

The dangers of evil counsel. A voice from the grave of Lady Flora Hastings to Her Most Gracious Majesty, the Queen.

Publication/Creation

London : R. Watts for T. Cadell & W. Blackwood, 1839.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/c6f7nztb>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

19631/p
L.P.J. 8610
THE DANGERS OF EVIL COUNSEL.

—
A
VOICE FROM THE GRAVE

OF
LADY FLORA HASTINGS:

TO HER MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY,

THE QUEEN.

—
THIRD EDITION:

WITH ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS, IN CONSEQUENCE OF THE
RECENT PUBLICATION OF IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS

—
LONDON:
PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, STRAND,
AND W. BLACKWOOD AND SONS, EDINBURGH:

By Richard Watts, Crown Court, Temple Bar.

1839

—
Price One Shilling.

86148

THE rapid demand for the first edition of "The Dangers of Evil Counsel" showed the great interest even then taken in the subject.—The observations in the following pages, on the documents lately published by the Most Noble the MARQUIS OF HASTINGS, have prevented the introduction of as large a portion of the first edition as the Author had contemplated. The case has presented new and awful claims upon the attention of the British Nation, since the publication of those astounding documents.

The present edition (as well as the former) has been prepared, and is given to the Press, wholly without the knowledge of any member or of any relative of the Noble Family of Hastings. The Author repeats his disdainful disclaimer of writing the following address from any feeling of political partisanship. The cause here advocated is that of female innocence, slandered and persecuted to death: it is the cause of the weaker party, oppressed by power: it is the cause of British justice and liberty: it is the cause of the character and honour of the Queen's Court: it is the cause of our innocent young Queen herself—"surprised," "betrayed," by evil suggestions and evil counsel, into that which she knew not.



ADVERTISEMENT.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1839.

THE writer of the contents of the following pages has this moment seen Lord Portman's Letter of the 27th instant, in the *Times* of this day.—He refers the reader to the 22d page of this pamphlet, for his statement, of his not desiring to aggravate the case against Lady Portman, and of his having deferred this publication until full time should have been given for the appearance of Lord Portman's promised proofs, that his Lady had done "neither more nor less than her duty, to the Court, to Lady Flora Hastings, and to the People of England, to whom she was constitutionally responsible."

At last, Lord Portman's publication has appeared; which (one would have supposed) might have been written within five minutes after his Lordship had read the DOCUMENTS of the Marquis of Hastings.

His Lordship's Letter is as follows:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR—Having carefully considered the extraordinary publication given to the world by the Marquis of Hastings, in the *Morning Post* of the 14th instant, I feel it necessary, in justice to Lady Portman, to lay before the public only a few observations on this painful subject.

Lady Portman is called "The Accuser." Lady Portman never originated any accusation against Lady Flora Hastings; but having been informed of the prevalence of suspicions entertained respecting Lady Flora Hastings, and observing the appearances on which they were founded, it seemed to her to be necessary that the doubts which rested on Lady Flora Hastings, and tended to reflect dishonour upon the Court, should be cleared up. She was, however, actuated by no feeling against Lady Flora Hastings, nor had she any desire but to discharge with the most scrupulous propriety her difficult and distressing duty.

Lady Portman never thought of, nor suggested, the medical examination; she never received nor delivered any message, suggesting, or requiring, or advising it; she never heard that any thing of the kind was likely to take place, until after she had come into the room at the request of Lady Flora Hastings. The statement, that on that occasion the demeanour of Lady Portman, "was unnecessarily abrupt, unfeeling, and indelicate," I only notice for the purpose of giving to it Lady Portman's absolute denial: no more cruel accusation than this can be made against Lady Portman, nor any more unfounded and incredible.

I refrain from commenting on other serious but unintentional mis-statements in the publication; yet I cannot conclude without declaring, with the utmost sincerity, that to Lady Portman and to me it has always been matter of the deepest regret that circumstances so singularly difficult and distressing should have concurred to create so much pain and so much sorrow.

Your most obedient servant,

BRYANSTON, *Sept. 27.*

PORTMAN.

The author of the following address, having thus prefixed to it Lord Portman's Letter, leaves to the judgment of the Public, whether that Letter refutes, or invalidates, the solemn averments to which it refers. He cannot see that it does;—and for these plain reasons :—

(1) The second paragraph refers to Lady Flora's having spoken or written of Lady Portman, as "her accuser"; and it asserts as an answer, only that she did not "*originate*" any accusation against Lady Flora. The persecuted and virtuous object of slander never said that she did so; but plainly intimated the contrary.—But, did not Lady Portman aver to Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent, and *as a married woman*, that there was no doubt that Lady Flora was guilty—or words to this effect?—*If she did*, she certainly was an *accuser* of the innocent Lady Flora. And, in order to refute this averment of the dying victim, the mere contradiction of the person charged with having thus *accused* her to her Royal Mistress evidently is quite insufficient.—HAS LORD PORTMAN THE POSITIVE AUTHORITY OF HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUCHESS OF KENT TO CONTRADICT IT?—*If he shall not be able to produce such authority*, what must be the undoubting conclusion, and clear conviction of the Public?—Let his Lordship then produce that authority!

(2) As to the assertions contained in the third paragraph, it is manifest that his Lordship should also have the express authority of the Illustrious DUCHESS OF KENT, asserting that the dying Lady Flora's statement respecting the delivery of the message to Her Royal Highness was a falsehood: and the evidence, on his oath, or (what from such a man would be equal) his honour, from SIR CHARLES MANSFIELD CLARKE, that the statement in the MARQUIS'S *documents*, corroborated by the oath of LADY FLORA'S maid-servant, respecting what occurred at the examination, is a FALSEHOOD. The charge as to certain *particulars* at the examination is against Lady Portman and Sir James Clark;—this charge, confirmed by

the dying victim, and by the oath of her maid-servant. A mere general contradiction from one, or from both of the persons so charged, cannot refute the solemn deposition, on her honour, by the victim, confirmed by the oath of a witness. Can the charge be invalidated, in the present case, by Lord Portman, unless he shall be supported by the decisive testimony of SIR CHARLES MANSFIELD CLARKE, who was present?—And if his Lordship shall have THIS NECESSARY testimony, will he not prosecute the false-swearer against his lady, for PERJURY?

The case is now for the judgment of the Public.

OCTOBER 10.

POSTSCRIPT.—In consequence of the demand for this Publication, direction was given, without the Author's knowledge, for printing a Third Edition. He had intended some corrections for a Third Edition; but the printing has so far advanced, before he was aware of its commencement, that he can now only avail himself of this opportunity of stating, (by cancelling a leaf,) that a more full consideration of Lord Portman's Letter served but to confirm him in the clear conviction, that the Letter is an utter failure.

The defence of himself which Sir James Clark has published, is also a failure; and even worse. With the exception of one single point, it *proves* nothing, unless it be very much *against* the party who has published it. The single point is, an implied appeal to the testimony of Sir Charles Mansfield Clarke, to show that a verbal communication made to the Marquis of Hastings, not by the lamented Lady Flora, was erroneous; viz. *that* which stated, that, at the *examination*, "some questions having been put to his Sister, and answered by her, it was suggested that the examination should proceed no farther; but that Sir James Clark objected; and then said, that nothing could satisfy the Ladies of the Palace but the most complete scrutiny."

On *this one point*, judgment will of course be suspended, until the testimony of Sir Charles Mansfield Clarke shall be known. Far be it from the Author of these pages, whose only object is the vindication of the sacred cause of JUSTICE, to do any injustice to any one! He requests the reader to bear in mind this statement, in reading the upper half of the following 21st page——also, if he shall read No. (5) and (6) in page 22, and the upper half of page 29, and the last three lines but four of page 30, in the publication entitled "Observations on the recent Letter of Lord Portman," annexed to the "Warning Letter to the Baroness Lehzen".

He knows of no other passage in these publications that can be affected by a more favourable answer from Sir Charles Clarke to the implied appeal of the Court physician, on the single point upon which he has produced any appearance of *proof* in refutation of any one of the charges mentioned in the documents of the Marquis of Hastings.

Her Majesty is entreated to bear in mind the following truth:—

There is a Court, even on this side of the grave, superior to any of those whose proceedings are conducted in the name of the young Queen. From the judgment in that Court, no person in the realm, Monarch or subject, is exempt. If, indeed, the actions of the Monarch be there condemned, they are ascribed to evil counsel—to bad suggestions, and influence. — — — — — That COURT is GREAT BRITAIN—this enlightened Christian NATION are the JURY—a FREE PRESS is the PROSECUTOR—PUBLIC OPINION the JUDGE;——and the KING of KINGS and LORD of LORDS — — — — — the LIVING and ETERNAL GOD—the SOVEREIGN.

[From the "Warning Letter to Baroness Lehzen," p. 4.

THE
DANGERS OF EVIL COUNSEL.

THE VOICE, which, from the untimely grave of persecuted innocence, lately addressed your MAJESTY, again appeals to you. With the same feelings of loyal duty—with the same sincerity of interest for your Majesty's welfare—it speaks the words of plain and honest truth. (Would that no other kind of language was addressed to our young Sovereign's ears!) — In the present dutiful remonstrance, it assumes a stronger tone—it breathes a spirit of augmented earnestness;—but the occasion calls for the change.

The Noble Brother of that persecuted innocent, who died in your Palace, the victim of base calumny and of a cruel outrage, has published documents of melancholy importance.—Fraternal duty—fraternal feeling—fraternal honour—have appealed to the PUBLIC OPINION of the moral and generous PEOPLE of GREAT BRITAIN.—THE APPEAL WILL NOT BE IN VAIN.

With a fervour of loyal duty, your Majesty is now implored to consider well the several unquestionable statements, upon which the judgment of PUBLIC OPINION, in this great and free country, is now demanded by one of the noblest of Britain's sons.—The charges shall here be submitted to

your Majesty, according to the order of time to which each refers.—But first, your Majesty is respectfully requested to observe, and to bear in mind, while you consider each charge, the manifest and striking facts, which, in a manner the most evident, proved Lady Flora's innocence, even at the very time when *first* a serpent was pouring into your ears the poison of the vilest slander against that spotless victim. (1) On the 9th of January, when Lady Flora arrived from Scotland, there was a particular appearance in her person, plainly visible to all, which would certainly have prevented her from coming to reside in your Majesty's Palace, if she had been conscious that it could have proceeded from a shameful cause. It would have been a direct and striking contradiction to the plainest sense and reason—it would have been absolute folly—nay, madness—in her to do so, under such circumstances. And yet Lady Flora was known to be a lady of a very sound understanding. (2) Her Ladyship was suffering from an other illness, for which she immediately *placed herself under the medical care of your Majesty's own Physician*: and this illness might fully account for the appearance in her person. She chose that physician, whose situation exposed him to be mixed up with the gossip of the Court. She chose the physician of your Majesty and your Illustrious Mother. In this, the unsuspecting confidence of innocence was manifest. (3) Lady Flora, who, in thus coming to reside in your Majesty's Palace, and in placing herself under the care of your own physician, did precisely that which an innocent unsuspecting lady would do, but what a guilty one

would evidently not have done, was a respected member of a Family distinguished for high and spotless honour. (4) If Lady Flora had been conscious of the existence of a cause for any idea of her infamy, she would not only have shown folly—madness—in those steps which, in all the unsuspecting confidence of innocence, she then took; but (let the truth be spoken!) she would have exhibited the most unfeeling—shameless—brazen impudence! Was it *possible*, that the noble and exalted young Lady, who had always been known to be sensitive, modest, and amiable, could be thus guilty? !!!—(5) She would have shown the most unnatural and monstrous contempt—not for her own honour merely—but for that of the sacred memory of a noble, a gallant, a chivalrous, an Illustrious Father;—for the honour of a noble and revered Mother, then suffering from sickness, and sorrowing in widowhood, but finding one of her best consolations in the comforting assurance of a daughter's virtues and a daughter's love;—nay, the most heartless disregard for the happiness—the life—of that fond, that venerated mother;—contempt for the honour of a noble, high-minded, and attached Brother;—in a word—contempt for the honour of her whole Family*; although that Family was one of the most distinguished and respected in the whole British Nobility! All this unnatural and monstrous contempt, Lady Flora must evidently have shown, if there had been truth in the “supicion.” (6) And

* How nobly the Duchess of Kent answered Lady Flora's defamers with this dignified argument!

this is not all. She would manifestly have evinced the most unfeeling and base ingratitude to your Illustrious Mother!—Let your Majesty observe, that all those facts were evident. They were, at the same time, manifest appearances, and certain realities. And, unquestionably, PUBLIC OPINION will judge the slanderers of that exalted and spotless young Lady, with a view of those plain and striking facts. —As to the appearance in her person—considered (as it most evidently should have been) in connection with those circumstances; and that it might have arisen from an illness of the very nature which she stated to the physician, and for which he was prescribing;—could it afford any ground for the false and scandalous idea of the noble young Lady's dishonour? A fair and honourable mind, *not under perverting influence*, could not, with a knowledge of those circumstances—which in Lady Flora's case were manifest and striking—have harboured for a moment such an unfounded and base suspicion.

But, if innocence has been slandered and persecuted to death in your Palace—if one of the purest and fairest flowers of our British Nobility has been crushed by a most iniquitous and cruel blow, from the hand of power, guided by evil counsel, or moved by a baneful influence—the evidence is now before the Nation. It is proclaimed to your People, in that series of documents, to which your Majesty's careful attention is here most earnestly intreated. The awful case is now brought under the judgment of PUBLIC OPINION,—and, in a manner which imperiously demands your Majesty's attention.

I.

In the first place, “a certain foreign lady is arraigned at the bar of PUBLIC OPINION, by the dying victim herself.”—Consider the accusation; and then, how far unquestionable facts, now published, go to confirm such a charge—or to show that it justly requires the most strict investigation.—The charge is, that “a certain foreign lady *pulled the wires of a diabolical conspiracy, of which LADY FLORA was to be the first victim.* And this charge is expressed as without a doubt.—How far do facts *at present known* go to maintain this charge?

In the first place, Lady Flora Hastings—a noble Lady, not only of purity and virtue, but of truth and honour, who must have anxiously observed the conduct of that foreign lady, had no doubt of it.—In the next place, what was the *first appearance* of the baneful effect of the vile slander in the Palace? Upon *this*, public opinion will now judge.—Lady Flora, having arrived from Scotland, came into waiting at the Palace on the 10th of January. And from the 11th (the very next day) “the idea”—“however or by whomsoever suggested”—appeared to be so strong in your Majesty’s mind, that you “never opened your lips to her” until after the fatal 17th of February. The Public will naturally feel confident, that your Majesty’s not having opened your lips for all that time to that noble young Lady, then in your Palace and in waiting on your Royal Mother, *must* have been occasioned by your having been possessed with “the idea” that Lady Flora was

in that state in which vile slander represented her to be.——Far be it from a loyal mind to believe that your young and innocent Majesty could, *of yourself*, have formed the impure, as well as most unjust suspicion!—or that, without some evil counsel or baneful influence, our very youthful Maiden Queen would have harboured “the idea”!——

Who then was it, that, so early as the 11th of January (the very day after Lady Flora’s coming into waiting) had poisoned the innocent mind of your Majesty (with *such* suspicion!!!) against that noble and virtuous young Lady?—That it was not a man, no doubt can be entertained: and your Prime Minister has expressly charged the whole slander upon the ladies of the Court. Who were the ladies at that time immediately about your Majesty? Lady Charlemont, Mrs. Campbell, Miss Paget, and Miss Spring Rice. These four ladies were then, by their turn, in waiting. But there were two other ladies, who were *in constant waiting*—Miss Davys, and a foreign lady—the Baroness Lehzen.——Upon one of those six ladies public opinion will naturally rest, as having possessed your Majesty’s mind with “the idea,” in consequence of which you did not, for the time before mentioned, open your lips to the noble and amiable Lady Flora. Now, let it be asked—on which of those six ladies?—Will it be on Lady Charlemont? It scarcely need be said, that public opinion will answer, “*No.*”—Will it be on Mrs. Campbell? Surely the probabilities are all against *her* being the person.—Will it be on any one of the three unmarried young ladies? As it is not for a moment

to be believed that your Majesty could, of yourself, have formed the impure suspicion; so it is not to be supposed that any one of these three young ladies would have formed it, and communicated it to your Majesty. Public opinion *will not* lay the charge upon any one of those three. — — — —
— — Lastly, then, are the circumstances such as to remove the probability of the guilt from the sixth mentioned lady? or, are they calculated to cause PUBLIC OPINION to fix the charge on *her*?— Was she the person, who, much more than any of the rest, was in your Majesty's habitual and intimate confidence?— Might her married situation, and her *age*, together with that habitual confidence, induce her to make herself the busy female mentor on such an occasion?— But, farther— could *she* have any particular impelling motive for exciting such a suspicion in your Majesty's mind? The dying innocent has recorded, that the hatred of a "certain foreign lady" in your Palace, to your Illustrious and universally-respected Mother, was "no secret." Thus, she not only averred it as from her own knowledge; but, also, as known by others in the Palace;—even so far, that it was "*no secret*." Public opinion will naturally judge, that such an *avermment* was not made by the virtuous and honourable Lady Flora, without some good foundation. And if the Public shall believe (and will they not believe it, if not disproved?) upon what the dying Lady Flora has recorded, that "a certain foreign lady" was known to entertain hatred toward your Illustrious and excellent Mother; upon which of the six ladies before named does your Majesty suppose

that public opinion will fix, as having an *impelling motive* for imparting the base suspicion to your Majesty?—Amongst the six ladies, there was but one foreign person—*Baroness Lehzen*.——Now, if, under all the circumstances at present known, PUBLIC OPINION shall fix on *her*, as the person who *first imparted the impure suspicion* to your Majesty, let not your Majesty believe, that your just and generous, your moral and high-minded people of Great Britain will be satisfied—or silent—while that foreign lady shall continue (without a strict investigation of her conduct with reference to the charge) to be favoured, honoured, cherished, by your Majesty!

If that foreign person be not guilty, a due respect for her own character should induce her to ask for the strictest inquiry into her conduct. She would grossly mistake this great moral country, if she were to suppose, that, by shrinking from meeting the accusation published against her, or by BRAVING THE PUBLIC OPINION OF BRITAIN WITH SHAMELESS FRONT, she could escape the retribution, which, if guilty, she would so fearfully deserve.——IF SHE BE INNOCENT, IS IT CREDIBLE, THAT, KNOWING THE CHARGE, SHE WILL NOT DEMAND THE STRICTEST AND FULLEST INVESTIGATION?—Shall a foreign woman, who so continually and publicly exhibits the especial favour of our young Queen toward her, leave any part of the dreadful charge, upon which she has been arraigned before the British Nation, undisproved?—Shall this foreign woman, who is announced in every “Court Circular,” as the highly-favoured companion of our young Maiden Queen,

leave the published accusation unanswered and unfuted, that she was the source from whence the impure suspicion was imparted to our innocent Sovereign ; and, that she promoted the fatal proceedings against the virtuous Lady Flora Hastings ? These charges have been repeated in the public papers. They are contained in the declaration of the dying Lady Flora. Let the “foreign lady” disprove the whole and every part of the accusation. Let proof be given, that she did not promote any part of the persecution of the innocent victim ; and, especially, that the impure suspicion was not imparted by her, in any manner, to our young Queen.—This may be done, if she be innocent. But if she shall not do so ; and if she shall not ask for a strict inquiry into her conduct ; will not your Majesty command it ?——In most respectful duty, but with all the confidence of truth, it is submitted, that your Majesty owes this to your own consistency, to the most imperious justice, and to the moral sense of the People of Great Britain, over whom you have the unequalled honour to reign. Shall it be said, that, after having been persuaded to give your authority, for the exercise of the most revolting and indelicate, the most cruel and barbarous rigour of severity, against an innocent BRITISH LADY, a virtuous ornament of ENGLAND’S Nobility, the esteemed friend of your Royal Mother, and residing under your roof—whom YOU NOW KNOW TO HAVE BEEN INNOCENT,—and who was brought to an untimely grave by that horrible severity,—gracious Heaven ! shall it be said, that the young Queen of England, who was persuaded to give authority, under which *such* severity was

perpetrated in her Court, shall *now* refuse the most moderate claim of JUSTICE, against the "foreign" woman charged with being the source of the fatal slander and deadly persecution of the victim?!!!

If the foreign woman shall be found guilty, it would be derogatory to your Majesty, and it would not satisfy the feelings of the British Public, that she should be allowed to retire from your Court, and escape from the country, *without some public mark of disgrace*. Your Majesty would owe it to yourself, as well as to those who have been most deeply injured, and to your just and moral People, to banish such a criminal from your Court with merited degradation. You would be applauded for such conduct; and the public disgust would drive the pest from our shores for ever. — — — — —
— — — Let your Majesty consider the unequalled generosity with which this great Nation supports the comforts and splendour of the Sovereign.— What may be the feelings of your moral and high-minded People, if they shall observe that a foreign woman—arraigned at the bar of PUBLIC OPINION, as the *known hater* of your Illustrious and universally-respected Mother—and as the author of the *impure and scandalous* communication to your Majesty, which led to the untimely death of a young British Lady, noble and virtuous, the friend of your Mother, and resident in your Palace—if they shall observe *that foreign woman* (the charges undisproved) still harboured, honoured, cherished by your Majesty?!!!

II.

The next person, to whose conduct, in the slander and persecution of the innocent Lady Flora Hastings, the recently-published documents refer, is LADY TAVISTOCK. What judgment will the Public form of the part taken by Lady Tavistock, even upon her own statement, although it is so manifestly partial, and purposely framed for her own defence? — She has stated, that on her coming into waiting in the Palace, at the end of January (ten days after the impure and base “idea” was communicated to your Majesty, during which time you had not opened your lips to Lady Flora, for a cause, of which that innocent object of slander and persecution was then ignorant), “strong suspicions of an unpleasant nature existed with respect to Lady Flora Hastings’ state of health;” and “that it was *considered necessary*, for the honour of your Majesty and the character of the Household, that these suspicions should not be permitted to continue and spread, without some step being taken to put a stop to them.” She then adds, that “observing the *opinion* in question was *borne out by appearances*” borne out by appearances!!! — What were the *manifest appearances* in Lady Flora’s case, which were *certain evidences of realities*? They are stated in pages 5 and 6 of this earnest address to your Majesty; and they must be obvious to the British People. Therefore PUBLIC OPINION will judge Lady Tavistock, for having been blind to all those striking appearances and decisive evidences, which would have made “the suspicion” incredible to any fair and reasonable mind; and for having

her vision open only to a *personal appearance* in Lady Flora, which fiendish malice had perverted into a ground for a false and infamous accusation against her. The admission of "the suspicion" into Lady Tavistock's mind so clouded her mental vision, and corrupted her judgment, that, in spite of all the plain, decisive, and honourable appearances—the striking and certain realities—in Lady Flora's case, she drew from the *personal appearance*, which that noble young Lady's declared illness might have accounted for, the conclusion—that "the opinion in question was borne out"!——

"Conceiving," however, "that Lady Flora might have been privately married," she "felt much desire to speak to her at once upon the subject: but *circumstances* occurred, which prevented her carrying this *wish* into effect, and rendered it her *painful duty* to inform the Prime Minister of the *opinion* that had been unfortunately entertained."——Now your Majesty is respectfully entreated to observe, that the Public will at once judge, that, according to this statement, there must have been some very powerful influence exercised over the mind of Lady Tavistock, to prevent her from performing that act toward her friend which she so *much desired*; and which "rendered it her *painful duty*" of being herself the bearer of "the suspicion"—to the Prime Minister—to Lord Melbourne!——Did evil counsel—or did a baneful influence—so far mislead Her, who came to Britain's Throne, from the hallowed care of one of the best of Mothers, with a mind so innocent and gracious, that she could misuse her high authority to con-

strain Lady Tavistock, so much against her earnest *wish*, and with such *pain* to her feelings, to abandon *that* which friendship and justice demanded, and to become herself the bearer of *such* a communication to the ears of Lord Melbourne? Your Majesty is implored to observe, that this question is now brought under the judgment of PUBLIC OPINION, by the statement of Lady Tavistock. Your moral and discerning People will be certain, that if the constraining influence came from the young Sovereign, this must have been in consequence of a baneful influence, which the honour of your Court and the public interest imperatively require to be removed. And they will naturally ask, what power, except the supposed authority of your Majesty, could have thus arrested Lady Tavistock in her strong "*wish*" and "*desire*" to do an act of friendship and justice to Lady Flora; and made her feel it to be her *painful duty*, to bear, against her friend, and without that friend's knowledge, the dishonouring communication to Lord Melbourne?—But, to what dreadful results will evil counsel and baneful influence lead?—Had your Majesty, at the first moment that the impurity was poured into your ears, repelled the serpent that was instilling the poison, and instantly called for the advice and guidance of that Illustrious Matron, whom the circumstances of her position respecting your Majesty and the accused, her prudence and virtues, the obligations of unbounded gratitude, the sacred ties of nature—the COMMANDMENT of the Living GOD—all pointed out, as the fit person for your Majesty to refer the case to,—had your Majesty repelled the evil counsel and baneful

influence, and at once flown to the proper guide in such a case——to Her, who, under Heaven, is the author of your being—who was so long the faithful and devoted guardian of your principles and innocence—your revered and admirable Mother—what a train of crime, infamy, and misery would have been prevented! — — — — —
 — — no constraining influence could then have required Lady Tavistock to resist her duty to her friend, and to overcome those feelings of delicacy, which must be supposed to have existed in the breast of one of her character.——At the same time, with loyal respect, but with the candour of truth, it is submitted, that if (through evil counsel) the direction had been given to her even from your Majesty's lips, Public opinion would judge, that, rather than be the bearer of *such* a communication to Lord Melbourne, her Ladyship would have acted most rightly in resigning her office and leaving your Court.

But what was the result of this private communication to Lord Melbourne?—Lady Tavistock having been obliged by “painful duty” (as she has stated), “to inform the PRIME MINISTER of the *opinion* that had been unfortunately entertained,” what was the advice—what “the desire”—of the PRIME MINISTER, thus officially consulted for the honour of your Court. His solemn declaration is published in the documents; that, “having been made acquainted with *the reports* by Lady Tavistock, he *desired the ladies of the Court to be quiet, he himself not placing any belief in it.*”—And yet, the “desire” of the PRIME MINISTER, and his opinion

—his *undoubting* opinion—(for he did “not place ANY belief” in the vile and scandalous “report”) were utterly disregarded; his authority was set at nought, and the cruel and infamous persecution was continued! Who was the secret adviser, that could thus overbear the authority of your PRIME MINISTER, after he had been officially consulted? Whose the “baneful influence,” which so fatally prevailed?—PUBLIC OPINION will judge this question: and if, under all the circumstances, it shall fix on your Majesty’s most constant and confidential attendant, “the foreign lady,” this will be an additional cause of a widely-spreading and increasing indignation on the subject of that person.—Your Majesty is intreated to consider this.

III.

The next person, to whom, in the order of time, the charges contained in the documents refer, is Lady Portman, the successor of Lady Tavistock.—She has stated, that a few days after she had entered upon her attendance in the Palace, in February; informed of the existing “*suspitions*” that Lady Flora “*must have been privately married*”—(what extremely kind palliation! — what considerate interest for the slandered victim!) “which information was *not* given her *by* or *from* the Baroness Lehzen:” (no one will suppose “*by*”; but “*from*” is a very different point; on which Lady Portman herself might be in the dark. The dying charge of the victim represented the *Source* of the foul and polluted stream to have been shaded even from the general view of the Court): but “this information

drew *her attention more particularly*" (not to the honourable, striking, and certain evidences of the utter falsehood of the "suspicions": (see pages 5, 6 of this):—in the truth of which the Prime Minister, officially consulted, had just before expressly declared that he did not place ANY belief, desiring the ladies of the Court to be quiet; not to any of these manifest and decisive proofs:) *but* to the "*appearance*" in Lady Flora's person; from *which* she immediately drew her conclusion. She "formed the opinion, that it was *necessary*, for the honour of the Court, and for the character of Lady Flora Hastings," (how infinitely kind!) "that all *doubt* should be removed upon the subject."—"A few days afterwards Lady Flora Hastings' *medical attendant* communicated to me, *as the lady in waiting*, his *suspicions*—(his suspicions!—Physicians of Great Britain, what a brand upon your honourable profession! Will you remain silent under it?)—his suspicions that Lady Flora was privately married" (still the kind, considerate *palliation*!) "and asked my opinion, which I gave——*only as connected with my observation of her appearance*. Sir James Clark subsequently informed me, that Lady Flora Hastings had denied to him her marriage; and that he had requested her to select another medical adviser, to consult with him upon her state of health."——Now, let what immediately follows be most attentively marked.

"It then" (adds Lady Portman) "*became my duty*" (this phrase here used will naturally lead public opinion more decidedly to explain the same expression, as used by Lady Tavistock, to refer to

the authority of your Majesty) “to communicate to her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent, that, *until those doubts were removed*, Lady Flora Hastings should not appear in her Majesty’s presence.”—But what a *shocking manner* of removing the “*doubts*,” did this lady, with the alleged authority of your Majesty, require. And be it observed—this same lady, “in a very warm conversation which her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent had with her, on *every bearing* of the transaction, took upon herself to *aver*, from her experience as a married woman, that there was NO DOUBT Lady Flora was in the situation they alleged her to be in*.” But, for “removing the doubts,” a most indelicate, revolting, cruel, and unparalleled order† is communicated by this lady, in your Majesty’s name, to your own Illustrious Mother, from which that admirable Mother “shrunk with horror.” Well, well, she might! Many a breast in Great Britain has it filled with horror.—Your Majesty did not—could not—have understood it! Nay, Public Opinion may, from the strong feeling of British loyalty, incline to believe that the *terms*, in which your Majesty gave your command, might not have authorised the outrage which so soon was perpetrated. And questionless, whatever authority was given by your Majesty upon the occasion, your People will ascribe it to the suggestions by which you were so lamentably misled. Under our happy

* Lady Flora’s Letter to Lord Hastings, from Buckingham Palace, in May. See the documents.

† This mandate, so delivered—the FIRST communication on the subject from your Majesty to your Illustrious Mother! O there was a baneful influence there!

Constitution, though your Majesty is not personally responsible, your free People will canvass, and may condemn, certain acts alleged to have emanated from you; but they will ascribe them to *counsel*, which is, or ought to be, responsible. And especially, in the present case, they will consider your Majesty utterly incapable, *knowingly and of yourself*, to have issued that order, which, as communicated and executed, would have been amongst the disgraces of the reign of Henry VIII, if it were one of the records of that brutal tyrant!——Your Illustrious and admirable Mother “shrunk from it with horror.” Oh! well she might!——Good God! that you had consulted HER, instead of your new female advisers!

Lady Portman states, that she communicated to your Majesty the result of the (medical) “CONSULTATION.” This word is gratifying, as confirming the *hope*, that even the *terms* in which the command came from your Majesty, did not authorise the outrage. But it was *not* a mere medical “*consultation*” that this lady required in your Majesty’s name:—no;—it was a medical “*examination*,” of a nature the most indelicate and shocking!——And how was the “*examination*” conducted, under the alleged authority of your Majesty?—Here the heart sickens: and it is with difficulty that the hand can guide the pen. The “*examination*” (to use the words of Lady Flora) was “most rigid.” The barbarous and indelicate investigation”* took place on Sunday the 17th day of February, in the presence of Sir Charles Mansfield Clarke, Sir James Clark, Lady Flora’s “accuser, Lady Portman,” and her own

* Lord Hastings’ most just expression.

maid. And (says the noble brother of the victim) “some questions having been put to my sister, and answered, it was suggested that the inquiry ought not to proceed farther, and that they might now feel satisfied. Sir *James* Clark objected, and stated, that the *ladies of the Court* would not be satisfied” (this in the presence of Lady Portman, his “confidante” as he called her) “without *the strictest examination*; and, that *if* Lady Flora knew her own innocence, she could have *no reason* to oppose the most complete scrutiny.” (Merciful Heaven!—no reason!—what insensibility to every feeling of delicacy and humanity!—*no reason!!!*—Is it possible that this person is still your Majesty’s physician?!) “It has been also stated to me,” (adds the noble brother of Lady Flora, in his heart-stirring appeal to the moral and generous People of Great Britain), “and corroborated to the fullest extent by a deposition sworn before a Magistrate of Ayrshire by my sister’s maid, who was present at the examination, that while the whole demeanour of Sir *Charles* Clarke, during the painful and humiliating scene, was characterized by kindness, the conduct of Sir *James* Clark, as well as that of Lady Portman, was *unnecessarily* abrupt, *unfeeling*, and *indelicate*.” but, he continues, “this deposition I withhold, as it contains much that is *WHOLLY* unfit for general perusal.”—Now, while that lady, who appears, in this part of the lamentable proceedings, to have been in confidential private communication with your Majesty, thus behaved, and was sanctioning the shameful and barbarous proceeding of Sir *James* Clark, she must have felt confident—convinced, *without a*

doubt, that the “complete scrutiny” would brand Lady Flora with infamy :—for she had averred to your Illustrious Mother, from her experience as a married woman, that there was *no doubt* Lady Flora was in the situation alleged :—and yet this lady, in her subsequent statement, described herself as actuated by feeling for the honour of the Court, and for “the character of Lady Flora Hastings” !—It is not to aggravate the case, as against Lady Portman, that the Voice from the grave of the persecuted innocent so fully speaks the truth to your Majesty :—no—would that justice permitted every fact, which could draw public censure upon *her* or upon Lady Tavistock, to be buried in oblivion ! But, alas ! it is far otherwise ; and most especially with Lady Portman. Her noble Lord (as it would appear—very partially informed) published his intention to prove, as soon as the promised documents from Lord Hastings should appear, that his lady did “neither more nor less than her *duty*, to the Court, to Lady Flora Hastings, and to the PEOPLE of ENGLAND, *to whom she was constitutionally responsible*.” This address to your Majesty has been delayed to this day (September 23d), by the wish to wait for the publication from Lord Portman, as long as could be reasonable, before the publication of any remarks upon that conduct, which his lordship, in the mistaken confidence of its rectitude and propriety, placed under the judgment of the People of England. The promised publication of his lordship seems no longer to be expected.—And if the writer of these pages, as one of the People of England, fairly and fully giving a faithful (but certainly

a reluctant) judgment, does not diminish ought from the censurable nature of that lady's proceeding ; it is to show to your Majesty the awful danger to which a departure from the guidance of your Illustrious and admirable Mother, and obedience to the suggestions of other female advisers, may subject our young Queen. It is as a warning—O may your Majesty deign to attend to it !—of the dangers of evil counsel.

Lady Portman “acknowledged” to the slandered victim, “that she had several times spoken a great deal to your Majesty on the subject, especially when she found it was your Majesty's *own* idea.” The expression was equivocal : but the public will hope, that the meaning was that which the dying victim stated in a form more considerate toward your Majesty—that the idea had been “*suggested*” to your Majesty, and was strong in your mind. But what appears to have been the result of this “great deal” of private speaking with your Majesty ?——the command, under the alleged authority of which the horrid outrage was perpetrated !——

The subject is most painful : but the public interest awfully requires its discussion ; in order to lead to the prevention of future danger.

IV.

The next person, whom, in the order of time, the charges in the documents bring under the judgment of public opinion—is—Sir James Clark.—First, your Majesty is entreated to bear in mind the following statement of the duties of a physician, made by an honourable member of the profession :—

“A physician is attending a maid of honour, for a bodily malady; and after some time, he begins to suspect that the disease is not that which at first it seemed to be. What would a wise and humane physician do, under such circumstances? He would, in the most delicate terms, hint his *doubts*, rather than his *suspensions*, to the lady herself; and appeal to her prudence and honour, for the safety of her life and character. If a lady who had arrived at the years of discretion, and who of all was the most interested in the result, and most cognisant of the facts, declared her innocence, NO MEDICAL MAN WOULD HAVE ANY RIGHT TO DISPUTE HER DECLARATION; BUT, ON THE CONTRARY, IT WOULD BE HIS BOUNDEN DUTY, AS A PHYSICIAN AND A CHRISTIAN, TO REPEL EVERY BREATH OF SCANDAL, FROM WHATEVER SOURCE IT EMANATED—even if it were from the lips of Royalty. If he were led into error by this procedure, no dishonour nor discredit should attach to the physician. All the responsibility would fall on the patient, and all evil consequences of deception would rest on her. Had the medical attendant on the virtuous Lady Flora thus performed his bounden duty, what a world of misery and wounded feelings would have been prevented! the tongue of detraction would not have ventured to pour (or at least would have ceased to pour) its venom into the ears of Royalty, when discountenanced by professional authority.—But here, the physician, instead of relying on his own skill, abruptly informs his patient, ‘that the Ladies of the Court’—(the Ladies of the Court!!!)—‘were convinced that she was———.’ And when the calumny is denounced, and the charge

most solemnly denied by the indignant lady against whom it was made, the physician adds insult to injury, by distrusting her veracity, as well "as questioning her virtue." *

But, what was the conduct of the medical attendant on the virtuous Lady Flora? A part—a shocking part—of his proceedings has been already stated.—To her most solemn protestations of innocence he gave no credit: nay, he proceeded to defame her to her Royal Mistress!!! But, how properly was this accuser of his innocent patient repelled by that Illustrious Lady! and how justly, and with what honour to herself, did she dismiss him with disgrace from her service! Never were dismissal and disgrace more merited.—There are few, perhaps, especially among females, who would not be in great danger of receiving a false and injurious impression from a professional opinion thus urged by the attending physician himself. But the lofty and honourable mind of the Duchess of Kent was proof against this danger. The attack of the physician was followed by that of the lady, bearing the *shocking command*. But, how little could these false accusers have known the mind of the Illustrious person, whose noble confidence in the virtue and honour of her innocent young friend they must have expected to overcome! With high feeling, she repelled them both; and not only dismissed the accusing doctor, but refused to see the *convinced* lady again. The repelling these two persons did not cost her noble mind any great effort.—But, there

* The above Letter appeared in the Morning Post, April 24th.

was a struggle soon to come — the humiliating, shocking examination, which was required as the only admissible mode of proving the innocence of her virtuous and slandered friend! She revolted from the thought; she “shrunk with horror;” she spurned the vile indignity. — But the persecuted sufferer, herself, chose the shocking alternative, in preference to dishonour: she resolved to drink the very dregs of the bitter cup, rather than suffer a stain to rest upon her virtue: she—she herself it was, who alone could persuade her noble-minded Mistress to consent to her being submitted to the shocking examination. A day elapses before even she can succeed. At last, the struggle in the mind of her Illustrious Mistress is overcome: and the Royal Lady gives her consent — — — — — her *reluctant* consent——(yes—still *reluctant*——God bless her!) The persecuted innocent endures the ordeal: her virtue is proved*, her honour vindicated:—but, she droops—she pines—she dies!—How hard was the lot of this amiable and lamented young lady! Persecuted as she was by female accusers, she found, even in the man whose bounden duty it was to assert her innocence in the Palace—and who, if he had performed his duty, would probably have stopped the progress of the fatal calumny—she found, even in *him*, a defamer of her virtue, to her Royal Mistress! a persevering, un-

* The fatal result was described, in a just and most touching manner, in an admirable leading article in the Morning Herald of August the 21st, in the following affecting and expressive passage:—

“The saint sustained it;
But the woman died.”

feeling, and indelicate executer of "*the most complete scrutiny*" — the barbarous outrage — under which the modest victim sunk!—Sinking as she was, the most cruel blow of all was struck by the command into which your Majesty was "betrayed." It may be a consolation to your Majesty, that, in the last prayers of that persecuted victim—(after her dying REDEEMER's example) for the Divine forgiveness of those who were instrumental to her bitter sufferings, she might truly add concerning you—she probably did add concerning you—that you "knew not what you did." Not to your innocent and gracious Majesty, but to evil suggestions and evil counsel, the persecuted sufferer most justly ascribed it.

During the short period in which the amiable young Lady survived the shocking examination, every appearance which she made at your Majesty's Court must have added a new pang to her breaking heart. All the punishment fell on her;—and that punishment was deadly: while the defamers, who brought her to an untimely grave, were still honoured in your Court. They knew the sad degradation they had brought her to—the humiliating examination! How could she, after this, meet them still held in honour in your palace, without a new wound to her already-tortured feelings? Her noble Brother would have removed her from such a scene; but *they doubted not* that her defamers would have been at work again. A new and continued course of deeply-wounding insult to the suffering innocent shakes her tottering frame. The royal promise of soothing kindness is broken, though her virtue was

vindicated by an ordeal so dreadful. An external display is made to the PUBLIC, of the Sovereign's favour toward her: yet that Sovereign does not even speak to her! Alas! some baneful influence misleads the mind of a young and inexperienced Queen! Day after day makes the near approach of her sure relief in death more certain. And, O! contemplate that virtuous and high-minded young lady, when informed that her dissolution was near at hand—not two days distant—resolutely directing, and in a solemn and awful manner not to be disobeyed, that her body should be dissected after death, so far as to give, *even then*, another full refutation to the defamers of her virtue!—Her desire was fulfilled; and the dead body of the martyr bore the awful witness—became a sacred monument of a last triumph on earth of female innocence and virtue, and of the fatal influence of slander. May your Majesty contemplate the mortal remains of the late virtuous inmate of your Court, and friend of your Illustrious Mother, as a beacon, to guard you, to the latest hour, against the dreadful dangers of evil suggestions and evil counsel!

But there are yet one or two striking facts relative to Sir James Clark, stated in the documents, upon which the Public opinion is called to judge. Lady Flora has left the “hand-writing” against him. She has declared, in her letter to her noble Mother, dated at your Palace the 13th of March—and referring (it would appear) to the day of the fatal outrage, and to a period of it subsequent to her endurance of the dreadful ordeal—that Sir James Clark “began, *that day*, to speak to me with

some degree of feeling ; but, irritated by my denial, became *violent* and *coarse*, and *even attempted to browbeat me.*" Will the public opinion judge such conduct—from *him*, and particularly at such a time—to be a crowning insult, an act of barbarous cruelty, and most audacious insolence?—If such shall be the judgment of public opinion, might it not also be thought, that your Majesty, by retaining such a person as your physician, (if through evil counsel you should do so,) would offer a continued and a public insult to the noble and respected family of Hastings, after all the injuries which your Majesty must now be supposed to *know* that they have sustained?

But two more facts of Dr. Clark.—The persecuted Lady Flora's words, in her own hand-writing, are: "On the 16th of February, Sir James Clark came to me, and asked me whether I were privately married; giving as *his* reason, that my figure had excited the remarks of *the ladies* of the Palace. On my emphatic denial, he became *excited*; urged me to *confess*, as the only thing to save me; stated *his own conviction* to agree with that of *the ladies*; that it had *occurred to him at the first*; that *no one could look at me and doubt it*; and remarks even yet more coarse"!—And yet, this same Sir James Clark, after attending the innocent sufferer for three weeks, from the 10th of January to the 1st of February, wrote a prescription for her on the *latter* day as well as on the former, quite inconsistent with such a belief! — — — — "I observed to him, that the swelling from which I had suffered was *very much reduced*, and offered him the *proof of my*

dresses. He replied: 'Well, I don't think so: I think you grow larger and larger every day; and so the ladies think.' I said
 . . . that his supposition (*viz.* as to the truth of the scandal) was untrue, and perfectly groundless. He ended by assuring me that nothing but a *medical examination* would satisfy *the ladies* of the Palace; and that he must inform Lady Portman, who had been his '*confidante*,' of my denial.—The Public is called to judge of such conduct in a physician, toward a noble and suffering young Lady, who had been his patient. To the most grossly-insulting assertions, and insolent denial of her veracity, he is charged to have added the iniquitous refusal to examine the *proofs*—the plain and positive *proofs*—which Lady Flora offered to present to him—of the truth of what she had averred! He *persisted* in his insulting assertion, and said that he must inform Lady Portman, who had been his *confidante*, of the denial!

V.

Your Majesty's Prime Minister!—He did "not place *any* belief in the report;" and he "desired the ladies to be quiet." Such was his reply to the *official* communication which it became "the painful duty of Lady Tavistock to make to him.—And yet, his authority and desire appear to have been utterly disregarded. The Public may feel astonishment, that he did not insist on attention to his opinion and direction, in a case where the character of a noble and slandered young Lady, the honour of your Court, and your Majesty deceived by false and

scandalous suggestions, were all (so manifestly to him) concerned. If his answer was set at nought, why was he officially consulted? It could not have been merely to make him partaker in the scandalous Court secret. How will the Public account for the entire disregard shown to his answer? Will they form the opinion, that the answer being one of acquittal, was displeasing to *the ladies*, who had looked for some steps to be taken on his part against the innocent object of persecution?

On the 7th of March (soon after the ordeal which her innocent daughter had undergone), the noble and afflicted mother wrote to your Majesty a letter which did honour to her head and heart. It has been the just subject of sympathizing admiration to vast numbers of your Majesty's loyal subjects—a theme of praise throughout the kingdom. In that beautiful and affecting letter, the venerable female ornament of the British Peerage used these memorable words: "It is all important, that no time should be lost in calling the culpable to account."—Her words were sadly verified. The time was lost: her innocent and persecuted daughter pined, and died*.

And did your Majesty deign, like your Illustrious Mother, to send a gracious and consolatory letter to the venerable and noble lady? Here it was, that (according to the grateful expression of Lady Flora) the excellent Duchess of Kent "crowned her goodness."—Perhaps the rules of etiquette forbade your Majesty's writing. Yet, in such a case,

* See page 26.

would not the rule have been "more honoured in the breach, than in the observance"? But certainly, if not directly from your Majesty, a kind letter, in your Majesty's name, would have been *just*, as well as gracious: it would have served to comfort the afflicted mother of the innocent sufferer: it would have imparted a consolation in her sorrows: it would have contributed, in some degree, to make a suitable reparation. The admirable letter of the deeply afflicted noble Lady to your Majesty was written (to use her own touching words) "in the anguish of a mother's heart for her innocent child." But never was a letter more full of loyalty, respect, and duty toward a Sovereign. She appealed to your Majesty, to "mark, by some act, your indignant sense of the slanders which some person or persons had ventured to cast, *in your MAJESTY'S presence*, upon her daughter; and *betrayed* your Majesty to follow up, by a course of proceeding, such as was no doubt intended, on their part, to degrade the victim of their persecution." The noble lady stated her "duty, respectfully, to call your Majesty's attention to its being not more important to her daughter, than essentially consonant to your Majesty's honour and justice, not to suffer the criminal inventor of such falsehoods to remain without discovery." And the noble and most respected Lady added—"To a female Sovereign especially, women of all ranks in Britain look with confidence for protection, and (notwithstanding the difference of their rank) for sympathy."

To the mournfully beautiful, affecting, and most just appeal of the afflicted and venerated widow of

the high-minded, chivalrous Moira—the friend of your Illustrious House—what answer was returned, in your Majesty's name, by your Prime Minister? How has his reply been characterized, from one end of the kingdom to the other? What epithets of reprobation have been generally and justly applied to it! What public indignation did it excite! How different the heart from which it proceeded must be from that which beats in the breast of the young Queen of Britain! Your Majesty, if unbiassed by perverting counsel, must have admired the noble and afflicted Lady's letter, sympathized with her feelings, felt the justice of her solicitation, and returned to her touching appeal a gracious answer of assent.

The Minister, indeed, stated that your Majesty felt “deep concern at the *unfortunate circumstances* which had recently taken place; and that you had hastened to seize the first opportunity of testifying to Lady Flora Hastings your conviction of the *error* of the impression which had prevailed.”——An order is brought, in your Majesty's name, for a shocking kind of examination, which your Majesty *could not* have thought of, except from some base suggestion; and, even then, could not have understood. The result of this examination, though it wounds (perhaps mortally) the delicate feelings of the pure and calumniated young lady, proves, to absolute certainty, her complete innocence, and convicts her defamers of falsehood and slander—of *bearing false witness against her*, so as to injure her health, destroy her peace, and endanger her life (in fact, as it has since appeared, to cause, or at least contribute to, her death). And the reparation made on the part

of your Majesty, by whose authority the order was issued under the baneful influence of those false accusers, has been, that your Majesty hastened to express, *to* the innocent persecuted victim, your “conviction of the *error* of the impression which had prevailed”!!! and that you were “deeply concerned at the unfortunate circumstances which had taken place.”—Could it be possible that this was the reparation—(reparation!!!)—which your Majesty was to grant?

In a subsequent letter, addressed by the same noble Lady to your Minister, she observed, “that *no steps* were taken to repair, as far as reparation could be possible, the indignity offered to her daughter within the precincts of your Majesty’s Palace”;—and added, at the close of her address to him, these words: “I claim, at your hands, My Lord, the dismissal of Sir James Clark.” To which claim your Minister replied, that “the demand was so *unprecedented* and *objectionable*, that even the respect due to her ladyship’s sex, rank, family, and character would not justify him in more (if, indeed, it authorised so much) than acknowledgment that he had received” her letter!!! The claim of the noble Marchioness, in the anguish of a widowed mother’s heart, for this justice upon a false accuser of her innocent and persecuted child—upon him, who was especially bound to have so acted as to become the defender of her innocence, but whose charge against his patient was calculated to confirm and give the most sure effect to the slanders of her persecutors—the claim for justice upon him, and from such a quarter—the claim for that justice, of

which the Illustrious Duchess of Kent had set the example—this (according to your Minister) was so *objectionable*, that he could not be justified in doing more (if, indeed, he should do so much) than to acknowledge the receipt of the letter!!!—As to the claim being *unprecedented*, the noble Brother of Lady Flora well replied, that “the conduct of her defamers had been *unprecedented*, and calculated, in the highest degree, to throw disgrace and discredit on the Court”; and would fully justify the making a precedent. “I once more urge upon you, My Lord,” said he, in his eloquent letter to the Minister, “that course which you say is without precedent: the *occasion will justify you in making one*. My sister is daily subjected to the bitterness that results from the presence of those who have so basely slandered her. I should have *instantly* relieved her from this, had I not known, that, by so doing, I should give fresh opportunity for calumniating her; and act ungratefully to her Illustrious and generous Mistress, the Duchess of Kent, whose noble conduct will ever be gratefully remembered by my family, and duly appreciated and respected by every well-thinking person within the realm.”

With what impressive force did the noble writer complain, in the same letter to the Minister, that his sister’s “family had been prevented from bringing her slanderers to justice, and holding them up to the contempt and indignation of the world, by the manner in which *they had been screened by the Court!*” Eminent, as he and his noble family have ever been, for loyal attachment to the Crown, he “imputed nothing to the Sovereign, but the mis-

fortune of being betrayed by the baneful influence which surrounds the throne." No reply has appeared from the Minister to this appeal: and even to this day (Sept. 23d), although more than twelve weeks have elapsed since defamation and indignities brought Lady Flora to an untimely death, no justice has been done, on the part of your Majesty, upon any one of her calumniators!!!

Your Majesty may recollect, that at an audience granted to the noble Brother of Lady Flora, after the shocking examination, your Majesty was pleased to assure him that his sister should be treated with *honour and kindness*. This is now before the Nation, in the documents. And your PRIME MINISTER, in his letter to Lady Loudoun, (however censurable other parts of that letter may be) assured the noble and venerable Lady Loudoun, that your Majesty was *most desirous to do every thing in your power to soothe the feelings of Lady Flora and her family.*" And yet it appears, from the documents, that, "with the exception of an inquiry after Lady Forbes's children, your Majesty showed Lady Flora no notice from the 24th of March (the date when Mr. Fitzgerald's Letter was published) until the 9th of June (the near approach of Lady Flora's death then being too evident*), when your Majesty sent to ask how she was"—!!! While the Public may feel amazed at this, and indignant at the secret baneful influence to which they may ascribe it (for they will not attribute to their young Queen herself a cruel violation of the Royal word—a word

* Her lingering sufferings terminated in death, in less than a month after.

pledged under circumstances that should make it, if possible, more than usually sacred), will they not also condemn the conduct of your Prime Minister? Believing that he must, from his own observation, have been aware of this breach of the Royal promise, will they not consider him deeply culpable, for not insisting on such a change as that promise required?—Was the publication of Mr. Fitzgerald's Letter any excuse for such a breach of promise? His Letter was in defence of his innocent and excellent niece, against false and scandalous reports. Such a publication was rendered necessary at the time, for the vindication of the noble and virtuous young Lady from slanders which had then widely spread, flowing (alas!) from your Palace! In that letter—a transcript from one of Lady Flora's,—far from stating any thing justly offensive to your Majesty, the persecuted sufferer, although writing *very recently* after the fatal shock of the “outrage,” not only entirely acquitted your Majesty of any intention of such an indelicate and shocking cruelty, but defended your Majesty, and recorded her conviction of your Majesty's innocence; and that you were “surprised and betrayed” into that which you knew not. And with respect to the Ladies of the Palace, and to Sir James Clark, she expressed herself in such terms of Christian forbearance, as may well excite admiration in the public mind, now that the proceedings of the Ladies and of Sir James Clark are made known to the Nation, by the documents.—Who could have suggested the breach of the Royal Word? Will public opinion point to a “certain foreign lady,” who

was then (as she still appears to be) in constant attendance on your Majesty? However this may be; the judgment of the Public will naturally pronounce that it was the bounden duty of your Prime Minister, who was so continually in your Court, to look to the fulfilment of the Solemn ROYAL PROMISE.

To the sad catalogue of injuries, it shall now be added, that not only has no justice been done upon any one of the calumniators; but that all the information which the noble Brother of the slandered victim so justly demanded, in order to trace the authors of the persecution, has been denied to him! ————nay, that in four or five days after the records of Sir James Clark's conduct, which have here been stated, were before the British Public, he was announced in the Court Circular as being received at Windsor Castle!!!—and that he is still your Majesty's physician!!!—May not the British Public feel indignant at the Prime Minister's not having interfered, to prevent such an insult to the moral sense of the Nation; while yet they ascribe that insult, not to your Majesty, but to evil suggestion—to a baneful influence?

But, what an awful train of evidence do the documents present of the evils and miseries resulting from your Majesty's having followed other female counsel rather than that of your admirable and Illustrious Mother! The regal office removes not the duties of the most grateful love, the most affectionate intimacy, and the most entire confidence

in those matters which particularly require female counsel. The regal power may well be reconciled with the utmost filial attachment, the most affectionate and reverential filial duty: nay, it affords frequent and peculiar occasions and means for showing such love, and testifying such duty.—Be not afraid of a slight error (if such should at any time occur) on the side of filial tenderness! Your Majesty rules over a generous—a Christian People. Far from censuring, they would feel even more general respect, and hold you in still higher estimation and honour, observing that you were rather apt to fall into a slight error on the side of filial gratitude and love, than on that of the exercise of regal authority. But, happily, in your Majesty's case, filial attachment and confidence are peculiarly safe and salutary, bless'd as you have been with a Mother dignified and noble-minded, prudent and just, kind and gracious.

And yet—was the shocking ordeal, which was so basely suggested to your Majesty, wounding only to the feelings of the suffering Lady Flora herself? Not to speak of the honoured family of this virtuous and excellent young Lady, there was one beneath your own roof, whom your Majesty never would, knowingly, be the instrument of wounding—one, illustrious not merely for her royal rank, but for her exemplary virtues—the kind and affectionate friend and protectress of Lady Flora—her “own beloved Mistress” (as the persecuted innocent so affectionately called her),—filling in a manner the place of a mother to her, and bearing to yourself the sacred relation of MOTHER; who had performed all

the duties of maternal care and tenderness and love to you from your birth, until, having succeeded to the throne, you became influenced by other female advisers. How incessant was her watchfulness over you; and how entirely did she devote herself to your welfare! How did her maternal heart expand with joy, when, on the day of your coronation, she heard the acclamations of thousands, greeting you as the young Queen of their hopes; and greeting her, as the happy Mother to whom that Queen was attached with all the duty of filial gratitude, and all the tenderness of filial love!

Lady Flora was weak in bodily health; affected, also, by family sorrows;—she cherished the mourning remembrance of a truly noble and revered, but lost father. She was depressed by filial concern for the sufferings and illness of a beloved, widowed mother (that mother a fond parent, honoured, by all who knew her, more for her virtues than for her long line of noble ancestry). In such interesting circumstances, the amiable and excellent Lady Flora required great tenderness. She had a right to expect sympathy and kindness from all the inmates of the Court, whose stations entitled them to associate with her; and, from the noble and distinguished females who resided there, peculiar interest, and even affectionate attention. True, she was most especially entitled to look for kindness and consolation from her Illustrious Mistress, the Duchess of Kent: and there she met with no disappointment: there, all was honour, all was goodness, kindness, and tender sympathy. How unlike was she to the defamers, who poured the poison of their base suspi-

cions into the ears of the Virgin Sovereign of England ! “Suspicion always haunts the guilty mind” (said an observer of human nature). Certainly, a facility of suspicion, with a disposition to circulate such suspicion, indicates the reverse of goodness : and slander is so vile and wicked, that the very name of the Evil-one is derived from it.—But what a noble, what a Christian mind, did your Illustrious Mother evince ! Experienced and judicious, confirmed by advanced maturity of years of honour in in her lofty and unbending sentiments, she received the false charge with utter disbelief, and repelled the proposal unconsciously sanctioned by your Majesty in ignorance of its nature—the proposal so humiliating and shocking to Lady Flora—with virtuous and noble indignation. Let the words of an Apostle describe the lofty mind she showed : “Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report ; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things :” (Phil. iv. 8.)

And, O ! let the affectionate and confidential union with your revered and admirable Royal Mother become more and more strong, never on this side of the grave to be interrupted !—a source of more true mutual happiness than all that royalty or sovereignty could bring without it ! And may she, from whom, under God, your Majesty has derived your existence—who watched over your infancy with tender solicitude, and guided your youth

with an anxious mother's care and all a fond mother's love—may she, noble-minded, upright, prudent, just, benevolent, and gracious as she is, long, long be spared to your Majesty, to console you in your cares—and, in your need of female counsel, to guide you in your difficulties!

And now, with devoted loyalty to the Throne, and ardent zeal for your happiness and honour, your Majesty is implored not to suffer any cause to induce you to oppose the moral sense and public opinion of the great and free People of Great Britain. The Voice, which in faithful duty gives this supplicating warning, would utter, from the heart that dictates it, the fervent prayer to Heaven, for your truest welfare. O may you escape, ere yet it be too late for your own and the Nation's safety, from evil counsel! May you be guided by advice, religious, moral, wise, and upright! May you be solaced by the fulfilment of filial duty, and the delightful exercise of filial love! May you pursue that course, in which you will be comforted by the approbation, and gladdened by the applause, of the just and generous British Nation!—True, alas! too true it is, that a heavy cloud hangs over the dawn—a baneful influence has obscured the early morning of your reign.—But, though it be darkened by the night-shade issuing from the untimely tomb of innocence; still we cherish the fervent hope, that the awful gloom will be dispelled, and, from VICTORIA'S Throne, a light of far other promise be shed over the land. We pray to HIM,

whose guardian providence has so long protected Britain, that her youthful Sovereign may rise, to her People's joy, with the radiance of those virtues which they so fondly anticipated. And may our young Queen, after a lasting and a happy reign——having through a long and a genial day cheered and bless'd her grateful subjects——set in glory !

of the same in Providence, as long as he
lived, that for yourself he might have
been satisfied, with the kindness of those who
were so kindly disposed to him, and may
have been, after a long and a happy life,
having through a long and a painful and
anxious life, a great deal of suffering.