmesbury was obliged to apologise. Committee adjourned about 12 ½ o'clock at night.

Tuesday 30 July (London)

The Committee again all night. We carried the representation of minorities moved by Cairns by a majority of nearly three to one. I spoke on it. This was the principal amendment.[249]

Adjourned about 12.30 again.

Wednesday 31 July (London)

All the morning spent over redistribution schemes with Hugessen[250] and at Lord Harrowby's where some seven or eight peers were present.

[248]Charles Wood (1800–1885), 1st Viscount Halifax (1866), a former First Lord of the Admiralty and a Liberal, proposed that there should be an increase in the number of representatives for the larger and more important constituencies (*Hansard*, CLXXXIX, 29 July 1867, cols 256–327; Halifax, cols 256–271, Carnarvon, cols 280–285). Cairns moved the amendment: Contents 124, Non-Contents 76.

[249]Ibid., cols 405–473.

[250]Edward Knatchbull-Hugessen (1829–1893), Lord of Treasury (1859–1866), Under-Secretary for the Colonial Office (1871–1874), 1st Baron Brabourne (1880).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lord Sherborne[251] came but left on the ground of non-agreement with our views. The Duke of Buccleuch was there.

Thursday 1 August (London)

House in Committee on Reform bill. Lord Grey moved his amendment in favour of increased distribution of seats. I had drawn up the proposed plan of redistribution after consultation with K. Hugessen. Lord Grey made a long and poor speech on opening his plan, leaving people in entire doubt as to what he proposed.[252] I afterward re-stated his case as clearly as I could.[253]

Lord Derby came down to the House with his arm in a sling, looking very ill. He was irritable and evidently very angry, but he put on the screw by threatening to move to report progress in order to consult the Cabinet (as if he ever consulted any one but Disraeli!),[254] that men gave way and we were beaten by 12. Lord Shrewsbury,[255] Lord Amherst, the Duke of Buccleuch and several others who had attended our meeting at Lord Harrowby's did not vote or voted with the Government. Twelve voted with me.

It is a great chance lost.

Monday 5 August (London)

Came up by the early train with the Greys, Lowe, Cork[256] and A. Herbert.

In the House the Government gave up the amendment on the Lodger franchise (raising it to £15 from £12) which they had accepted with such unwise precipitation.[257] It was a very contemptible spectacle and I do not think that any one was edified on either side of the House. The bill passed the Report. Dined with Stanhope at the Carlton.

[251] James Henry Legge Dutton (1804–1883), 3rd Baron Sherborne (1862).

[252] *Hansard*, CLXXXIX, 1 August 1867, cols 526–539.

[253] Ibid., cols 565–571. Earlier in the day, Carnarvon wrote to Grey, 'You must remember that we have but a few hours tonight in which to put our views forward – and no time to inform men's minds. If we produce a reasonable and symmetrical scheme, the Government are not likely to be able to make much of an answer, especially if Lord Derby is absent' (Carnarvon to Grey, 1 August 1867: Grey Papers, 80/13).

[254] *Hansard*, CLXXXIX, 1 August, 1867, cols 565–571.

[255] Henry John Chetwynd-Talbot (1803–1868), 18th Earl of Shrewsbury (1856), Vice-Admiral.

[256] Richard Edmund Boyle (1829–1904), 9th Earl of Cork and Ossery (1856), Deputy Speaker, House of Lords.

[257] *Hansard*, CLXXXIX, 5 August 1867, cols 821–828, Lodger Franchise in Boroughs; amendment moved by Earl Russell, cols 821–822; motion agreed.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I stood godfather today to Cranborne's child.[258] The ceremony took place at All Saints. Lady Salisbury was godmother.

Tuesday 6 August (London)

Reform bill passed the 3rd. Reading, Lord Derby admitting in *ipsissimus verbis* that "it was a leap in the dark."[259] No Prime Minister ever before ventured to say such a thing. Lord Grey walked back from the House with me. He is very much depressed at the prospect before us – and with reason.[260]

Monday 12 August (London)

Lunched with the Sandons.

In the House of Lords we considered the Commons reasons of disagreement with our amendments of the Reform bill. Lord Derby made one of the most imprudent speeches I ever heard, a speech abusing and ridiculing the House of Commons whilst he was obliged to accept their conclusions.[261]

Afterwards in putting a question as to the Australian postal subsidy I had rather an unpleasant little wrangle with him. He interrupted me in so disagreeable a manner that it is possible that I replied rather more sharply than I should otherwise have done.[262]

Saturday 17 August (Highclere)

Sir W. Heathcote came over and I had some hasty talk with him on political matters. I threw out to him the doubt which I have recently

[258]Cranborne had invited Carnarvon to take on the task 'both for auld lang syne and political sympathy'. He added, 'I am sure it would have the effect of implanting some principles in the infant's mind. Shall we call him "Benjamin" in memoriam of this year's campaign or Ichabod?' (Cranborne to Carnarvon, 26 July 1867: Hatfield House Papers, 3M/E).

[259]*Hansard*, CLXXXIX, 6 August 1867, cols 930–952; Derby, cols 948, 950–951. At the end of the debate, Derby stated, 'No doubt we are making a great experiment and "taking a leap in the dark".' The bill was passed with only Lords Ellenborough and Selkirk against. The Royal Assent was given on 15 August. See also A. Hawkins, 'Lord Derby and Victorian Conservatism', *Parliamentary History*, 6 (1987), p. 254.

[260]Cranborne was equally pessimistic. He told Carnarvon, 'The best thing would be to settle some compromise at a Conference; but I feel that everybody was too weary to attempt it' (Cranborne to Carnarvon (copy), 9 August 1867: Hatfield House Papers, 3M/E).

[261]*Hansard*, CLXXXIX, 12 August 1867, cols 1306–1326; Derby, cols 1306–1316.

[262]Ibid., cols 1329–1332; Carnarvon, cols 1329–1330.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

had whether under my present relations with Lord Derby I ought to retain the High Stewardship of the University.[263] He strongly urges the retention of it, even if my disagreement with Lord Derby were greater than it is. There was of course much force in all that he said, but I am not quite clear that under all and possible circumstances he would be right.

Saturday 21 September (Hatfield)

Reached Hatfield (from York) after rather a tiring day's journey. Found here the Queen of Holland,[264] the Clarendons,[265] Stanhopes, Cowleys,[266] one or two Dutch people and Subaroff, a rather pleasing Russian attaché. Stanley also came and came not in a pleasant humour. He has not yet recovered his temper and seems to resent my opposition to the Reform bill as a personal attack on himself. It is very absurd but I shall take no notice of it.

Lord Cowley is agreeable. Like every one else alarmed at the recent reform measures and citing all his foreign experiences in aid of his opinion. The Queen is very frank and easy to get on with so things do not drag much.

Sunday 27 October (Highclere)

Had a long talk with Cranborne as to political prospects. He is very hopeless of doing anything under present circumstances. At first his reasoning went almost to the utter uselessness of doing or attempting anything. Afterwards he agreed that it was our duty to go on and make the best of a very bad affair. He agreed with me that the only course which gave any hope of success would be the formation of some third Party as analogous as possible to the Peelites; but he said and truly that they were essentially a *central* party whilst our materials were likely to be drawn from an extreme side. In his opinion Lord Derby's death or retirement probably would offer the first opening for a redistribution and resettlement of parties.

[263]Appointed as High Steward of Oxford University on 13 October 1859, Carnarvon continued to hold office until his death.

[264]Sophie Friederike Mathilde (1818–1872), first wife of King Wilhelm III of Holland.

[265]George William Frederick Villiers (1800–1870), 4th Earl of Clarendon (1838), Foreign Secretary (1853–1858, 1865–1866, 1868–1870).

[266]Henry Richard Charles Wellesley (1804–1884), 1st Earl Cowley (1857), ambassador at Paris (1852–1867).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

He had had advances made to him by Gladstone and J. S. Mill[267] which he has neither accepted nor rejected. His dislike of Disraeli was certainly not diminished. His view as to any future policy not to hold for a while untenable posts, but to decide clearly what we are to stand upon.

Tuesday 29 October (Highclere)

Cranborne and Sir W. Heathcote and I had a long discussion on the present political situation. The general conclusion arrived at was free criticism of the government and government measures, but no pronounced opposition to the Government as such, though we are all agreed that the main subject in view is the getting rid politically of Lord Derby's and Disraeli's supremacy. Cranborne does not rank Stanley very high. He has, he says, less influence in the House than he had and does not impress.

We talked a good deal about the Irish Church, but settled that it is not necessary now to indicate any particular course of action. The issue of the new Commission and the reasonableness of leaving the decision of so large a question to the new constituencies are adequate reasons for delaying all real action for another year. But we all lean towards larger measures.

The chief object should be no longer to defend untenable posts. It is even desirable to clear away all collateral questions that only raise dust and embarrass Parliament in coming to a decision. We ought to settle what we will not defend and that by which we intend to stand.

The English Church is a great problem, but even here Cranborne agrees with me that moderation on both sides is the doctrine now to be inculcated.

Sunday 10 November (Highclere)

Received a letter from Mayo[268] asking me to serve on a Commission which the Government are about to issue with regard to Primary Education in Ireland and to act as Chairman in place of Lord Rosse[269] who has just died.

[267]John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), author and Lib. MP for Westminster (1865–1868).

[268]Mayo to Carnarvon, 9 November 1867: CP, BL 60829, fo. 2.

[269]William Parsons (1800–1867), 3rd Earl of Rosse (1841), scientist and educationist, had died on 31 October. Carnarvon declined the invitation to chair the Commission on Irish Primary Education: see Diary, 12 November 1867.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Decided to go to Winchester to talk the matter over or rather the form of refusal with him.

Friday 29 November (Oxford)

Went down to Oxford [. . .] called on Dr. Pusey[270] and had some talk with him [on the Ritual question]. Liddon[271] especially dreads the effect which any legislation in this subject may have upon the minds of many persons who are already nervously sensitive on the question of State interference [. . .]. Nothing could be more moderate than both Pusey and Liddon. Both too see that the main danger at present lies in the possible ascendancy of the infidel party rather than the Low Church. The story which I have heard on this point from all at Oxford is concurrent and most melancholy. The younger tutors and masters seem in a great measure to be poisoned by Mill's philosophy and they of course poison the undergraduates with whom they are brought in contact. The educational system so far as philosophy is concerned seems to have become inverted since my day. Then Classical authors, Plato and Aristotle, formed the basis of instruction and were illustrated by Christian writers: now modern (not to call them Christian) writers like Mill are the textbooks and basis, illustrated by heathen writings. The result is a deplorable one. The main interest (Liddon says) centres in philosophy rather than classics the intellectual set of young men's minds in this direction – and the philosophy in vogue is already going far beyond that of Mill himself. It is a gross and coarse materialism in which all idea of free will is discarded.

[270] Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800–1882), Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford University since 1828.

[271] Henry Liddon (1829–1890), Vice-Principal, St Edmund Hall, Oxford (1859–1870), canon at St Paul's Cathedral and Ireland Professor of Exegesis, Oxford University (1870–1890). Both Pusey and Liddon were leading lights in the Oxford Movement.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309990133 Published online by Cambridge University Press