

SELECTIONS

FROM

COBBETT'S POLITICAL WORKS:

BEING

A COMPLETE ABRIDGMENT OF THE 100 VOLUMES WHICH COMPRISE THE WRITINGS OF "PORCUPINE" AND THE "WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER."

WITH NOTES,

HISTORICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

BY

JOHN M. COBBETT AND JAMES P. COBBETT.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY ANNE COBBETT, 10, RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET;
W. TAIT, EDINBURGH; AND W. WILLIS, MANCHESTER.

London : Printed by Mills and Son,
Gough-square, Fleet-street.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME III.

	Page.
Members of Parliament.....	1
Trading Anti-Jacobins	6
Duke of York.....	13
Duke of York	34
Duke of York	55
Duke of York	73
Duke of York	110
Duke of York	128
Duke of York.....	148
Duke of York	166
Duke of York	193
American States (Commerce)	209
Hampshire Meeting. Mr. Wardle	211
To the People of Hampshire. Letter I.....	215
..... Letter II.	221
..... Letter III.....	227
“Elements of Reform”.....	235
To the People of Hampshire. Letter IV.....	240
..... Letter V.	249
..... Letter VI. Pauper's Action.....	265
Jacobin Guineas	281
Jacobin Guineas	282
Jacobin Guineas	287
Jacobin Guineas	293
To the King, Letter I., on the Maritime War against France.....	306
To the same on the same, Letter II.	315
The Jubilee. To Richard Goodlad, Esq.	330
The Jubilee. To William Bosville, Esq.	337
Paper-Money	346
Paper-Money	352
Paper-Money	368
Local Militia and German Legion	373
To the Reader.....	375
To the Reader. Mr. Cobbett on his Imprisonment in Newgate	388
Plan for an Army	396
Commercial Relief.—Over-Trading	410

	Page.
Commercial Relief.—Over-Trading	415
Consolidated Fund.....	424
Austrian Paper-Money.....	426
King's Illness.—The Regency.....	428
The Regency	430
The Regency	439
The Regency	450
The Regency	461
The Regency	471
The Regency	482
The Regency	491
The Regency	501
The Regency	510

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

(*Political Register, January, 1809.*)

NOTE BY THE EDITORS.—The pledge spoken of below was put by Mr. COBBETT to the candidates for Hampshire at a county meeting held previously to the election, in 1808. It was as follows: "That he will never, either directly or indirectly, either by himself or by any person related to him or dependent upon him, receive a single shilling of the public money, in any shape whatever, so long as he shall live; and that he will use the utmost of his endeavours to obtain for this burdened people a redress of all their manifold grievances, and especially of that most crying grievance of having their money voted away by those amongst whom there are many who receive part of that money."

Mr. HERBERT This gentleman's address to the electors of Hampshire, a copy of which will be found immediately below,* contains matter worthy of

* *Mr. Herbert's Address to the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the county of Southampton, dated, Highclere, Dec. 21, 1808.*

I. I should have thought myself very deficient in respect to those, whom I once had the honour of calling my constituents, if upon a vacancy, when no candidate appeared in the field against me, I had not renewed the humble offer of my services. It is most pleasant to my feelings, that some, who were formerly hostile to my pretensions, should have spontaneously tendered their support; and I shall ever remember with gratitude and pride, that at a premature and surreptitious nomination, which the sheriff was persuaded to call without due notice (though an active personal canvass had been undertaken by my opponent, with all the advantage of ministerial influence, though the greater part of my friends knew not of the meeting till the day was passed), the show of hands in my favour should have been so numerous and respectable, that the sheriff should have paused for a time, and not without hesitation have pronounced his judgment. I must express my thanks for the profound attention with which the whole meeting, with which both parties heard my refutation, of a most unjust and unfounded misrepresentation, of my conduct in parliament, and for the universal expression of approbation at the part I had acted on that occasion.

II. Called upon at that meeting to declare that I would accept no office or pension, I pledged myself to reject every offer of a pension or sinecure, and to exert myself in parliament to dry the sources of corruption; and I applaud the motives that prompted the request. But further urged to debar myself from the prospects of fair and honourable ambition, and bind myself, at no future period, to take any share in the administration of public affairs, I felt it my duty, not to myself only, but to the body of electors, but to the nation at large, to refuse a pledge, which, if universally extorted from candidates, would be subversive of the constitution, and fatal to the liberties of the country.

III. If the ministers of the crown are to be excluded from parliament; if members are to lose that which is the best privilege of the representatives of the people, the right of questioning those ministers face to face before the public assembly; their debates would be frivolous, uninteresting, and unimportant; their censures would be little worth, and passed without a hearing; the advisers of the King, who, if they have erred through guilt or incapacity, must tremble at the awful moment when they are called upon publicly to account for their

the notice, not of the people of Hampshire only, but of the whole nation. For the purpose of saving time, I have numbered the paragraphs. The FIRST contains nothing of general interest. Not so the SECOND and THIRD, which may be looked upon, and evidently were intended, as an answer to the *pledge* demanded by me.

It is something, at any rate, to hear a candidate declare, that he never will accept of a *pension* or *sinecure*, and this declaration Mr. Herbert has distinctly made, in a manner the most likely to be remembered. I, therefore, conclude, that he means, under all possible circumstances, to adhere to this promise, and in that conclusion I have, I must confess, great pleasure. It is one step, at least, in the right path; and it is a step, which, with the sole exception of Lord Cochrane, no one, of late times, has, as far as I have observed, thought proper to take.

But, from *place* Mr. Herbert will not debar himself by any *pledge*. This he calls foregoing the prospects of *fair ambition*, and binding himself to *take no share* in the administration of public affairs.

The *pledge*, which I demanded, as the only terms upon which I would give my vote, had no such object in view. As will be seen by reference to it, all that I wished to accomplish was this, that persons, once chosen to be the *guardians of the people's money*, never should, during their whole lives, pocket, either by themselves or their relations and dependants, any part of that money. I said nothing about prohibiting any one from becoming a minister, or filling any office, upon any future occasion; but, then, I clearly meant, that, supposing him to fill any office, he should do it *without pay*, which, in many cases, at least, a man qualified to be a member of parliament, may very well do.

But, I confess, that my wish would be, that men who are chosen members of parliament, should *never* become servants of the King. A man cannot serve two masters; and, it matters very little, whether he be nominally the servant of both at one and the same time; or whether he be the nominal servant of one of them, while he is paying his way for being taken into the service of the other.

But in his THIRD paragraph, Mr. Herbert lets us see, that he thinks it right, and even necessary for the public good, that members of parliament should, at the same time, be servants of the King; that they should, in

misconduct, would lull themselves in silent security, without the necessity, without even the means, of justifying themselves to the nation. The dread of meeting an able minority front to front in parliament, is in these days almost the only check upon the actions of ministers.

IV. With sentiments most hostile to the corruption that preys upon the vitals of the kingdom, most eager for satisfactory investigation of public misconduct, I offered myself to your notice; but ministers cannot tolerate such freedom, and all the influence of government was armed against me, in favour of a gentleman not eligible to represent the county. With a majority, even under those circumstances, of independent electors in my favour, as the nomination on the 23rd appeared to witness, I was advised not to harass the county by the prolongation of a poll, which was deemed superfluous, when the only eligible opponent felt himself unable to cope with me, and declined the contest. I am grateful for the free and zealous friendship I have experienced, and that strong support which has deterred any eligible candidate from persevering at the poll. I trust that I shall be seated as your representative in parliament; and I hail the dawn of better days in this county, from the unsolicited assurances of support, in the present and any future contest, which I have received from freeholders connected with the dock-yard, who would not resign their mental independence, though harassed and persecuted by the agents of government.

one and the same hour, ask for money in the latter capacity, and vote it in the former. This opinion being so directly at variance with plain common sense, it is worth while to examine into the reasons upon which it is founded. He says, that, if members were to lose the right of questioning the ministers face to face, the debates would become unimportant; that the censures of the House would be little worth, and passed without a hearing; that evil counsellors, who *must* tremble at the awful moment when they are publicly called to account, would lull themselves in security, without the necessity and even without the means of justifying themselves to the nation; and, that the dread of meeting an able minority front to front, is, in these days, almost the only check upon the actions of ministers.

"In these days" is an important phrase; for, it is precisely because the "days" are what they are, that I wish for a change. Mr. Herbert's doctrine is in direct opposition to the *Act of Settlement*, which declares persons holding places of profit under the Crown to be incapable of serving as members of parliament. This act, till base and corrupt ministers found it troublesome, remained in force, and no inconvenience was experienced from it. Nay, when the act, as far as related to this important point, was repealed, the repealers, though most profligate men, had not the impudence to do it without an appearance of *preserving the principle*; and, therefore, they enacted, that, if a member accepted of a place of emolument *after* his election, his seat should, in consequence thereof, be vacated, in order to give the people who elected him when he had no place, an opportunity of rejecting him on account of his having a place. Now, will Mr. Herbert say, that the object of this law was, and is, really what it professes to be? Will he say, that the electors do really hereby obtain the opportunity stated above? I think, he will not; for it is impossible for him to produce me a single instance of a member of parliament having been prevented from again entering the walls of the House after having accepted of a place of profit under the Crown. It is notorious, that the vacating of the seat, upon such an occasion, is a mere matter of form. The Secretaries of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the rest of them, are appointed without any one entertaining the smallest doubt of their being again returned. Nay, when a change of ministry takes place, during a session of parliament, is it not notorious, that "the Opposition," as it is called, the regular body upon the opposite benches, abstain from all warfare, till the enemies arrive; and do we not always hear it said, that such an one cannot come into the engagement till such a day, because, until that day his return cannot arrive? That this is the fact no one can deny. But, whether it be so, or not, Mr. Herbert is left in a dilemma, if he approve of the law as it now stands; for, suppose the people to obtain an opportunity of rejecting the member that becomes a placeman, and suppose them to reject him, of which the letter of the law implies the probability and even the propriety; suppose the electors of all the members, composing a new ministry, to reject them upon the score of place, and supposing there to be no good-natured, modest gentlemen to give up their seats and their constituents to them; in that case, we should lose the amazing benefit, which Mr. Herbert perceives in the having of the ministers in the House; and, on the other hand, if this be impossible, or, if there be not the smallest chance of this, the law with respect to re-election is; and, those, who affect to see a necessity for the people in it, are what I need not describe, and what

I will not describe in terms other than those, which they so richly deserve. I will not wrong my thoughts by the using of words, which would be an inadequate expression of them.

But, the *debates*, Mr. Herbert says, would become frivolous and unimportant, if the King's counsellors and servants were not in the House. The *debates!* All is debate. Why, there is a standing order of the House against publishing any debate; and, moreover, any member may, whenever he pleases, cause the galleries to be cleared, and the doors to be locked against all spectators and hearers. It is, to be sure, a very valuable thing that we possess; a mighty thing for our liberties, that any one member, either of those for Old Sarum, without even a seconder, may, at any time, totally deprive us of.

But, Sir, *why* should the debates become of no importance; of no interest at all to us, if the ministers and other placemen were kept out of the House? They might, indeed, be of little interest to those, who are now seeking for place through the means of debates; but, to the people: is it possible, that you can think, that the discussions of men, who were the real representatives of the people; who could scarcely have any views towards gain of any sort; who would be under no temptation to vote this way or that way to serve themselves, or to serve a party: is it possible, that you can think, that the discussions of such men would be less interesting to the people, than the wranglings of two parties, *always* opposed to each other, taking opposite positions in the House as naturally as two hostile armies, and well known to be contending for the places and emoluments which the Crown has to bestow? No, it is not possible; I assert, that it is not possible for you to believe, that the discussions of an assembly where, upon all great occasions, it is known beforehand of which side each member will speak and vote; where it is known beforehand what the result will be: I assert it to be impossible for you to believe, that the debates of such an assembly, can be so interesting as the debates of an assembly, where there is no such foreknowledge, and where there is known to exist, generally speaking, nothing to bias the judgment of the members. You must have observed, Sir, the difference which, in point of interest, is excited by the speeches of *Barristers* and that of the *Judge*. The cause of this is, not the superior ability of the Judge, for such is not always the case; not the novelty of the matter, for that has been already amply detailed: but solely the persuasion, that what is said by the Judge proceeds from an unbiassed mind. And, Sir, for this same reason, the debates of an assembly, not divided into regular parties, would, in the same degree, excite an interest greater than that which is excited by the debates of the House of Commons, as that house is now filled.

As to the advantage of "questioning the ministers face to face," they were so questioned, when they were excluded from parliament. They were sent to the House by the King, to bear his messages; to ask for money in his name; and to give such explanations, as the representatives of the people required at their hands. There is, surely, nothing difficult in this. It is the regular and natural course of proceeding; but, can any one pretend, that it is natural; can any one pretend, that it is not a monstrous absurdity, that ministers, that the servants of the King, or, indeed, that any body else in this world, should be called to account by themselves; that they should sit in judgment, and vote, and assist in the deciding, upon the merits, or demerits, of their own conduct; and especially when it is known beforehand, when it is acknowledged to be

essential to the very system, that they have, and must have, a majority in their favour, it being, according to that system, impossible for them to hold their places any longer than they have that majority?

“Tremble at the *awful* moment of meeting an able minority!” You surprise me, Sir. What have they, as long as they can preserve their majority, to tremble at? When did you see a ministry tremble, except for the loss of their places? And why should they? But, if there were a House of Commons, without placemen or pensioners; consisting of men not capable of being placed or pensioned; if the race could not be for power and emolument; if the members could not, in the future, discover any motive for indulgence, and lenity with respect to the past; then, indeed, wicked or foolish counsellors would have good cause to “tremble at the awful moment of meeting,” not an “*able* minority,” but an *honest* majority, in parliament, who would not waste their time in making long *lawyer*-like speeches, in order to show their fitness for conducting *wars* and *negotiations*; but, who, having only their own good, as connected with that of the public, in view, would busy themselves in doing that which belonged to their office, as guardians of the public treasure and the public liberty.

If the House of Commons contained no placemen; if it were unmixed with the servants of the King; if it were composed of men who never could touch the public money, can it be believed, that the public money would not be better taken care of? Besides the incompatibility of the two situations, in this respect, is it not evident, that a man, who has, for one half of the year, to fight daily battles in the House of Commons for the preservation of his place, must neglect the duties of that place? Is it not evident, that, if a man be compelled to give his mind up to debate and the preparation for debate, the duties of his office must be left to underlings, or be wholly neglected? Nay, is it not evident, that, if the possession of the place is to depend upon debates in the House of Commons, he will fashion his measures and especially his appointments and other favours to that mould which is likely to ensure him the greatest number of friends in that House; which fashioning would be useless for his purpose, were the members and the relations of the members incapable of receiving emoluments from the public purse?

The King, too, would, if this were the case, be left free in his choice of servants. He would not be compelled to take into his council a whole pack together. He would not be compelled to consider who could make the best, or, rather, the longest, speeches, and who would carry with them the greatest number of votes. He would be free to select whomsoever he thought most able and most trust-worthy; while the Commons, on their side, could have no reason for undue bias or partiality, in this respect, at the same time, that, if the King had counsellors, whom they disapproved of, they would, at all times, have the power of censuring them, of impeaching them, or of causing their removal by following the old constitutional course of *refusing money*; which is now, all the world knows, a power that is never exercised, nor is it ever thought of being exercised.

Is there an evil we complain of, or feel, which cannot be traced to this source? Let Mr. Herbert review all the circumstances, which led to, and which have followed, the Cintra Convention; and, I am persuaded, that, whether in the appointments, the progress of the thing itself, or the proceedings consequent upon it, he will clearly discover the prime

cause to be that very system of things, of which he professes himself to be an advocate. If the war-minister, or all the ministers together, had had no debates and dividings to look to; if they had had nobody but their master to obey; no families or particular individuals to conciliate or gratify; they would have acted upon the evidence of their senses; and being men of common discernment at least, they could not have greatly erred. But hampered, perplexed, divided in their feelings, as they constantly are, with duty on one side, and powerful importunity, not to say menace, on the other, is it any wonder that they so frequently yield to the latter, and that, of that yielding, we have so frequently to suffer and to blush for the consequences?

Such are the reasons which induced me to propose the pledge, at Winchester; and, with me, at least, these reasons will continue to operate, until I hear something more forcible opposed to them, than what I have yet met with in any writing, ancient or modern.

TRADING ANTI-JACOBINS.

(*Political Register*, April, 1809.)

I HAVE long delayed the execution of justice, in a set and formal manner, upon this race of politicians.

I have often called them *traders*, *regular traders*, and the like; and have occasionally shown how dearly the people of England have paid for the "*loyalty*" of the said traders. I have said, many times, that they found Anti-Jacobinism a thriving trade; and that, therefore, they were unwilling to give it up. I have pointed out the many efforts, which, from time to time, they have made, to make the people believe, that there was still a jacobin conspiracy going on. Many, and, indeed, the greater part of the nation, have long been convinced, that there was no such thing as jacobinism existing in the country, and that the cry of jacobinism, set up against every man who complained of abuses or corruptions, was a mere lure, a mere contrivance, to deceive honest and uninformed men. But, it was not till Mr. Wardle came out with his exposures, that the whole nation saw clearly to the bottom of this villainous deception. It was not until his charges, which, in the hope of being able to *cry him down*, were answered with a charge of jacobin conspiracy, that the whole mass of the people began to see the detestable fraud, which had so long been practised upon them, and of which many men of great understanding had become the dupe.

Now they are completely undeceived. Now they see, that a *Jacobin* means a man, who endeavours to root out corruptions and to prevent public robbery; and that, as the word imports, an *Anti-Jacobin* means exactly the contrary. Still, however, it will be useful to expose the traffic of Anti-Jacobinism. Hitherto we have considered it as something of a *sectarian*, or *political*, nature; but, we are now to abstract our minds from all such associations of ideas, and to consider Anti-Jacobinism merely as a *trade*; a trade in the plain and common acceptation of the word; a mere money-making concern; a calling upon which men

enter with no other views than those of Lloyd's and the 'Change, and to which apprentices may be bound in the regular course of law, there being gradations in it from the master tradesman downward, through the foreman and journeyman, to the sweeper and sprinkler of the pavement before the shop.

In this case, as in all others, the best way is to proceed with the stating of facts; for, a few facts answer a better purpose, they produce a deeper and juster impression, than can be produced by any general description, from however able a pen it may proceed.

I have, at different times, noticed, and shall hereafter notice, several persons, who have followed, and still do follow, this once flourishing trade. But, if I were called upon to name the tradesman, who has obtained the greatest celebrity in his way, and who most deserves that celebrity; the man who is, in this trade, what Mr. Packwood is in that of razor-strops, truth would compel me to say it was MR. JOHN BOWLES. There are others, who have had great vogue, and have not been without their profits, such as Mr. Green, Mr. Redhead Yorke, and the co-partnership of the Rev. Messrs. Nares and Beloe (the latter of whom was, sometime since, in the *British Museum*, whereby hangs a tale yet to be told); there are several clergymen, each of whom has traded very thrivingly upon his own bottom, and there are some others who have carried on the trade, with many journeymen under them; there are Mr. Gents and that pink of knighthood, Sir Francis D'Ivernois, amongst the foreign traders; but, at the head of the whole most assuredly stands Mr. JOHN BOWLES.

This gentleman was, as the phrase is, *bred to the bar*, but, to use the pun of Admiral Paine, the bar being, I suppose, *bad bread* to him, he changed his calling in or about the year 1792. He appears to have begun, about that time, his manufactory of Anti-Jacobinism, with a pamphlet against TOM PAINE, which being quite to the taste of that minister, who lent, without law, 40,000*l.* of the public money, without interest, to two of his then majority in parliament, he made our hero a *Commissioner of Bankrupts*, worth, I believe, about 3 or 400*l.* a year.

As yet, however, the term Anti-Jacobin was not in use. The trade had begun; but there was not a suitable name for it. The traders called themselves friends to their King and Country, and the like; but, John Bull loves short appellations; he is everlastingly prone to abbreviate; it was, therefore, necessary to find out an appropriate term whereby to designate the persons engaged in this new and thriving trade; and, to the honour of the Church, be it known, the term Anti-Jacobin was, at last, discovered by a clergyman.

About the year 1796, the trade seemed to be somewhat at a stand, and therefore, the government, as in the case of other useful trades, such as that of printing bank notes &c., took it, in some sort, under its immediate protection; or rather, it showed an example to be imitated by others. I here allude to the establishment of the "WEEKLY ANTI-JACOBIN" newspaper. This was an era in the history of the trade. Messrs. Canning and Frere (John Hookham) and George Ellis were the principal Directors in this establishment. They were, too, the fabricators of the choice articles that went from this shop; but, in setting the thing on foot, they were unable to proceed without the experience of Mr. John Bowles, who, from what source the reader may easily judge, found the means of setting all the machines in motion. But, whether the three persons, before mentioned, thought that John's weighty matter would be apt to be too

heavy for the wire-drawn work in which they excelled, or whether they were afraid that he would, as senior tradesman, and projector of the establishment, aspire to be the head of the firm, they soon jostled him out of the concern, for which, it is said, John never cordially forgave them. Messrs. Canning & Co. being engaged in other branches of business at the same time, were, however, compelled to have assistance; and, not liking to take an additional partner into the House, they got a respectable journeyman to superintend the business for them, a Mr. WILLIAM GIFFORD, who had written some good poetry and better prose; who was a very sensible, acute, and, I verily believe, a very honest man; who never ought to have been exposed to the necessity of becoming the journeyman of Canning and Co.; and who always appeared to me to be cursedly ashamed of the calling.

At the end of 26 Numbers the manufacture stopped, all of a sudden, to the great surprise of every body; but, the fact is, that the raw material was wanting. Messrs. Canning and Co. had expended their stock of epigrams and antitheses, and, in the latter Numbers, were reduced to downright punning. Their pride would not suffer them to resort to the stores of their journeyman; and so the thing went out, like the snuff of a candle.

Short, however, as was its duration, it produced a very powerful example. Mr. Wm. Gifford had first a *patent place* given to him; to that was added a *double commissionership of the Lottery*; to that another place in the Household, making, in total amount, about a *thousand pounds a year for life*. Pretty well, I think, for 26 *weeks* superintendence on the printing and publishing of the droppings of the brains of Mr. Canning, Mr. George Ellis, and Mr. John Hookham Frere, neither of whom ever knew him previous to that time!

Reader, stop here, a moment, and ask yourself if it be any wonder that the taxes are heavy. Ask yourself if it be any wonder that the landowners are little more than stewards and collectors for the government. Ask yourself if it be any wonder that family hospitality has ceased, and pauperism has reared its head where plenty, or, at least, comfortable independence, formerly presided.

Are we told by the traders, that these places must have been given to *somebody*, and that, therefore, it makes no difference to us, in point of expense? First, I deny the premises; for, such places should be abolished as fast, at least, as they become vacant. But, if we admit the premises the conclusion does not follow; for, if such places *must* be given to *somebody*, are there not enough disabled officers of the navy or army; are there not enough superannuated servants of the public; are there not enough and enough persons, who have done something for the country, and who are either *penioned*, or *starving*; are there not enough of these to give such places to?

But, it is useless for us to swell and foam with indignation. Thus it has been, thus it is, thus it will be, and thus it must be, while seats in Parliament are to be obtained in the manner negotiated for by Mr. Reding and Lord Clancarty.

Now we come back to the great regular trader, Mr. John Bowles, who, though he had been jostled out of the firm of Canning & Co., though he was not allowed to take any, or but very little, share in what they sent forth against every man, be his rank what it would, who disapproved of any of the measures of Pitt, he continued to push on a very valuable concern of his own; and, as the booksellers well remember, to

their cost, he absolutely inundated the town with his pamphlets. He used to publish pamphlets upon "The Political and Moral State of Society at the end of such and such a year," in all which pamphlets, though containing some very good stuff, as a sort of passport to the rest, he failed not to introduce an abundance of sterling Anti-Jacobinism. In 1804, at the time of one of the Middlesex Elections, he made a grand effort to restore the trade to the flourishing state in which it was in 1797 and 1798; and, failing in that attempt did not discourage him from another in 1806, at another Middlesex Election, when he and his new associate, Redhead, did actually bring forward that very Mr. Mellish, who was, the other day, so justly treated by the freeholders of the county, met at Hackney.

"Well," says the reader, "but, really, this must have been a very honest and zealous man. Say that his loyalty was purchased; still he had but 3 or 400*l.* a year, and for that he was obliged to perform the drudgery of a Commissioner of Bankrupts. His loyalty must have been unfeigned and have proceeded from principle; for this paltry sum could hardly keep soul and body together."

Now, reader, we come to the point; now we come to the secrets of the trade, as carried on by this active and enterprising Anti-Jacobin, whose real great occupation was totally unknown to that public, upon whom he so frequently intruded his *moral reflections*.

In the year 1795, there was a *Commission* (a commission is a very convenient thing) appointed for the purpose of superintending the management of *Dutch Property*; that is to say, the cargoes of Dutch ships detained or brought in. These Commissioners were, by an Act of Parliament, authorized to take such ships and cargoes under their care, to manage, sell, and dispose of the same, according to instructions which they were to receive, from time to time, from the King in council. These Commissioners were five in number, and of the five, John Bowles was one. Let us have all their names, in the language of the Commission: "To our *trusty and well-beloved James Craufurd, John Brickwood, Allen Chatfield, JOHN BOWLES, and Alexander Baxter.*"

It will seem odd to the public, that this Commission, which began to exist *fourteen years ago*, should have still an existence; but, when that public comes to see the pretty profits which it was, and still is, bringing in, and how much it was the interest of the Commissioners to protract its duration, it will not be at all surprised at that duration. The document which lets us into an authentic account of this Commission, is the Fourth Report of a Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to control the several branches of the Public Expenditure, which Report, as far as it relates to this matter, will be found inserted in number 16, vol. XV. of the *Register*.

It will be seen, from this Report, that no bargain was made, as to the *compensation*, which these gentry were to receive. They had the handling of property to the gross amount of nearly THREE MILLIONS sterling. They were seated at a rich feast, and having nobody to carve for them, they were, it appears, not such fools as to forbear from *helping themselves*, which, I dare say, was exactly what Pitt intended. They had too much modesty to remind the government, that no terms of compensation had been settled; they never, in the course of fourteen years, made any application upon the subject; but, they set to work very early to feathering their nest, by taking into their own pockets a *commission of five*

per cent upon the gross proceeds of their sales, just as if they had been *merchants*, who had got into business *through talents and labour and capital of their own*, instead of being put into business by a stroke of Pitt's pen. This would have been pretty well of itself; but, as the Report will show, they used the money besides; that, instead of paying the cash into the Bank of England, and letting it remain there, according to the terms of the Act of Parliament, they kept large balances in their hands, which they employed in various ways, each taking a share of it to his private banker's, and that they, in some cases, *discounted private bills with it*. In short, their total of profits, according to what they *acknowledge* to, would be 133,198*l.*, that is 26,639*l.* to each Anti-Jacobin.

There is a trade for you! A trade that requires no stock, other than that of impudence, and no tools but an inkhorn and a goose-quill.

The Report will show what are the opinions of the Committee of the House of Commons upon the exorbitancy of these charges, and upon the general conduct of the Anti-Jacobins, by whom they have been made. The Committee prove, that even according to the principles upon which the charge is made, it ought not to be half what the Anti-Jacobins have made it.

The reader will perceive by looking at the Report, which I do beseech him to read, that the *charges* upon the sales; that is to say, the *portage, cartage, warehouse room, &c.* amounted to 631,239*l.* sterling, and this, he will see, is nearly *one third* of the amount of the net proceeds! Very pretty traders these! And, mind, they charge the country a *commission of five per cent* upon *these charges too* as well as upon the net proceeds!

It has been proved before the Committee, that these charges of commission would be unusual and unjust, even if we were to admit the Anti-Jacobins to take the footing of *merchants*; but, reader, is that for one moment to be admitted? What capital did they possess? What advances were they ever required to make, as all commission merchants are? What labour had they ever had to perform, in order to get into business?

Again: They charge for the expenses of their *establishment* 17,000*l.* exclusive of all the charges upon the sales. What do they mean by this? What did it consist of, but of a house of 200*l.* a year rent, perhaps; coals and candles; a woman to sweep out the place, and a couple of clerks: for, observe, they themselves were *five* in number? How were these things to cost 1,200*l.* a year for 14 years, especially as almost all their business was ended in 1799?

I shall here introduce an article, upon this subject, from the *Times newspaper* of the 18th instant, which paper, the reader will please to observe, was that in which John Bowles used to puff off his *loyalty*, and the proprietor of which has very laudably thus endeavoured to undeceive his numerous readers:—

“These Commissioners, it appears, entered upon their office without making any express agreement what they were to be paid; and they continued so to act for twelve years, without ever giving the slightest intimation to Government as to what they were taking in the way of remuneration, whilst they were during this time, on their own authority, withdrawing five per cent from all the gross proceeds of public money that went through their hands. This they have declared to be the usual mercantile commission; whereas it appears on examination that half that sum, viz. two and a half per cent, is the usual mercantile commission, which even they themselves paid to others.—And farther,

"it appears, that by the usual mercantile practices, an interest account is kept
 "between merchants selling on commission and their employers; the former
 "paying to the latter the interest of the average balance retained in their hands :
 "whereas these Dutch commissioners retained an immense balance, some part
 "of which they are discovered to have converted to personal gain, even by negotia-
 "ting private bills of exchange with it ; they admit that they never meant to place
 "the whole of the interest actually received, to the national account ; and still
 "less that which might have been received from the more active employment
 "of the money. But their intentions will be plain enough from these circum-
 "stances : that of the public money employed at interest they made no minute ; no
 "proof of such employment appears in their cash-book ; and when required by the
 "committee, to give an account of their fees and other emoluments, they directly
 "stated that they had 'no salary, fees, or emoluments,' but that commission,
 "which they denominated the usual one.—And, lastly, it has been seen, that
 "pending these transactions, the country was so distressed, that Mr. Pitt, the
 "Finance Minister, not knowing how to raise money for the public service, did
 "actually apply to these very commissioners for assistance, which they, with an
 "augmenting balance of 190,000*l.* in their hands, declined to afford him, con-
 "cealing their possession of such a sum ; and refusing the country's money
 "to supply the wants of the country. In what language are we to address
 "such men ?

"That pity they to England show'd,
 "That pity show to them."

"Oh, JOHN BOWLES! JOHN BOWLES! little did we think when we were
 "unwittingly inserting thy paragraphs against *Jacobins and Levellers*, how much
 "thy loyalty was warmed by considerations like these: and even when thou
 "saidst that thou wast no admirer of Lord St. Vincent, it hardly occurred to us
 "that he who had driven away the miscreants that gnawed the vitals of the
 "State in one department, might reasonably create terrors in those who were
 "sucking the blood of another. Oh, JOHN BOWLES! JOHN BOWLES!"

Now, reader, leaving this pious man to write his *moral* and *political*
 State of Society at the beginning of the year 1809 ; leaving him to his
 labours in the Society for the Suppression of Vice, of which he is one of
 the most zealous members ; leaving him to put down bull-baits, village
 fairs, and twopenny hops, of which he is a mortal enemy, as the people
 of Peckham, Camberwell, and Dulwich can testify ; leaving him to his
 actings as a Surrey and a Kentish and a Middlesex justice of the peace ;
 leaving his godliness to dictate false assertions about the naked woman
 at Nottingham, and about the late Duke of Bedford's breaking the Sab-
 bath ; leaving him to these occupations, let us proceed to notice one
 little point in the Report and documents, which, otherwise, may escape
 public attention. In a paper, laid before the committee, it is said, that
 the Commissioners trust, that the Committee "will not forget, that two
 of their number, have been *under the necessity of relinquishing their*
professions, in order to attend to their duty as commissioners." Now,
 I take it for granted, that John is one of these two ; and, then, let the
 reader bear in mind, that John had actually become a *Commissioner of*
Bankrupts, before he was a Dutch Commissioner ! Would he have done
 this, if he had had much practice at the bar ? I will bet him my right
 hand against his net proceeds, that he never had the pleading of a cause
 in his life, though he must have been thirty-five years old, at least, before
 he became a Dutch Commissioner. Besides, he has, *during the time*, if
 not the whole time, that he has been a Dutch Commissioner, been *also*
 a Commissioner of Bankrupts, and, if I am not much in mistake, he is
 actually a Commissioner of Bankrupts at this moment ! Well, John, if
 we do not give full credit to thy professions now, the devil is in us.—

The Committee do, indeed, say, that they cannot admit of this plea of compensation for loss of profession; but, why did they not ask, whether the said gentry held no *other* places under the government? I am persuaded they *all* do at this moment.

But, what a scandalous thing it is, that, when any creature, who calls itself a *lawyer*, is taken into government employ, he is not only to receive the pay of the post, but is to receive compensation for the loss, the imaginary loss, of his profession. Just as if he was *pressed* into the service; just as if he was taken and forced to come to the aid of the country. Thus it is, that the *bar* is enslaved; thus it is that no minister is afraid of legal talents; thus it is that the bar is the tool of the government. Men are bred to the law, not for the purpose of being lawyers, but for the purpose of qualifying for a post and a pension under the government. No wonder, that we see, amongst lawyers, what we have recently seen. In short, this is another of the many ways, in which we have been reduced to our present degraded state; from which state we must raise ourselves, or we deserve to perish as a people, and the means of doing which is only to be found in legal, and constitutional, and loyal applications for a reform in that assembly, where the laws originate; all other remedies having been tried, over and over again, and having been found unavailing.

John Bowles was amongst the loudest of those, who clamoured against Sir Francis Burdett for his phrase about the "accursed Red Book," the leaves of which he wished to tear out. But, John took care not to tell the public, that *his own name* was in that book, in two places, at least. No; it suited John better to say, that Sir Francis wanted to tear out the name of "our good and pious old king;" and, thereupon, to call him a bloody-minded Jacobin. But, *now* let the reader say, who has done the most injury to the throne; who has brought most discredit upon the government, Sir Francis Burdett or the abusers of Sir Francis Burdett. The Jacobin Baronet, or the Anti-Jacobin friends and associates of the Duke of York and John Bowles?

John has had a longer race than most men like him; his hour is certainly come. During the late busy season, John had quite slipped out of my mind; and this morning, just as I was thinking about beginning an exposure of the affair of the correct Colonel's improvements, at Chelsea, in dropped, from the mail-coach, the Case of John and his five per cent partners, every one of whom is not only a staunch Anti-Jacobin, but belongs also, I am told, to the *Society for the Suppression of Vice*; Anti-Jacobins, Anti-bull-baiters, Anti-boxers, Anti-revellers, and Anti-dancers; Anti-every thing that is calculated to draw the people together, and to afford them a chance of communicating their ideas; Anti-every thing which does not tend to abject subjection.

Thus, reader, have you the grand Anti-Jacobin before you. He comes out at a fortunate time, and serves as an excellent elucidation of the doctrine of those, who set up the cry of Jacobinism against Mr. Wardle; thanks to whom, thanks to whom be for ever given, for having opened the eyes of this blinded nation to the character and conduct of these the very worst of its foes.

DUKE OF YORK.

(Political Register, February, 1809.)

NOTE BY THE EDITORS.—The affair of the DUKE OF YORK occupied all public men, and the attention of the whole public, during a large part of the year 1809, and it takes a large part of the Political Register for that year. In looking through all the speeches, examinations, and comments, as they are given in that work, we, at first, intended merely to give the latter; but, on reading these, we found it impossible to disjoin them from the facts with which they are interspersed, and, therefore, we have thought it necessary to give the whole as it now stands in the work from which we extract it. It seems, indeed, more just towards all the parties, that the *whole* case should stand with the comments on it, than that the comments should go forth without the case. The reader cannot fail to perceive the then-growing animosity against the popular part of the press, which this affair ripened; and he will be prepared to find, that Mr. CONBETT was prosecuted by the Attorney-General, GIBBS, before the end of the year, for an alleged seditious libel.

“’Tis all a libel, Paxton, Sir, will say.”—POPE.

MUCH as I wish to communicate to the public some information, some *really* authentic information, which I possess, respecting the disposition of the people of Spain, their behaviour towards our army, the manner in which the retreat was conducted, the superior bodily strength and the superior bravery of our troops; anxious as I am to communicate this information to the public, I must defer it for the present, the parliamentary discussion relative to our illustrious Commander-in-Chief imperiously demanding a preference to every thing else.

On last Friday, the 27th ult., Mr. WARDLE, a member of the House of Commons, who came into the honourable house for the first time, I believe, in consequence of the dissolution in 1807, when his Majesty was last “most graciously pleased to appeal to the sense of his people,” and for which gracious act the public will do me the justice to say, that I, at the time, expressed my profound gratitude, though I could not then possibly foresee a thousandth part of the good which has resulted from the dissolution. Mr. WARDLE, having before given due notice of his intention, did, on the day above-mentioned, after a speech of considerable length, make a motion “for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the conduct of the Commander-in-Chief, with regard to Promotions and Exchanges in the Army, &c. &c.” This is truly *high matter*; and, as it is also matter of great “delicacy,” as will be seen in the sequel, it will demand, from reader as well as writer, more than an ordinary degree of attention, to say nothing about the reverence, which, upon such an occasion, will naturally take and keep possession of our minds. The honourable persons, who spoke on the side of the Duke, and who, from what appears in the report, seem to have known his wish upon the subject, declared, that that wish was decidedly for *publicity*; that every part of the inquiry, from the beginning to the end, *should be made as public as possible*. In this respect, the public do, I am certain, perfectly coincide in wishes with the royal chief; and, therefore, though, in general, it is not desirable that reports of debates should be inserted in this work, I shall insert here the *whole* of this most interesting debate, or, rather conversation, of the honourable house. Upon comparing the reports in

the different newspapers, I find the best, that is to say, the *fullest*, to be in the Morning Chronicle, as is, indeed, usually the case. I find very little difference as to the *substance*, the accuracy with which the debates are, in general, taken and published, being really wonderful, and a circumstance eminently creditable to the talents of the gentlemen, by whom those debates are given to the public. But, upon this important occasion, I will, as I proceed with the insertion of the debate from the Morning Chronicle, subjoin, in notes, parts of the report as given in the Courier, wherever it appears that there has been any material omission in the report of the Morning Chronicle; and thus we shall have the best possible chance of letting nothing of consequence escape us.

Mr. WARDLE's speech, I find divided into distinct paragraphs. These I shall distinguish by numerical figures, which will facilitate the work of reference, a work which, in all human probability, we shall frequently have to perform, it being quite evident to me, that this is a matter, which is not only, at present, extremely interesting in itself, to the country in general, to all the payers of taxes, as well as to every man in the army; but, also a matter, the inquiries into which must, at a day more or less remote, produce important national consequences.

It may be thought, perhaps, by some, that it would be better for me to wait; to reserve my observations upon this debate, until it be seen whether Mr. WARDLE be able to substantiate his charges; especially as that may, perhaps, be known before this sheet can possibly reach the press. I am of a different opinion; because, whatever the result may be, there is much in the report, which appears to me loudly to call for that observation, with which it is my intention to close this article; and because, from certain expressions therein contained, I think it may be reasonably supposed, that, if the observation is to go forth through the press, there is no time to be lost.

Having said this by way of preface, I shall proceed to insert the debate, just as I find it in the above-named newspapers, without the omission of a "hear," or a "laugh."

Mr. WARDLE rose, pursuant to his notice, and spoke to the following effect:—

I.—Fully aware, Sir, of the great importance of the subject I am about to submit to the consideration of the House, I most sincerely lament that my abilities are unequal to do it complete justice. But yet I trust that an ardent zeal for the welfare of my country, supported by facts strong and incontrovertible, will enable me to surmount every difficulty, and eventually to rescue the state from the baneful influence of a power which has long been exercised for the worst purposes, and which, in fact, tends to endanger our ultimate security. To stand forward the public accuser of a man so high in rank and so strong in influence as the Commander-in-Chief, may very naturally be deemed no less a bold than an arduous undertaking. But, however bold, however arduous it may be, being determined that no consideration of that nature shall ever induce any hesitation or wavering in the performance of my duty, either upon this or upon any other occasion, my mind is fully made up for perseverance. In the resolution I have formed, it is but reasonable for me to calculate upon the concurrence and co-operation of this House and the country. For, at a crisis of peculiar peril, when the great, if not the only means of our safety may depend upon the judicious organization and able direction of our military force, every man in the community must feel a lively interest in the object which my motion has in view. I trust, therefore, that H. R. H. the Duke of York will this night find, that however exalted his rank, however powerful his influence, the voice of the people, through their representatives, will prevail over corruption, and justice will be done to the calls of a long-suffering and meritorious body, to the best, to the

usual interests of the people. In the course which I am pursuing, I feel conscious of no motive but that of a desire to serve my country, and I am confident, that none other can be fairly ascribed to me. The conviction of my mind is and for some time has been, that unless the system of corruption that has so long prevailed in the military department be done away, this country may fall an easy prey to the enemy. Consistently, therefore, with any rational feeling of solicitude for my country, which involves my own connections and my family, it is impossible that I should sit silent, and allow the practices which have come to my knowledge, to be any longer concealed, from those who are so much interested in their character and tendency. It is upon these grounds, Sir, that I am urged to offer myself to your attention.

II.—The first point in the case which I have to state, relates to the Half-pay Fund, which is an establishment under the direction of the Commander-in-Chief. This fund arises out of the sale of commissions vacant by death; by the promotion of officers not allowed to sell; or by dismissals from the service. The power of the Commander-in-Chief over this fund was constituted, and intended, for the reward of merit, either by the appointment of meritorious officers to the commissions which so became vacant, or by selling them and applying the produce of such sales to the redemption of half-pay commissions, or to the Compassionate Fund. Here the power of the Commander-in-Chief over such produce ceases. If the commissions I have described are otherwise disposed of, the authority vested in the Commander-in-Chief is abused, and the objects of the Half-pay Fund are abandoned. Now, if I can show that those commissions are appropriated to very different purposes, it will of course appear that such abuse and abandonment do take place—that merit is not rewarded—that the Half-pay List is not reduced—that the Compassionate Fund is not assisted. For the purpose of showing this, it is absolutely necessary to call the attention of the House to another establishment of the Commander-in-Chief's, which is quite of a different complexion to that I have just mentioned. This establishment, which consisted of a splendid house in Gloucester-place, a variety of carriages, and a long retinue of servants, commenced in the year 1803, and at the head of it was placed a lady of the name of Clarke. As this lady forms a principal party in several of the facts which I have to cite, I am under the necessity, however reluctantly, to mention her name, as well as that of others, in order to make out a fair parliamentary basis for my motion, and to satisfy the House that I have not brought it forward upon light grounds. In producing this satisfaction, I have no doubt of succeeding, and I assure the House, that I shall endeavour to avoid trespassing upon their time by the statement of more cases than appear to me necessary to the particular points which my motion embraces.

III.—The first case to which I have to call your attention is that of Captain Tonyn, whom I understand to be an officer of merit, and in alluding to him upon this occasion, I beg it to be understood that I mean no reflection whatever upon his character. This officer, who held his captaincy in the 48th regiment of foot, was promoted to a majority in the 31st regiment according to the Gazette, on the 2nd August 1804. For such promotion, to which no doubt Captain Tonyn's professional merit entitled him to aspire, he was indebted to the influence of Mrs. Clarke; without which he might have long looked for promotion in vain. To Mrs. Clarke, Captain Tonyn was introduced by Captain Huxley Sandon, of the Royal Wagon Train; and the terms of agreement were, that Mrs. Clarke should be paid 500*l.* upon Captain Tonyn's majority being gazetted. In order to secure this payment it was arranged, that the amount should be lodged in the hands of a third person, as agent to the parties, and this agent was a Mr. J. Donovan, a surgeon, of Charles-street, St. James's-square. As I shall have frequent occasion to introduce this gentleman's name to-night, and may be obliged to resort to him hereafter, it seems right that I should present the House with some information about him. It appears that Mr. Donovan was appointed a lieutenant in the 4th Royal Garrison Battalion in the year 1802, and that he was afterwards promoted to the 11th Battalion. What the cause of this appointment and promotion was I have endeavoured to ascertain, but without success. I have however found, that the services of Mr. Donovan could not have been of a military nature. In fact since the day of his appointment in 1802, he has never joined his regiment. But there seems to be some reason for granting him a perpetual leave of absence, as he has been on constant duty in London. This gentleman was a member of the medical department of our army in the American war. If he deserved promotion, surely our medical staff is large enough to provide for him. What then

could have taken him into the army? But to return to his pursuits in London.—The 500*l.* lodged with this gentleman was paid to Mrs. Clarke, by Captain Huxley Sandon, as soon as Major Tonym was gazetted. Here it becomes necessary to observe to the House, that the *regulated* difference between a Company and a Majority is 1100*l.* which should have been appropriated as I before mentioned. But how does the affair stand? Mrs. Clarke gains 500*l.* and 1100*l.* are lost to the Half-pay Fund. This sum, however, of 500*l.* was paid by Mrs. Clarke to a Mr. Birket, a silversmith, in part payment for a service of plates for the establishment in Gloucester-place; *the balance for which plate was afterwards paid by H. R. H. the Commander in Chief.* The positions which I hold to be clearly deducible from this case are these—First, That Mrs. Clarke possessed the power of military promotion. Secondly, That she received pecuniary consideration for such promotion. And thirdly, That the Commander-in-Chief was a partaker in the benefit arising from such pecuniary consideration. To establish the truth of this case, I have the following witnesses;—Major Tonym, Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Donovan, Captain Huxley Sandon, and Mr. Birket's Executors.

IV.—The second case I have to adduce relates to the subject of exchanges. Upon the 25th of July 1805, an exchange was concluded between Lieut.-Colonel Brooke, of the 56th regiment of Infantry, and Lieut.-Colonel Knight, of the 5th Dragoon Guards, through the influence of Mrs. Clarke. The agent for negotiating this transaction was a Mr. Thynne, a medical gentleman. The circumstances of the application to the Duke of York were shortly these; Mrs. Clarke wanted some money to defray the expenses of an excursion in the country; she therefore urged the Commander-in-Chief to expedite the exchange, as she was to receive 200*l.* for it. This urgent request was made upon a Thursday, and its influence was such that the exchange was actually gazetted upon the Saturday following. Mrs. Clarke in consequence received 200*l.* from the agent. This case then serves to show—first, that, in addition to promotions, exchanges also were at the disposal of Mrs. Clarke; and secondly, that the purse of the Commander-in-Chief was saved by the supply which his mistress derived from such sources. The witnesses to this case are, Lieut.-Colonel Brooke, Lieut.-Colonel Knight, Mrs. Clarke, and Mr. Thynne.

V.—As a contrast to the preceding exchange, I shall take leave to state a case of peculiar hardship which occurred within the last year: two meritorious officers, Major Macdonald and Major Sinclair, both of the first regiment of infantry, and both indisposed, were anxious to make an exchange—the one desiring, for the recovery of his health, to remain in England; while the other, from a similar motive, desired to go to the West Indies. These gentlemen sought their object by every honourable means. The most urgent requests, and the most respectable recommendations were made in their favour, but in vain. No mistress was resorted to: no bribe of 200*l.* was offered; Major Macdonald was forced to go to the West Indies, and fell immediately a victim to the climate; Major Sinclair was forced to remain in England, and survived but a few months. Thus was the country deprived of two highly deserving officers.

VI.—The fourth case I have to adduce refers to Major John Shaw, of Colonel Champagne's Ceylon regiment. Major Shaw was appointed Deputy Barrack Master of the Cape of Good Hope upon the 3rd of April, 1806, through the influence of Mrs. Clarke. It was known that this officer by no means enjoyed the favour of the Duke of York; that in fact his royal highness entertained some prejudices against him. But these obstacles Mrs. Clarke easily contrived to overcome: for it was agreed to pay her 1,000*l.* for the major's appointment. The appointment was therefore made, and the major himself paid Mrs. Clarke 300*l.* Soon after, 200*l.* more were sent to Mrs. Clarke, by Major Shaw's uncle, through Coutt's bank, and the payment was made by one of Mr. Coutt's clerks. The remaining 500*l.*, however, was not paid; and when it was found not to be forthcoming, Mrs. Clarke was enraged, and threatened revenge. She actually complained to the Commander-in-Chief of Major Shaw's *breach of contract*, and the consequence was that the major was soon after put on half-pay. I am in possession of several letters which passed upon this subject, from Major Shaw and Mrs. Shaw, threatening both the Commander-in-Chief and Mrs. Clark with public exposure &c. if their complaints were not redressed, but in vain. In consequence of this business, I have been induced to examine the half-pay list, in order to see whether any similar reduction to that of Major Shaw had taken place in the Barrack Department; but I have found no such thing. Such officers being, in fact, kept on full-pay, even on the home staff. This case of Major Shaw

was indeed the only instance I could find of such an officer being reduced to half-pay. The case of this officer then demonstrates, first, that Mrs. Clarke's influence extended to appointments on the staff of the army, as well as to promotions and exchanges in the army itself; secondly, That the Commander-in-Chief punished an individual by reducing him from full to half pay, for non-performance of a nefarious contract with his mistress; thirdly, That the Commander-in-Chief was a direct party to all this shameful transaction. The witnesses to this case are, Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Shaw, uncle to Major Shaw, Mr. Coutts's clerk, and Mrs. Shaw.

VII.—I now come to the very novel case of Colonel French and his levy. This officer was, through the influence of Mrs. Clarke, appointed by the Commander-in-Chief to conduct a levy in the years 1804-5. The colonel was introduced to Mrs. Clarke by Captain Huxley Sandon, and the condition upon which he obtained his appointment was, that Mrs. C. should have one guinea out of the bounty of each man raised, together with the sale or patronage of a certain number of the commissions. The agreement being concluded, it was communicated to, and approved of, by the Commander-in-Chief. Colonel French was accordingly sent by Mrs. Clarke to the Horse Guards, and after many interviews, the levy was set on foot. As the levy proceeded, Mrs. Clarke received several sums of money from Colonel French, Captain Huxley Sandon, and a Mr. Corri. She also received 500*l.* from a Mr. Cockayne, who is a well-known solicitor in Lyon's-inn, and a friend of Captain Huxley Sandon's.

VIII.—But, to return for a moment to Mr. Donovan, the garrison-battalion lieutenant.—This gentleman, who was such a prominent agent in those transactions, was acquainted with an old officer, a Captain Tuck, whom he very strongly recommended to seek promotion; and to encourage him by a display of the facility with which it might be attained, he sent him a written scale of Mrs. Clarke's prices, for different commissions, which, in stating, I beg leave to contrast with the regulated prices of the Army:

<i>Mrs. Clarke's Prices.</i>	<i>Regulated Prices.</i>
A Majority £900	£2600
A Company 700	1500
A Lieutenantcy 400	550
An Ensigncy 200	400

From this scale it appears, that the funds I have before alluded to lost, in an enormous ratio to the gain of Mrs. Clarke, or any other individual acting upon the same system.

IX.—Here I am to take leave of Mrs. Clarke. Here the scene closes upon her military negotiations; and in what follows, the Commander-in-Chief alone is interested. It appears that his royal highness required a loan of 5000*l.* from Col. French, and Mr. Grant, of Barnard's inn, promised to comply with the request in procuring the money, provided the Commander-in-Chief would use his influence and obtain payment to Col. French of a balance due to him by government on account of the levy. This was promised, but the Commander-in-Chief failing to fulfil his part of the condition, the loan he required was not advanced, and 3000*l.* still remain due from government to Col. French. The case of this levy shows, first, that Mrs. Clarke, in addition to promotions in the army, to exchanges, and appointments on the staff, possessed the power of augmenting the military force of the country; secondly, that in this case, as in all others, she was allowed to receive pecuniary consideration for the exercise of her influence; thirdly, that the Commander-in-Chief endeavoured to derive a pecuniary accommodation for himself independently of Mrs. Clarke's advantages. The witnesses in this case are, Col. French, Capt. Huxley Sandon, Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Corri, Mr. Grant, Capt. Tuck, and Mr. J. Donovan.

X.—The last case with which I shall at present trouble the House is that of Capt. Maling. This gent. was appointed to an ensigncy in the 87th reg. on the 28th of Nov. 1805; to a lieutenantancy in the same reg. on the 26th of Nov. 1806; and to a captaincy in the Royal African Corps, under the command of the Duke of York's own secretary, Col. Gordon, on the 15th of Sept. 1808. I have every reason to believe Capt. Maling to be a very unexceptionable character, although I cannot help pronouncing the mode of his promotion as extremely exceptionable. But this promotion was effected through the influence of the favourite agent, Mr. Greenwood, in whose office Mr. Maling was a clerk, remaining at his desk while advanced in the army by such an extraordinary course,—by a course

which interfered with the interests, which superseded the rights of many meritorious officers who had long served in the army,—who had fought and bled for their country. This Mr. Maling has also, I understand, had, while so promoted, some appointment of paymaster in Ireland. I would appeal to the candour of the House, to the common sense of any man or body of men, whether it be right, whether it be tolerable, that such an accumulation of favours should be conferred upon any individual without any claim of professional merit, but merely through the operation of undue influence, while so many hundreds of truly deserving men are slighted and overlooked? I would ask, whether it be possible that our army can prosper,—that its spirit can succeed, or its character be advanced, while such injustice is tolerated? But I will not dwell upon those points,—it is quite unnecessary.

XI.—The facts I have stated are such as must suggest such reflections to any man's mind. The House must feel the propriety, the necessity of grounding some proceeding upon such facts. The proceeding I propose will, I have no doubt, be acceded to. I am sure I have stated quite enough to induce the House to give me what I ask,—I could state more if necessary. There is, indeed, one thing to which I cannot omit alluding. The House must be astonished indeed at the corruption of the times, when told that there is at this moment a public office in the City for the Sale of Commissions, at the same reduced scale as that of Mrs. Clarke, and that the persons who manage this office stated in my presence that they were the agents of *the present favourite mistress, Mrs. Carey*. Indeed, these agents declared further, that they were also enabled to dispose of places both in *Church and State*, and that they did not hesitate to say, that they were employed by two of the first officers in the administration. But these are points to which I may, on a future day, feel myself more enabled to speak at large. The hon. member concluded with moving for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the conduct of the Commander-in-Chief, with regard to Promotions and Exchanges in the Army, &c. &c.

Sir FRANCIS BURDETT seconded the motion.

The SECRETARY AT WAR said, that he did not rise to give any opposition to the motion. (*Hear, hear, from the Treasury Bench.*) If he did so, he would ill consult the wishes and worse consult the interests of the Commander-in-Chief.* The facts which the hon. gent. had brought forward were of the most serious nature, and well deserved the attention of the House. He hoped the House would go into the inquiry, but listen to no charge unless it was clearly and distinctly stated. Charges on these or any grounds distinctly stated his royal highness was ready to meet, and even *desirous* of going into the investigation. This, he believed, was all that was necessary for him to say in this stage of the business; but he requested the indulgence of the House while he made a few observations not foreign to the question. With regard to the private transactions stated by the hon. gent. he had never heard of them before, and therefore could not be prepared to give an answer. But he could contradict those that were stated to have occurred at the Horse Guards. The papers respecting the half-pay fund were before the House, and he had stated in his place, without being contradicted at the time, that his royal highness had given up a great part of his patronage for the benefit of that fund. It was needless to go into the facts, more particularly as a full inquiry would necessarily take place. He would only remark, that the thanks which the House had been conferring on the army reflected no small credit on the Commander-in-Chief. His gallant friend near him (Sir Arthur Wellesley) might perhaps state of what description the army was which the Commander-in-Chief had put into his hands. Could the army have achieved the great exploits, for which it had been distinguished, *if it had been ill-managed for a series of years*. It had been universally allowed, that to make courage available in the day of battle *discipline* was necessary; and it was well known how much the Commander-in-Chief had attended to that object, which had rendered the army so formidable to the enemy. Another fact, to which it was important to allude, was the extreme order and regularity

* From a regard to the interests of the Commander-in-Chief, he felt *unfeigned satisfaction*, that, at length, an opportunity was afforded of instituting an effectual inquiry into the grounds of the various *calumnies and misrepresentations* which had, of late, been so industriously circulated against that illustrious personage.

which had been introduced into the office of the Commander-in-Chief, which the inquiry would prove.

Sir ARTHUR WELLESLEY rejoiced that the hon. gent. had at length brought forward facts, to which a specific inquiry might be directed,—and he rejoiced also, that the character of the Commander-in-Chief would not be the subject of that general sort of discussion, which sometimes took place in that House; but that every fact would be fully and fairly sifted. It had fallen to his lot to know how promotions were conducted in the office of the Commander-in-Chief, and he knew that it was regularly recorded in that office who recommended the promotion, and the documents would be found there, so that all these transactions might be completely traced. With regard to the produce of the half-pay fund, the mode in which the money came into the office, and the mode in which it was issued, were recorded. Under these circumstances, he rejoiced that a committee was to be appointed, and he hoped they would make a special report—so much with regard to the alleged facts; but he must observe, with respect to the removal of the Barrack-Master of the Cape of Good Hope, that such removals were circumstances of common occurrence. The instance in question related to the establishment at Ceylon; and in foreign establishments, though the facts stated by the hon. gent. should be true, it constituted no ground of charge, for it was in the ordinary course of the service. With respect to the exchange between an officer going to the West Indies and one remaining here, the Commander-in-Chief would be in a most extraordinary situation if it was to be made a ground of accusation, that he had not consented to an arrangement tending to the convenience, perhaps to the benefit of individuals. As to one of these gentlemen dying here, and the other in the West Indies, if these general charges were to be listened to, it would be impossible for a person in his royal highness's illustrious station to conduct the business. The circumstances stated by the hon. gent. went to show, that his royal highness, with a view to put a little money in his own pocket, had encroached upon the half-pay fund. But the House would recollect, that this fund was established by his royal highness, and the money furnished from the produce of commissions, which he might have given away without any sale at all. But the Commander-in-Chief gave up his own patronage, and saved to the public an immense sum—and yet he was charged with an embezzlement of this sort! But he was glad that a full inquiry was to take place. There was still one topic on which he would be to blame, if he did not say a few words—he alluded to the state of the army under his command last summer. He must say, that never was there an army in a better state as far as depended on the Commander-in-Chief, and he must further say, that if the army had not performed the service for which it was destined, the blame would not have rested with the Commander-in-Chief, but with him.*

(*Hear, hear.*)

Mr. YORKE observed, that he never listened to a charge more serious, and he had heard it with the greatest possible concern, both on account of the Commander-in-Chief, and the hon. gent. who had brought it forward (*hear, hear*), who took so heavy a responsibility upon himself. But he was glad that the House had come at last to some charges against H. R. H. the Commander-in-Chief in a tangible form.† Publications which he would treat as libels (*hear, hear*), had lately appeared against the Commander-in-Chief, and these had been circulated with a pertinacity hitherto unexampled. He was glad, therefore, that something was now brought forward in a tangible form, and he hoped the House would do its duty to itself, to the country, and to the ROYAL HOUSE OF BUNSWICK (*Loud cries of hear, hear*); that blame might rest where it ought to be fixed, and that if there was no ground for these accusations, justice might be done to the Commander-in-Chief. And he sincerely hoped, that if the latter

* If that army had not performed those services, which it had pleased that House to honour with its thanks, it would not have been their or the Commander-in-Chief's fault, but his own; and whatever enthusiasm they had felt, was the result of the example and discipline, afforded by the illustrious person at the head of the army.

† At length they could reach in a tangible shape some of those libels which had for some time past been more assiduously and pertinaciously circulated than at any former period in this country, so prolific in libels.

should turn out to be the fact—the hon. gent. would be enabled to acquit himself, by showing at least, that there existed some probable reasons in support of the *heavy charge* which he had taken upon himself. For my own part, Mr. Yorke continued, I believe that there exists a CONSPIRACY of the most atrocious and diabolical kind against his royal highness (*loud cries of hear, hear*)—founded on the JACOBINICAL spirit which appeared at the commencement of the French revolution; for though this spirit did not show itself exactly in the same form as at first, when once raised it was not easily quelled, and it never could promote its views with better hopes of success than by TALKING down illustrious persons. (*Hear, hear.*) It was the object to write down his royal highness—it was no less so to write down all the establishments of the country. By means of the press, the liberty of which was so valuable, and the licentiousness of which was so pernicious, it appeared to be the design of the CONSPIRATORS to write down the military system through the Commander-in-Chief—the army through its generals, and other establishments through the persons most conspicuous in each—

[*The remainder of the Debate will be found at p. 36.*]

Now, as I said before, we need not wait for this discussion, in order to be able to form a judgment upon certain very important points, introduced into this debate; because those points are quite distinct from the main subject of the debate.

Upon the statement of Mr. WARDLE no observation need be made. It consists of facts; not of declamation or loose assertion; but of specific facts, the truth or falsehood of which may be, and are to be, ascertained. I should, however, do great violence to my feelings, were I to suppress an expression of my admiration of the manly as well as the able manner, in which that statement was made. The speech was, at once, concise, plain, and impressive; the allegations were unequivocal, the motives undisguised, and the principles such as do honour to the heart of the speaker; such principles as a great majority of us entertain, but such as very few of us indeed have the courage to avow. There was no hypocrisy in the speech; no affected solicitude that the charges might prove false. The persuasion in the mind of the speaker evidently was, that he was stating truths; and, accordingly, he appeared to be afraid of nobody. The Morning Post newspaper calls it “a curious speech.” If by “curious,” he, the editor, means *rare*, I must confess that it was “curious” in the highest degree.

As to the reported and published speeches of the other speakers, the first thing that struck me was, that they should have contained any thing at all, except what might relate to *the mode of inquiry*. The charges were so clearly stated, that there seemed to be nothing to do but, at once, to fix upon the mode of inquiring into them. However, it appeared to be an occasion for many persons to express their opinions relating to the person accused, and, therefore, we will notice what they said, it being desirable that nothing should escape publicity that belongs to this important subject.

A direct denial of the facts does not appear to have been made by any one; but, the Secretary at War (General Sir James Pulteney, who marched against *Ferrol*, as the reader will remember) said, that, as a proof that the army had not been badly managed, as a proof that the Duke of York had not abused his powers, the excellent *discipline* of our army might be cited, and for the proof of the goodness of that discipline, he referred to Sir Arthur Wellesley. Sir Arthur, who appears to have been seated near Sir James, bore testimony to the excellence of this dis-

cipline; imputed, in part, to the Duke, that valour the consequence of which had recently been a subject of the thanks of the House; and concluded by saying, that, whatever *enthusiasm* the army had felt was the result of the *example* and discipline afforded by the illustrious person at the head of the army. Mr. Yorke said, that, at the time when the Duke took the army in hand, it was in such a state as *scarcely to deserve the name of an army*.

Now, whatever others may think of the matter, I do not believe, that any, even the smallest portion, of the strength or the bravery of my countrymen is to be ascribed to the Duke of York, to any branch of the government, or to any other cause than that which proceeds from nature. I look upon steady courage; upon a temper to resist or attack without trepidation; to bear up when they come to the pinch; I look upon these as qualities *natural* to the people of this kingdom; nor will I, upon any account, give my assent, express or tacit, to any assertion leading to a contrary conclusion. But, the ascribing of the *enthusiasm* of the English soldiers at Vimiera to *discipline* is what I cannot understand. *Discipline* consists of *restraints*, at least; generally it implies checks, pains and penalties. Discipline may, and does, produce prompt *obedience*, *submission*, and, of course, *order* and *regularity*; but, that it should fill the soul with *enthusiasm* is, to say the least of it, something wonderful. "*Example*," indeed, may inspire an army with enthusiasm; and as to the probable effect of the *Duke of York's example*; the *example* afforded by *his battles*; as to this, I am sure, it is quite unnecessary for me to say one word to any living creature in this kingdom.

After all, however, what has this to do with the main subject; the great subject now before the parliament and the public? Suppose we were to admit, that the men of the 50th regiment, when they were making that gallant charge at Vimiera, before which the French instantly ran like a flock of sheep; suppose we were to admit, that the brave private dragoon, who took General Lefebvre; suppose we were to admit, that our regiments before Corunna, who, when engaged against triple their force, in point of numbers, and who, at the end of a march that had left even the officers barefooted, stood like a wall before the enemy, and when they saw fresh numbers pouring down, gave three huzzas, rushed forward upon the gathering host, drove them up the hill, and by that act of almost unexampled bravery secured the safety of the embarkation: suppose we were to admit, that all these men were inspired solely by the "*example*" of the Duke of York. Nay, suppose we were to admit, to its full extent, the idea of Mr. Yorke; suppose we were to admit, that it was the Duke who alone had rendered the English soldiery worthy the name of an army; that he, and he alone, had poured courage into the breasts of Britons, and had given them strength of bone and of sinew. Suppose we were to admit all this, and, I think, it is hard if a broader admission could be demanded, or wished for, even by the most zealous Anti-jacobin in the country; suppose we were to admit all this, what would the admission make; of what weight would it be: how would it at all alter the case, when set against facts such as those stated by Mr. Wardle? The *skill* and the *courage* of the Duke of York are things which appear to me to have nothing at all to do with his mode of distributing promotion. Nothing at all to do with those bargains and sales mentioned by Mr. Wardle. Mr. Wardle plainly stated, that Mrs. Clarke, with the connivance of the Duke of York, had received so much

a head upon a new levy. Is this to be answered by citing the *military renown* of the Duke of York? Mr. Wardle states, that a man was going through a long course of military promotion and pay, while he was actually a clerk in the agent, Greenwood's, office. Is this to be answered by telling us, that our army fought well at Vimiera? No, no. Such facts are to be efficiently met by nothing short of *flat denial*; and, unless they can be so met, at once, it were much better to wait the want of proof on the part of those, from whom the accusation has proceeded.

There was another *argument*, made use of by Mr. Adam, which does not seem to me to be much more conclusive as to the main point. It was this: that he had, for 20 years past, had an intimate knowledge of the pecuniary concerns of the Duke of York; that he had been acquainted with all his embarrassments (of the *cause* of which, however, he did not speak); that, in all his transactions with the Duke, he had found him extremely unreserved, fair, and correct; that he never heard of any concerns with Mrs. Clarke, and the like; that he thought he must have heard something of them, if they had had any existence; and that, *therefore*, the accusation must be false. The report of Mr. Adam's speech must, certainly, be incorrect; for, it is incredible, that a gentleman, who is so well able to reason, and who has so long been accustomed to weigh arguments with such nicety, should have drawn, either expressly or by inference, so illogical a conclusion; a conclusion destroyed, at once, if we perceive, that it proceeds solely upon premises, which are *matter of opinion*. All that Mr. Adam asserts positively, I, for my part, who have good reason to know and be grateful for his wisdom and integrity, implicitly believe; but, there may, without any impeachment of any of the excellent qualities of his head or heart, be great doubts with respect to the fact, whether, if an illicit commerce in commissions existed, he would necessarily hear of it; nay, it may be thought, that he would be amongst the *last* men in the world who would be made acquainted therewith.

The next point that presents itself is that of the "*heavy responsibility*," to which it was said, that Mr. Wardle had *subjected* himself. Almost all the honourable members, who spoke in praise of the Duke of York, used some phrase or other expressive of their *pleasure* at what Mr. Wardle had done. The Secretary at War declared his great *satisfaction* at it; Sir Arthur Wellesley *rejoiced* three times and was *glad* once; Mr. Yorke was *glad* twice and once *happy*; and Mr. Canning *congratulated* the Duke of York upon the matter being brought forward. This cannot fail to give the country a high opinion of the independence and love of impartial justice in these gentlemen. Yet, somehow or other, they did, most of them, seem to be deeply impressed with a *risk*, of some sort, that Mr. Wardle ran, from having performed this pleasure-giving task. Mr. Yorke called it a "*heavy responsibility*;" and Mr. Canning said, that "*infamy* must attach, either upon the accused or the *accuser*." If Mr. Canning meant, by the accuser, the *informer*, I agree with him; but, not so, if he meant Mr. Wardle; for, if that were to be admitted, what would become of the characters of Attorneys and Solicitors, high as well as low, who prefer accusations against men, who are acquitted? Will Mr. Canning say, that "*infamy*" attached to Sir John Scott (now Lord Eldon), because Mr. Horne Tooke was, upon a charge of treason preferred by Sir John, *proved to be innocent of the charge*, being acquitted by a jury, which acquittal corresponded with the charge of a most learned and upright judge? No. Mr. Canning will not say this.

It must, however, not only be said, but *proved*, before it will be admitted, that "infamy" will attach to Mr. Wardle, though his charges against the Duke should, like those against Mr. Horne Tooke, finally appear, from the best possible evidence, to be false; except, indeed, it should be made appear, that the charges *originated* with Mr. Wardle; that he *hatched* the facts; that he has *hired and bribed spies and informers*; that, in short, he has formed a conspiracy to injure, by base means, the reputation of the accused person. Mr. Yorke qualified his phrase of "heavy responsibility" by afterwards saying, that he hoped Mr. Wardle had, at least, "*probable grounds*" for what he had done. This was right; and, giving to Mr. Canning's words the application above pointed out, I agree with them; but, if "*infamy*" were to attach to a member, who failed to prove a case put into his hands, the House of Commons would be in a pretty situation. "The freedom of debate" would soon be reduced to a level with another sort of freedom, of which we shall speak by-and-by. Suppose a case of a different nature. Suppose a good, honest, well-meaning member of parliament to be informed, that there is, even at this late day, a plot against the life of the King, and for the purpose of overturning "the monarchy," upsetting "regular government," overthrowing "social order," and blowing up "our holy religion," and that the conspirators (names this and that) with all their books and papers, all their bloody and anti-christian implements, were at that moment hard at work in some garret in St. Giles's. Suppose this; suppose the good man to inform the House of it; suppose the King's messengers, the police magistrates, the horse-guards, dispatched to the scene of brooding destruction, with an order to bring to the bar every creature there found; and, suppose the conspirators to consist of a poor old woman and her cat. Would it be fair, would it be just, to say that *infamy* attached to the good hoaxed gentleman? No. He might be reasonably enough laughed at for his credulity; but, even the parties accused could not justly charge him with *infamy*. In this case of Mr. Wardle, as in all other cases of a similar nature, the blame, if any, must be in proportion to the want of grounds, not for the *charges themselves*, but for *his belief of them*; and, therefore, however the *proof* may turn out, if it appear, that Mr. Wardle did receive information of the facts, which he has stated; that the informants are persons whose oath would be taken in a court of justice, and be sufficient for the hanging of any one of their neighbours in common life; and especially if it should be proved, that, amongst these informants, there be one, or more, of character so respectable as to have lived in habits of intimacy with the person accused; if *this* should be made appear, the public will, I am of opinion, agree with me, that, so far from any blame attaching to Mr. Wardle, he would have been guilty of a scandalous neglect of his duty, if he had refused, or delayed, to do what he has done.

I now come to a part of the debate, to which I must beg leave earnestly to crave the reader's most serious attention; after which allusion, he will readily conclude that I mean that part which relates to an existing CONSPIRACY in this country. Not an imaginary thing like the one above supposed; but a real conspiracy, for the purpose, as Mr. Yorke described it, of *talking and writing down the Duke of York, and, through him, and the Generals of the army, the army itself*; of talking and writing down *all the establishments of the country*; which descrip-

tion, with somewhat of limitation, appears to have been repeated by Mr. Canning and Lord Castlereagh.

Coming from such high and grave authority, the statement demands our attention. We have, indeed, seen publications in some of the newspapers, stating something about an existing design, in certain persons, to overthrow "social order;" to undermine, at the instigation of the devil, our happy constitution in church and state; and, we have lately seen, a stupid author, in a dirty pamphlet about Jacobinism, addressed to the Earl of Lonsdale, hammering his brains, to show, that the Edinburgh Reviewers have formed a plan, a regular system, for effecting this wicked purpose, by the means of their Review, which, to the regret of all those who admire excellent and most powerful writing, is published only four times a year, and which work, in only one single article upon the subject of the Methodistical doctrines, has done more good to the country, than all the writings of all the trading Anti-Jacobins, than all the hundreds and thousands of volumes, all the wagon-loads and ship-loads of printed trash, that have issued upon, and disgusted the world, from this, at once, vapid and polluted source. From this abundant, this overflowing tide, this Nile of venality, corruption, filth, falsehood, venom, and all uncharitableness, we have heard it asserted, that a Jacobinical conspiracy is in existence, and accordingly, to the assertion we have turned a deaf ear. But, now, when it is made in parliament; when it comes from such high authority, we must not only give it belief, but must accompany that belief with our regret, that the important, the awful, truth, was not sooner officially proclaimed, and that it should have been kept back until the moment, when *distinct charges* of corruption and profligacy, of the very worst sort, were, however unjust they may finally appear, made, *by a member of parliament*, against the person, at whose reputation the "CONSPIRATORS" are said to be levelling their most deadly shafts.

That the conspiracy does exist, and has for some months (I think, that's it) existed, there can, however, be *now* no doubt; that it has an existence, not like the *real* presence in the wafer; not a legerdmain or metaphorical existence; nothing of priestcraft or law-fiction about it; but, that there is, in England (oh! poor England), amongst the dwellings of John Bull, at this very time, without any mental reservation, a Jacobinical Conspiracy; a conspiracy of corporeal beings, for the purpose, as Lord Castlereagh expressed it, "of overthrowing the monarchical branch of the Constitution."

Mr. Yorke must understand these things better than we, in the country, do; but, to us, a *talking* conspiracy is something new, and calls to my mind Dennis's admirable criticism upon the tragedy of Cato. "What, the Devil!" says he, "are your conspirators come here again, to hold, aloud, treasonable dialogues in Cato's own hall?" The man, who, in one of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays, is apprehended as a conspirator, when his real sin is mere gluttony, is accused upon the ground of his half-uttered sentences, while in eager search for a cod's head instead of that of his sovereign. And, indeed, the great characteristic of conspirators heretofore has been that of cautiousness, and silence; but, as we are now assured, from such high authority, that there is actually a *talking* conspiracy on foot, it becomes us all to put a *bridle* in our mouths, that "we offend not with our tongue."

As to the *writing* part of the conspiracy, I have, I must confess, observed things that appeared to me to lean this way; and upon reading

the debate, above inserted, I looked over the Courier newspaper, from the *eleventh* to the *twenty-sixth* of this month, comprising a space of fifteen days, or half a month. The following are amongst the Jacobinical productions that I found, and I lay them before a public, that, I am sure, will participate in the abhorrence which I entertain of the mean and villanous miscreants, from whose pens they proceeded :—

“ONE HUNDRED POUNDS in a Banker's hands ready to be advanced to any *Lady or Gentleman* who will procure the Advertiser a *permanent situation in the Stamp-Office or Customs adequate*. The greatest **SECRECY** may be relied upon. A line addressed, post-paid, to J. Smith, the Rose and Crown, Wimbledon, will meet due attention.”

“FROM FIVE HUNDRED TO ONE THOUSAND POUNDS, will be presented to any *Gentleman or Lady*, who can obtain or procure for the Advertiser, *an adequate and permanent Situation or Place under Government*, in Town, or a few Miles from it.—For Integrity and Trust, Testimonials of Character and Respectability can be had, &c. &c. Letters addressed to J. P. L., Peele's Coffee-house, will meet due and secret attention.”

“ONE THOUSAND POUNDS will be given by a Gentleman to any Person having interest to procure him a *respectable Situation under Government*.—Direct to A. B., at Mr. West's, Bookseller, No. 81, Great Portland-street, Mary-le-bone.”

“COUNTRY PATRONAGE. Any Gentleman enabled by *Resignation or otherwise*, to present the Advertiser with a *permanent Situation, in the Country only*, may be treated with, by addressing a Letter, post-paid, to L. P. C., Mr. Lauman, Tailor, St. James's-street, London.”

Now, the manifest object of the persons making these publications, must be *to cause it to be believed*, that the places under government are to be *bought and sold*, pretty much in the same way as beef or mutton. There are about twelve daily papers in London; and if we reckon on the above standard, at *eight*, a month, for each paper, it will make 1,152 of these publications in a year; publications, each of which amounts to an assertion, that, at least, in the opinion of the writer, the offices under the government, the salaries of which ought to go to pay for *services* to the public, are sold, and the price put into the pockets of such women or men as can procure the bestowing of the places.

These, indeed, are writings that tend to the destruction of “the monarchical branch of the Constitution;” and, how it happens that *they* have never been noticed, I must leave the reader to find out.

Oh! the sad rogues! They would persuade us, that they can *buy*, actually deal for, cheapen, and buy, for a sum of money, to go into the pocket of some woman, those very salaries which we pay for the doing of the nation's business! If this is not striking at “social order” and “regular government,” I should be glad to know what is.

Mr. PERCEVAL, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, said, as will be seen by referring to the debate, that “it was not for him to tell the House, that, in this great capital, it *might happen* that *foolish* persons were frequently deceived by advertisements in the public papers, announcing the disposal of official patronage; and, *perhaps*, it has, *occasionally*, **TURNUED OUT**, that the very persons, who were originally **DECEIVED** by these advertisements to make applications, *did ultimately obtain the very appointments for which they had endeavoured to negotiate.*”

Eh? How's that? Yes! I see it now; I see it now, as clear as daylight. Aye, aye; that is plain enough. It is just as Mr. Perceval said. *Foolish* people, seeing places advertised for sale, were *deceived* by them; but, it occasionally *turned out*, that these same

foolish and deceived people did, in the end, get those very places, which the advertisements invited them to purchase.

This explanation cannot, I should hope, fail to produce a very salutary effect.

The last part of the debate, upon which I think it necessary, at present, to make any remark, is that which related to *libels* and the *liberty of the press*. I have so recently discussed this subject, that it is quite irksome to return to it; yet, what was said in the debate, especially by Mr. Yorke and Mr. Canning, strongly urges me to say something, though it be mere repetition.—Both these gentlemen said, that there had been a series of libels published against the Duke of York; which may be very true; and, if they mean *falsehood* as an essential ingredient to constitute a libel, no man in all the world can wish the libellers to be punished more sincerely than I do; though I cannot help repeating what I have a thousand times said, that I do not think, that an aspersion upon the character of any man, was ever wiped off by an appeal to the law. No man ever practised what he preached more strictly than I do this doctrine. I have been, for about thirteen years, and am at this very day (see the Morning Post of Monday last), the object of almost continual printed calumny. Not calumny conveyed in *iauendoes*, but in downright charges of the most infamous nature. I do not think, that there is a crime known to man, that I have not, either in America, or at home, been charged with. Knowing them to be false, those charges never gave me a moment's uneasiness. Once in a while, I have given a contradiction to lies, and have exposed misrepresentations. Trusting to the force of truth, I have, for the most part, left falsehood and malice to work their way; and, I do not believe, that in the opinion of one single sensible man that ever even heard of me, I have suffered, in the smallest degree, by the publications that have been made against me; and, as for fools, it is no matter what are their opinions.—But, there were two positions, one from Mr. Yorke and the other from Mr. Canning, to which I am disposed to pay particular attention.—The first of these gentlemen said, that libels had, of late, been more abundant, *against persons in authority*, than at *any former period*, in this country, so fertile in libels; and the latter said, that, in publications, *rank* ought to be regarded like *sex*, and that, to assail persons of exalted rank, was an act of baseness and cowardice, equal to that of assaulting a defenceless woman.—Mr. Canning may have been misrepresented by the reporters; they may not have caught his meaning; but, if they did, that meaning is decidedly hostile to my sentiments upon the subject; nay, it is the very reverse of those sentiments. There was much said about the "*blessings of a free press*;" but, if it be to be regarded as an act of baseness to assail men of rank, I should be glad to know in what those "*blessings*" consist? The "*freedom of the press*" means, the freedom of examining and exposing the actions of *public men*; men who are entrusted with the nation's affairs; and these are necessarily men of high rank. If the "*freedom of the press*" has not this meaning, it has no meaning at all, and all the talk about it is nonsense; and, therefore, according to this new doctrine, to use the freedom of the press at all, is an act of baseness and cowardice. Of all bad, or despicable, qualities, that of *cowardice* is the last that I should have expected to hear imputed to an unsupported individual, who assails men in power. Cowardice might, indeed, well be imputed to those, who, supported by the powerful, should send their publications forth like a mail-coach, under government protection. To those,

who, thus backed, should assail individuals, pour out upon them all sorts of calumnies, having no dread of punishment, cowardice may well be imputed. Here the charge of cowardice is due; for, not only would the calumniator be pretty secure from the dangers to which the opponents of men in power are exposed; but, worst come to worst, he would be sure of a compensation for his pains and his losses.

I have never yet got any answer to this question: "*What is freedom of the press?*" I want an answer to this question from some one of those, who talk of the "*licentiousness of the press.*" It does not consist in publishing books upon planting, farriery, or fox-hunting. There is not a despot upon earth, who attempts to prevent such publications. In short, it is farcical to talk about freedom of the press, unless by it we mean the *right*, the acknowledged *legal right*, of freely expressing our opinions, be they what they may, *respecting the character and conduct of men in power*; and of stating any thing, no matter what, if we can prove the *truth* of the statement.

In this sense the freedom of the press is a great "*blessing.*" In this sense it is "a terror to evil-doers, and a reward to those who do well;" but, if the freedom of the press means, that we are not to assail men in power; that they are to be as sacred from the quill as women are from the sword; while, on the other hand, the press is to *praise* them as much as it pleases; then, the "*freedom of the press*" is the greatest curse that ever fell upon a nation. It is in the character and conduct of *men in power* that the public are interested. These are *the very matters*, upon which they want, and ought to receive information. The babble of the day is of no public utility. The particulars of who walks or rides out with the King; of where and when the Duke of York salutes his royal parents; of the breakfasts and dances of Frogmore; of Generals Cartwright and Fitzroy's going to chapel and hearing a sermon; of the cabinet and other grand dinners: these may amuse some few gossiping people; but of what *use* are they to the nation? Of full as little use are dissertations containing merely general principles, without a direct application of them to men and things of the present day.

But, we are sometimes told, that we *may* discuss the characters and measures of men in power, taking care not to *hurt their feelings*; that is to say, taking care never to *blame* either the men or the measures; for, if blamed, it follows of course, that their feelings *must be hurt*. We have been talked to a great deal about *decency* in these discussions; and we are now told, that we, of this day, are *abusive*; indeed, *censure*, or even *disapprobation*, however expressed, is now-a-day always called abuse. We are charged, too, with being *foul-mouthed*; *coarse*; *personal*; and are accused of *surpassing in libellousness the writers of all former times*. These assertions have been often made; but now, at a moment when there are so many persons under government prosecution for libels; now, when all the venal writers seem to have formed a conspiracy against the character, and, perhaps, the lives of those prosecuted persons, by exciting in the mind of those who are to be their jurors, a prejudice against them; now it is absolutely necessary to inquire into the truth of such assertions.

The writers of former times; times when not a thousandth part of the present corruptions prevailed; the writers (from some of whose works I am forming a collection to be published hereafter) who, in those times of comparative purity, surpassed in boldness, the writers of the present

day; the bare names of those writers would fill a volume. I will, however, content myself with some extracts from POPE, who was one of the greatest scholars, the most acute reasoners, the most independent and virtuous man, and, without exception, the brightest genius that England ever produced. When he wrote, in the last reign, and in the year 1738, the laws and constitution of England were as well understood as they now are, and loyalty was not less a virtue than it now is. *Corruption* (under the administration of Sir Robert Walpole) was only in its infancy. Now, then, let us hear how this accomplished scholar, this great genius, whose works are read with such admiration, and which make a part of the library of every man of sense who has the means of procuring books; let us hear how this all-accomplished writer expressed himself upon the subject of the then prevailing vice and corruption.

Lo; at the wheels of her triumphal car,
 Old England's Genius, rough with many a scar,
 Dragg'd in the dust! his arms hang idly round,
 His flag inverted trails along the ground!
 Our youth, all liv'ry'd o'er with foreign gold,
 Before her dance: behind her, crawl the old!
 See thronging millions to the pagod run,
 And offer country, parent, wife, or son!
 Hear her black trumpet thro' the land proclaim,
 THAT NOT TO BE CORRUPTED IS THE SHAME.
 In soldier, churchman, patriot, man in pow'r,
 'Tis av'rice all, ambition is no more!
 See, all our nobles begging to be slaves!
 See, all our fools aspiring to be knaves!
 The wit of cheats, the courage of a whore,
 Are what ten thousand envy and adore:
 All, all look up, with reverential awe,
 At crimes that 'scape, or triumph o'er the Law;
 While truth, worth, wisdom, daily they decry—
Nothing is sacred now but villany.

Yet may this verse (if such a verse remain)
 Show there was one who held it in disdain.

This is only one instance. In many others he *named* the corrupt persons. But, POPE was called a "libeller;" and, in his preface to that part of his inestimable works, from which the above extract is made, he observes, that "there is not in the world a greater error, than that which *fools* are so apt to fall into, and *knaves* with good reason to encourage, the mistaking a *satirist* for a *libeller*." He says, that the clamour raised on some of his former writings, induced him to bring before the public the writings of HORACE and Dr. DONNE. With a similar view I now appeal to him, who exceeded them both in genius, and yielded to neither in any estimable quality. Having shown the public with what freedom those authors wrote, he next gives us his own sentiments upon what was, by the venal tribe of his day, called *libellous, gross, coarse, filthy, brutal, personal* and *seditious*; and one cannot help being struck with the exact similarity in the clamours of that day and the clamours of this; though, indeed, there is nothing wonderful in it, seeing that profligacy and corruption, being always the same in nature, must always have the same antipathies, as surely as vipers of the

present day inherit the fears as well as the poison of their progenitors of a century ago.

Here, in the following extracts, we have all the old grounds of clamour, together with the refutation and exposure. I beseech the public to abstract themselves from the poetry and the wit, and fix their attention wholly upon the *reasoning*. In it they will find an answer to *all* the cavilling and clamouring now in use by the conspirators against the real freedom of the press; and, I trust, they will join with me in sentiments of profound gratitude to the memory of the matchless author.

Friend. 'Tis all a libel, Paxton, Sir, will say.

Pope. Not yet, my friend! to-morrow, 'faith, it may;

And for that very cause I print to-day.

How should I fret to mangle ev'ry line,

In rev'rence to the sons of *Thirty-nine!*

Vice with such giant strides comes on amain,

Invention strives to be before in vain;

Feign what I will, and paint it e'er so strong,

Some rising genius sins up to my song.

Fr. Yet none but you *by name* the guilty lash;

Ev'n Guthry saves half Newgate by a dash.

Spare then *the person*, and expose *the vice*.

Po. How, Sir! not damn the sharper, but the dice?

Come on then, Satire! gen'ral, unconfin'd,

Spread thy broad wing, and souse on all the kind.

Ye statesmen, priests, of one religion all!

Ye tradesmen, vile, in army, court, or hall!

Ye rev'rend atheists.

Fr. Scandal! *name them*. Who?

Po. Why that's the thing you bid me not to do.

Who starved a sister, who forswore a debt,

I never nam'd; the town's inquiring yet.

The pois'ning dame——

Fr. You mean——

Po. I don't. *Fr.* You do.

Po. See, now I keep the secret, and not you!

The bribing statesman——

Fr. Hold, *too high* you go.

Po. The brib'd elector——

Fr. There you stoop *too low*.

Po. I fain would please you, if I knew with what;

Tell me, which knave is lawful game, which not?

Must great offenders, once escap'd the crown,

Like royal harts, be never more run down?

Admit your law to spare the knight requires,

As beasts of nature may we hunt the squires?

Suppose I censure—you know what I mean—

To save a Bishop, may I name a Dean?

Fr. A Dean, Sir? no; his fortune is not made;

You hurt a man that's rising in the trade.

Po. If not the tradesman who set up to-day,

Much less the 'prentice who to-morrow may.

Down, down, proud Satire! tho' a realm be spoil'd,

Arraign no mightier thief than wretched *Wild*,
 Or, if a court or country 's made a job,
 Go drench a pickpocket, and join the mob.
 But, Sir, I beg you, (for the love of vice !)
 The matter 's weighty, pray consider twice ;
 Have you less pity for the needy cheat,
 The poor and friendless villain, than the great ?
 Alas ! the small discredit of a bribe
 Scarce hurts the Lawyer, but undoes the Scribe.
 Then better sure it Charity becomes
 To tax Directors, who (thank God) have plums ;
 Still better, Ministers ; or, if the thing
 May pinch ev'n there—Why, lay it on a King.
Fr. Stop ! stop !

Po. Must Satire, then, nor rise nor fall ?

Speak out, and bid me blame no rogues at all.

Fr. Yes, strike that *Wild*, I'll justify the blow.

Po. Strike ? why the man was hang'd ten years ago :

* * * * *

Fr. The Priest, whose flattery be-dropt the crown,
 How hurt he you ? he only stain'd the gown.
 And how did, pray, the florid youth offend,
 Whose speech you took, and gave it to a friend ?

Po. Faith, it imports not much from whom it came ;

Whoever borrow'd, could not be to blame,
 Since the *whole House* did afterwards the same.

Let courtly wits to wits afford supply,
 As hog to hog in huts of Westphaly ;

If one, thro' Nature's bounty, or his Lord's,

Has what the frugal, dirty soil affords,

From him the next receives it, thick or thin,

As pure a mess almost as it came in ;

The blessed benefit, not there confin'd,

Drops to the third, who nuzzles close behind ;

From tail to mouth, they feed, and they carouse.

The last full fairly gives it to the *House*.

Fr. This *filthy* simile, this *bestly* line
 Quite turns my stomach—

Po. So does *Flatt'ry* mine ;

And all your courtly civet-cats can vent,

Perfume to you, to me is excrement.

But hear me farther—Japhet, 'tis agreed,

Writ not, and Chartres scarce could write or read,

In all the courts of Pindus guiltless quite ;

But pens can forge, my friend, that cannot write ;

And must no egg in Japhet's face be thrown,
 Because the deed he forg'd was not my own ?

Must never Patriot then declaim at gin,

Unless, good man ! he has been fairly in ?

No zealous pastor blame a failing spouse,

Without a staring reason on his brows ?

And each blasphemmer quite escape the rod,

Because the insult 's not on man, but God ?

Ask you what provocation I have had ?
 The strong antipathy of good to bad.
 When Truth or Virtue an affront endures,
 Th' affront is mine, my friend, and should be yours.
 Mine, as a foe profess'd to false pretence,
 Who think a coxcomb's honour like his sense ;
 Mine, as a friend to ev'ry worthy mind ;
 And mine as man, who feel for all mankind.
 Fr. You're strangely proud.

Po. So proud, I am no slave :
 So impudent, I own myself no knave ;
 So odd, my country's ruin makes me grave.
 Yes, I am proud : I must be proud to see
 Men not afraid of God, afraid of me :
 Safe from the bar, the pulpit, and the throne,
 Yet touch'd and sham'd by ridicule alone.

O sacred weapon ! left for *Truth's* defence,
 Sole dread of folly, vice, and insolence !
 To all but Heav'n-directed hands deny'd,
 The Muse may give thee, but the gods must guide ;
 Rev'rent I touch thee ! but with honest zeal,
 To rouse the watchmen of the public weal,
 To Virtue's work provoke the tardy Hall,
 And goad the prelate slumb'ring in his stall.
 Ye tinsel insects ! whom a court maintains,
 That count your beauties only by your stains,
 Spin all your cobwebs o'er the eye of day,
 The Muse's wing shall brush you all away :
 All his Grace preaches, all his Lordship sings,
 All that makes *saints of queens*, and *gods of kings*.
 All, all but *Truth*, drops dead-born from the Press,
 Like the *last Gazette*, or the *last Address*.

* * * * *

Yes, the last pen for Freedom let me draw,
 When *Truth* stands trembling on the edge of Law ;
 Here, last of Britons ! let your names be read :
 Are none, none living ? let me praise the dead,
 And for *that cause* which made your fathers shine,
 Fall by the *VORRES* of their *degen'rate* line.

Such were the sentiments of that writer, who, more than all the rest put together, has done honour to English literature. Such was the language of the friend and companion of BOLINGBROKE and ATTERBURY : of the man, whose writings were the admiration of his day, and the model for succeeding times ; of the man, whose acquaintance and friendship were sought by *all* the statesmen of his time ; of a man, whom a queen wished to visit, but whose scrupulous independence declined the intended honour.

Now, can any man show me in any periodical publication of the present day, language more completely divested of squeamishness than this ? Does any political writer of this day presume to go beyond what is here exhibited ; and what was practised by this accomplished gentleman ? To our clamourers we may say as he did to his : "*Speak out*, and bid

us blame *no rogues at all*; for that is the point, at which, it is evident, the venal writers are aiming. POPE was freely permitted to "strike that *Wild*," the famous *pick-pocket*; but the clamourers wished to prevent him from soaring *higher*. Here, too, we see an exact similarity: *we*, too, may take a free range in attacking the poor shoe-less caitiffs, who are brought before the police magistrates, whom, before they are *tried*, we call *rogues, villains*, and what else we please, *naming* them at the same time. Here, against these miserable wretches, we have "*freedom of the press enough*;" but, if we so much as laugh at those, who "*make saints of queens, and gods of kings*," we are branded as conspiring traitors, as men having formed a settled scheme for overturning the monarchical branch of the constitution. In another poem, and that, too, the most admirable of all his admirable works, he has these verses.

A nymph of quality admires our Knight:
 He marries, bows at court, and grows polite;
 Leaves the dull cits, and joins (to please the fair)
The well-bred cuckolds of St. James's air;
 First for his son a gay commission buys,
 Who drinks, *whores*, fights, and in a duel dies:
 His daughter flaunts a *Viscount's* tawdry wife;
She bears a coronet and p—x for life.

If any of us were to publish, from our pens, a story like this, it would be produced as a *certain proof* of our intention, of our settled design, of our deliberate scheme, for overturning the privileged orders, and with them the whole of the establishments of the kingdom. Yet, in the days of POPE, that man would have been laughed to scorn, who should have attempted to set up such a clamour; though despotism was much less prevalent in that day, throughout the whole of Europe, than in the day in which we live. Here is "*coarseness*" for you! Yet is this poem published *now*, daily; and is to be sold, and is sold, at every bookseller's shop in England. Why not suppress *these* publications? That they have their effect is evident, even from the use I am now making of them. And, a publication is still a publication, whether the book be of ancient or modern date. Why not put down all these publications, with which our printing-offices, and book-shops, and circulating-libraries teem? Why not put them down, and not expose us to the mortification of seeing, and the danger of being led to imitate, the boldness of our celebrated countrymen? Why not put down *these* works, which are read more in one day, than all the Anti-Jacobin writings that ever were published, or have ever been read; not excepting the *Weekly Anti-Jacobin*, with which the series began, the writers of which, by-the-bye, affected to imitate POPE, but whose poetry as well as whose prose, after having assisted to ruin the bookseller, have, long since, been consigned over to the trunk-maker; though not destitute of "*personality*," or of "*filthy*" allusion? Why not put down the works of POPE, and SWIFT, and GAY, and GARTH, and AKENSIDE, and CHURCHILL, and scores of others; nay, and of poor JOHNSON, too, though a dependant and a pensioner; and of MILTON, and LOCKE, and PALKY. The list is endless. Why not put them all down? Why not burn them all by the hands of the common hangman, and not expose us to the danger of imbibing, and acting upon, their principles, and, according to our abilities, imitating their writings?

Of the constitution of England the *liberty of the press* constitutes an essential part. The power, lodged in the crown and its ministers, has been there lodged upon the presumption, upon the *implied condition*, that the exercise of it shall be open to public, free, and *unrestrained*, investigation, through the means of the press. It is in this sense, and this sense only, that the phrase "*liberty of the press*" has any comprehensible political meaning. To utter *lies* is always a moral offence; to utter them to any one's injury is, and always has been, an offence punishable by law. If, therefore, the utterer cannot prove the *truth* of what he has uttered, and if it be proved that his lies have produced even a fair *probable* injury, he ought to suffer for the offence. But as to *opinions*; to make men liable to punishment for opinions, is, at once, to say, "Slave! you shall not utter your thoughts." If the opinion be accompanied with *reasons*, these are the reasons to be examined; if good, the opinion will, and ought to, have weight with the reader; if bad, or if no reasons at all be given, the opinion is mere wind; it passes for nothing, and can have no effect.

It is an observation that can have escaped no man, that despotic governments have never tolerated free discussions on political matters. The reason is plain; that their deeds will not bear the display of reason and the light of truth. But, what has been the invariable consequence? The sudden final destruction of those governments. The flame of discontent is smothered, not extinguished; the embers are still alive, the materials drying, the combustibles engendering; some single accidental spark, from within or without, at last communicates the destructive principle, and down comes the pile, crumbling upon the heads of its possessors. Let free discussion take its course, and, as you proceed, abuses and corruptions are done away, redress from time to time is obtained; or, at the very least, the breast of the injured and indignant is unloaded. The Charleses and the Jameses had recourse, under the colour of law, to imprisoning, ear-cropping, and hanging; and what were the final consequences? James was the instigator to the beheading of Russel, and James, when, in the hour of distress he appealed to Russel's father for support, received for answer: "I had once a son, who, if he had been now alive, might have been able to give you assistance."

Had the Charleses and the Jameses, instead of listening to the counsel of parasites calling themselves "*the loyal*," to the exclusion of others, permitted free discussion; had they allowed corruption to be checked in its course; had they, as it was manifestly their interest, suffered their people to obtain *timely* redress of their wrongs; their descendants would now have been upon the throne of this country, which they would have enjoyed, without any danger from plots and conspiracies. But, they arrayed *power* against *truth*, and in that conflict, they finally fell.

What is the reason, that all these reports about the Duke of York; all this "*talking him down*," have so long prevailed, and have gone rolling on, till, at last, they have collected into that form, in which they have been exhibited to the parliament? The reason simply is, that the press has been *timid*. If this had not been the case, some one or other of the reports would, long ago, have been embodied into a *plain statement*, when it would, if false, have met with as plain a denial, and there would have ended the calumny; if true, the effect would have been, a stop to the reported practices *in time*; before any great degree of discontent had been engendered, and leaving only a trifling fault to be atoned for.

But, punish men for writing plainly, and they will have recourse to metaphor or fable ; punish them for that, and they will talk ; punish them for that, and they will whisper ; and, at every stage of restriction, they will, by their additional bitterness, show that to the feeling of public is added the feeling of personal injury, and also of personal resentment.

I hope, and trust, that these observations, and others of a similar tendency from abler hands, will have their due weight, and that the conspiracy against the remaining freedom of the press, as well as against the persons now under government prosecution, will not be persevered in ; but, upon one thing I am resolved, be the consequences to myself what they may, and that is, to continue to exercise the freedom of writing and of speaking, as my forefathers were wont to exercise it, as long as I have my senses, and the power of doing either one or the other. As witness my hand,

WILLIAM COBBETT.

Botley, 2nd February, 1809.

DUKE OF YORK.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, February, 1809.*)

I LAST week expressed my regret, that any thing should have occurred to prevent me from giving an account of the campaign in Spain. That expression I now repeat ; and, there are several other subjects, of great political importance, on which I am anxious to offer some remarks to the public ; but, the subject of the Charges against the Duke of York, especially as these charges have been forced into connection with questions of general policy and liberty ; this subject is not only of more interest than any other, but, it absolutely supersedes all other ; discussion upon any other subject, is, in fact, useless, till this has been decided upon. An attempt has, through a connection with Mr. Wardle's charges, been made to deprive us of the remains of our freedom. From the tone and manner of the venal herd of writers, it has long been manifest, that there was on foot a scheme for putting down all free discussion ; and, upon the preferring of these charges, they have broke out afresh, and with more boldness than ever, in accusations, not only against the freedom of the press, but also against the freedom of the tongue. Their mode of reasoning is this : " These charges are false ; such charges are the consequence of the licentiousness of writing and of speaking ; such charges tend to overthrow the monarchical branch of the constitution ; to overthrow the monarchical branch of the constitution would be to produce general confusion, distress, misery, and bloodshed ; therefore, it is the interest of the nation in general, and particularly of all persons of property, to concur in putting a stop to this licentiousness of writing and of speaking."

Such is the reasoning of the venal writers, in newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, and especially in the poor paltry Reviews, which are conducted by clergymen, by salaried magistrates, and by pensioners. To this sort

of reasoning not a little countenance has now been given by persons in possession of great official power. One minister has said, that it is *become matter of doubt with many good men, whether the benefit of a free press be not overbalanced by the licentiousness attending it*; and another of the King's ministers has said, that it is not perceived by every one, how difficult it is, in many cases, to convict a man of a libel, though the libel be obvious enough. Just at this very time, too, we see advertised, at an enormous expense, to be published by the Horse-Guards bookseller, EGERTON, a pamphlet pointing out the *present difficulties of producing conviction* in cases of libel, which pamphlet is dedicated to the Duke of York and Albany. While this is going on, a Mr. WHARTON, who, I am told, is the same that is *Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means in the House of Commons*, is publishing a pamphlet to inculcate the notion that *Jacobinism is revived*. This is, to be sure, an excessively stupid and dirty performance: it is so very low, so very shabby, so very despicable, that one cannot help laughing at it, especially when one considers it as opposed to the Edinburgh Review; but, it does, nevertheless, tend to prove the existence of a concert, premeditated or accidental, to persuade the public at large, that there is yet too much freedom of writing and speaking enjoyed.

Till this point, therefore, is settled, all other public matters are uninteresting. From freedom of speech and of the press, the next step is the safety of property and person. The war in Spain, or anywhere else; the success or failure of any military or naval enterprise; the additional conquests and increasing means of the Emperor Napoleon; all these are of no interest to us, if we be in a state of uncertainty as to what is to be the fate of our freedom at home. We are called upon daily for "sacrifices" in support of the war against the Emperor of France; and, upon *what ground* are these sacrifices demanded? Why, upon the ground, that the war is necessary to prevent our country from being finally conquered by Napoleon. And, why, wherefore, *for what reason*, are we called upon to make *sacrifices* to prevent our country from being conquered by Napoleon? The reason alleged is this: that, if he were to conquer our country, we should become slaves; that is to say, we, like the people in France, should be deprived of the liberty of uttering our complaints, whatever corrupt and profligate acts our rulers might be guilty of; and, that, we being thus deprived, should, in a short time, have no security for our property or our lives. It is to prevent this evil; this very evil that we are making daily such enormous pecuniary sacrifices, and that so many of our countrymen make a sacrifice of their lives. Viewing the struggle in any other light, there is no sense in it. In any light but this we cannot view the contest, without acknowledging ourselves to be almost upon a level with the brute creation. It is not for a name, for an empty sound, for any thing merely imaginary, that we are making all these unparalleled sacrifices. It is not for any thing theoretical; but for the substantial practical benefit of English freedom; the right the legal right, of freely making our complaints, and of demanding redress, when we think ourselves injured or insulted; which, as all the world must see, are the only means of ensuring safety to property and persons.

Till, therefore, we see the result of the pending proceedings, and the fate of the doctrines, now abroad, relative to the freedom of the people, all other public matters, not excepting those relating to our means of defence against the conquering Napoleon, are, comparatively at least, of

very trifling importance. To busy ourselves about schemes of war or peace, or of political economy; thus to busy ourselves, while the present proceedings are unclosed and while these new doctrines are undecided upon, would be as foolish as for a man to be engaged in making repairs at one end of his house, while the other end was on fire.

This being my view of the matter, I shall, as far as my small power will go, keep the attention of the public closely nailed to the inquiries now going on, relative to the conduct of the Duke of York, who is not to be regarded merely as "a son of the crown," as Mr. Fuller called him, nor merely as the person, to whose skill and courage the military defence of our country is committed; but also as a person who has the chief command of a department, which costs this nation 23 millions of pounds sterling a year; and who, under the King's sole control, has the absolute power of promoting, or of cashiering, any one, or any number, of about twelve, or fifteen thousand commissioned and staff officers, connected by ties, more or less close, with almost all the families of any note in the kingdom. Merely as a son of the King, and a person receiving such large sums out of the public purse, we should have an interest, and a deep interest too, in the moral example of the Duke of York; what, then must be our interest in his wisdom and integrity, when we see committed to his hands a far greater degree of power than as, in this country, ever before been committed to the hands of any individual?

In my last [at page 20], I was obliged to break off the insertion of the first debate upon this all-important subject. The remainder of that debate I shall now first insert, and, when that is done, I shall come to the first Examination of witnesses, of which Examination I shall be careful to omit no essential part, and especially of what has a tendency in favour of the Duke of York; because, on every account, my wish is, that no conclusion against him should be drawn from doubtful premises.

Debate of the 27th January, continued from page 20.

—and of this plan the present was only a particular instance, (*hear! hear!*).—* Let blame fall where it ought; but the House ought to consider the illustrious object against whom the charge was directed; they ought to consider his high station in the country, and the *eminent services* which he had performed for the country, in the state to which he had brought the army—(*hear!*) What was the state of the army when he became Commander-in-Chief? It *scarcely deserved the name of an army*, and it was now found by experience to be, in proportion to its numbers, the best army that ever existed. The best mode to do justice to the sovereign—to do justice to the high character now impeached—and to do justice to the country, would, perhaps, be to appoint a Parliamentary Commission

* He was glad that this inquiry was to take place, because there was in the country a conspiracy against all that was eminent in the state. They all knew what that spirit was upon which this conspiracy was founded; and though it was not the same at present as at the time of the French revolution, yet as the late Mr. Pitt had truly said "*the jacobinical spirit, when once roused, is not easily put down.*" The spirit was not yet extinct, and the consequence was a conspiracy for *talking and writing* down every thing illustrious and eminent in the nation—to run down the royal family through the Duke of York, and to run down the army through its generals. This was a consequence of a free press, the freedom of which was justly considered *the palladium of liberty*, but whose licentiousness was the destruction of civil society. That licentiousness of the press had been actively directed against the illustrious person who was the object of this motion, and who from his station and *all his past services*, might be supposed secure from its attacks.

with power to examine each party on oath—(*loud cries of hear! hear! from both sides of the House.*) The gentleman might have circumstances in view to support these charges, which he believed to be founded in truth. He only spoke of this Commission with reference to his own argument. He had said that he believed a CONSPIRACY to exist, and if the House could go along him, and suppose that this was actually the case, he threw out for their consideration whether a Parliamentary Commission with power to examine on oath was not preferable to a Committee. He could not think he had done his duty if he had not thrown out this idea for consideration. The importance of the subject well deserved such a mode of proceeding. But at all events, he was *happy* that the matter would now be properly investigated.

Sir FRANCIS BURDETT considered the subject most important, and demanding the deepest and most accurate inquiry. He coincided with the right hon. gent. opposite (Mr. Yorke), that the House should maturely deliberate on the mode of proceeding best calculated to render effectual justice.

Mr. ADAM stated, that for nearly the period of 20 years he had been, from professional avocations, very intimately connected not alone with the pecuniary concerns of the illustrious personage affected by the motion of the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle), but even with his embarrassments. In the attention which he had directed to those concerns, he was assisted by the most frank and candid communications from his royal highness. Every difficulty, and every particular was disclosed to him by his royal highness with a recollection the most retentive, an accuracy the most correct, and a fidelity the most unquestionable. If, therefore, any such irregularities or transactions took place, as the motion of that night went to convey, *it was almost impossible but that in the course of his inquiries some feature of such a system would have appeared*, whereas the direct contrary was the result of a long and minute application to the pecuniary transactions of his royal highness.* Having felt it his duty to make this statement, he had next to impress upon the House that both in justice to its own privileges, and to the dignified character of the illustrious personage, it ought not to surrender its inquisitorial powers, nor delegate to any Select or Secret Committee that inquiry, which, to be efficient, ought to be public, and for the *publicity* of which there was no person in the country *more anxious* than his royal highness the Duke of York—(*Hear! hear!*).

Mr. WILBERFORCE expressed his sense of the importance of the subject which was submitted to the consideration of the House. He was confident that the hon. mover was impressed with the great responsibility which attached to a charge brought, as it was, against such an elevated character in the country. He did by no means wish to convey that the extent of such responsibility ought at all to deter a member of that House from bringing before it an accusation, for which he had convincing testimony, although directed against one of the most considerable persons in the empire, both in rank and influence; but he did conceive that when high character was implicated, the most efficient and most satisfactory mode of investigation ought to be adopted. To enable the House to arrive at that desirable end, he fully agreed with his right hon. friend (Mr. Yorke) near him, that the investigation of the charges that night preferred ought to be committed to a Parliamentary Commission, specially delegated for that specific purpose. Such inquiry was not to be considered private or secret. It would afford the best species of communication, namely, publicity at the end, but not in the progress. Whoever had attended to the consequences of public

* At every moment of that long period he had possessed the unlimited confidence of that illustrious person, even during his embarrassments (for as they had been under the consideration of parliament, he may advert to these embarrassments), and in all his experience of him, he had known his royal highness uniformly to state the situation of his affairs with an accuracy that was extraordinary, with a truth beyond example, and with a fidelity of memory that reflected the highest credit upon his understanding. In all that time he had never heard of his having procured any accommodation or loan on any other terms, than the Duke of Bedford, the Duke of Devonshire, or the Duke of Northumberland would, if they had occasion. This he stated, in order to show that, in the inquiry that was to take place, from what he knew personally, he could confidently assert that the facts alleged would prove unfounded.

examination at the bar of the House, could not be blind to the numerous and fatal inconveniences of such a mode of proceeding. The very object for which it was proposed was too often defeated by the means. By acquiescing to the appointment of a commission the witnesses would be examined upon oath, all party bias and personal altercation would be prevented, and, of course, a weight and confidence would be attached to the decision of those delegated, which it was impossible to expect from any public discussion or examination at the bar. It was for the House to bear strongly in its recollection, that in the present unexampled and critical state of the civilized world, all Europe looked with a vigilant and anxious attention to the deliberations of the British House of Commons. *That House was now put on its trial before the scrutinizing tribunal of public opinion.* It had to render justice, both to the illustrious personage, whose character he expected would come clear and unsullied from the ordeal, and to the country, who was equally interested in the result. The claims of the public demanded that the representatives of the people should look to substantial justice, however high the rank, eminent the services, or splendid the connections of the dignified personage against whom such charges were preferred.—That justice, he conceived, could be most satisfactorily obtained by an inquiry, private in its progress, but to be public in the result, particularly when he reflected on the description of persons likely to be examined and the importance of the interests affected by the accusation.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER coincided in the unanimous feelings of the House, that to the most solemn and serious accusation brought forward that night, the most solemn and serious inquiry ought to be afforded. The only difference that seemed to exist in the mind of gentlemen was, as to the manner of conducting that investigation, whether the ends, to which all looked with equal eagerness, were more likely to be acquired by a private and delegated examination, or by a full, prompt, and public discussion, arising from the testimony, which the hon. gent. who submitted those charges to parliamentary considerations may be enabled to produce at the bar of that House. When he contemplated the important interests which the country had, whether in acquitting the exalted personage, if, as he was convinced, the event would prove, such charges could not be substantiated, or in rendering justice to the dignity of the character of parliament, he was compelled by all and every consideration, to call upon that House not to abandon its legitimate judicial province, and by its first step to deprive itself of that freedom of conduct and action, that might eventually preclude it from adopting the course which it might be convinced was ultimately serviceable. There was no course that could prove satisfactory to the country but a public one—and whatever inconveniences may follow from its adoption, they were dissipated by the superior and paramount advantages. Independent of its general recommendation, some consideration ought to be extended to the wishes of his royal highness. That wish he could positively state was, that the investigation should be most complete and public. (*Hear, hear, hear.*) There was nothing that his royal highness so particularly deprecated as any secret or close discussion of those charges. Standing as that illustrious personage did on the fairness of his character, and the fulness of the evidence which he was enabled to produce in refutation of these charges, he was most peculiarly anxious to appear before the country; if acquitted, acquitted by the most accurate and severe inquiry, or if condemned, condemned by the most public and undeniable evidence. Were the present moment suitable for the statements, he believed he could enter into particulars which would convince the House, that it was impossible to bring those alleged charges home to his royal highness. The hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) had in the course of his speech stated a circumstance which particularly involved the character of his Majesty's government. He had mentioned that two members of the King's cabinet were concerned in this agency for the disposal of government patronage. This was a topic on which he felt it due to himself to require the fullest information, and it was for the option of the hon. gent. to determine, whether he would afford it in a public manner in that House, or by a private communication to some of the responsible servants of the crown. (*A cry of "Name, name."*) When in possession of that information, he assured the House that by him no measure would be left undone to unravel and elucidate the truth or falsehood of that allegation. It was not for him to tell that House, that in this great capital it might happen that foolish persons were frequently deceived by advertisements in the

public papers, announcing the disposal of official patronage. And perhaps it has occasionally turned out, that the very persons who were originally deceived by these advertisements to make applications, did ultimately obtain the very appointments for which they had endeavoured to negotiate; but he was convinced that as there was nothing so discreditable to government, so there was nothing more false in fact, than the idea, that money was paid to persons high in office for such transactions. For the distinct manner in which the hon. gent. submitted the question to the House, he conceived him entitled to its thanks. He had pledged himself to bring his charges home to H. R. H. the Duke of York. Upon that pledge the proposed inquiry was admitted; and both for the accuser and the accused, to guard against suppression and insufficiency of evidence, publicity was essentially necessary.

Mr. WARDLE stated, that he was anxious to afford the fullest inquiry in his power to the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The office where this agency was transacted was in Threadneedle-street, under the firm of Pollman and Heylock. The persons conducting the business there did not deny the influence under which they were able to procure appointments. They had stated various situations purchased in the island of Jamaica, and that two members of the present Cabinet, for whom they acted in such negotiations, and to whom he alluded in his speech, were the Lord Chancellor and the Duke of Portland.

It was then carried *nemine contradicente*, that the conduct of his royal highness the Commander-in-Chief, in the appointment of Commissions, and filling up of Vacancies in the Army, be referred to a Committee.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER then moved, that it should be a Committee of the whole House.

Lord FOLKESTONE considered the hon. mover entitled to the fullest credit, for the manner in which he brought the subject forward. He was of opinion that the ends of justice would be best answered by referring the inquiry to a Select Committee, from whose reports all the benefits of publicity would be derived. It was extraordinary to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer interfere with the mode of proceeding which the hon. mover had adopted, when the House recollected with what severe comment that gentleman (Mr. Perceval) remarked upon certain members at his side of the House, for the alleged indecorum of taking certain measures out of the hands of the original proposers.

Mr. SECRETARY CANNING conceived that the surprise expressed by the noble lord in seeing his right hon. friend propose to the consideration of that House the most desirable mode of proceeding, would have been prevented if that noble lord had considered the nature of the improvement which was recommended. The interference of his right hon. friend was not to restrict, but to extend inquiry—it was not to narrow the means, but to enlarge the sphere of deliberation. It was an improvement suited to the importance of the accusation, and to that serious discussion which so many commanding inducements pressed it upon that House to afford. The House should recollect that if such charges were proved, the issue of its deliberation might lead to a proceeding affecting the most valuable privileges of Parliament, and the dearest interests of the elevated and illustrious personage affected by their decision. It was established by various precedents in parliamentary history. It was to a Committee of the whole House the case of the Duke of Marlborough was submitted, because such proceeding was considered correspondent with the gravity of its judicial character, and because it was a species of trial which united *earliness with publicity*. When, therefore, the noble lord complained that an attempt was made to take the subject out of the hands of the hon. gent. who originally brought it forward, the propriety of his reproach amounted to this, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had proposed a motion calculated most effectually to promote the object, which the original mover professed to have solely in his view. Indeed the hon. mover himself did not feel any unjustifiable attempt at interference, nor did he evince any hostility to submit his charges to the House of Commons in its most extended capacity. That hon. gent. had declared to the House, that in calling its attention to this very solemn subject, he was solely actuated by the sense of public duty; that he was free from any hostile feeling to the elevated personage whose character his charges went so vitally to affect. For the impulse of public spirit and disinterested patriotism, he (Mr. Canning) was willing to give him

credit, and surely that hon. gent. could not be dissatisfied with those who placed him upon the most commanding stage, to reap the benefit of his patriotic labours. (*Hear, hear.*) He surely must be aware, that having undertaken the *responsible* task of submitting to a British House of Commons such a serious accusation, that whatever may be the issue of its deliberation; in whatever view the House shall consider the transactions which he has disclosed, whether they be refuted or substantiated, *infamy* must attach *somewhere*—either upon the accused or the accuser. From the *system* which has been *deliberately* pursued for some time past, by the enemies of H. R. H. the Commander-in-Chief, he had to *congratulate* that illustrious personage, and at the same time to *thank* the hon. mover, for the opportunity of canvassing the subject upon charges preferred in a tangible shape. *Whatever result* may ensue from such accusations, it was *not to be denied*, that that royal personage had been subjected to the systematic *calumnies of a set of unprincipled libellers*; that in their vile and malignant publications he had been treated with a brutality of insult which almost made *good men hesitate in deciding*, whether the value of a free discussion was *not considerably depreciated by the evils of its unbridled licentiousness*. For the last six months scarce a day elapsed without some fresh attack upon his honour and his feelings. There was a co-operation of cowardice with falsehood, which far exceeded the calumnious profligacy of other times. A cowardice too of the *basest* kind, participating of the most depraved and odious qualities, deserving of that execration which the best feelings of humanity would pronounce on the base assailant of *female weakness*, because to direct unfounded attacks against *those in high authority*, was nearly similar to an attack on an *undefended woman*. It was, therefore, as sincerely interested in the honour and reputation of his royal highness, that he *rejoiced* to find that this question had taken a distinct shape, and that in the due and proper place, the period for inculpation, and he was sure of exculpation, had arrived. (*Hear, hear.*) It was for parliament to give the subject the fullest inquiry, but he trusted that the hon. mover would in the first instance, without any subsequent restriction, direct his proofs to the specific objects on which his charges of that night were founded.

Mr. WHITBREAD concurred heartily in the recommendation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the most public inquiry. It was due to the elevated rank of the illustrious personage accused, and to the great interests of the country, which were so implicated in the issue. The right hon. Secretary had assumed as a fact, that such a conspiracy as he described, existed, and upon that assumption he rested all his arguments. If such a conspiracy did exist, every man must lament, that such a character, elevated in rank and influence, should be exposed to unmerited calumny.—Still it was to be presumed and hoped, that a prince of the house of Hanover would prefer even suffering under such attacks, rather than risk the liberty of that press to which that family and the British empire owed so much. But why was this brutality of insult so long suffered to continue? Were the Attorney and Solicitor Generals asleep, and the other law officers of the crown asleep? How came it that they neglected their duty? He was ready to give them credit that the omission was not intentional. (*A laugh.*) There was one point in the speech of the right hon. Secretary from which he must dissent. It was assumed by him, that if the result should, as he trusted, acquit his royal highness, his hon. friend would be *infamous* for preferring the accusation. Such doctrine was not supported either by the spirit or usage of the constitution. If there were justifiable grounds for his charge, or if information of a strong kind was laid before him, it was his bounden duty, as an honest public servant, to act upon it in that House. In compliance with that sense of duty, his hon. friend did submit the subject to the House, and whatever might be the issue, he was convinced that not a particle of dishonour could attach to him (Mr. Wardle). There was one strong reason that it should go to a Committee of the House, which weighed particularly with him—namely, that it would be impossible to *select any set of names that would satisfy this herd of libellers and calumniators*, of which such mention had been made by the right honourable Secretary.

Lord CASTLEREAGH supported the opinion, that such a CONSPIRACY did exist, with the determined object of running down the characters of the princes of the blood, and through them to *destroy the monarchical branch of the constitution*. Having failed in the attempt to injure it by open force, they now pro-

ceeded to sap and undermine it by the diffusion of seditious libels, converting *the noble attributes of a free press* to the most dangerous and detestable purposes. H. R. H. the Commander-in-Chief was the principal object of their rancorous invective. To his prejudice facts were falsified, and motives attributed to him of which his very nature was incapable. As to the observation of the hon. gent. that the crown lawyers had not done their duty in not prosecuting libellers, he had only to say, that *it was not always easy to convict upon an obvious libel*, as a very small portion of legal knowledge united with some ingenuity, would be sufficient to defeat a prosecution. *When forbearance was stretched to its utmost point*, and prosecutions were commenced, the base libellers were found to have absconded. Scarce had the calumny of one of them proceeded from the press, when the calumniator was found to have withdrawn himself to America. (*Hear, hear.*) The motion of that night put the Duke of York and the public in a new situation. It gave the subject a distinct turn, and he knew that that elevated personage would deprecate any proceeding that did not rest upon steps taken in the face of day.

After a few observations from Mr. Wardle, *it was resolved that the House should on Wednesday next resolve itself into that Committee.*

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER then proposed, that the honourable gentleman should give in a list of the names of those witnesses he intended to call to substantiate his charge, that such persons might be summoned to attend at the bar of the House on Wednesday next.

Mr. WARDLE (after having gone to the table to make out his list of witnesses) returned to his seat, and said that he thought it would be attended with no inconvenience to defer mentioning the witnesses till Tuesday, when he should come down to the House prepared to furnish the House with the first part of the case he should proceed to prove, and a list of the witnesses whom it might be necessary to examine relative to that first charge.

On Wednesday, the 1st instant, Mr. Wardle, after an introductory speech, brought forward the charge, relating to an exchange of MAJOR BROOKE of the 56th foot to the 5th dragoons, the other party being LIEUT.-COL. KNIGHT.

The charge was this : that the application of these two gentlemen had been for some time before the Duke of York ; that the exchange was not ordered to be permitted, till Mr. Robert Knight, brother of Lieut.-Col. Knight, had, through the negotiation of a Dr. Thynne (the medical attendant of Mrs. Clarke), got the thing effected by paying to Mrs. Clarke the sum of 200*l.* ; that the Duke of York, before the exchange was ordered, knew that Mrs. Clarke was to receive some money in consequence of it ; and that, after the exchange was ordered and the money received by Mrs. Clarke, he, the Duke, was informed by her of such receipt.

The first witness, in support of this charge, was *Dr. Andrew Thynne*, who stated, that, at the request of Mr. Knight, he made the overture to Mrs. Clarke ; that he was authorized to offer her 200*l.* if she would cause the exchange to be expedited ; that he expected her to be able to get the thing done through her influence with a certain great person ; that this great person was the Commander-in-Chief ; that, when the exchange was effected, Mrs. Clarke sent to the witness the Gazette, in which it was recorded, accompanied with a note from herself, saying, that, as she was going to the country, 200*l.* would be very convenient to her ; that, when he made the offer to Mrs. Clarke, he gave her the names of the parties upon a slip of paper ; that Mrs. Clarke talked about

the necessity of secrecy, but the witness cannot tell from whom she was desirous to keep the thing a secret; that he never saw the Duke of York at Mrs. Clarke's; that he, the witness, understood, from Mr. Knight, that the exchange would be carried through in the regular manner, but Mr. Knight wished, in consequence of the bad health of his brother, that the business should be expedited, and for that purpose application was made to Mrs. Clarke.

Mr. Robert Knight corroborated Dr. Thynne as to the motive of the application to Mrs. Clarke; he said further, that, when the exchange was effected, he sent Mrs. Clarke the 200*l.*; that his brother had before received, from the office of the Duke of York, a notification in the usual way, that when a proper successor presented, there would be no objection to the exchange; that he does not know of any positive promise made to his brother by the Duke, previous to the application to Mrs. Clarke. Upon being asked, "Why was the application made to Mrs. Clarke?" he answered, "There was a delay in the business; but the cause of it I do not know. I mentioned the circumstance to Mr. Thynne, who was then attending my family. He advised me to apply to a good friend of his, Mrs. Clarke." He then repeated what he has said before about the offer of money.

Upon further questioning, he says, that Mrs. Clarke desired him to keep the whole transaction a secret, *lest it should come to the ears of the Duke of York*; and, that, recently, she has told him, that the Duke having used her extremely ill, leaving her in debt about 2,000*l.*, she would, if she could bring him to no terms, expose him, whereupon the witness said, he hoped she would not expose him and his brother by mentioning their names, to which she answered, that God knew that was not her intention.

Mrs. Clarke was next examined by Mr. WARDLE, and her examination, all through, I shall give just as I find it in the Morning Chronicle newspaper, where I find it given in the best manner. The whole of the Evidence, as reported to the House, will hereafter be published in the PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES; but, if, upon seeing it in that shape, which I soon shall, I should discover any material error in the newspaper report, I shall lose no time in publishing a correction of it. The evidence of this witness should *all* be before the public; we should have a fair view of every part of it; because she must *necessarily* be the principal witness *as to the knowledge which the Duke had of these transactions with her*; and because, of course, much, in our decision, must depend upon the *credibility* of her testimony, and that credibility must again depend upon the *general complexion and character* of that testimony.

EXAMINATION of Mrs. Clarke.

DID the witness, in the month of July 1805, reside in Gloucester-place? I did.—Under whose protection was she at that time living? Under that of his royal highness the Duke of York.—Did Dr. Thynne at that time attend the witness in his professional capacity? He did, and was for some years in the habit of doing so.—Was there any application made by Dr. Thynne to the witness, relative to an exchange between Lieut.-Col. Knight and Lieut.-Col. Brooke? There was, and Dr. Thynne urged strongly the necessity of great dispatch.—Was there any pecuniary compliment held out as an inducement to the witness to use her interest to promote the exchange? He promised on the part of Mr.

Knight, that a compliment should be made me.—Was not the witness promised a consideration in money when the change would be effected; was she not promised a sum of 200*l.*? I was.—After Dr. Thynne's application to the witness, did she speak to the Commander-in-Chief upon the subject of that application? I told him of it that day at dinner, and handed over to him the slip of paper Dr. Thynne had given to me, containing the names of the parties. I told him I did not know them, but had reason to believe they would make me a compliment. I did not then state to his royal highness the amount of the sum; but when the exchange was effected, and that appeared in the Gazette, I sent the Gazette with a note to Dr. Thynne.—Did the witness, after she had sent the Gazette to Dr. Thynne, receive any pecuniary consideration, from any person, on account of the exchange having been effected? I received afterwards 200*l.* in two Bank notes, under cover, with Dr. Thynne's compliments.—Were the compliments sent verbally by the messenger, or written in the cover? I rather think written, but am not certain.—Did the witness make known to the Commander-in-Chief the having received this money upon this account? I mentioned it to his royal highness on that day.—Is the witness sure his royal highness must have been apprized of the amount of the notes? He must have been; because I showed him the note, and sent one of the servants to get it changed for me.—(Sir T. Twiston.) Does the witness know Mr. Robert Knight? Yes: I met him in company with Mr. Biddulph.—Can the witness state, as near as possible, what conversation passed at this meeting? I cannot recollect. I had certainly a conversation with Mr. R. Knight relative to his brother's exchange. That affair gave rise to our intimacy.—Did the witness ever desire Mr. Robert Knight to keep the transaction about which they were then conferring, a secret? I don't recollect that I did; but it is likely that in such a case I might have given such a caution; perhaps I did; but I don't recollect it.—Did the witness charge Mr. R. Knight to keep that transaction a secret from the Commander-in-Chief? Oh! no, no, never; certainly not; I'm quite sure of that.—(Mr. Lyttleton.) At the time the witness communicated to the Duke of York, the application made to her by Dr. Thynne on the part of Lieut.-Col. Knight to expedite his exchange, did his royal highness make any remark, and what? His royal highness said he knew the business very well; that there had been much application about it, but that he suspected that *one of them* was rather a *bad subject*. However, he would do it; it should be done.—When the witness showed to the Commander-in-Chief the bank-note she had received for her using her interest in this business, did his royal highness make any observation, and what? I don't recollect that he made any.—(The Attorney-General.) What time was the application of Dr. Thynne made to the witness? I can't say.—Was it more than three days before the exchange appeared in the Gazette? I don't think it was more.—When did the witness first mention this business to Col. Wardle? I don't know; it must have been very lately.—Why does the witness say that it must have been very lately? Because I speak from the fact.—Let the witness mention what fact? It was within the last month.—What, within the last month, did the witness communicate to Mr. Wardle? He asked me was it true? I told him it was; it was he attacked me upon the subject; for he had heard it from other quarters, and had asked me only if it was true.—What led the witness to a knowledge of Col. Wardle? Himself.—Was it within the last month that the witness came to know Col. Wardle? I knew him six months before he attacked me on this subject.—Did the witness mention it first to Col. Wardle, or in consequence of being first questioned by him? In consequence of his first questioning me: he had heard it from other quarters; upon his asking me was it true, I said it was. I did not then think I should have been brought here in consequence of having said so, or I would have concealed it.—Would the witness have willingly concealed it? I concealed it from the beginning: it was not my wish to make it public. I have sense enough to keep private that which ought to be kept private.—When the witness gave Col. Wardle an account of this transaction, did she give the same account she has now given? No, I did not.—Which was the true account? Both.—In what do both the true accounts differ? I don't think they differ at all. I mean, I did not then go into the detail I have now; my account to Mr. Wardle was a much shorter one than I have given here.—Can the witness name the day either of the week or month on which Dr. Thynne applied to her? Neither.—The witness has said, that it was not more than three days before the Gazette; now the Gazette days were either Tuesdays or Satur-

days; was it upon either of those days? I can't be particular in so trifling a matter. I am not conversant in days or dates.—Has the witness told the House all she told Col. Wardle in her account to him of this transaction? Much more than I told Mr. Wardle.—What has the witness told the House she did not tell Col. Wardle? I did not, as I have said already, go so much into detail as I have done now. I did not tell Mr. Wardle about the showing the bank-note to his royal highness, nor the getting it changed, and other matters of detail which I have mentioned now.—If Col. Wardle had not questioned the witness upon this subject, would she have made any communication to him upon it? Perhaps I might, and perhaps I might not.—Had the witness no end to accomplish in making this transaction known? None whatever.—Did the witness never state any grounds of complaint against the Duke of York? All my friends knew that I complained of the conduct of his royal highness.—The witness was not asked as to the knowledge of her friends. Did she herself complain of the Duke of York, and threaten in certain circumstances to expose him? I never did. All I did was, I sent a letter to Mr. William Adam (he is present), and I said in that letter that if his royal highness did not pay me the annuity, which he, and Mr. Adam for him, promised should be paid punctually, I would publish his royal highness's letters.—Was this the only letter in which the witness made use of those threats? Not threats; I solicited. I wrote two letters. Mr. Adam has them both.—Did the witness never state that she would expose the Duke of York if he did not agree to her terms? Never; the worst I did or said against his royal highness was in those letters, and I wrote them in anger. I did not then expect to be here, nor is it willing in me that I am here. I know of nothing more in the letters; but satisfy yourself; ask for the letters; read them; they can be produced, I suppose, as Mr. Adam is present. He has them.—Did the witness never state to any person whatever, that if the Duke of York did not satisfy her, she would expose him? Never.—Or to that effect? I never said any thing to that effect.—She was quite sure of that? Positive.—Did not she tell Mr. R. Knight something to a similar effect? No, I told him that I was a going to publish the Duke's letters, in order to raise money to pay the creditors, whom his royal highness had refused to pay. *His royal highness had insisted I should plead my marriage to avoid the debts; and if I did not, I must go to prison; there was nothing else for it.* My lawyer sent me this communication.—Who is your lawyer? The gentleman who is now my lawyer was not then.—Who was at that time your lawyer? Mr. Stokes, of Golden-square. He made the communication to me.—And who made it to him? Somebody from Mr. Wm. Adam, who is himself a *sort of a lawyer*.—Did not the witness lately send for Mr. R. Knight to come to her? Since our acquaintance began, I have asked him often to call and see me.—Did not the witness write Mr. R. Knight a note, requesting him to call upon her, and was it not in consequence of that summons that he did call upon her? It was nothing more than a common note, such as I am in the habit of sending to many more gentlemen of my acquaintance.—Is the witness a married woman? You have no reason to doubt it.—Are you a married woman or not? I am married: Mr. William Adam there has my certificate.—When was the witness married, where, and to whom? I was married about 14 or 15 years ago at Pancras, to a Mr. Joseph Clark.—Is your husband now living? I don't know.—Did not the witness swear herself a widow? No, I did not swear it; I'll explain that: I had applied to the Duke of York for 1 or 200*l.*; he sent me back for answer, that if I dared to say or write any thing against him, *he would put me in the pillory or the Bastile.* His royal highness was alarmed at my having (as he thought) sworn myself a widow-woman, *as then the debts could not be avoided*; but I had not sworn myself a widow-woman; but as I was called upon at the Court-martial, I told the Advocate-General (who certainly treated my distressing situation with more delicacy than the gentleman who has been now examining me), that I thought it would be wrong for me, who was so well known to be living with the Duke of York, to call myself a married woman, and I did say to him, after I had left the Court (not while I was in the Court), that I was a widow. I said I was, but I did not swear I was, though it was erroneously entered in the minutes of the Court-martial.—Who brought this message from the Duke of York to the witness? One of his royal highness's most particular and intimate friends.—Who is he? One Taylor, a shoemaker in Bond-street, very well known to Mr. Adam.—How did the witness make her application for this one or two hundred pounds to his

royal highness? By my pen.—By whom did she send her letter? By this same ambassador of Morocco—Whom does the witness mean by the ambassador of Morocco? The shoemaker.—Was it Taylor, the shoemaker, who brought back the answer from his royal highness? Yes. He gave it as the Duke's words. I have mentioned Taylor's own language.—Mrs. Clarke was then asked whether she had not said that she was born at Berkhamstead, to which she answered, that if she had said so, it was in a laughing and jocular way.—Did you not make Mr. Adam believe that you was born there? I don't know whether Mr. Adam believed it, or not.—Did the witness represent her husband as the nephew of Mr. Alderman Clarke? He told me that he was so.—Did the witness believe that he was the nephew of Mr. Alderman Clarke? Yes.—Did you ever see Mr. Alderman Clarke? I never saw any of my husband's relations, except a brother and sister.—Do you now believe that he was the nephew of Mr. Alderman Clarke? I never asked him any thing concerning his connection. He is nothing at all to me, nor I to him. I have not seen him these three years, nor heard of him since he brought the action against the Duke.—What is your husband? I don't know.—What is his business? He is in no business; his father was, he was a millwright.—Did you ever live in Tavistock place? Yes.—When? I don't recollect the time exactly. I lived there under the protection of my brother.—How many years ago? I do not recollect.—When did you go to Park-lane? I do not recollect.—How long before you went to Park-lane did you live in Tavistock-place? I do not recollect.—Was you in any other place between the two periods? I might have been in another place.—How long did you live in Tavistock-place? I do not recollect.—Where did you live when you first knew the Duke of York? I beg to be excused answering that question.—*Chairman.* The witness must answer the question. I do not recollect.—Why then did you desire to be excused answering the question? Because I did not recollect.—Is that the only reason for the wish to be excused? Yes.—I desire positively to know whether the witness did not live in Tavistock-place before she knew the Duke of York? I do not think that is a fair question. I am a married woman with several children, and one daughter grown up.—I wish to know whether the witness lived in Tavistock-place, before she was under the protection of the Duke of York? I was then under his protection.—Was she under his protection when she first lived at Tavistock-place? No, under that of my brother.—Has not the witness said, that she was a widow? No, never, except on the occasion of the court-martial which she had mentioned. She then thought it was saving her family, and also the Duke of York, as he too was married.—Does she say she never lived in Tavistock-place, till under the protection of the Duke of York? I knew him previous to that, but did not live with him.—Did she not represent herself to the tradespeople there as a widow? Never, to any one.—I would ask, whether she has not threatened, that unless the Duke would come into her terms, and pay her what money she wanted, she would put his letters into the hands of persons who would pay her? No.—Did she not state, that she either had or would put on paper all the transactions of the last 14 or 15 years, and put the memorial into the hands of persons who would publish it, unless the Duke of York would pay her? No, she could not recollect that she ever said so, but she referred to the letter or letters she had written to Mr. Adam.—The witness had said that she had mentioned this business to others besides Mr. Wardle. Who were they? She did not recollect all her acquaintances with whom she might have conversed on the subject, but at any rate it must have been in a slight sort of way, and was of no consequence.—How long was it before she mentioned the business to Mr. Wardle? She did not exactly recollect, but it was since she wrote to Mr. Adam. She did not know Mr. Wardle at that time.—Who was present besides Mr. Wardle when she first mentioned this business? Some ladies, perhaps of her acquaintance, but nobody of any consequence.—To what man besides Mr. Wardle had she mentioned it? There were many acquaintances of hers to whom it might have been mentioned, but she could not recollect any particular persons.—Did the witness know Major Hogan? No, never. She had never seen him in her life. Mr. Greenwood had written to her to say that he was sorry to find she was acquainted with a Mr. Finnerty. She had about nine years ago seen a man of that name, at Margate, who was said to be connected with a newspaper, but had never seen him since.—(*Examined by Mr. Croker.*) Did the witness recollect any particulars of the conversation she had with Mr. B. Knight, lately, on this subject? Yes. He asked on what terms she was with

the Duke of York? whether she had been paid her annuity? She said, no: that the tradespeople were clamorous for their money, and that she would publish the letters to pay them. Upon which he said, that he hoped she would spare his brother.—Whether any other notice had been taken of this business by Mr. Knight, except that she would spare his brother? No; certainly not.—Whether she had made any inquiries of Mr. Knight with regard to the business under discussion? She asked Mr. Knight what sort of a man the other was who had exchanged with his brother; and he said he was an Irishman.—Whether the witness said any thing more to Mr. Wardle on this subject than at the particular time she had before mentioned, and whether she still would abide by that answer? Yes, she did abide by it.—Whether she had any more than one conversation with Mr. Wardle upon this subject? No; and she hoped she would never hear of it any more.—Whether she was in the habit of seeing Mr. Wardle more frequently than when making inquiries relative to this business? Yes; she had seen him on other occasions.—Could the witness recollect when the conversation on this subject took place? She had answered that question before.—Had any conversation taken place on this subject within these three days? No.—Had any taken place since Friday last? No.—Did the witness see Mr. Wardle on Saturday last? She saw him at the Opera House.—Whether she saw him any where else than at the Opera House, on Saturday last; whether Mr. Wardle had intimated that he meant to call her as a witness, and when? Soon after she saw the newspaper which gave an account of the business having been brought forward in the House, he called, and she was angry, as he had made very free with the name of a friend of hers, a Mr. Donovan. Mr. Wardle had one morning taken away a parcel of letters of hers without her sanction, and she could never get them back again.—Whether it was not on Saturday that she saw the newspaper which gave the information? She did not recollect.—Whether she did not see Mr. Wardle on Sunday? She was in the habit of seeing him every other day. She could not exactly recollect.—Did she see him yesterday? She did not.—Whether she was certain of that? She believed she might speak positively.—Had she any conversation with him on the subject this day? Yes.—Whether she now still adhered to her former assertion, that she had no conversation with him on this subject since Friday last? This day something had passed between them about appearing to the summons; and about a week ago he had said that the House would commit her if she did not appear, and send her where they had sent some sheriffs before.—(Examined by Mr. Lytleton.) The witness had stated that she had shown the note to the Commander-in-Chief; he wished to know whether she had shown it at any time except when she mentioned the business of exchange? No.—By whom had the message about Finnerty been sent? By Taylor. He told her that Mr. Greenwood had been reading Mr. Hogan's pamphlet and others; and that he had been informed that she was intimate with Mr. Finnerty, which she then denied, as she did now.—(Examined by Sir A. Pigot.) The witness had stated, that Mr. Knight and Mr. Biddulph had paid her a visit together. Did Mr. R. Knight soon after call upon her alone? Many times.—Did she at any time say to him that she was desirous the business should be concealed from the Duke of York? Never in her life.—If any one had said so, then, it was false? Certainly; and she hoped before she left that place, that whoever had said so should be called in.—(Examined by Lord Folkestone.) The witness had said that she sent the Gazette with a note to Dr. Thynne. He wished to know whether she recollected what was in that note; what were the contents? She did not recollect exactly; but she believed it contained very little.—She had said that the 200*l.* had been sent her in a note with Dr. Thynne's compliments. Was she quite certain of that? Yes, she was; as she recollected at the time having sent her maid to give the man a guinea.—Were the compliments written in the note, or verbally sent? She was certain that the 200*l.* came enclosed, but as to the compliments, she could not exactly recollect. She had paid very little attention to the matter, as she never expected to be called upon to give an account of the matter.—Did she recollect who brought the note to her house? No; but she understood it to be Dr. Thynne's servant.—Did she recollect the time of the day? It was about the middle of the day.—The witness had said that the exchange took place two days after the application; he wished to know whether she alluded to the application of Dr. Thynne to her, or her application to the Duke of York? She spoke to the Duke of York about it the same day at dinner.—How soon after that did the

exchange appear in the Gazette? Only a few days after.—Whether she had any reason to desire Mr. Knight to conceal his visits from the Duke of York, and did she desire him to conceal them? She never received his visits in a way that she wished to be concealed.—(Examined by Mr. Perceval.) The witness has said that Mr. Wardle had got her letters without her sanction or consent. He wished to know when that happened? She could not tell precisely; but he laughed the matter off, saying, that he would get possession of all her love-letters.—Was it before this inquiry was set on foot? Yes.—How long before? She could not recollect.—Had she any conversation on the subject of the letters with Mr. Wardle before he took them? No.—How happened they to be lying in the way? Because she was leaving her house, and removing to her mother's.—Did the witness mean seriously to say that Mr. Wardle took her letters without her authority? Yes; as he had got many other nonsensical little notes, which induced him to take these.—Were these the letters of his royal highness the Duke of York to the witness? There might be one or two of the letters of his royal highness intermixed with them.—Did the witness mean to say, that these were for the most part, letters of his royal highness? No.—Why then was it said, that these were the letters that led to this inquiry? Because Mr. Wardle had read them.—Did she recollect ever having been offered any money for delivering up the letters of his royal highness. Never.—Did she put them into the hands of any person, in order to forward any negotiation of her own? No; except to Mr. Adam, who was the confidential friend of his royal highness.—Had the witness never said, that she put the letters into the hands of any one, to facilitate a negotiation of her own? No; except to Mr. Adam. She had never written a note on the subject of the letters to any but Mr. Adam.—(By Lord Stanley.) Whether the Duke of York was in the room when the 200*l.* was brought her? No, he was not.—How soon after was it that she stated that Mr. Knight had fulfilled his promise? The same day.—Was it on the same day that she desired the note to be changed? Yes.—What was the name of the servant by whom the note had been changed?—She did not know; it was a very irregular thing to ask servants their names.

Now, before we proceed any further, let us take a view of the Evidence as it stands. **FIRST**, it is *proved*, that Dr. Thynne, *who had, for several years, attended in the house of Mrs. Clarke*, pointed out to Mr. Knight an application to her as the effectual and speedy way of obtaining the Duke of York's approbation of an exchange between two field officers of the army, which exchange had already been applied for in the regular way, and had, as yet, at least, not been obtained: **SECOND**, it is *proved*, that Dr. Thynne did make the application to Mrs. Clarke, and that he promised her 200*l.*, in case the exchange should take place: **THIRD**, it is *proved*, that the exchange did, in a few days afterwards, take place: **FOURTH**, it is *proved*, that Mrs. Clarke, in consequence of the exchange having taken place, did receive, from Mr. Knight, the said sum of 200*l.* All this is proved without any of the testimony of Mrs. Clarke. Mrs. Clarke, if the Duke had a knowledge of the bargain, must be looked upon as an accomplice; and, accomplices are not usually allowed to be sufficient witnesses to produce legal conviction; but, when their evidence is corroborated by strong circumstances, and especially, when, as in this case, they are in *no danger themselves*, such evidence is invariably taken to be good. She states, that she immediately applied to the Duke; that he said one of the parties was a *bad subject*, but that the thing should be done; and she further states, that when she had received the 200*l.*, she told the Duke of it, and, in his presence, sent the note to be changed by one of his own servants, whose name she does not recollect. If we believe her here, the case is complete. But, as weighing against her evidence, the statement of Mr. Knight has been much dwelt upon. He, who, after the exchange, got acquainted with her, says, that she desired him to keep the matter a *secret*, and that she expressly gave as a reason

for this, her fear of the consequences, *if it should reach the Duke of York's ears*. This statement Mrs. Clarke positively denies. Which are we to believe? Mrs. Clarke, who *took* the bribe, or Mr. Knight, who *gave* the bribe, and who first *tendered* the bribe? Character, here, is quite out of the question. People may say what they will about Mr. Knight's having been a member of the honourable House. So have many others that I could name. We here see Mr. Robert Knight as a *briber*; and, the parties being, in this respect, upon a level, we must decide between their opposite assertions upon the *internal probabilities* of the case.

Mr. Knight was asked, *what part* of the transaction Mrs. Clarke wished to have kept a secret; and, whether it was solely the *money* part of it; he answered, that the *whole transaction might be concealed from the Duke*. This question was put so often, and the reports in all the newspapers so exactly correspond with respect to the answer, that there is very little probability of its being incorrect.

Now, then, let it be remarked, that Mr. Knight went to *thank* Mrs. Clarke for the use of her influence in the case of his brother's exchange, having before paid her 200*l.* for that influence; and, was it *probable*, that Mrs. Clarke should express to Mr. Knight a wish, calculated to make him believe, *that she had not at all interfered in the matter with the Duke of York*? Nay, Mr. Knight himself says, that he looked upon the thing as having been done by her influence, and further, that *she took credit to herself for it*; but, how could she, if she pretended that she had induced the Duke to do it; how could she, at that same time, have the folly to express a wish, that her having had any hand in the business might be kept from the knowledge of the Duke; kept from the knowledge of that very person, who, if her claim to Mr. Knight's 200*l.* was not fraudulent as well as corrupt, must have known, that she was the cause of the exchange? Will any one believe, that Mrs. Clarke would say, "It was I who *prevailed upon the Duke* to permit of your brother's exchange; but, for God's sake, *don't let the Duke know of it*"? Why, there is a manifest absurdity in the supposition. It is a thing too *preposterous* to be believed. That she might, indeed, desire Knight not to *blab*; not to talk of the transaction for it to reach the Duke's ears through *third parties*; this is likely enough, and this she herself admits may have been the case; but, to suppose, that she expressed a fear of the Duke's *knowing* of her having been the instrument in the business: to suppose, that she expressed such a fear to the very man, with whom *she was taking credit to herself* for having obtained the grant *from the Duke*, is an absurdity too gross to be for one moment entertained by any man in his senses.

It appears, however, that Mrs. Clarke did tell Mr. Knight, that she would expose the Duke, unless she could bring him to terms; and, it is fair to presume, that she did so, because, not only does she admit something of this sort herself, but it appears, that, in two letters to Mr. ADAM, she pushed the threat much further, or, at least, expressed herself more fully. To an enraged woman, fallen from her high estate, and left to be worried by creditors, who had crawled to her in the days of her affluence, a pretty large portion of vindictiveness is fairly imputable: and, this state of her mind the impartial reader of her evidence will not fail to keep constantly in view. Unsupported by *strong* corroborating circumstances I have no hesitation in saying, that her evidence against the Duke of York

would not be worth much ; and if the fact of the *offer* of 200*l.*, the subsequent *taking place of the exchange*, and the *actual payment of the 200*l.** immediately afterwards : if all these facts had not been *proved*, I should have paid very little attention to her testimony, relating to this transaction.

Still, however, the Duke's actually *knowing* of her *pocketting money* on account of the exchange rests solely upon her evidence ; and, we must now hear what was said by Mr. ADAM, Col. GORDON, and the DUKE'S SERVANT, which, apparently, has been regarded as throwing discredit, not only upon this part of her statement, but upon her general veracity.

We will take the whole of Mr. Adam's statement of the 1st of February as given in the Morning Chronicle of the 2nd.

Mr. Adam said :—A great part of the evidence which I have now to state, I communicated upon a former night to the House. About the year 1789 I was requested by his royal highness the Duke of York to look into some of his concerns, and from that period to the present I have continued to examine those concerns with all the attention and accuracy in my power, without acting, as I before mentioned, professionally—without receiving any emolument, but giving my services quite gratuitously. In the year 1805 it came to my knowledge, that the husband of the person who has just gone from your bar, *had threatened to bring an action for crim. con. against the Duke of York*, and, in consequence of this information, it became necessary to inquire into the general conduct of that lady, which was found to be very incorrect. But in my intercourse with his royal highness, I observed, that he was exceedingly unwilling to believe the reports made to him, and he continued so indeed to the last. These reports, however, were of such a nature as to suggest the propriety of a further investigation, and the result was a confirmation of Mrs. Clarke's incorrectness, which was such as tended much to prejudice the interests of the Duke of York, not upon military business, for nothing at all appeared of the description of that now before the Committee ; but, with regard to money obtained by an improper use of the Duke of York's name ; this, I felt it my duty to state fully to his royal highness. For the purpose of having the investigation made, I applied to Mr. Lowton, of the Temple, and he employed Mr. Wilkinson to conduct it, who is generally engaged by that eminent solicitor to make preliminary arrangements upon business committed to his direction. The investigation was completed about the 8th of May, 1805, and I had the details of it laid before the Duke of York ; the consequence was, that his royal highness came to the resolution of putting an end to his connection with Mrs. Clarke, and he requested me to communicate his resolution to her. The separation was a measure which I so much approved—which I felt to be so material to the interest and credit of the duke, *that I was induced to overlook any consideration of unpleasantness, and to accede to his royal highness's request.* I saw such a disclosure of her character in the report, that I thought it totally inconsistent with his royal highness's honour any longer to continue the connection.—*It appeared, indeed, in this Report, that she pleaded her coverture, in defence to an action for goods which she had obtained by representing herself as a widow.* Upon my interview with her, I discovered still further proofs of her incorrectness. Although it turned out that she was married at Pancras, she said that she had been married at Berkhamstead. At Berkhamstead also she stated that she had been born, that her mother's name was Mackenzie, and her father's name Parker. But although I had the register of Berkhamstead examined, for forty years back, no such name was to be found. I took occasion to put many questions to Mrs. Clarke in the course of this interview, and I came away from her with the impression that the facts mentioned in the Report I have alluded to were correct. She had stated that her husband was nephew to Mr. Alderman Clarke, the Chamberlain of London, which statement proved to be unfounded. In announcing to Mrs. Clarke the Duke of York's resolution to separate from her altogether, *I informed her, by his royal highness's authority, that if her conduct should be correct, she would be allowed 400*l.* a year ; but for this there was no bond or written obligation whatever.* It was merely an annuity, which his royal highness should be at liberty to withdraw, if the conduct of this lady should *not be correct.* From the time of that communication I have not

seen Mrs. Clarke until she appeared at the bar this night. I have stated, I think, all that relates to the transactions in which my name has been used. Upon recollection there are some other points—I received a letter in June 1808 from Mrs. Clarke, which is, no doubt, that to which she has alluded this night. That letter, I believe, still is in the custody of the gentleman who conducted the examination. Indeed, I endorsed the date and transmitted it to Mr. Wilkinson immediately after I received it. The knowledge I have of Mr. Wilkinson I have stated to the Committee; of the other person, Taylor, mentioned by Mrs. Clarke as an acquaintance of the Duke of York's, I have no knowledge whatever. I hope I have explained myself satisfactorily to the Committee. If I have not spoken quite intelligibly, I shall be ready to give any further explanation in my power by answering any question that may be put to me. I think it proper to add that the threat of an action for *crim. con.* was made in 1805, that the inquiry immediately followed, and that the separation took place in 1806.—He did not know whether the annuity promised Mrs. Clarke had been paid her or not, as pensions or matters of that sort formed no part of the financial concerns of the Duke of York which were under his administration. Those concerns to which he had to attend elated to *certain claims*, for the discharge of which his royal highness had appropriated a proportion of his annual revenue, to manage which Mr. Coutts and he were appointed trustees. This proportion was originally but 12,000*l.*, but it was now raised to between 26 and 30,000*l.* a year, out of which 4000*l.* were annually applied to the liquidation of debt due by his royal highness to the public, on account of the loan advanced to him under Mr. Pitt's administration. To discharge this and other claims, his royal highness had, highly to his honour, set apart as much of his income as, consistently with necessary expenditure, could be possibly spared.

Colonel Gordon, who is the public military Secretary of the Duke of York, says in substance, this : that it is his duty to make to the Duke a report upon all applications for promotions, or exchanges; that he has no doubt that he made an inquiry upon the case of Knight and Brooke; that he fully believes, that the grant of the exchange was made in consequence of his report; that he kept no minute of the inquiry or report, and was not in the habit of doing so; that the delay in question took place on account of some doubts of the eligibility of Col. Brooke, and not on account of any objection to Col. Knight's request; that he has not the smallest reason to suspect that any influence other than that of the general rules of the service produced the grant of leave to exchange; that the Duke's approbation was given on the 23rd of July 1805, that the King's signature was affixed to it on the 24th, and that the exchange was gazetted on the 30th.

Ludovick Armor, a footman of the Duke of York, said that he was a foreigner; that he had lived eighteen years with the Duke; that no other of the Duke's servants ever went to Mrs. Clarke's; that he used to go there at eight o'clock in the morning to take the Duke's clothes; that he never saw Mrs. Clarke at her house but once, when he went to take a favourite dog for her to see; that the Duke was not then there; that he is quite certain that he never was sent by any one, from her house, to get any note changed. In his cross-examination, he repeated these assertions; he said, that no other servant of the Duke was permitted to go to Mrs. Clarke's; he asserted of his own knowledge, that no other of the Duke's servants ever went there. He said he had been asked (previous to his coming to the House of Commons) the same question about the note, by the Duke, by Mr. Adam, by Mr. Lowton, and by Mr. Wilkinson, and that he had given them the same answer.

I leave the evidence of Mr. Adam and Col. Gordon, as I find it. The character which Mr. Adam gives of the lady is very bad indeed; but one cannot help regretting that he should have been the instrument of offer-

ing to such a person an annuity of 400*l.* a year, on the part of the Duke, while the latter was accommodated with so large a loan out of the public money.

If what *Ludovick Armor* says be true; namely, that no other servant of the Duke ever went to Mrs. Clarke's, and that he never took a note to change from that house, what Mrs. Clarke says about sending the note to change *must* be false. That is quite clear. But, bare justice to the fair annuitant compels us to observe, that this falsehood, if we set it down for one, must have been a mere freak of fancy; for, it would, I think, be impossible to assign, or conceive, any *reason* for her stating it. Of itself there was nothing in it, either good or bad. To have said, that she merely *showed* the Duke the money would have answered full as well for all the purposes of accusation and of crimination. It is quite impossible to guess at any end she could have in view by telling such a falsehood, except that of bringing forth *Ludovick Armor*; or of affording a chance of being exposed as a false witness. If, therefore, she be a false witness, a fabricator of false accusations, we must, I think, allow her to be as awkward an one as ever appeared at any bar in the world.

After the examination of *Ludovick Armor*, Mr. Wardle examined Mr. Adam, which examination led to a very novel scene, namely, the reading of *an anonymous letter* in the House.

Mr. Wardle asked Mr. Adam whether he had a *son*, and was answered in the affirmative, adding, that he was Lieut.-Colonel of the 21st regt. of foot. Being asked at what *age* he was made a Lieut.-Colonel,

Mr. *Adam* said, that he would answer that question; but the House, he hoped, would allow him to make some previous observations. General Sir Charles Stuart, the friend of his early life, asked him, whether any of his five sons had an inclination for the army. There was one of them fourteen or fifteen years of age, who he thought had a strong tendency that way. The general said, that by the rules of the service he was permitted to appoint him to an ensigncy. He was accordingly made ensign. His regiment was in Canada, and as he was so young he did not join immediately, *but was first sent to Woolwich for education*. As this question had been asked him, he hoped it would not be considered as unbecoming in him to say of so near a relation, that he distinguished himself extremely. A second commission was given him by Gen. Stuart, in a manner equally gratuitous. When the great Abercomby, likewise the friend of my early life, was sent to the Helder, he went under him at the *age of sixteen*, as a volunteer. The House would pardon him, as it was impossible for him not to feel strongly, he must state his merits. He landed in a hot fire, and conducted himself so as to command the applause and thanks of all who surrounded him. He was present in every active engagement during that expedition. He commanded a body of men of the number generally committed to a lieutenant. They were from the Supplemental Militia, and *required a great deal of management*, and it was universally allowed that he conducted them well. When he returned, he was, without any solicitation of his (Mr. Adam), so help him God, appointed to the Coldstream Guards. There he remained till he went to Egypt again under Abercomby, accompanied by his friend, who had made the same progress as himself (the son of Sir John Warren) who was killed by his side. He landed at the head of the guards, at the famous landing in Egypt, and distinguished himself equally well on that occasion. On his return, the Duke again appointed him to the rank of major, and at the age of twenty-one he rose to the situation of lieutenant-colonel of the second battalion of the 21st, and afterwards of the first battalion, he (Mr. Adam) having merely stated a circumstance in his favour, which he left entirely to the Duke's consideration; and this regiment was as well commanded as any in the service; he might call upon the officers who were acquainted with the service to confirm his words; and Sir John Moore, if he had been alive, would have spoken of him.—Mr. Adam said, that he now would read a letter which he had received, and which appeared to have some reference to this question.

He then read a letter which he had received, and of which the following is the report, as given in the Courier newspaper of the 4th of February:—

“ Sir: Your character was once respected; that is now over. Your shifting in the House of Commons, and your *interference in the Duke of York's lechery concerns*, would have dubbed any other man a *pimp*. This subserviency to royalty *has made your son a Colonel at twenty years*, and given your other boy a ship.”—(I wish, exclaimed, the hon gentleman, turning to Mr. Wardle, you would ask me a question respecting this son too, that I might have an opportunity of telling by what means he got his ship.)—“ Bravo! Go on! Try if you can say you act for *no profit* when you get your sons thus provided for. Decide as you please, that the man who is paid for his services out of the public purse, because he is the second man in the kingdom, as you say, and a prince, forsooth, *should not show a good example*. Let the Commons decide as they will, the public will judge for themselves; and it is not a decision of the *Bear Garden* that will convince burdened millions that black is white. This rubric (it was written in red ink) “ is typical of my feelings. I blush for you, and wish you would change your principles to correspond with the colour of your hair, and live the latter part of your time in honour. Though the decision of the House will not go far with the public, *yet all eyes are upon it, and the damnation or salvation of the Commons depends upon this decision.*”

There will be much for observation upon these matters hereafter; but, I cannot refrain from observing, that this audacious letter appeared to kindle somewhat of wrath in the breasts of the honourable House. Mr. ELLISON said it was unworthy of the character of any individual to pay attention to anonymous letters. Mr. ADAM said, that the letter was written to deter him from doing his duty, and to libel the House of Commons, *both of which were beyond the power of any such attempts*; that he had to protect his own and his family's honour, and that he would do it without minding the opinion of any one.

Mr. FULLER defended the reading of the letter, and said the House ought to be whipped, if they did not offer 500*l.* or 1000*l.* for discovering the author. “ If you are such poor creatures,” said he; but was stopped by a loud and general cry of *order*.

The public are much obliged to Mr. Adam for reading this letter, and to Mr. Wardle for taking care to have it inserted in the evidence. Yet, strange to say, the *Morning Chronicle* has *suppressed* it. That print states, that there was a very abusive and vulgar letter read; but, it does not insert it. This is not dealing fairly either with Mr. Adam, the honourable House, or the public.

Now, in the account which I have given of the evidence, as well as of the debates, or that I shall give of either, I am, of course, to be understood merely as re-stating what has been before stated in the newspapers, which original statements may, for aught I know, be incorrect; but, as I said before, if I find them to have been so, I will lose no time in correcting them, and communicating the correction to the public.

Publicity, and even *speedy publicity*, is what Mr. Canning stated to be desirable, and for that reason he preferred an examination at the bar of the House, in preference to an examination before a committee, upon *oath*. To assist, as far as my little sheet is capable, in this work of publicity, is my object, and shall be my constant endeavour, until the whole of the business is closed. My wish is, that the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, should be known to, and believed by, every soul in the kingdom; and, if this be the case, great *good* must arise from this inquiry, while it is impossible that any *harm* can arise from it.

If there be any one, who from report, has imbibed *prejudices* against the Duke of York, this is the time for him to dismiss those prejudices from his mind. He should resolve upon doing that; and by no means give way to the very prevalent and dangerous propensity of hailing open accusation as proof of guilt, merely because such accusations correspond with his pre-conceived opinions. Nothing is more common than to hear men exclaim, when an open accusation takes place, "Ah! I always said so, or I always thought so." In this state of their minds, the accused stands but a poor chance. They *wish* him to be guilty; and it is but too true, that, what we wish, we frequently believe, with or without sufficient reason. Against the whisperings of this spirit of injustice I wish to guard the reader. I hope that all prejudices will be dismissed from the mind of the public; that we shall all look upon the Duke of York as being now accused for the *first* time; that we shall consider him as a person exposed to much ill-will and obloquy from the nature of his situation; and that we shall not condemn him without such proof as would be sufficient to produce the condemnation of any one of ourselves.

But, on the other hand justice to ourselves, justice to our country, and to the army, requires that we should not be carried away from rational and fair conclusions by any assertions, or insinuations, against the authors of the accusation or against any of the witnesses; by any outcry about a *Jacobin Conspiracy*, and the *licentiousness of the press*, and a design against the *House of Brunswick*. These, I trust, we shall regard as empty sounds. The utmost extent to which the press has gone, upon this subject, is, to have published, that *Major Hogan told the Duke of York, that promotions were to be purchased of women at reduced prices; that the Major offered to prove this to the Duke, and that the Duke made no answer, and never called for the proof.* This is the utmost extent of the "*licentiousness of the press.*" The statement may be false; Major Hogan did, perhaps, never say this to the Duke; but, observe, the Major does not accuse the Duke of *receiving, either directly or indirectly, any part of the money*; nor does he accuse him of *knowing that any other person got money in such a way.* Well, then, how has the press sinned? What has it done, in this case, to be so severely censured? What has it done to excite "a doubt whether the *benefits of its freedom* be not *overbalanced by its licentiousness?*" It has now been proved before the parliament itself, that, at the recommendation of the physician of Mrs. Clarke, money was offered to her to obtain from the Duke of York the grant of an exchange in the army; it has been proved, that the exchange soon afterwards took place; and it has been proved, that the money was paid to her according to the terms of the bargain. Must not the parties to this transaction have believed that Mrs. Clarke was the cause of the exchange? Must not *they have believed this?* Were they not liable to talk of it? If such like transactions were frequent, must not the knowledge of them have spread? And, if any public writer came to the knowledge of them, was it not his bounden duty to state them to the public? If not for such purposes, I should be glad to know *for what purpose there is, or ever was, any thing, called "the freedom of the press."*

Mr. Sheridan told the House, that he had besought Mr. Wardle not to proceed with this business, a fact of which I have not the smallest doubt; but he added, that his "*honourable friend*" (for so he called him) had lent himself to the designs of "*a foul conspiracy.*" Foul conspiracy as

long as he pleases ; but that will not remove the effect of the evidence of Dr. Thynne, Mr. Knight, and Mr. Adam ; the word *conspiracy* will have no weight against the proofs of the 200*l.* bargain with, and of the *annuity* to, Mrs. Clarke ; nor will it have any weight at all against the evidence of Mrs. Clarke herself. Conspiracy, indeed ! *Who* should conspire ? *Where* is the conspiracy ? Much has been said about the cowardice of general insinuations against the Duke, and about the advantage of, at last, getting at the accusations in a *tangible* shape. Why do we hear nothing specific about this conspiracy ? A conspiracy generally implies conspirators. *Where* are they ? At present, all the persons that have appeared are Dr. Thynne, Mr. Robert Knight, and Mrs. Clarke. Are these some of the conspirators ? Is Mr. Adam one, who has told us all about the *connection* and the *annuity* ? Who the devil are these conspirators then ? *Where* is the place of their meeting ? Why not place this conspiracy before us, in a "*tangible* shape ?" These loose assertions about a conspiracy must operate to the injury of the Duke of York ; for the people of this country are too much in the habit of deciding upon the merits of the case ; of deciding upon actual evidence, not to suspect to be bad that cause, which has recourse to *recrimination*. It is so constantly the case to hear the guilty revile his accusers, that if the Duke had a *real* friend, that friend would not fail to avoid all such revilings, not fully justified by the *proved* turpitude or malice of the party reviled.

"Jacobinism !" Is it, then, to be a jacobin to complain, that bargains such as that between Mrs. Clarke and Mr. Knight were going on ? Is it to be a jacobin to complain, that while the Duke of York was borrowing public money from the minister, he was, as his counsellor has informed us, settling an annuity of 400*l.* a year upon a person such as her whom this counsellor has described to us, and who has now, in the parliament, been called "*an infamous woman* ?" Is this jacobinism ? Is this to conspire against the illustrious House of Brunswick ? Oh ! no. It is not the House of Brunswick, but the house in Gloucester Place, and other such scenes of corruption and profligacy, if any exist, that the conspiracy is formed against ; and, say the revilers of the press what they will, this is a conspiracy of which all the virtuous part of the nation approves, and in which it most cordially partakes. Is the man, who sees thus squandered part, at least, of the means which his incessant industry has collected, and which his paternal affection would fain devote to the comfort of his one-day fatherless family ; is such a man, because he feels sore, because he expresses his indignation at seeing his earnings squandered in this way ; is such a man for such a cause to be reviled as a jacobin and a conspirator, and to be held forth as worthy of the gibbet ? If this be the case, away with all the talk about the sacrifices necessary for our defence against a conqueror ; for if the devil himself were to become our master, he could not make our situation worse. But, I hope and trust, this is not to be the case ; I trust we shall still have a country to fight for, and courage to defend it ; that we shall still be *truly* free and *truly* loyal in spite of all the endeavours of all our enemies foreign and domestic ; in spite of all their efforts to enslave us, or to goad us into disloyalty.

To Mr. WARDLE, for his public spirit, his frankness, his candid and bold manner of bringing the matter forward, his steady perseverance, and all the admirable qualities he has displayed upon this occasion, the unanimous thanks of all the worthy part of the nation are due, and I will

add, are justly rendered. I have not conversed with a single person upon the subject, who has not expressed admiration at this gentleman's conduct. No, he did not *consult* with you, Mr. Sheridan, nor with any of the *party*; but, this, Sir, is that part of his conduct which we most approve of. He wanted no counsel but that of a sound head and an honest heart; no support from any thing but truth and justice. He wanted no "*parliamentary experience*." None of what has been called "the tactic of the House." He had a complaint to make in the name of the people, and he made it, without discovering fear either for himself or for his cause. He has neither obtained, nor asked for, any indulgence. In his arduous and most laborious task, he has received assistance from SIR FRANCIS BURDETT and LORD FOLKESTONE; but, whether by *declaimers* or any thing else, he appears never to have been disconcerted; his own resources appear never to have failed him; and at every stage of the proceeding, he has risen in the esteem of the nation, the trading "*anti-jacobins*" excepted.

Botley, Wednesday, 8th Feb. 1809

DUKE OF YORK.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, February, 1809.*)

TO THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND,

THE attention of every person in this country is now, with more or less eagerness, directed towards what is going on in the House of Commons. By a sort of involuntary motion, all eyes have been turned that way. There is no man that now seems to think it of any consequence what is done in the way of war, or of negotiation. All of us seem to feel, that, until this affair be settled, it would be absurd to waste our thoughts upon any question connected with our interests, or our honour, as a nation.

So far the state of the public mind is what it ought to be. But, while all are exclaiming against the infamous corruptions, plunderings and robberies; the insulting profligacy, that have now been *proved* to exist; while all mouths are open upon these topics, there has appeared no attempt to draw the attention of *the people* to the effect which these abominations have upon them, in their individual and family capacity.

Be this my task, by way of introduction to such other matters and remarks as it appears to me necessary, at this time, to submit to those, who bear the burdens, which arise from the corruptions that have now been proved to exist.

To persons, not accustomed to go beneath the surface of things, it may possibly appear, that it makes little difference to the *people*, whether commissions and offices be sold or not, because, in whatever manner they be disposed of, the expense of them must still be the same. But, it requires but very little reflection to perceive, that this proposition is opposed to the truth; for, in the first place, it is evident, that the person who purchases a post, will seek for reimbursement, either in the positive

profits of the post, or in a deduction from the time or the services, which ought to be spent or rendered in that post. In the case of DOWLER, for instance, who paid, it appears, to Mrs. Clarke, large sums of money for his appointment as a Commissary, is it not clear that he would not fail, during the execution of his office, to keep in view the money which he had paid for that office? And is it not equally clear, that he would miss no opportunity of reimbursement? Indeed, it is impossible to believe, that a person, who has obtained his office by the means of a bribe, whatever the nature of that bribe may be, whether consisting of money or of a vote, will ever refrain from plundering, from any other motive than that of the fear of detection. In such a case, all the effects of morality, all the influence of sentiments of honour, are completely lost to the public. That which is "conceived in sin and brought forth in corruption," must naturally be productive of wicked and mischievous deeds.

Now, then, the money which DOWLER paid to Mrs. Clarke we must consider as coming, through the exercise of his office, out of our pockets, whence it has first been taken by the tax-gatherer. To this we must add the probable further sums, which a man who had obtained his office by a bribe would be likely to appropriate to himself; and, when we see to what extent this system of bribery has prevailed, we shall not be surprised at the immense amount of the sums which we are annually called upon to pay on account of the Commissaries' department.

In the case of offices, which are merely *military*, the *mode* of our suffering is different; but, it is not less real than in cases more immediately connected with money transactions. If the office be obtained by money, when no money ought to be paid, then there will be, by leaves of absence, or other means, a deduction of services due to the public; and, if money ought to be paid to the public, which is paid to a kept mistress, then the public clearly loses the amount, which ought to go to its credit. But, the chief evil here is, that unworthy and base persons are preferred before persons of a different description; that the vile and corrupt vermin, who hang about the metropolis, step over the heads of veterans, who have passed their lives in toils and dangers; that boys become entrusted with commands, which ought never to be in any hands but those of men of experience; that the comfort, the happiness, the *backs*, and the *lives*, of our brave soldiers are committed to the power of such men as Captains Donovan and Sandon, and Colonel French; to the power of men, whose promotion to that power has been obtained by means such as those which have now been brought to light.

Hence *desertions*; hence the *sufferings of the soldiers*; hence *blunders and failures without end*; and hence the millions upon millions, which all these annually cost us. To be a good military officer requires, not only bravery, but *wisdom, experience, and integrity*; a good understanding and a just mind. And, can these be expected in men, who have gained their posts by bribes given to a kept mistress?

Besides these, there is a positive loss in money. We pay for *more officers* than we need pay for if this infamous system did not exist. We see, in the case of one of the MALINGS, that he became a *captain* without ever having been on *military* duty. We see that others have been officers, while at *school*. Well, then, less officers are necessary; or, if that be not the case, the service must suffer, and the public must lose, by the absence of so many of those whom it pays.

I cannot refrain here from mentioning the case of Mr. ADAM'S son,

who became the Lieut.-Colonel of a regiment *at the age of twenty-one years*. After he was appointed an *Ensign*, he was sent to school. His father tells us of his feats in Holland. A second commission, that of *Lieutenant*, was given him *while at school*. At the age of *sixteen* he went to Holland; and here his father says he distinguished himself in the command of a body of men usually committed to a Lieutenant. "They were from the Supplementary Militia, and *required a great deal of management*." Did they so? Then, was it well to commit them to a *boy of sixteen*, just come from school? Should it not have been a *man* to have the command of such men? At twenty-one years of age no person in the world can be fit for a Lieutenant-Colonel. He has the absolute command of a *thousand men*. The comfort, the happiness, the morality, the *backs* of a thousand men depend upon his wisdom and integrity. A person to be intrusted with such a charge, ought to be sober, considerate, compassionate, and yet firm to execute justice. Where are these to be found united with the passions inseparable from youth? Besides, is it possible, that the other officers, captains old enough, perhaps, to be his father, and who have every fair claim to prior promotion, can cordially submit to the command, and, occasionally, to the *reproof*, of a boy of twenty-one? What would Mr. Adam say, if he had to plead before a *judge* of twenty-one years of age? Yet, the Lieut.-Colonel of a Regiment (for the Colonel *never* commands) has powers still greater than those of a judge. He has, in the course of a year, to decide upon the cases of, perhaps, two thousand offences. He has to judge of characters; to weigh the merits of candidates for promotion; his smile is encouragement, and his frown disgrace; it depends upon him, whether the soldier's life be a pleasure or a curse. Is not all this too much for the age of twenty-one years?

Every desertion from the army is a loss of fifty pounds to the country; and, how many of these losses *must* arise from the want of wisdom and experience in commanding officers?

But, the *cost*, the bare cost, of officers who do not actually serve, is immense. The *younger Sheridan*, for instance, has, it is notorious, been living in and about town all his lifetime. Yet, he was, sometime ago, a captain in a regiment serving abroad, and will now, I believe, be found upon the *half-pay list*. A return of all the officers belonging to regiments abroad, *not serving with those regiments*, would give us a view of the extent of this intolerable abuse. If men *give money*, or render *secret services*, for their offices, to a kept mistress, how can it be expected, that any *service* should be performed by them to the public? They give their money, or render secret services, for the sake of getting the *pay*. When Colonel French gave his money to Mrs. Clarke, it was with a view of getting three or four times the sum out of the taxes that we pay. *We* were the payers for Mrs. Clarke's *service of plate*; we paid for her *landau*; we paid for her *trip to Worthing*; we paid for her *wine-glasses at a guinea a piece*; we paid for her *boxes at the Opera and the play-house*; and French and Sandon and Dowler and Knight and the rest of the bribing crew were merely the channel through which the money passed from the taxed people to her.

Oh! how many hundreds, how many thousands of the people, have suffered for her; she has stated, and no one has attempted to disprove her statement; she has stated in answer to the very judicious questions of LORD FOLKESTONE, that she received in money from her keeper only 1,000*l.*

a year; and that this was barely sufficient to defray the expense of *servants' wages and liveries*; but, that the Duke told her, if she was *clever*, she need never want money. Twenty thousand a year was, perhaps, not sufficient to defray the amount of all her expenses. Here is 20*l.* a year taken, in taxes, *from each of a thousand families*. It is the maintenance of 645 labourers' families at 12*s.* a week, the common wages of the South of Hampshire. It is equal to the poor-rates of about 50 parishes of England and Wales, taking those parishes upon an average. It is equal to the poor-rates of 66 parishes like this of Botley. It is equal to all the direct taxes, of every sort, of 21 or 22 parishes like this. First, the farmer is deprived, by these means, of a part of his comforts and conveniences; his house contains less of goods and displays less of hospitality; from him the deprivation descends to the labourer, whose scanty and coarse food, and want of raiment and fuel, produce, besides the pinching of hunger and cold, the miseries of disease, and which disease, the never-failing effect of hunger and filth, is spreading far and wide its baleful and hereditary effects. How many widows and other females, whose incomes admit of no nominal augmentation, have suffered, and are still suffering from this accursed system? Every penny paid to Mrs. Clarke is just so much taken out of the pockets of the people. All her "four or five men servants;" all her dashing carriages, all her wines, her music; all her endless luxuries, have been taken from the comforts of this suffering nation, as clearly as if the tax-gatherers had taken the money and paid it in to her housekeeper or her tradesmen. That which has been devoured by her crowd of footmen, waitingwomen, pimps, and bawds, would, if the system of corruption and profligacy had not existed, been left to augment the hospitality of gentlemen, the conveniences of tradesmen and farmers, and the loaf of labourers and journeymen; while those, her footmen, waitingwomen, pimps and bawds, would have been compelled to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow.

Taxation, when excessive, must produce *misery*; and especially when the taxes are applied to the purposes of luxury. It is necessary, at this time, in particular, that the people should clearly perceive this truth. Suppose there to exist a community of a hundred persons, all of whom labour, in one way or another, *usefully* to the community. Let ten of them cease to labour, and let them live upon the labour of the other ninety; and the consequence must be, that the ninety must work one-tenth harder upon the same quantity of food, and raiment, and fuel, or that each will have one-tenth less than he used to have, of these necessaries of life. Hence a general decrease in productions, or a general increase of the miseries growing out of labour not sufficiently fed; hence the fall of some into utter inability to supply their wants; and hence the increase of the number of paupers in this country has kept an exact pace with the increase of the taxes, or, in other words, with the increase of the number of persons who are not engaged in productive labour.

The immense sums received by Mrs. Clarke were not devoured by her. She did not consume more food than before she was the Duke's kept mistress. But, she was enabled to keep a crowd of persons, of various descriptions, who, had they not been so maintained, must have laboured for their bread.

This is a view of the subject of which the *people* should never, for one moment, lose sight. This is the way, in which they are directly affected by the hellish system, which has now been *proved* to exist. From this

view of it, they will not, I trust, be diverted by any attempts to induce them to attach most importance to the *meanness*, or even the *immorality*, of the parties. These are quite sufficient to excite national disgust and hatred; but, the main thing is for the people to see the *robberies*, and to be able clearly to trace to these, and such like robberies, their own privations and miseries.

Now is the time for the people to ask the revilers of SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, whether he was so very much to blame, when he told the Electors of Westminster, that no good was to be expected, till we could "tear out the leaves of the *accursed Red Book*." Col. French, and Col. Knight, and Capt. Donovan, and Capt. Sandon, and Mr. Dowler, and the rest of the numerous petticoat-patronized crew, are all to be found in that *Red Book*, the leaves of which he wished to tear out. *His* voice will, I trust, now be heard by those who were before *misled*; if, indeed, there could be any such. I trust that now, the venal declaimers about "Jacobinism" will no longer be able to blind the understanding of any man, however simple that man may be. The man, who now affects to believe, that a *deep-rooted* system of corruption does not prevail, must be an arrant knave; and, of course, none but an arrant knave will affect to believe, that a *radical* reform of that system, and a *speedy* one too, is not necessary to the preservation of the throne, as well as of the remaining liberties of the people.

But, in the mean time, and, indeed, as necessarily conducive to this reform, let the people bear in mind, that it is *their money* that has been sported with; that it was not Col. French's money nor Mr. Dowler's money that the Duke of York's kept mistress took, and that was expended upon her footmen, chariots, musicians, singers, players, dancers, parasites, pimps, and bawds, but in the end, *the money of the people*. This is the important truth for them to keep in view. Let every father of a family consider how much less, from this cause, he will have to bequeath to his children. When those, who formerly lived in affluence from the rent of their estates, reflect how they have been obliged to dismiss servant after servant; sell horse after horse; abridge pot after pot of the ale that formerly gladdened the heart of the comer; aye, and to cut down tree after tree, and sell acre after acre; let all such persons, when, with aching heart, they so reflect, think of Mrs. Clarke and the services of plate and the wine-glasses at a guinea a piece and the rattling carriages and the laced-footmen and the musicians and the singing-boys and the players and the dancers and the pimps and the bawds in Gloucester-place; and let every mind in the kingdom be fixed upon the scene described by Miss TAYLOR, every tongue repeat, and every ear tingle at, the words, "*how does French behave to Darling?*" Darling! How many a widowed mother has had to pronounce that word over a child driven from beneath her roof by the penury produced by these and similar corruptions! Look into families, once respectable in point of fortune, and you find them consisting of a crowd of helpless females, unable to work and ashamed to beg, the sons all forced away, for want of the means possessed by their father, to seek a subsistence from patronage, to get back again some small portion of what their father has paid in taxes, and, in order to succeed, creeping to those whom that father would have despised; nay, perhaps, the last stake of the family is converted into a bribe for a whore, while a score of breasts are filled with anxiety lest the sum should not be sufficient. Thus has the nation been degraded; its

spirit subdued; its heart broken; and its property rendered a prey to the infamous reptiles, who, at last, stand exposed to its execrations, and who, I trust, are at no great distance from the hour of feeling the effects of its vengeance. I mean not the vengeance of a mob, but the steady, sober, deliberate vengeance of the law.

I now would fain call the attention of the people to the *altered language* and tone of the House of Commons. It will not soon be forgotten, that, when Mr. Wardle first brought forward his charges, he was answered with the boldest defiance. From both sides of the House he heard of nothing but of *joy*, that, at last, the charges against the Commander-in-Chief could be met in a *tangible* shape. He was told, that a conspiracy had long existed against the illustrious House of Hanover, and that his hearers were delighted to find, that they should now have fair play against that conspiracy. He was told, that he had incurred "*a heavy responsibility*;" and that the result must be "*infamy* upon either the accused or the accuser." Mr. Perceval said, that, "was the present moment suitable for the statements, he believed he could enter into particulars, which would convince the House, that it was impossible to bring these alleged charges home to his royal highness." He said, in the name of the Duke, "that his wish was, that the investigation should be most complete and public; that there was nothing his royal highness so particularly deprecated as any secret or close discussion of these charges; that standing as that illustrious personage did, on the fairness of his character, and the fulness of the evidence now he was enabled to produce in refutation of these charges, he was most particularly anxious to appear before the country, acquitted by the most accurate and severe inquiry." All this bold language, this tone of menace, have been dropped for some days; and it seems to be almost forgotten, that Mr. Wardle ever was under any very "*heavy responsibility*." Nay, Mr. Yorke, who spoke so roundly of the *Jacobin Conspiracy against the illustrious House of Brunswick*, seems to have begun to think, that all the "*talking*" was not without some foundation. Mr. Canning says not a word, neither does Lord Castlereagh; Mr. William Smith, the famous Whig-Club member, thinks it no longer necessary to *disclaim* Mr. Wardle, in the name of his party; Mr. Whitbread is no longer in a passion at being accused of a connection with the accusing member; and the elder Sheridan talks no more of his dissuasive messages to that gentleman.

But, what is more worthy of the attention of the people is this, that *now, now, now, now*, behold! the East-India Company people have moved for a committee up-stairs to inquire into the sale of *Writerships* and *Cadetships*, when it is notorious to all the world, that, for many, many years past, these offices have been *advertised* for sale as openly, and almost as frequently, as Packwood's Razor-strops or Spilsbury's pills. How comes it, that we never before heard of any Committee up-stairs, or down-stairs, or in any part of the house, to inquire into these matters? What has alarmed the honour of the Directors now? Why *now*, for the first time? Oh! it is very surprising, that *now*, all of a sudden, this horror for jobbing should have seized them! For eight years I have been a witness of these advertisements. Every one must be satisfied, that, during that time, the traffic has been going on; and yet, not a whince have we heard from the tender Directors till now.

Still more worthy of the people's attention is what dropped from Mr.

Perceval the other night, after the grand explosion, including the *Church* as well as the State. He said, he had, for some time past, had it in mind to bring in a bill to prevent this scandalous jobbing. We thought, that you and your colleagues, Sir, said, but the other day, that we were libellers; that we had formed a conspiracy for writing and talking down all that was great and noble in the country. Why pass a bill, if what we said was libellous? Aye, a bill, oh! a bill; by all means a bill! But it does come somewhat of the latest. Yes, certainly "a day after the fair." If you had talked of a bill of this sort long ago, instead of charging the press with being libellous; instead of instituting a long list of government prosecutions against those who complained of jobbing; then, indeed, we should have received your notification with applause; but, now, Sir, we do not. My neighbours in the country, are even so irreverent as to laugh at it; and, though I caution them against the consequence of giving way to ridicule upon state affairs, they still persist in comparing it to maternal precautions when the girl's shape convicts her of bastardy. These country people are slow to move. They are as obstinate in their credulity as they are in their want of faith. At last they see their situation plainly; and I venture to say, that nothing short of a fair, full, entire, radical reform of abuses and corruptions will now satisfy them. The farmers have read about Mr. *Beazley*, and Drs. *Glasse* and *O'Meara*. They did not like *tithes* before; and, be you assured, that they will not now like them any thing the better. They are a strange people; always judging of what they cannot get a sight of, by what they can get a sight of. If they see a full sack, for instance, and perceive wheat dropping out, through an accidental hole, in the sack, they conclude that the sack is filled with wheat. This logic they apply to clerical preferments, and look upon Mr. *Beazley*, the *no-papery* pamphlet writer, and Drs. *Glasse* and *O'Meara*, as the grains that have dropped out. "A bill" will never satisfy such people. They do not so easily perceive the virtues of such a bill. In short, they heard enough of bills to check the Treasurer of the Navy. They want something to make them see and feel, that they cannot again be robbed by infamous jobbers; and, until they have this, bills will be of no use. But, what is to become of all the past? Or is this bill to be by implication a bill of indemnity for the past? Is there no law to punish the jobbing rascals? Bless us! no law of any sort, by which they can be come at? Why not apply to them that most convenient and accommodating thing, called the law of libel? Give me a file of newspapers, or go to *Peele's Coffee-House*, and I will engage you shall have some thousands of advertisements for the purchase and sale of offices under government. I have, several times, pointed out to the ministry these scandalous advertisements. I have, more than once, taken them for mottos, a sort of text, whereon to preach a political sermon to them. I have asked why the authors of those advertisements were not called upon. No notice has ever been taken of my representations. Nay, on the very day when Mr. *Wardle's* charges were brought forward; so late as that day, and after the charges had been stated, Mr. *Perceval* seemed to think very lightly of the matter. He said, that, in this great metropolis, there were "foolish people" who were, by such advertisements induced to throw away their money; but, as to the actual sale of places, he scouted the idea. Not a word did he, even at that late day, say about a bill to prevent jobbing. He now tells the House, that he has, for some time, thought of this bill. It is not for a very long time,

it seems. On the contrary, the whole of the language of himself and his colleagues was the language of *defiance*. Every thing they said was in *opposition* to the charges of Mr. Wardle; not a soul of them allowed, that corruption existed in any shape. No, the whole cry was, that a conspiracy was on foot "against every thing *great and noble*;" that Jacobinism was still alive, and that what the late Pitt said of its malignant qualities was now verified; in short, every thing that could be said was said to make us believe, that the charges had had their rise in the licentiousness of the press, and in a conspiracy against all the establishments of the country, not excepting the kingly office. *Denial* was the word; all was denial and defiance; and not a breath about *a bill* to prevent jobbing. Where have the 658 members of the House been living, that they, that no one of them, ever saw cause for such a bill before? It is strange, passing strange, that this talk about a bill, this plain acknowledgment that jobbing does exist, should never have been made *before*. Has it sprung up, all at once, under Mr. Perceval and Mr. Canning and Lord Castlereagh? Oh, no! It is a very deep-rooted plant. Aye, and *a bill* will not grub it up. Of that the whole nation is convinced.

It is of the greatest importance for *the people*, by which term I mean all those who are not in the receipt of the public money, or any part of it, to bear in mind what *passed at the time when Mr. Wardle first brought his charges forward*. I was aware of this; I knew that every word then uttered would become of more and more consequence as the investigation proceeded. For this reason I was induced to depart from my usual practice, and to insert the debate entire. As it cannot be too often read, I will now remind the public, that the first part will be found at page 13 the conclusion at page 36. To this debate, as to a *standard*, I shall constantly refer. It is by *looking back*, that we are enabled to judge of what we have to expect. We are too apt always to forget the *past*. When any thing of interest arises, we attach our attention solely to that; but this is wrong; for, in fact, we see but half the thing without taking into view what has gone before.

This being my opinion, I will now endeavour to lead the abused people back to the beginning of the formal, public complaints, made in behalf of the Duke of York *against the press*; and, this is the more necessary, because it seems to me that every public writer appears to have forgotten them.

For more than a year past there have been, occasionally, little dirty pamphlets, complaining of *libels* against the Duke of York; but, they were so insufferably stupid, that no man of sense thought it worth his while to notice them.

In the month of August, however, when there had been published some pretty bold paragraphs against the Duke's being sent to Spain, there was published a pamphlet, entitled "A PLAIN STATEMENT OF THE CONDUCT OF THE MINISTRY AND THE OPPOSITION TOWARDS HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF YORK." It was in this pamphlet, as the public will not soon forget, that it was stated, that there existed "a *family council*, a *domestic cabinet*," to protect the King even against his ministers; that the Queen was at the head of this council, and the Duke of York a leading member of it.

The pamphlet states, in substance, that the *late* ministry wished, and even attempted, greatly to *abridge the power* of the Duke of York; and, observe it well, the writer adds, "that his royal highness *deemed it neces-*

“ *sary to throw himself upon the protection of his ROYAL FATHER* ; and
 “ that the proposed measure of the Grenville party was *thus defeated by*
 “ *the immediate interposition, not to say the COMMAND of his Majesty.*”
 It is of great importance; it is of incalculable importance, that we
now look back to these publications. But, the part of this memorable pam-
 phlet (the writer of which has never been *prosecuted*) adapted more im-
 mediately to our present purpose, is that which relates to the complaints
 made by this writer against *both ministries for NOT INTERFERING*
WITH THE NEWSPAPERS, in order to prevent publications against
the Duke. Every word of this part of the pamphlet is now to be re-
 perused and treasured up in the memory. Here is the passage, and I do
 beseech the people of this kingdom to read it over and over again.

“ These incessant attacks could not but very seriously affect his royal highness,
 “ and after having maintained a dignified reserve as long as *human patience* could
 “ support it, he at length found it necessary to demand an inquiry into his con-
 “ duct. Nothing could be so ridiculous as the affected astonishment of the
 “ ministry upon this demand. Who has presumed to attack the interest or the
 “ reputation of your royal highness? *There are laws in the country to which*
 “ *your royal highness may appeal.* Why should there be a formal inquiry where
 “ there is no formal charge? Why should the ignorance or malignity of the
 “ daily papers be raised into the consequence and dignity of having called forth
 “ an official inquiry? If any thing has been said or written against your royal
 “ highness, of which all his Majesty’s ministers must solemnly disavow even any
 “ knowledge, the Attorney-General should be ordered forthwith to commence a
 “ prosecution; and if your royal highness be unwilling personally to give your
 “ instructions to that officer of the crown, *they may be given to the Treasury, by*
 “ *your royal highness’s secretary.* But his Majesty’s ministers would think them-
 “ selves deficient in a due sense of what they owed to their own dignity as his
 “ Majesty’s counsellors, if they adopted a popular rumour as sufficient grounds
 “ for an official inquiry.”

Well, this was pretty well, I think. What *more* did this writer wish
 them to do? He will tell us directly, in speaking of what he says has
 been the conduct of the present ministry, upon a similar occasion.

“ It may be urged, indeed, in reply to all that has been said above, that the
 “ attacks complained of, have not been made with the knowledge, and still less
 “ with the consent or concurrence, of his Majesty’s ministers: that they are all
 “ of them too honourable men to concur in such a system of anonymous attack:
 “ that such a system, moreover, could answer no conceivable purpose: that the
 “ ministry are too strong in public opinion and confidence, to require the assistance
 “ of such unworthy arts. In a word, that such a persecution, and so indirectly
 “ put into operation, can have no purpose, and therefore that it is a reasonable
 “ inference that it has no existence.

“ To this it must be answered, that when his royal highness made similar
 “ representations, under the late ministry, the answer was uniformly, that his
 “ Majesty’s ministers were totally ignorant of the very existence of the facts
 “ alleged; that the law was open to his royal highness, and that the Attorney-
 “ General might be instructed to prosecute; that they had no influence or
 “ authority over the free press; and that they advised his royal highness to hold
 “ all such libellous accusation in the contempt which it merited.

“ It is notorious, however, notwithstanding all this disavowal, that the free press
 “ as it is called, and as it should be, is almost *equally divided between the two*
 “ *leading parties in the country, and that the ministers and the opposition have the*
 “ *same influence, NOT TO SAY AUTHORITY, over them as if they were THE*
 “ *ACTUAL EDITORS.* Has any instance ever occurred, in which a *billet from*
 “ *Downing-street has been refused admission, and if required, an ample confirma-*
 “ *tory comment, through all the Treasury papers?* And will any, either of the
 “ ministry or the opposition, declare, upon their honour as gentlemen, that they
 “ have no authority or weight with the public papers? Whence does it happen,
 “ that the honour of parties is not the same with that of individuals, and that a

“ party will assert conjunctively, what every individual of that party knows to be false? Why is there not the same point of honour with a party as with an individual?

“ The indecent language in the daily papers, is certainly not from the mouth of the ministers. It is impossible that men of honourable stations should descend to such terms, and to such anonymous acrimony. We are persuaded that his royal highness most fully acquits his Majesty’s ministers of any immediate participation in such libels. But *the encouragement, the countenance, the impunity, of these libellers*, is the efficient cause of the whole. Would the Editors of the Daily Papers thus write, *unless they were persuaded that they were advocating a cause generally pleasing to their patrons?* As to a legal remedy for this torrent of libel and invective, though a jury of his countrymen would visit the libellers with merited punishment, his royal highness, we believe, will not be lightly persuaded to introduce a practice which he has never approved. There have been, perhaps, already too many government prosecutions, and a precedent may thus be constituted, which, much to the injury of the free press, may be hereafter acted upon. *Add to this* that there may be innumerable allusions, innuendoes, and even assertions, which may have substance enough to wound, and that most deeply, but are *not palpable enough for the violation of the law*. The libellers of his royal highness have been too long practised in their school, to commit themselves to the hands of a jury. Let any man of honest feelings read some of the cold-blooded articles which have lately appeared in many of the daily papers, and then answer, if his indignation be not moved by their savage malignity—yet are these libels conceived in terms *so studiously picked and culled, as to elude the just vengeance of the law*.

“ How many subjects, moreover, are there which, however grossly offensive to all honourable feeling, cannot be produced to the publicity of a legal trial. Let any man put it to his own mind—how many slanderous reports are daily in circulation to the ruin of the peace and character of their unhappy object, but for which the sufferer is yet unwilling to make his appeals to the laws of his country. *There is a necessary and indiscriminating publicity in law, from which a mind of any DELICACY cannot but avert*. His royal highness has indeed suffered much, but he will suffer still more, we should think, before he can persuade himself to call on the *laws of his country*.”

So, here we have an expression of this writer’s wishes. He seems to allow, that nothing has been said of the Duke that even our libel law can lay its fangs upon, or, at least, with a fair chance of success; and, therefore, as the newspapers are, as he says, as completely at the command of the two parties, as if the leaders of those parties were the actual editors; and as, with regard to the Treasury papers, “ a billet from Downing-street is never refused admittance, accompanied, if required, by an ample confirmatory comment,” he would have had orders issued from Downing-street, to those papers, to insert certain billets, and to refuse others, relating to the Duke of York.

This writer must be an enemy of the Duke, under the mask of friendship; for is it possible to form an idea of any thing more low, more mean, more shabby, more scurvy, more dirty, more base, than going to a ministry, and asking them to obtain the publication or the suppression of paragraphs, respecting him, in prints, which he must regard as being edited by the most venal of mankind? As if he had said to himself: No; the law will not do; the law cannot find any hold in the publications against me, and beside, I do not like the publicity of law; I will, therefore, have recourse to corruption; I will, by the means of influence purchased with the public money, get a good word from those whom I despise. This is what this writer imputes to the Duke of York, and this he does under the mask of friendly compassion. This he does under the pretence of *defending* the royal chieftain against the attacks of his calumniators. I do not believe that any act more base was ever before imputed

to any human being. What, go sneaking to the ministry to beg of them to speak a good word for him to the editors of the newspapers! Foh! it is so rank, it so stinks of meanness, that one's bowels are disordered at the thought, especially when imputed to a modern "CORIOLANUS." I am not for appeals to the law, respecting matters of this sort; but, something should certainly be done by the *real* friends of the Duke of York, to convince the world, that this part, at least, of the pamphleteer's statements is false. I, for my part, shall anxiously wait for the contradiction, and shall hasten to give it to the world. What! (I cannot get it out of my mind) go to the ministry to supplicate their interference with the public papers! It is such an abominable story; such atrocious slander, that surely it will be speedily contradicted.

Such is the passage, and such were my remarks upon it at the time. To this the writer added, in a very positive and peremptory tone, that the ministry and opposition *must*, when parliament met, both **DISAVOW the attacks of the press upon the Duke**. How far this positive prediction, not to call it a threat, has been fulfilled, I leave the people to judge, when they have again carefully looked over the debate upon Mr. Wardle's Charges, bearing in mind, at the same time, the disavowal of Mr. W. Smith, in the name of his party, the anger of Mr. Whitbread, at being suspected to have given encouragement to Mr. Wardle, and the declaration of Mr. Sheridan, relative to a foul "conspiracy."

Here, then, People of England, you have seen the origin of all these complaints against the press; I mean the first formal published complaint. Since that publication, MAJOR HOGAN's Pamphlet, edited by the able pen of Mr. Finnerty, has appeared. In consequence of that pamphlet, many prosecutions by the Attorney-General have been commenced. Major Hogan's pamphlet boldly speaks of *petticoat promotions*; it states, that the Major, who is *proved*, by letters from most respectable superiors, to be a man of long and very meritorious services, told the Duke, that his long-sought promotion might have been obtained, at a reduced price, if he had, like others, chosen to disgrace himself by applying to petticoat influence; that the Major was ready to produce to the Duke proof that promotions were thus disposed of; that the Duke *made no answer to him*; and that he (Major Hogan) *has never been called on for his proof*. There could be no harm at all in the Major's saying, that he stated this to the Duke; the harm consisted in his stating, that the Duke made him no answer, and never called for his proofs; and, *if this statement was false*, it was very wicked and richly deserving of punishment; because the direct and inevitable tendency of it was to cause it to be believed, that such villanous influence, influence so manifestly disgraceful and injurious to both the army and the public, was used *with the knowledge and connivance of the Duke*, than which a heavier charge could not have been preferred against mortal existing.

It must be confessed, that this pamphlet had a wonderfully great effect all over the country. I recommended it to the attention of my readers; because I foresaw, that, whether true or false, it must finally bring to an open discussion, that question, which had, for several years, been agitated in private, and of the importance of which question I from my correspondence, was better able to judge than the public in general.

Prosecutions were now resorted to, in which prosecutions Mr. Finnerty, and the printer and venders of Major Hogan's pamphlet, are involved, and, of course, were so involved at the date of Mr. Wardle's

bringing forward his charges. But, in the meanwhile, many people appear to have been busy in their inquiries; and, at last, Mr. Wardle, who had been successful in his inquiries, comes before the parliament, and, without applying to any *party* for support, or assistance, boldly makes the complaint, and prefers the charges, in the name of a burdened, an injured, and insulted people.

Now, then, we come to the *reception* which those Charges met with upon their first appearance. They were stated with a degree of frankness unparalleled. The accuser not only explicitly stated the nature of the several cases; he gave the details; and he even named his witnesses; leaving to the accused every possible advantage, especially if we consider of what description those witnesses were, what was their situation in life, and what was their manifest interest as connected with the cases whereon they were to be called, it being almost impossible that scarcely any one of them should support the charges, without, in the same breath, proclaiming their own infamy, or, at best, their meanness.

This procedure, so frank, so honest, so manifestly free from all desire to take advantage, was met with observations on the "*heavy responsibility*" to which the accuser had exposed himself; with charges against unnamed "*Jacobin conspirators*," who had formed a settled scheme for writing and talking down the Duke of York, the army, and all the establishments in the country; with the severest censure upon the press, the recent "*licentiousness*" of which was represented as surpassing that of all former times, and the benefits of the freedom of which were, in the opinions of very good men, overbalanced by the evils of its licentiousness; with representations of the *difficulty* of producing *convictions* for *obvious* libels. Nor must we fail to keep fresh in our minds, that, just before the parliament met, and while so many persons were under government prosecution for alleged libels upon the Duke of York, we saw daily advertised in all the newspapers, "*THOUGHTS ON LIBELS, ON JURIES, and on the DIFFICULTIES of PRODUCING CONVICTION in the case of libel*," which Thoughts were "*dedicated to the Duke of York and Albany*," and published by EGERTON, the Horse-Guards bookseller. At the same time, just upon the eve of the meeting of parliament, a person of the name of WHARTON, said to be the same who is Chairman of the Committee of the House of Commons, published a pamphlet, entitled, "*Remarks on the Jacobinical tendency of the Edinburgh Review, in a letter to the Earl of Lonsdale*;" in which stupid Letter the author talks of *libels*, and of settled schemes, on the part of the press, to overthrow the establishments of the country.

Whereunto these publications tended was evident enough. Their natural tendency, supposing them to have answered the purpose for which they were written, was, first to create in the public mind, an alarm for the internal peace and safety of the country; to cause it to be believed, that, somewhere or other, there was a conspiracy brooding against the government; that this conspiracy was aided, in its diabolical views, by the press; that, of course, it was the duty of *juries* to get over the *difficulties* which had heretofore been experienced in the *producing of conviction in cases of libel*; and if all this should fail, to prepare the minds of the public for new, and still more severe laws, with respect to the press, providing a complete security for every great offender in future.

That such was the *tendency* of these publications is quite clear, and,

I think, there can be very little doubt of its having been their principal, if not their sole, object. This object has, by Mr. Wardle's exertions, been, *for the present*, at least, defeated. The Lord Chancellor has declared, in his place, in the House of Lords, that the laws in existence, relative to the press, are a sufficient check upon it. And, well might he make the declaration! For, what further checks can be devised, what greater dangers a writer or publisher can be exposed to, without establishing, at once, an imprimatur, and the power of transportation without trial, such as they have at Calcutta, I am at a loss to discover. We cannot now plead *the truth* in justification of what we write and publish. It has now been *proved*, thanks to Mr. Wardle, that there has, for years and years, been carried on a regular trade in military commissions and in appointments of all sorts. But, if I had happened to *know*, that French and Sandon gave money to Mrs. Clarke for their letter of service, and that, in consequence of that bribe, they obtained their levy from the Duke of York; if I had happened to *know* this; if I had stated it; and if I had been prosecuted by the Attorney-General for the statement, I should not have been able, according to the present practice of the law, to produce, in my defence, *the proof of the truth of my statement*, nor would my accusers have been called upon for *proof of their falsehood*. All that would have been requisite to my conviction would have been the proof that I was the proprietor of the paper, and a thorough opinion, in the minds of the jury, that my statement was of a sort to *hurt the reputation*, or even the *feelings*, of either of the parties; and, thus, I might have been torn from my family, and shut up in Gloucester or Dorchester jail for years, *as a sacrifice to the wounded feelings of a peculating pimp*. And yet, there are men, who have the assurance to tell us, that the press *is still too free*; and that the *difficulties* in the way of conviction, in cases of libel, are *still too great!*

Had not this, such as I have described it, been the state of the press; had not the danger of *publishing truth* been so great; can any one believe, that the enormities, the atrocious deeds, that have now come to light, would have been carried on for so many years? Why, I have had hundreds of letters upon the subject; but, I had no taste for either Gloucester or Dorchester jail; and, therefore, the knowledge thus communicated to me, was confined to my own indignant breast, or, at most, extended a little by the means of conversation.

If *truth* had not been a *libel*, those injuries to the nation would have been stopped in time, or, rather, they never would have had an existence. They would have been prevented by the dread of exposure; but, the press being enslaved so far as not to dare to speak the truth; as not to dare to utter what might *hurt the feelings* of any one, whether guilty or not; this being so notoriously the case, there was no danger of exposure, and, of course, the corruption and profligacy went on increasing, until they arrived at the pitch in which they now appear before us.

There is one way, and that a most effectual one, of silencing the press; of silencing both *writers* and *talkers*; namely, by *reforming*; by taking from the people the grounds of complaint; by ceasing to wrong and to insult them. But, this is a way that never seems to have been thought of. It is all to be done by *force*; by the law, or by the bayonet. These may silence, but they never convince; they smother for awhile, but they do not extinguish the fire of discontent; as the fate of all the old corrupt governments of the Continent has clearly demonstrated.

Conspiracy against the *establishments*, indeed! No, no! There is no jacobinical conspiracy: it is a conspiracy of such persons as the Reverend Drs. Glasse, and O'Meara, and the Reverend Mr. Beazley, who when they took priests' orders, declared, *that they were thereunto moved by the Holy Ghost*. It is these persons, if what has been given in evidence be true; it is these, and such-like persons who are conspiring against the established church. It is impossible, that the people should believe, that these are the *only* instances of the kind that have existed; it is impossible, that the general opinion should not be, that *many* of the clergy have been preferred by the means, which were employed in behalf of these persons; and, as the people cannot know precisely where to fix, it will necessarily follow, that their suspicions will fall upon the clergy as a *body*; and, then, who can be surprised, if the churches should become *quite* instead of three-fourths, deserted? It is a very great hardship upon the worthy part of the clergy, that they should suffer in reputation from this cause; but, it is inevitable now, and the blame will not lie upon the people, but on those, who have carried on, who have winked at, and who have tolerated, these corruptions.

These observations apply to the army also, the general character of the officers of which must greatly suffer from what is now come to light. Who can tell which officer has, and which has not, obtained his promotion by bribing or pimping? Mr. Yorke said, there was a conspiracy to write down the army, through the Duke of York. What is the House of Commons at now? Is not it hard at work to pull down the reputation of the officers of the army? After this, is it possible, that the people should think, as they before thought, of rank in the military profession? Nay, is it possible, that the *non-commissioned officers and soldiers* should not have a quite new set of ideas respecting their officers? Is it not shocking, that the *backs* of hundreds of our brave countrymen should be committed to the power of a wretch, who has been base enough to purchase that power with a bribe to a kept-mistress? The case of good and honourable men, who hold offices in the army is very hard. At present it is impossible to know, who are the petticoat officers and who are not. The suspicions of the public and the soldiers must be divided amongst the whole body of officers; and the whole body must suffer accordingly. Was it not then, with good reason, that SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, in the last session of parliament, wished to provide some legal checks upon the power of the Commander in-Chief?

The same reasoning will still apply to the royal family itself. It is not *possible*, that the people should look upon that family with the same eyes that they did before this explosion took place. First, the Duke of York is one of that family. Next, the question, *how the rest of the family never came to hear of any of these corruptions*, must, and will, pass through the mind of every man in the kingdom. I wish to guard my readers, and, as far as I am able, the people in general, from any hasty suspicions of this sort. A father and mother are, generally, the last who hear of the faults of their children. None of us would think it just to be suspected of participating in the vices of our sons and daughters. But, we may be reasonably allowed to ask, what the *advisers* of the King have been about all this time? Where they have lived, what society they have frequented, that they have never discovered the existence of any part of all that, which has now been brought to light? If there was such a *writing* and such a *talking* against the Duke of York, was it not

their duty to have inquired into the matter? and, had they not all the means of coming at the truth? When they saw the statements of Major Hogan, ought they not to have sent for Major Hogan, and have examined him upon the subject? Did not their duty to the King, as his sworn advisers, demand this at their hands? The pamphlet entitled "A PLAIN STATEMENT, &c." says, indeed, that the *late* ministry made an attempt to *abridge the power of the Duke*, and that a stop was put to their project "by the immediate interference of the King;" but, their duty was, to go to the King with a full and fair representation of the *reasons* why they wished to abridge that power. To state *painful* truths is what a faithful counsellor is wanted for. There are always people enough about a court to flatter, and to tell what is pleasing to the ear of a king; and, how many kings have we seen come tumbling from their thrones, in only a few weeks after their flatterers had taught them to believe, that all was safety!

If the King had had wise and upright advisers, should we have ever seen two pensions for life, amounting together to 2,678*l.*, granted to Lady Augusta Murray, lately called Duchess of Sussex? Such advisers would not have failed to perceive, and to point out to their master, the bad impression which such a grant of the public money, at a time like the present, must have upon the minds of his people. Such advisers would have reminded him, that the people could not fail to ask what *services* this lady (though a virtuous person, and whose case is a very hard one) had performed *for them*, or for the crown, to merit such an income out of the *public* purse, at a time when the *Captains of the Navy* are supplicating for a small addition to their pay. Such advisers would have pressed upon the King, who would, we must believe, have, at once, followed their advice, to abstain from all grants, either direct or indirect, to his own family, while his people were so heavily burdened, and while fresh sacrifices of their comforts, and even necessities, were annually called for, upon the ground of their being wanted for the defence of the country against a foreign invader.

If the King had had wise and upright advisers, should we ever have seen the newspapers announcing, under the head of "*court news*," the movements of Mrs. JORDAN and her family, backward and forward, between *Bushy Park* and *St. James's Palace*? If the King had had wise and upright advisers, should we ever have seen publications, like the following, circulated through all the newspapers of the kingdom!

"The Duke of Clarence's birth-day was celebrated with much splendour in *Bushy Park*, on Thursday. The grand hall was entirely new fitted up, with *bronze pilasters*, and various marble imitations; the ceiling very correctly *clouded*, and the whole illuminated with some brilliant patent lamps, suspended *from a beautiful eagle*. The dining-room in the right wing was fitted up in a *modern style*, with new elegant lamps at the different entrances. The pleasure-ground was disposed for the occasion, and the servants had new liveries. In the morning the *Dukes of York's and Kent's bands arrived in caravan*; after *dressing themselves and dining*, they went into the pleasure-grounds, and *played alternately some charming pieces*. The Duke of Kent's played some *of the choruses and movements from Haydn's Oratorio of the CREATION*, arranged, *by command of his royal highness*, for a band of wind instruments. About five o'clock the Prince of Wales, the Dukes of York, Kent, Sussex, and Cambridge, Colonel Paget, &c. arrived from reviewing THE GERMAN LEGION. After they had dressed for dinner, they walked in the pleasure-grounds, accompanied by the Lord Chancellor, Earl and Countess of Athlone *and daughter*, Lord Leicester, Baron Hotham and *Lady*. Baron Eden, the *Attorney-General*, Colonel Paget and M'Mahon, Sergeant Marshall, and a

" number of other persons. At seven o'clock the second bell announced the dinner, when THE PRINCE took MRS. JORDAN *by the hand, led her into the dining-room, and seated her at the head of the table.* The Prince took his seat at her right hand, and the Duke of York at her left; the Duke of Cambridge sat next to the Prince, the Duke of Kent next to the Duke of York, and the Lord Chancellor next to his royal highness. The DUKE OF CLARENCE sat at the foot of the table.

" It is hardly necessary to say the table was sumptuously covered with every thing the season could afford. The bands played on the lawn, close to the dining-room window. The populace were permitted to enter the pleasure-grounds to behold the royal banquet, while the presence of Messrs. Townshend, Sayers, and Macmanus, preserved the most correct decorum. The Duke's NUMEROUS FAMILY were introduced, and admired by the Prince, the Royal Dukes, and the whole company; an infant in arms, with a most beautiful white head of hair, was brought into the dining-room by the nursery-maid. After dinner the Prince gave 'The Duke of Clarence,' which was drunk with three times three. The Duke gave the 'King,' which was drunk in a similar manner. A discharge of cannon from the lawn followed. 'The Queen and Princesses.'—'The Duke of York and the army.' His royal highness's band then struck up *his celebrated march.*"

This article was contained in the Courier newspaper of the 3rd of August 1806; and, as the people will have observed, many such articles have appeared since, while not one of them has been contradicted. Now, if there was any truth in such statements, would not wise and upright counsellors have advised the King to put a stop to the grounds of such statements? Must not the people, upon reading such accounts, call to mind the King's Proclamation for the suppression of Vice; and also, as if the laws were insufficient for keeping the common people in order, the erection of self-created societies for the purpose? And, will they not now ask of those pious societies, why, when they were pursuing the *poor* whores with their day-light lanterns, they never thought of a lantern for Gloucester Place? These godly gentlemen, no small part of whom, by-the-bye, derive their incomes from the public purse, appear to have eyes so constructed as to see vice only when she is accompanied with poverty. They fish with a net that will hold nothing but the small fry.

There is one of Mrs. JORDAN's sons in the *navy*, and another in the *army*. The latter has been described to me as a very little boy. A gentleman, who saw him in Spain, described him as not being much bigger than a son of mine who is only about ten years of age. He must, however, be older, and, it is probable, that he is fourteen years of age, or more. But, then, observe, he is a cornet in the tenth regiment of Lt. Dragoons, of which the Prince of Wales is Colonel; that he is even the second cornet upon the list; and that, according to the army-list now before me, he is *senior* to four other cornets. When in Spain, he was an *aid-de-camp*, and, a gentleman who frequently had occasion to see the quarters of the dragoons, saw *his name upon a door*, signifying that the apartment was his, a mark of distinction not used by *common subaltern officers*. Yet, this person could, by those subalterns, and by the officers in general, be looked upon as no other than the son of Mrs. JORDAN; than the son of a play-actress; than the son of a person, whom, but a day or two, perhaps, before their departure from England, several of those officers had seen, in the character of NELL JOBSON, pawing Bannister's dirty face.

Aye, Mr. Yorke, say what you like, these, *these* are the things that create discontent and disgust; these are the things that gail; these are

the things that sting the soul ; and sting they will in spite of all that can be said or preached about jacobinical conspiracies. Oh, Sir ! We, surely, are not *all* jacobins ; we, surely, are not *all* conspirators ; but, with the exception of those, who participate in corruptions, like those that have come to light, we *all* feel alike with respect to these things. No, Sir, the “ illustrious House of Brunswick ” is in no danger from conspiracies amongst the people, or any part of the people. *Writers* and *talkers* have no power to hurt any thing established, any thing settled by law, and defended by all the constables and judges and an army to boot, unless that establishment *undermine itself*. “ Philosophy,” Sir Francis Burdett observed, in one of his early speeches, in answer to those who ascribed the fall of the old French government to the writings of an anti-christian philosophical conspiracy ; “ Philosophy has no such trophies to boast ; the trophies are due solely to the corruption and profligacy of those, who have fallen a sacrifice to the vengeance of a people at first discontented, next indignant, next enraged, and at last infuriated, urged on by a mad and indiscriminating spirit of revenge.” From such a catastrophe, Sir, God preserve the Royal Family of England ! But, Sir, let no part of that family disregard the feelings of the people. Let them bet in mind the words of Burke : “ What a base and foolish thing it is for any consolidated body of authority to say, or to act as if it said : “ I will put my trust, not in mine own virtue, but in your patience ; I will indulge in effeminacy, in indolence, in corruption ; I will give way to all my perverse and vicious humours ; because you cannot punish me without ruining yourselves.” These words, written in letters to be read at half a mile distance, should be seen upon the top of every public edifice. They should be imprinted on the hearts of princes, and of all persons in authority. Yet, in direct contradiction to the wise precept contained in them, we are continually asked, by the venal writers of the day : “ how,” if we dislike this or that, of which we complain ; “ how we should like Buonaparte and his government ?” Just as if it were necessary for us to have the one or the other ; just as if we had no choice but that between Buonaparte and Mrs. Clarke ! Of all the insults, which we have had to bear, this is the greatest. When we complain, that we are not as our forefathers were, these venal wretches do not attempt to deny the fact, but fall to giving us a description of the state of the people in France ; and look upon their triumph as being complete, when they have asserted, that it is possible for us to be worse off than we are ; that there is one nation in the world who have less liberty than we. When we complain of the weight of the taxes, the answer is, that Buonaparte would take all ; and, in short, the tenour of the whole of the writings of these venal scribes is, to silence our complaints by saying, that we must submit to any thing, no matter what, or that Buonaparte shall come and put chains round our legs and necks.

And is it reasoning like this, or rather, these impudent and insulting assertions, that will induce us cheerfully to give up the necessaries of life, and shed our blood in the country's defence ? “ The country,” says Burke, in the passage above quoted from ; “ The country, to be saved, must have warm advocates and passionate defenders, which heavy discontented acquiescence never can produce.” If this proposition did not carry in itself the evidence of its truth, that truth would now, one would think, have been forced by experience, the teacher even of fools, upon every mind. The map of Europe laid before us, where is the spot,

which does not afford an awful lesson to those, who are still disposed "to put their trust in the *patience* of the people?" who are still disposed to say, or to act as if they said, "We will give way to all our perverse and "vicious humours, *because you cannot punish us without the hazard of "ruining yourselves?"* On how many a spot will that map enable us to lay our fingers, where the people, whose patience had been exhausted, who had long been yielding "a heavy and discontented acquiescence," have been disposed to punish, aye, and *have punished*, their rulers at all hazards, and that, too, without appearing to care whether or not their own ruin would be the consequence! With these lessons before them, what must we think of those whose language tends to encourage such of the great as indulge in their vicious humours; instead of warning them of their danger? These are the *real* enemies of the King's family and government; these are the *real* enemies of "the illustrious house of Brunswick;" these, who, when they should speak wholesome truths to them, pour in their ears the poison of flattery; these, who, when they should recommend to them conciliating language and conduct, urge them on to reproachful words and vindictive deeds; these, who, when they should show their gratitude for the timely, the gentle, the humble, admonitions of the press, fall to loading it with accusations, and turn against it every shaft in the quiver of the law.

What would have been the course of wise counsellors, even at the late hour, when Mr. Wardle preferred the accusations? They would have begged him to stay his public proceedings; they would have verified the truth with his assistance; they would then have made, in a message from the King himself, a candid statement, to the parliament and the people, of the whole of the circumstances, however painful to state; and then, as coming from the King, they would have proposed, and at once adopted, such measures, as to the past as well as the future, as would have drawn from the people an unanimous exclamation of "*This is just.*" How different would the effect of this course have been from the effect of the course which has been pursued! How very different with respect to the whole of the government and the establishments of the kingdom, and especially with respect to the person and family of the King? All that would then have been gained, would, by this nation, never wanting in forgiveness or in gratitude, have been received as a boon; all that is now gained will be looked upon as extorted. In the former case, the candour of the proceeding would have excited confidence for the future, and would even have called forth all the milder feelings in mitigation of the past; now, let the result be what it will, suspicion will lie brooding at bottom, and, in its own justification, will still preserve the past in all its hideous and hateful colours. This is consulting human nature; but, when did ministers and courtiers consult human nature, or any thing else but their own passions, or their own immediate interests? All the old governments of the continent have clung to their corruptions, till their hold has been cut, till it has been *hacked* off. They have never begun to reform till it was too late; never till *compelled*, and who is there that feels grateful for a compulsory compliance? Such a compliance never produces reconciliation: one party hates and the other suspects: the feelings only change bosoms: it is merely a suspension of open hostilities: the contest is soon again renewed; and the final consequence is sure to be the destruction of the government, or the complete absolute slavery of the people. Thus has it uniformly been in all the struggles between a

government and a people; and I most anxiously hope, that, by turning the minds of all considerate men to thoughts on a *radical and timely reform here*, I may contribute, in some small degree, towards the salvation of our once happy and still beloved country.

Botley, Wednesday, 15th Feb. 1809.

DUKE OF YORK.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, February, 1809.*)

ANNE, BARONESS GRENVILLE, wife of Lord Grenville, has, for life, a Pension of 1,500 pounds a year, to commence from the death of Lord Grenville.

LADY LOUISA PAGET, a daughter of the Earl of Uxbridge, has now a pension of 300 pounds a year, which pension she has had since the year 1801.

THE MARCHIONESS OF STAFFORD had, until January 1807, a pension of 300 pounds a year. Whether it has since been resigned does not appear.

CHARLES ABBOTT, Esq., Speaker of the House of Commons, besides his salary and house, as speaker, the salary being 6,000 pounds a year, holds the sinecure place of Keeper of the Signet in Ireland, the annual value of which place is 1,500 pounds a year, and which place he has for life.

In the account of places and pensions, laid before parliament in June last, it is stated, that, in the year ending on the 8th of April, 1808, the sum of 4,271 pounds was paid to *Servants* of the late *Queen Caroline*, and the late *Princess of Wales*; that is to say, to servants of the present King's grandmother and mother. In this sum is included 18*l.* 3*s.* 8*d.* annually paid, even last year, to an *almshouse* in *Hanover*.

The same account exhibits a charge of 200 pounds a year, paid to ministers at *Amsterdam* and *Rotterdam*, and this is stated as actually paid up to 5th January, 1807, without any notification that the payment is to be discontinued.

“Let those think now, who never thought before,

“And those who always thought, now think the more.”—POPE.

In my last, I stated very fully the reason why the people should, as to public matters, fix their attention solely upon what was going on in the House of Commons; and, I endeavoured to point out to them the way, in which they ought to *apply* the facts that came to light; the way, in which they ought to trace the corruptions to the injury of themselves and families.

It now becomes necessary to give an analysis of the examinations which have been published; for, though they have all been read, with great avidity, in the daily papers, which papers have discovered, upon this occasion, wonderful capacity, and a very laudable zeal for affording that “*publicity*,” which appeared to be so anxiously desired by the friends of the Duke of York; though the examinations have all been read, in that shape, day after day, the interesting facts contained in them must, in the mind of every reader, as they do in mine, lie in a confused state; because, it has necessarily happened, that the cases have not been kept distinct; evidence relating to one case has been brought out during the examination into another case; the cases have, in fact, run into one another, like the branches of plants too luxuriant for their space. To separate them, therefore, to draw to the stem of each its own branches,

so that every individual case may stand clearly exposed to the view and inspection of the public, seems to me to be likely greatly to further the cause of truth; and, indeed, to be absolutely necessary to the forming of a right conclusion.

Considering the mass of evidence that lies before me, I am not unaware of the arduousness of this task, to be performed by one person, in a space of time necessarily so short; but, there are few things of this sort that any man of common capacity cannot accomplish, if he set resolutely about it; and, at any rate, seeing how large a portion of the public attention I have, for so long a time, enjoyed, it is a duty which I owe that public to make the attempt.

It is necessary further to premise, that this analysis will extend no further than the examinations of Friday, the 17th instant, inclusive, that being the period to which I am in possession of the evidence. It is possible, that, at a later date, fresh examinations may take place, touching cases, whereon it now appears the evidence is closed. If that should happen, and if any new facts, at all material, should transpire, I shall hereafter notice them, making at the same time, reference to the case, or cases, upon which they bear.

No desire was ever more clearly, or more strongly expressed, than the desire on the part of the Duke of York, that *publicity* should be given to all these proceedings; and so entirely do I agree in that wish, that, before I have done with the subject, my intention is, not only to communicate every fact of importance to the public, but also, to furnish a *table of contents*, and a complete *index*, to the whole; so that, with the least possible difficulty, the reader may, at any moment, refer to any part, whether of the evidence, the debates, or the comments. This is not a matter that ought to pass away like a summer's cloud; it is not, and it ought not to be, the subject of a nine days' wonder; it is an event, which, sooner or later, must lead to great consequences; it will, in short, form an epoch in the history of this nation; therefore, it ought to be put upon record with fidelity and clearness, in every publication wherein the mention of it shall find a place, and especially in a work professing to be a Political Register.

As to the manner of the Analysis, upon which I am about to enter, I shall endeavour to follow, as nearly as I am able, the example of an impartial judge, when he is what is commonly called *summing up the evidence upon a trial*; and, if I do strictly adhere to this most excellent example, neither party can possibly have reason to complain.

I shall not confine myself to such cases as are merely of a *military* nature; for, though Mr. Wardle's *charges* were so confined, other matters have come out, and in all, the people are interested full as deeply as if they were matters solely connected with the office of the Commander-in-Chief. The first head, therefore, under which I shall enter upon this Analysis, is that of

THE ADULTEROUS INTERCOURSE.—The existence of this intercourse has not been attempted to be denied. Indeed, the whole proceeding is founded on the admission of it. But though those who have taken the part of the Duke of York; though both sides of the House of Commons seem to give up his moral character, as far, at least, as relates to his conjugal obligations, it will be right for us to draw to a point those parts of the *evidence*, which establish the fact of this adulterous intercourse.

First, then, *Mrs. Clarke* states, that she lived in the house in Gloucester-place, under the protection of the Duke of York; that he took the house in order to keep her there; that he made her a pecuniary annual allowance; that he bought her furniture and jewels; that he ate, drank, and lived with her.

The Duke's own servant, *Ludovick*, states that he was the person who attended his master at Mrs. Clarke's; that his master was frequently there, and that it was part of his employment to carry his master's clothes in the morning.

Three servants of Mrs. Clarke state, that they saw the Duke there constantly; that they saw him at table with their mistress; and, at last comes *Mrs. Favourite*, Mrs. Clarke's housekeeper, who, in speaking of one particular transaction, states that she saw the Duke and Mrs. Clarke in bed together.

Mr. Adam states, that Mrs. Clarke was under the protection of the Duke; that a separation took place upon his advice; and, that upon this separation, he (Mr. Adam) was, upon that occasion authorized by the Duke to tell her that he thought it his duty to give her an annuity of 400*l.* a year, provided her conduct should be correct.

Lastly, we have the written evidence of *the Duke himself*, who in the following two letters, addressed to Mrs. Clarke, and which letters have been proved to be in his hand-writing, enables us to form an unerring judgment as to the nature of the connection which existed between him and Mrs. Clarke.

"August 4, 1805.—How can I sufficiently express to my sweetest, my darling love, the delight which her dear, her pretty letter gave me, or how much I feel all the kind things she says to me in it? Millions and millions of thanks for it, my angel! and be assured that my heart is fully sensible of your affection, and that upon it alone its whole happiness depends.—I am, however, quite hurt that my love did not go to the Lewes Races; how kind of her to think of me upon the occasion; but I trust that she knows me too well not to be convinced that I cannot bear the idea of adding to those sacrifices which I am but too sensible that she has made to me.—News, my angel cannot expect from me from hence; though the life led here, at least in the family I am in, is very hurrying, there is a sameness in it which affords little subject for a letter; except Lord Chesterfield's family, there is not a single person except ourselves that I know. Last night we were at the play, which went off better than the first night.—Dr. O'Meara called upon me yesterday morning, and delivered me your letter; he wishes much to preach before royalty, and if I can put him in the way of it I will.—What a time it appears to me already, my darling, since we parted; how impatiently I look forward to next Wednesday se'nnight! —God bless you, my own dear, dear love! I shall miss the post if I add more; Oh, believe me ever, to my last hour, yours and yours alone."
Addressed: "Mrs. Clarke, to be left at the Post-office, Worthing."

"Sandgate, Aug. 24, 1804.—How can I sufficiently express to My Darling Love my thanks for her dear, dear letter, or the delight which the assurances of her love give me? Oh, My Angel! do me justice and be convinced that there never was a Woman adored as you are. Every day, every hour convinces me more and more, that my whole happiness depends upon you alone. What a time it appears to be since we parted, and with what impatience do I look forward to the day after to-morrow; there are still however two whole Nights before I shall clasp My Darling in my arms!—How happy am I to learn that you are better; I still however will not give up my hopes of the cause of your feeling uncomfortable. Clavering is mistaken, My Angel, in thinking that any new regiments are to be raised; it is not intended, only second Battalions to the existing Corps; you had better, therefore, tell him so, and that you were sure that there would be no use in applying for him.—Ten thousand thanks, My Love, for the handkerchiefs, which are delightful; and I need not, I trust, assure you of the pleasure I feel in wearing them, and thinking of the dear

"hands who made them for me.—Nothing could be more satisfactory than the tour I have made, and the state in which I have found every thing. The whole of the day before yesterday was employed in visiting the Works at Dover; reviewing the Troops there, and examining the Coast as far as this place. From Folkstone I had a very good view of those of the French Camp.—Yesterday I first reviewed the Camp here, and afterwards the 14th Light Dragoons, who are certainly in very fine order; and from thence proceeded to Branbourne Lees, to see four regiments of Militia; which, altogether, took me up near 13 hours. I am now setting off immediately to ride along the coast to Hastings, reviewing the different Corps as I pass, which will take me at least as long. Adieu, therefore, My Sweetest, Dearest Love, till the day after to-morrow, and be assured that to my last hour I shall ever remain Yours and Yours alone."

Addressed: "George Farquhar, Esq., No. 18, Gloucester-place, Portman-square."

All that it is necessary to add to this evidence is, a statement of the well known facts, that the *Duchess of York* is living, that she is in England, and that there never has been any legal separation between her and her husband.

THE ANNUITY.—Contracts, with whomsoever made, are binding upon the parties. To break a promise is a breach of moral duty; and, therefore, it becomes us to ascertain, as nearly as we can, the truth with respect to the Annuity, which Mrs. Clarke was to receive, as the cast-off concubine of the Duke of York.

She herself has stated, that Mr. Adam, in the name of the Duke, promised her an Annuity of 400*l.* a year. In one instance she says, that Mr. Adam *guaranteed* the payment of this annuity. She complains, that for more than a year and a half it has not been paid; and, upon this non-payment we see that she grounds all her disclosures against the Duke of York. She states, besides, that she was left, upwards of two thousand pounds in debt to divers tradespeople; and that, having since sent a remonstrance to the Duke upon the subject, the Duke insisted that she should *plead her marriage to avoid her debts*, or that she might, if she liked, go to prison. She further states, that having sent the Duke a letter, not long since, by one Taylor, a shoemaker in Bond-street, requesting a few hundred pounds, he sent for answer, by the mouth of this same Taylor, that if she dared speak against him, or write against him, he would put her in the *pillory* or the *Bastile*. The reader will bear in mind, that this fact rests *solely* upon Mrs. Clarke's evidence; but he will also bear in mind, that, if false, it *might have been easily disproved* by Taylor, the bearer of the message, and that Taylor *was not called to disprove it*; and he will further bear in mind, that this threat, if he should conclude that it actually was made, was made against that very person, to whom the Duke had written the *two letters* above inserted.

But now, as to whether the annuity was actually promised, or, if upon *conditions*, whether the breach of those conditions justified the non-performance of the promise.

Mr. Adam's words, as to the promise, are these: "I told her, that the Duke of York thought it his *duty*, if her conduct was *correct*, to give her an annuity of 400*l.* a year, to be paid quarterly; that he would enter into no obligation in writing, by bond or otherwise; that it must rest entirely upon his word, to be performed, or not, according to her behaviour."

Her statement is, that 500*l.* arrears of the annuity were due in *June*

last.—There seems to be no doubt of the promise having been *made*, and that, after a little while at first, it *has not been fulfilled*. It, therefore, remains for us to inquire, what were the *conditions*, if any, and whether these conditions have been observed by Mrs. Clarke.

The only condition stated by Mr. Adam to have been made by him, in the name of the Duke, was, that "her conduct should be *correct*." This, if it can be called a condition, was, especially as coming from the lips of a lawyer, very *raguely* expressed. The word *correct*, as applied to the conduct of a person, can hardly be said to have a meaning, and, when applied to the *general* conduct of a person, has absolutely no meaning at all. In short, as used in this case, it is one of those convenient terms, that admit of *any* construction; that may be made to mean whatever the person using it chooses it should mean; that may be twisted and turned to any purpose for which it may be wanted.

The reader, therefore, leaving Mr. Adam's connection with the Duke out of the question, and leaving out of the question also Mr. Adam's general character, will ask himself, whether the internal evidence of the case would lead him to think that a person like Mrs. Clarke would, even for a moment, have been satisfied with any promise, to which *such a condition* was attached?

But, next, in *what way* has Mrs. Clarke broken the contract? This has nowhere been shown. Indeed, no attempt has been made to prove that she has violated the contract. We have no occasion to ask what was meant by the word *correct*, because no *proof* has been produced, that there was any justifiable cause for the non-fulfilment of the promise. Mr. Adam says, in explanation of the meaning of this term, that, what he meant by it was, that she should not any longer *contract debts by making use of the Duke's name*; and, no evidence has been produced, that she has done so.

That Mrs. Clarke understood, that she was to be paid 400*l.* a year quarterly, is evident enough; her complaints, made in letters to Mr. Adam himself, are strong presumptive proof of this; and, it is here to be observed, that Mr. Adam made no answer to these letters; that he did not repel the accusation against the Duke of having broken his promise; and that, in stating that he showed these letters to the Duke, he does not say, that any observation was made by the Duke as to the truth or falsehood of the contents of the letters. He merely says, that the Duke expressed no apprehension at the *threats*; but, does not say, that he expressed any indignation at the falsehood of the charge of having broken his promise; which, however, if the charge had been false, it was very natural for him to do, and particularly to Mr. Adam, who had been his agent in this negotiation with his concubine, and through whose lips the promise of the annuity had been made.

Upon the whole of this case, then, it is clear, that the promise *was made*, and that it *has not been fulfilled*; and, the question for the reader to settle in his mind is this: whether the non-fulfilment arose from a conscientious conviction, in the mind of the Duke of York, that Mrs. Clarke had violated her part of the compact; or, from a persuasion, in his mind, that his well-known power, joined to his positive threats of the *pillory* or the *Bastille*, would enable him, with impunity, to withhold the means of living from a female, on whose breast he had, for years, rioted in bliss, and to whom, but a few months before, he had vowed everlasting affection.

If the former, the decision must be, that, in this respect, the Duke is not intentionally to blame; if the latter, that he is the most unfeeling as well as the most mean of mankind.

ESTABLISHMENT IN GLOUCESTER-PLACE.—The *expenses* of this establishment form a very prominent and a very important branch of the inquiries, upon the sum of which, we are now endeavouring to arrive at a correct opinion; because, from a view of these expenses as compared with the pecuniary allowance, immediately out of the pocket of the Duke, an inference must be drawn as to the Duke's knowing whether, or not, money must have been raised by Mrs. Clarke from sources other than his private purse.

The establishment, from the evidence of several servants, who formed part of it, appears to have consisted of a housekeeper and from three to four other females; of a butler, and, at the lowest, six other men-servants; of eight horses and of two carriages. It appears, from the same concurrent testimony, that a continual round of company was kept in Gloucester-place; that a great deal of wine was drunk; and that there were frequently employed two, and sometimes three, men-cooks. It appears, that concerts were frequent, or, at least, musical parties; that music-masters, singing-boys, drawing-masters, were frequently there, and that, in short, every thing was carried on in a style the most expensive that can be imagined.

Mrs. Clarke herself states, that the servants' bare *wages* and their *liveries* cost her, at least, 1,000*l.* a-year. She says, that the Duke paid for some of her horses, but that, in one year, she laid out 900*l.* in horses only.

The allowance, made to her by the Duke, for the support of this establishment, she states at 1,000*l.* a-year, which sum, she says, she soon convinced the Duke, was hardly sufficient to defray the expenses of servants' wages, and of their liveries. Upon further examination, she says, that the 1,000*l.* a-year was always very irregularly paid; that, sometimes, when she has been hard pressed by the tradespeople, she has got a hundred or two pounds from the Duke; but after much examination and cross-examination, she has, to the last, persisted in averring, that the whole which she got from the Duke, did not exceed in amount from 1,200*l.* to 1,500*l.* a-year. She says, that she got divers presents, in trinkets and jewels, from the Duke; but that these were frequently *in pawn*, to the knowledge of the Duke, whose draft the pawnbroker refused to take as a surety on a proposition for their emancipation. She allows that the Duke furnished the house in Gloucester-place, generally, at the outset; but that she herself paid for the glasses, which cost her 500*l.* She was allowed a house at Weybridge by the Duke; and she says, that, out of her own purse, she paid from 3 to 400*l.* for the repair and enlargement of the house and its buildings. She allows that the Duke paid her 500*l.* at the outset, exclusive of the 1,000*l.* a-year. She allows, that the Duke sent a large quantity of Port wine to Gloucester-place; but says, that she bought and paid for the Madeira and Claret, a great deal of which was drunk in the house. She states, and the fact appears not to have been questioned, that, when the Duke left her, she was, at least, 2,000*l.* in debt, debts contracted by her, while she was in his keeping, and that this sum was exclusive of the amount of the lease of the house (4,400*l.*) which the Duke gave her, and which she transferred to

her lawyer in part payment of debts due to him. She says, that she has heard that the Duke should say, that she might sell her trinkets to pay the remainder of her debts, but she states that he knows very well what became of them.

Being questioned as to the circumstances of her pecuniary embarrassments, while in Gloucester-place, she says, that when the tradespeople could not get money from her, they pressed for *places*; and that, though they renewed their pressing for money, when they could not get places, they were always well pleased to trust her, because, in the end, they were sure to make her pay handsomely for it.—Being questioned as to the time when she began to be pressed for money, her answer is: “About half a year after my connection with his royal highness began. I never applied to him; till I found myself distressed; and, then he told me, that I had *more interest than the Queen*, and that I should use it.”—Being asked: “Was the Duke acquainted with any of your transactions, respecting the disposal of commissions, &c.?” Her answer is: “*With the whole of them.*”

The reader, after having made an estimate of the expenses of an establishment, or rather, double establishment (including town and country) like that above described; after duly weighing in his mind the effect of charges made upon calculations of such manifest risk, as well from final probable loss as from almost certain long delay; after having well considered all the consequences of the observations of servants, respecting the manner in which their mistress got her money, as well as the consequences of a total want of check or control, whether as to quantity, quality, price, or disposal: after thus estimating and thus considering, the reader will be the better prepared for hearing the matter which Mr. Perceval brought forward, upon this part of the subject, on Friday the 17th instant, and which, according to the fullest report that I can find of his speech, was stated in the following words:—

“The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, before proceeding to the letters brought up by the select committee, said, he had a few observations to offer in answer to a question which had been put to him a few nights since, by an hon. gentleman under the gallery (Mr. Cripps), with respect to the *amount of the expense furnished by the Duke of York*, for the establishment in Gloucester-place—As far as he could obtain information, *no accurate account of that expenditure could be got*; but so far as he had been able to procure any items, he would now inform the House.—By the drafts in the House of the Duke of York’s banker, it appeared that 5,551*l.* had been paid to the person who was always employed by his royal highness, to receive the money intended for Mrs. Clarke. Beyond that (*as his royal highness authorized him to state to the committee*) his royal highness frequently gave her personally other and considerable sums, of which, however, he had kept no memorandum. Mrs. Clarke had stated at the bar, that her allowance of 1,000*l.* per annum, was paid in drafts. With regard to those drafts from the banker, if the House thought it necessary to have any proof, they might examine the servant, to whom they were uniformly paid at the banker’s. This servant then took the money to the Duke, who put it under a cover, sealed it, and sent it by the same person to Mrs. Clarke. Besides this, there were tradesmen for furniture, wine, jewels, and the plate (with which the House was already acquainted) to make the total amount of 16,760*l.* from Jan. 1804 to May 1806. Here the right hon. gentleman, if it was necessary, might be called to prove the facts he now stated, on *the authority of his royal highness*, at the bar of the House.”

Reader; impartial reader, does not this strike you as a very *novel* procedure? However Mr. Perceval, who came into office to protect “our holy religion,” may console himself with a statement of the Duke of York

having expended 16,760*l.* upon a concubine, while, in addition to all his immense salaries and pensions, he was borrowing 54,000*l.* from the minister out of the taxes raised upon us; however *consoling* this may be to Mr. Perceval, does it not strike you, that the producing *as evidence*, facts stated *upon the authority of the party accused*, is something new, quite new, in English jurisprudence? Have you ever seen, or heard, of any thing like this before, either in parliament, or in any court of justice? Is this the way in which any of us are treated, when we are tried? If there happen to be more than one judge upon the bench, do we ever see any of them pulling papers out of his pocket, and, in contradiction to evidence given before the court, state so and so, *upon the authority of the person under trial*?

But, reader, why was this statement kept in petto, till the last moment? Why was not the *bare word* (for it is no more) of the Duke taken before, and opposed to the declarations of *every witness*, in every stage of the proceeding?

In short, why all this time taken up in *inquiry*? Why not have asked the Duke, at the beginning, whether there was any truth in Mr. Wardle's charges, or not? and why not have produced a short note from him to *satisfy* us all, that the thing was false from beginning to end?

Nevertheless, the report (in the Courier newspaper of the 18th instant) says, that Mr. Canning said, that the "Chancellor of the Exchequer," Mr. Perceval, "was enabled to *prove*, on the *most unquestionable authority*, that the Duke had furnished Mrs. Clarke with the 16,760*l.*" So that, after all this work, the Duke's word is the best authority!

Mr. Fuller is reported to have spoken thus:—"What would the "House, or *the public*, wish for more, than that 16,000*l.* should be "spent in two years on such a baggage as this. For his part, he thought "it might have been seen from the shuffling way in which she answered "the first six questions put to her, that they ought not to have proceeded "with this silly and foolish inquiry."

In the last part of his observations, Mr. Fuller was right enough, if the Duke's word is to be opposed to the evidence against him. Not only not more than six questions; but no question at all should have been put to Mrs. Clarke, if the Duke's word is to be opposed to her evidence.

Mr. Beresford, however, is reported to have observed, upon this very novel procedure, that "it was needless to think, that, by shutting their own eyes, the House *could also shut the eyes of the public*;" and never did he make a truer observation in his life.

Mr. Perceval was then examined thus:—*Question*: "Do you know if "his royal highness paid any, and what sums, towards keeping the house "in Gloucester-place, besides 1,000*l.* a-year allowed to Mrs. Clarke?—" *Answer*: I know nothing of the 1,000*l.* a-year but from the witness "at the bar. From the paper I now hold in my hand, I see, that from "the 11th of January, 1804, to the 18th of June, 1806, 5,551*l.* has "been paid in drafts (*as the certificate of the Duke of York at the "bottom states*) for the use of Mrs. Clarke. The payments to the "tradesmen are also verified *by the certificate*, and to the best of my "recollection and belief."

Lord Folkestone objected to this *hearsay* evidence in *favour* of the accused, when it had uniformly been rejected, if attempted to be used *against* him.

They now desisted; and they still left it, as the reader will receive it,

the bare word of the Duke of York against the evidence of Mrs. Clarke, corroborated by the magnitude of the establishments in Gloucester-place and at Weybridge.

Mr. Cripps, however, whose question appears as *naturally as can be*, to have produced that "*diligent inquiry*" from Mr. Perceval, that led to this curious procedure, was, it appears from the report of his speech, wonderfully well *satisfied* with the account of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

"Mr. Cripps *thanked* the right honourable gentleman for the information he had given him. He would not have made the inquiry till the end of the present investigation, had he not been aware that *very strong impressions had been made on the public mind*, from the belief that Mrs. Clarke was supposed to support her expensive establishment on the allowance of 3000*l.* for three years. The answer was *most satisfactory*, and whatever might be the issue of this inquiry, it must be a great consolation to his Royal Highness to know, that without it, it never would have been known to the public in the manner unfolded by Colonel Gordon, in how excellent and regular a manner every thing was conducted in the Office of the Commander-in-Chief, so highly to his honour, and so productive of benefit to the British army."

Aye, aye, Sir! It was not necessary for you to state, that you were fully aware of the strong impression made on the public mind by Mrs. Clarke's evidence, though, if I forget not, some one or more did say, that she shuffled in such a manner, that *no one could possibly believe a word that she said*. We can have no doubt, Sir, that you are satisfied, because you say so; but, it does not follow, that we should be satisfied by so easy a method.

And why, Sir, digress? why fly off from this soul-comforting statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and draw us after you, into observations upon the "excellent and regular manner," in which Col. Gordon shows "every thing is conducted in the Office of the Commander-in-Chief?" What has he shown, Sir? That the dates of recommendations and of appointments and commissions are regularly entered, and that letters are neatly copied into books? Why, Sir, we know, that this office costs us, including the salaries and pensions of the Duke, *hundreds of thousands a year*; aye, hundreds of thousands; and, there is nothing there done, as far as appears from the evidence given to the House, that might not be done, and *full as well too*, by any four or five of the five hundred persons, who, by an advertisement in the newspapers, offering them 150*l.* a year a piece, would be induced to offer their services before next Saturday night. This is my sincere opinion, and, if it can be shown to be erroneous, let it be done.

But, be this as it may; what has the *regular keeping of books* in the Duke's office to do with Mrs. Clarke's sale of commissions? what has it to do with the establishment and the vile traffic in Gloucester Place? This "*regularity*" did not prevent the officering of Samuel Carter, the concubine's foot-boy, as we shall see anon. Oh! this will never do. This is poor work. If Colonel Gordon can bring proof, from his books or his boxes, that all that has been *proved* has *not been proved*; why, then, this able Colonel may be said to have afforded "*great consolation*" to his royal employer; but, if he cannot do that, it is even to undervalue the sense of the Duke to suppose, that, from what the Colonel has done, or can do, he will derive any consolation.

Before we return to our case, a remark or two is, by this digression, justified, and even called for, with respect to the evidence of all the

military officers, and indeed, almost all the witnesses that have been called.

In courts of justice, the evidence of a brother, a father, or a very close friend, is always received with some portion of allowance for partiality. Persons, known to be in any-wise *dependent* upon the parties, are heard and believed with similar caution. There is no doubt, that my neighbour, or a stranger, is a better evidence for me than my own servant. The officers of the army are not the servants of the Duke of York; but, it is perfectly well known, that they are much more dependent upon him than any servant, considered merely as such, can *possibly* be upon any master. The worst I can do to a servant is to *turn him off*; but, the Commander-in-Chief can, with the approbation of the King, at any moment, *without reason assigned*, not only turn any officer off, but, by that very act, strip him of his *rank in life*, and of the means of obtaining *even bread to eat*. My discarded servant can go to another master; but, there is no other master, no other service for the cashiered officer to go to. For this reason, amongst others, it doubtless was, that Sir Francis Burdett wished it to be enacted, that no officer should be discarded without being so sentenced by a court martial; a law the more necessary, because the office of Commander-in-Chief was held by *a son of the King*, by which means the advice as well as the power was concentrated in the throne.

I say not this with any wish to disparage the evidence of Colonels Gordon and Loraine, or of any other of the military officers; but, I say it, with a view to show to the public, that their evidence is not all to be taken for Gospel, merely on account of the rank they hold. Mr. French is a Colonel, and Mr. Clavering is a General.

Let it be remembered, too, in answer to what has been said about taking the Duke and his friends *by surprise*, that Mrs. Clarke's letters to Mr. Adam have been in his possession from *June last*. They were there apprized of her intended exposure. So that they have had *six times* as much *time* as Mr. Wardle, who became acquainted with the facts but a *month* before he brought forward his charges.

Having thus cleared all the cases together of these unfair impressions scattered about amongst them, we will now return to that immediately under consideration.

The reader has had a view of the magnitude of the establishments in Gloucester-place and at Weybridge; he is pretty well able to judge of their annual expenses; he has Mrs. Clarke's evidence that she never got from the pocket of the Duke, more than 1,200*l.*, or, at most, more than 1,500*l.*, a year wherewith to defray those expenses, when 1,000*l.* a year was scarcely enough to pay wages and purchase liveries; he has her evidence, that the Duke, when she complained of her pecuniary embarrassments, told her *she had greater INTEREST than the Queen, and that she ought to use it*; and, he has, in the Duke's own handwriting, the *proof*, that she did interfere in promotions, and that he spoke to her of such things, as of things of course, witness the cases of General Clavering and Dr. O'Meara. Opposed to all this there is not one particle of evidence good or bad, unless the Duke's bare word; unless the bare word of the accused, be admitted as evidence. If, however, the reader thinks that bare word sufficient to knock down such a body of evidence, he will, of course, have his doubts about the Duke's knowing that his concubine's establishments were partly supported by bribes given for commissions and the like; but, if the reader should be of a contrary

opinion, his conclusion, without going into any of the particular cases of corruption, must be, that the Duke must have been all along fully aware, that the establishments were for the far greater part, supported by those corrupt and wicked means, and of course, that the expenses attending his profligate pleasures were, in that same degree, ultimately defrayed out of taxes raised from the fortunes and labour of the people.

CASE OF KNIGHT AND BROOKE.—It is alleged, that, in July 1805, Col. or Lt.-Col. (no matter which) Knight wished to make an exchange of commissions with a Major, or a Lieut.-Col. Brooke; that the application of these two gentlemen had been, for some time, before the Duke of York; that it was not followed by the grant of the Duke to exchange; till, at last, Mr. Robert Knight, brother of Col. Knight, at the suggestion of Dr. Thynne (the medical attendant of Mrs. Clarke), offered to Mrs. Clarke, through Doctor Thynne, the sum of 200*l.* if she would get the exchange accomplished; that Mrs. Clarke undertook the job; that she told the Duke of York that she was to be paid for it; that the exchange, in a few days afterwards was ordered to take place and was actually gazetted; that, upon this, the fulfilment of the contract on her part, Mr. Knight paid her the 200*l.*, and that she not only told the Duke that the money had been paid her, but actually showed him the note or notes.

Dr. Andrew Thynne stated, that at the request of Mr. Knight he made the overture to Mrs. Clarke; that he was authorized to offer her 200*l.* if she would cause the exchange to be expedited; that he expected her to be able to get the thing done through her influence with a certain great person; that this great person was the Commander-in-Chief; that, when the exchange was effected, Mrs. Clarke sent to the witness, the Gazette; in which it was recorded, accompanied with a note from herself, saying, that, as she was going to the country, 200*l.* would be very convenient to her; that, when he made the offer to Mrs. Clarke, he gave her the names of the parties upon a slip of paper; that Mrs. Clarke talked about the necessity of secrecy, but the witness cannot tell from whom she was desirous to keep the thing a secret; that he never saw the Duke of York at Mrs. Clarke's; that he, the witness, understood, from Mr. Knight, that the exchange would be carried through in the regular manner, but Mr. Knight wished, in consequence of the bad health of his brother, that the business should be expedited, and for that purpose application was made to Mrs. Clarke.

Mr. Robert Knight corroborated Dr. Thynne as to the motive of the application to Mrs. Clarke; he said further, that, when the exchange was effected, he sent Mrs. Clarke the 200*l.*; that his brother had before received, from the office of the Duke of York, a notification in the usual way, that, when a proper successor presented, there would be no objection to the exchange; that he does not know of any positive promise made to his brother by the Duke, previous to the application to Mrs. Clarke. Upon being asked: "Why was the application made to Mrs. Clarke?" he answered, "There was a delay in the business; but the cause of it I do not know. I mentioned the circumstance to Mr. Thynne, who was then attending my family. He advised me to apply to a good friend of his, Mrs. Clarke." He then repeated what he has said before about the offer of money.

Upon further questioning, he says, that Mrs. Clarke desired him to

keep the whole transaction a secret, *lest it should come to the ears of the Duke of York*; and that, recently, she has told him, that the Duke having used her extremely ill, leaving her in debt about 2000*l.*, she would, if she could bring him to no terms, expose him, whereupon the witness said, he hoped she would not expose him and his brother by mentioning their names, to which she answered, that God knew that was not her intention.

Mrs. Mary Anne Clarke states, that in, or about, July 1805, Dr. Thynne applied to her to obtain leave for an exchange between Knight and Brooke; that he made her an offer of a pecuniary compliment; that she thinks the sum mentioned was a couple of hundred of pounds; that Dr. Thynne told her, at the time, that Mr. Knight had long been endeavouring to get this leave, but had not yet succeeded; that, on the same day, in which the proposition was made to her, she mentioned it to the Duke of York, and gave him, while at dinner, the slip of paper which she had received from Dr. Thynne, containing the names of the parties; that the Duke asked her whether she knew the parties; that she answered that she did not know them at all, and that certainly they would make some sort of compliment, but that she is not certain that she mentioned the exact amount of the compliment; that, when the exchange appeared in the Gazette, she sent the Gazette to Dr. Thynne, together with a note from herself; that, in a day or two after that, she received the 200*l.*, which came to her in a note, with Dr. Thynne's compliments; that she thinks the compliments were written in the note; that she made this circumstance of the receipt of the money known to the Duke of York; that she did this on the day on which she received the money; that the Duke must have known the amount of the note, because she showed it him, and she thinks that she got one of his servants to get it exchanged for her, through his Royal Highness.

Upon her cross-examination, she says, that she thinks she can say positively that the note, with the money in it, came from Dr. Thynne, because she told her maid to go down and give the man who brought it a guinea; that the Duke got the note changed for her, because she could not get it done herself; that she did not know anything of the servant's name who was sent to get the note changed.

Being asked, whether she desired Mr. Knight to keep the matter *secret*, she says, she should think that she did certainly, but does not recollect, but it is very likely she did. Being asked, whether she ever expressed a wish that it should be kept a secret from the Duke; she says, "O no, never;" and that she is quite positive that she never said any thing like it. Being asked, what the Duke said, when she first opened the business to him and told him she was to receive a compliment; she says: "He told me that he knew the business very well, that they had been trying at it some time, and that he thought one of them was rather a *bad subject*; but he would do it." Being asked what time of the year the transaction took place, she says: "The Duke was going down to Weymouth on the night that I changed the note, which was the reason that I got the note changed; my servants could not get it changed, and his servant got it changed for me. Lord Chesterfield's family was going down, and he was going to be godfather to Lord Chesterfield's child: it was the end of July or the beginning of August."

Colonel Gordon, who is the public military Secretary of the Duke of York, says, in substance, this: that it is his duty to make to the Duke a

report upon all applications for promotions, or exchanges; that he has no doubt that he made an inquiry upon the case of Knight and Brooke; that he fully believes, that the grant of the exchange was made in consequence of his report; that he kept no minute of the inquiry or report, and was not in the habit of doing so; that the delay in question took place on account of some doubts of the eligibility of Col. Brooke, and not on account of any objection to Col. Knight's request; that he has not the smallest reason to suspect that any influence other than that of the general rules of the service produced the grant of leave to exchange; that the Duke's approbation was given on the 23rd of July, 1805, that the King's signature was affixed to it on the 24th, and that the exchange was gazetted on the 30th.

In the course of his examination he produced an answer of his to a letter from Col. Knight (which answer was dated 21 June, 1805), requesting leave to exchange, the answer stating that the Duke had no objection to the exchange, and that, when an *eligible successor could be recommended*, the request would be taken into consideration.

Col. Gordon also produced the following document contained in a letter from Greenwood and Cox, the agents of some of the parties, which document bears date 1 July, 1805.

BROOKE'S SERVICES.

Cornet, 8 Dns.	- 29 June	93	<i>C. L.</i>
Lieut. 83 F.	- - 7 Oct.	93	<i>cannot be acceded to, H. R. H.</i>
Capt. Ind. Co.	- - 14 Dec.	93	<i>does not approve of the exchange pro-</i>
— 96	- - 25 Mar.	94	<i>posed.</i>
Maj.	- - - 13 Dec.	94	
Placed on half pay	Mar.	98	Sir:
Bt. Lt.-Colonel	- 1 Jan. 1800		By direction of General Norton, we
Maj. 48	- - 24 May 1804		have the honour to enclose a form,
Cancelled	- - 9 June 1804		signed by Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel
Maj. 56	- - 5 Jan. 1805		Brooke of the 50th regiment, to ex-
			change with Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel

23 July, 1805.

H. R. H. does now approve of this exchange. together with a copy of a letter from Lieutenant-Colonel Knight, stating, that he is satisfied with the security

given for payment of the regulated difference between the value of the two commissions; and being informed the counterpart of the exchange has been sent in through the Agents of the 5th Dragoon Guards, you will be pleased to submit the same to Field Marshal His Royal Highness the Duke of York.

We have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient humble Servants,
GREENWOOD & COX.

N.B.—Mark well, reader, the words in *Italics*, were, in the original produced, written in PENCIL!!!

Ludovick Orramin (who was called on a later day) a footman of the Duke of York, said, that he was a foreigner; that he had lived 18 years with the Duke; that no other of the Duke's servants ever went to Mrs. Clarke's; that he used to go there at eight o'clock in the morning to take the Duke's clothes; that he never saw Mrs. Clarke at her house

but once, when he went to take a favourite dog for her to see ; that the Duke was not then there ; *that he is quite certain that he never was sent by any one, from her house, to get any note changed.* In his cross-examination, he repeated these assertions ; he said, that no other servant of the Duke was permitted to go to Mrs. Clarke's ; he asserted of his own knowledge, that no other of the Duke's servants ever went there. He said he had been asked (*previous to his coming to the House of Commons*) the same question about the note, by *the Duke*, by Mr. Adam, by Mr. Lowten, and by Mr. Wilkinson, and that he had given them the same answer.

David Pierson (who was called on a day after Orramin had given his evidence) was butler to Mrs. Clarke in 1805, and is now butler to the Hon. Mr. Turner. He states, that he recollects in 1805, the Duke going to Weymouth and Mrs. Clarke to Worthing ; that, about that time, which was in hot weather, he saw Mrs. Favourite (Mrs. Clarke's housekeeper) bring down a bill, in the morning, and Ludovick going out and getting it changed, and coming back and giving it to Mrs. Favourite again, and she took it up stairs ; that he does not know the amount of the note ; that the Duke was up stairs at the time ; that he is not certain whether the Duke was up or not ; that this is the only note he ever recollects Ludovick's getting changed.

Pierson, in a second examination, recollects, what he had forgotten before, that, on the night that the Duke of York went to Weymouth, about 11 o'clock at night, he himself was sent out to get a bill changed ; that he went out and got it changed ; that he brought the change to Mrs. Clarke, who said it was all right ; that the Duke of York was present both when he got the bill from his mistress and when he brought the change ; that he got the bill changed at Byfield Bridgeman's ; and that, to the best of his recollection, it was a bill of 100*l.*

Mr. Bridgeman states, that he recollects *Pierson's* bringing a note to be changed, about July 1805, and that *Pierson* said it was a note of 100*l.*, but that the note was not changed.

Mrs. Favourite, the housekeeper of Mrs. Clarke, is asked : " Did you ever give Ludovick a note to get changed ?" Her answer is this : " I did ; but I cannot say what was the amount of the note. I gave it him ; he went out and brought me the change. I brought up the change to the bed-chamber, where his royal highness and Mrs. Clarke were. In short, they were in bed."

Such is the evidence upon this case, and now let us see what it amounts to ; let us examine into the quality of the separate parts ; see how those parts correspond with each other ; and how far the criminatory evidence is contradicted by the exculpatory.

FIRST (repeating, for a little, some former observations of mine), it is *proved*, that Dr. Thynne, *who had, for several years, attended in the house of Mrs. Clarke*, pointed out to Mr. Knight an application to her as the effectual and speedy way of obtaining the Duke of York's approbation of an exchange between two field-officers of the army, which exchange had already been applied for in the regular way, and had, as yet, at least, not been obtained : SECOND, it is *proved*, that Dr. Thynne did make the application to Mrs. Clarke, and that he promised her 200*l.*, in case the exchange should take place : THIRD, it is *proved*, that the exchange did, in a few days afterwards, take place : FOURTH, it is *proved*, that Mrs. Clarke, in consequence of the exchange having taken place,

did receive from Mr. Knight the said sum of 200*l.* All this is proved without any of the testimony of Mrs. Clarke. Mrs. Clarke, if the Duke had a knowledge of the bargain, must be looked upon as an accomplice; and, accomplices are not usually allowed to be sufficient witnesses to produce legal conviction; but, when their evidence is corroborated by strong circumstances, and especially, when, as in this case, they are in *no danger themselves*, such evidence is invariably taken to be good. She states, that she immediately applied to the Duke; that he said one of the parties was a *bad subject*, but that the thing should be done; and she further states, that when she had received the 200*l.*, she told the Duke of it, and, in his presence, sent the note to be changed by one of his own servants, whose name she does not recollect. If we believe her here, the case is complete. But, we must now take a view of the opposing evidence, beginning with what has been said as to her *general character*. Mr. Adam represents her as a woman, who, upon former occasions, had told contradictory stories, and, in particular, relating to her being a *widow*, and to the place of *her marriage*. She had, it is asserted, stated herself to be a widow, had contracted debts under that character, and had afterwards, in a court of justice, got rid of the debts by pleading her marriage. Through the whole of the evidence there is no proof of her having *herself* represented that she was a widow, except in the case of a court-martial, where she had been called as a witness, and of this she gives the following explanation. Being asked: "Have you not *sworn yourself to be a widow?*" She answers: "His royal highness, a very short time since, when I sent to him to ask him to send me a few hundred pounds, sent me word, that if I dare speak against him, or write against him, he would put me into the *pillory*, or into the *Bastile*. He fancies that I *swore* myself to be a widow woman when I was examined at a Court-Martial. But the Deputy Judge-Advocate had more feeling than the gentleman who has examined me now; he told me I might say anything out of the Court which it might be unpleasant to me to swear to; I told him it would be very improper for me to say that I was a married woman, when I had been known to be living with the Duke of York. I did not swear that I was a widow; I said it out of Court, and *it was put into the Court-Martial Minutes as if I had sworn to it, but it was not so*. The Judge-Advocate, to whom I told it, is at the door, and I think he had better be called in; I know now what he is come for."

This explanation of Mrs. Clarke is not at all contradicted by the evidence of the Deputy Judge-Advocate, *Sutton*, who was called in on a subsequent day. He was asked, what passed at the Court-Martial concerning Mrs. Clarke's being considered a widow; and he answered thus: "Having been directed to summon Mrs. Clarke, he applied to the agent of Captain Thompson, *who returned her as a widow*, of Glouton Lodge, Essex. In consequence of such a description he administered the usual oath to Mrs. Clarke, who answered every question put to her, and upon that charge Captain Thompson was acquitted. Was sure he took the description *from the Attorney*, and that *no interrogatory was put to her whether she was a widow or not*."

Thus, then, she did *not* swear herself a widow, and that imputation against her falls to the ground.

There is one witness who says, that *her servant* did, indeed, represent her, upon one occasion, as a dashing, or gay, young widow; it appears,

that she was trusted under the presumption of her being so; and, it is probable enough, that she wished to be so thought, for the purpose of obtaining credit, as well as for other purposes; but, there is no proof of her ever having represented herself as a widow, except in the case of the court-martial.

As to the charge relating to the place of her marriage, being asked: "Was it true or not, that you were married at Berkhamstead?" She answers: "I tell you I told it him laughing; and I told the Duke I was *making a fool of him* when I said that; for which his royal highness said he was very sorry, for that he was entirely in Mr. Adam's *clutches*."

To say the truth, there is very little in these allegations against her as a witness in this case. She would, from the nature of her situation, naturally wish to keep from the world the real facts relating to her family connections. To own poor relations; to lead our acquaintance down into our origin, and to the low scenes whence we sprang, is not common; nor is it at all uncommon for people, even of unimpeachable veracity, to be weak enough to use all the arts of disguise in such cases.

During the examinations, it has been proved, I think, that she did *pass*, amongst some persons, for Mrs. Dowler. One witness says, that she called herself Mrs. Dowler; and she says, over and over again, that she never so represented herself, except in jest. There is little doubt of her having been looked upon, by some few people, as Mrs. Dowler; but, then, these two circumstances should be kept in view: first, that, with much pains to get at the fact, no one can be found to say, that, even when she was thought to be Mrs. Dowler, *any letter ever came to her in that name*; or in any other name than that of Mrs. Clarke; and, secondly, that this charge of calling herself Mrs. Dowler is manifestly at war with the other charge of calling herself a widow.

Much affected stress has been laid upon her having asserted, that she said she had seen Mr. Dowler *twice* since his return from Portugal, when it now appears, that, besides that *twice*, she had not only seen him, but *slept with him*, at Reid's Hotel, in St. Martin's Lane; and, as the *twice* had also been stated by Mr. Dowler, his general veracity, too, is impeached upon the same ground. But, I put it to any man, to any human being, whether, in such a case, the *third* time would not, by him, have been kept out of sight as long as possible? When asked how often they had seen one another, they said *twice*; so they had; the answer was true in words, but it was false in meaning, because the meaning was that they had seen one another *no oftener than twice*. There was deception in the answer; there was a moral offence in it; yet, is there one man or woman in the whole world, who would not, in such a case, have been strongly tempted to commit that offence? The fact clearly appears to be this: that Mr. Dowler, who seems to be a very clever man, has, for years, been her paramour; that, in his society, she has sought for a compensation for the drudgery and the disgust and loathing experienced in the society of the Duke; and that, accordingly, upon the very first night of his return from Portugal, she flew to his embraces; a circumstance which human nature, which the decency retained even by the lowest of prostitutes, bid her, as long as possible, abstain from stating to the world.

Another observation upon the general complexion of her testimony is this: that, in several instances, where her assertions have been contra-

dicted by others; and particularly in the cases of Ludowick and General Clavering, proof has afterwards been brought of the truth of her evidence, and of the erroneousness, not to call it *wilful falsehood*, of theirs.

She has been called, "*impudent baggage, infamous woman,*" and the like; and it has been much dwelt upon, that she had *threatened vengeance* against the Duke of York. Now, as to *general character*, there can be no doubt, that a woman like Mrs. Clarke is not to be believed so soon as a woman of perfectly virtuous character. But, then, we must consider, that, whatever degree of turpitude we, on account of her way of life, attribute to her, must be shared by her *keeper*, by the person, whose society she so long dwelt in. If we conclude that *her mind has been vitiated, her morals destroyed by such a course of life*; bare justice bids us also conclude, that *his mind and his morals have undergone the same degree of ruin*; and, of course, that whatever we, on this account, take from her credibility, we must, on the other hand, add to the probability of his doing that which is vicious.

It appears, as I once before observed, that Mrs. Clarke did tell Mr. Robert Knight, that she would expose the Duke, unless she could bring him to terms; and, indeed, she does not deny this, nor could she *possibly have any intention of denying it*, because she knew, and said, that Mr. Adam had her letters to the same amount, which letters are inserted below.*

* Sir,—On the 11th May, 1806, you waited on me by the desire of H. R. H. the Duke of York, to state H. R. H.'s intention of allowing me an Annuity of four hundred per annum. H. R. H. by His promise is now indebted to me five hundred pounds. I have written repeatedly, but of no avail. H. R. H.'s conduct towards me has been so devoid of principle, feeling, and honour; and as His promises are not to be depended on, though even given by you; I have come to the determination of making my intentions known to you, for the consideration of H. R. H.;—and thus it is:—

I solicit H. R. H. to make the Annuity secure for my life, and to pay me the arrears immediately, as my necessities are very pressing (this he knows).—If H. R. H. refuses to do this, I have no other mode for my immediate wants, than to publish every circumstance ever communicated to me by H. R. H. and every thing which has come under my knowledge during our intimacy, with all his letters; those things amount to something serious: He is more within my power than may be imagined. Yet I wish for H. R. H.'s sake and my own, that He will make my request good, as I know full well I should suffer much in exposing Him in my own mind; yet before I do any thing publicly, I will send to every one of H. R. H.'s family, a copy of what I mean to publish. Had H. R. H. only have been a little punctual, this request had never been made. One thing more: should H. R. H. throw up his protection to my Boy (for I thank Him much for the past) I hope He will place him on the foundation of the Charter-house or any other public school: the child is not accountable for my conduct. You will please then, Sir, to state this communication to the Duke of York; and on Wednesday I will send to your house, to know what may be H. R. H.'s intention; which you will please to signify by a letter to Your most obedient, humble servant,—M. A. CLARKE.

Sunday morning, June 19.

His Royal Highness must feel, that His conduct on a late affair deserves all this from me, and more.

11 Holles-street, Cavendish-square.

Sir,—On Wednesday, finding there was not any answer to my letter, I am led to infer, H. R. H. the Duke of York thinks proper not to make good his promise given by you, and that you encourage him in it. I have employed myself since, in committing to paper every circumstance within my recollection during the intimacy of H. R. H. and myself. The fifty or sixty letters of H. R. H. will

and which letters, she must be quite sure, would not fail to be brought forth against any denial of her having threatened the Duke with an exposure. To an enraged woman (though, by-the-bye, to suppose her *enraged* we must suppose her ill-used); to an enraged woman, we may, as I before observed, allow a pretty large portion of vindictiveness; and, indeed, unsupported by other evidence, I should have no hesitation in saying, that she was not to be believed. Yet, I cannot help stating a case, bearing strongly upon this point, as to the principle of evidence, which case occurred at the last Quarter Sessions held at Winchester.

Three men were indicted and tried for breaking into a barn and stealing wheat out of it. The *only witness*, to speak to *the fact itself*, was a common prostitute, who, at midnight, had crept into a heap of straw, in the yard, to sleep. There were two women of her acquaintance, at the house of one of whom she had since resided, who gave evidence of some suspicious conduct of the prisoners, with respect to their tampering with the witness to get out of the way. But, there was, on the side of the prisoners, evidence going far towards proving an alibi with respect to one of them; another witness was brought, who said, that one of the prisoners having accused the girl of giving him the foul disease, she said, *she would be up with him*. It was proved, too, that when before the magistrate, she had said, that she would *swear* to but one of the three prisoners. Yet were they, upon the positive testimony of this one witness, and she a common prostitute, found guilty of the charge for which they had been indicted; and, I well remember, that the Chairman, Mr. Borough, a very clever man, and a lawyer of great experience, observed to the jury, that, though some allowance was to be made for the general character of the principal witness, yet her immoralities, of the sort alluded to, ought not to be considered as sufficient to cast any great degree of discredit upon her testimony, in a case where those immoralities could be supposed to have had little, or no, influence upon her conduct. Indeed, if evidence like this were rejected, how could crimes be punished? In, perhaps, four cases out of five, great guilt is established by the mouths of persons, in some degree, guilty. Vice punishes itself. If accomplices are not to be accusers; if their evidence is not to be taken, is it not manifest, that there is an end of that great check upon crimes; namely, *the fear of being betrayed?*

Submitting these more general observations to the consideration of the reader, I now return to the case immediately before us, bearing in mind, that the only question, which we have, in this case, to settle in our minds, is, whether the Duke of York did, or did not *know*, that Mrs. Clarke was concerned in, and took money for, the effecting of the exchange between Knight and Brooke.

We have her positive declaration, that he knew of *all* her proceedings in this way, which declaration is strongly corroborated by the Duke's own letters, wherein he so familiarly speaks to her of the requests of General

give weight and truth to the whole. On Tuesday I have promised to give these up, if I hear nothing further after this last notice; and when once given out of my own possession, it will be impossible to recall. It is to Gentlemen, and not any publisher they will be committed; and those Gentlemen are just as obstinate as His Royal Highness, and more independent: they are acquaintances of yours; and to relieve my wants, in pique to others will do what the Duke will not; however, He has it all within His own power, and so He may act as He pleases. —I am, Sir, Your most obedient, M. A. CLARKE.

Saturday morning.

Clavering and Dr. O'Meara, bidding her *tell the former* that he is mistaken in the ground of his application; and we have her declaration as to his knowledge of her practices in this case in particular.

Now, opposed to this, we have the testimony of Mr. Robert Knight, upon whose evidence, as thus opposed, I have only to repeat my former observations.

Mr. Knight, who after the exchange got acquainted with Mrs. Clarke, says, that she desired him, to keep the matter *a secret*, and that she expressly gave as a reason for this, her fear of the consequences, *if it should reach the Duke of York's ears*. This statement Mrs. Clarke positively denies. Which are we to believe? Mrs. Clarke, who *took the bribe*, or Mr. Knight who *gave the bribe*, and who first *tendered the bribe*? Character, here, is quite out of the question. People may say what they will about Mr. Knight's having been a member of the honourable House. So have many others that I could name. We here see Mr. Robert Knight as a *briber*; and, the parties being, in this respect, upon a level, we must decide between their opposite assertions upon the *inter-nal probabilities* of the case.

Mr. Knight was asked, *what part* of the transaction Mrs. Clarke wished to have kept a secret; and whether it was solely the *money part* of it; he answered that the *whole transaction might be concealed from the Duke*. This question was put so often, and the reports in all the newspapers so exactly correspond with respect to the answer, that there is very little probability of its being incorrect.

Now, then, let it be remarked, that Mr. Knight went to *thank Mrs. Clarke* for the use of her influence in the case of his brother's exchange, having before paid her 200*l.* for that influence; and, was it *probable*, that Mrs. Clarke should express to Mr. Knight a wish, calculated to make him believe, *that she had not at all interfered in the matter with the Duke of York*? Nay, Mr. Knight himself says, that he looked upon the thing as having been done by her influence, and further, that *she took credit to herself for it*; but, how could she, if she pretended that she had induced the Duke to do it; how could she, at that same time, have the folly to express a wish, that her having had any hand in the business might be kept from the knowledge of the Duke; kept from the knowledge of that very person, who, if her claim to Mr. Knight's 200*l.* was not fraudulent as well as corrupt, must have known that she was the cause of the exchange? Will any one believe that Mrs. Clarke would say, "It was I who *prevailed upon the Duke* to permit of your brother's exchange; but for God's sake, *don't let the Duke know of it*." Why, there is a manifest absurdity in the supposition. It is a thing too preposterous to be believed. That she might, indeed, desire Knight not to *blab*; not to talk of the transaction for it to reach the Duke's ears through *third parties*; this is likely enough, and this she herself admits may have been the case; but to suppose, that she expressed a fear of the Duke's *knowing* of her having been the instrument in the business: to suppose, that she expressed such a fear to the very man with whom *she was taking credit to herself* for having obtained the grant *from the Duke*, is an absurdity too gross to be for one moment entertained by any man in his senses.

As to the evidence of Ludovick about the getting the note changed, I before made these observations:—If what Ludovick Armor says be true; namely, that no other servant of the Duke ever went to Mrs. Clarke's, and that he never took a note to change from that house, what Mrs.

Clarke says about sending the note to change *must* be false. That is quite clear. But, bare justice to the fair annuitant compels us to observe, that this falsehood, if we set it down for one, must have been a mere freak of fancy; for, it would, I think, be impossible to assign, or conceive, any *reason* for her stating it. Of itself there was nothing in it, either good or bad. To have said, that she merely *showed* the Duke the money would have answered full as well for all the purposes of accusation and of crimination. It is quite impossible to guess at any end she could have in view by telling such a falsehood, except that of bringing forth Ludovick Armor: or of affording a chance of being exposed as a false witness. If, therefore, she be a false witness, a fabricator of false accusations, we must, I think, allow her to be as awkward an one as ever appeared at any bar in the world.

These observations occurred to me before I had seen the examinations of Pierson and Mrs. Favourite; but, they have now put the matter beyond all doubt, that Ludovick's *memory*, though refreshed by questions, *before he came to the house*, put to him by the Duke, by Mr. Adam (one of the judges in this case), by Mr. Lowten and by Mr. Wilkinson, did, upon this occasion, fail him.

Colonel Gordon's evidence has in it nothing *positive*. It speaks, indeed, to the general regularity of conducting business in the office of the Commander-in-Chief; the Colonel *firmly* believes, that he made his report, as usual, to the Duke as to the fitness of the exchange, though he kept *no minutes* of the inquiry, upon which the report was founded; and he has not the *smallest doubt*, that the Duke acted solely upon that report, unbiassed by any other influence whatever. For the Colonel's *opinions* we may have a very great respect, especially as he appears to have had so much to do with the illustrious personage, whose conduct was the subject of inquiry; but, with all due deference to the Colonel, *opinions* are not facts; nor will they, in the mind of any impartial man, weigh one grain against positive and corroborated testimony.

In his speech, stating the charges, Mr. Wardle, at the first opening of the business, stated the exchange of Knight and Brooke to have been concluded on the 25th of July. It now appears, that it was not *gazetted* till the 30th; and, observe, it has been attempted to be shown, that the thing was done without the aid of Mrs. Clarke, because Colonel Gordon has produced a document to show, that the Duke gave his sanction to the exchange on the 23rd of July, just as if Mr. Wardle had ever pretended to *name the day* when the application was made to Mrs. Clarke! He merely misstated the date of the Gazette, a misstatement which could not possibly be intentional, because there was the Gazette to refer to. But, what is this document? What is this written proof, that the Duke gave his sanction to the exchange on the 23rd of July? Why, it is a document, in which the material part, the only words that are material, are found written in PENCIL! The exchange was not *gazetted*, it appears, till *seven* days after it was approved of by the Duke, though there must have been one *gazetting-day* between; not till seven days after the Duke is, in *pencil*, stated to have approved of it. In *pencil*, reader, you will please to bear in mind; always keep in mind, that it was in *pencil*. I wonder what judges and juries would say of documents, of written evidence, partly in *pencil*?

Colonel Gordon states, however, positively, that the Duke of York went to Weymouth on the 31st of July; which is important, because

the *Gazette* in which the exchange of Knight and Brooke appeared, was published on the 30th of July, and Mrs. Clarke says, that she received the 200*l.* before the Duke went to Weymouth: This brings the whole of the operations subsequent to the *Gazette* into a crowded space. She sent the *Gazette* to Dr. Thynne; Dr. Thynne sent it to Mr. Knight; Mr. Knight sent her the money; she showed the money to the Duke; and all this must, if true, have taken place, between some time in the day of the 30th, and some time in the night of the 31st, or in the morning of the 1st of August; that is to say, if Colonel Gordon be correct as to the day of the Duke's setting off for Weymouth. Yet is there nothing, that I can perceive, at all incredible in this rapidity. If Mr. Knight got the *Gazette* on the 30th, he would not, after the pressing note from Mrs. Clarke to Dr. Thynne, fail to send her the money the next day; on that day the Duke, before his departure, would naturally go, as the witnesses stated he did go, to Mrs. Clarke's; she would, if ever, then show him the money; and, of course, if she got the note, or notes, or one of them, changed through him, that was the very time when she would get it done: All the servants agree, that the Duke was there on the day, and in a part, at least, of the night previous to his departure for Weymouth, and Mrs. Favourite, perfectly corroborated by Pierson, says that she gave Ludovick a note to get changed; and she further says, that she took up the change and delivered it to the Duke and Mrs. Clarke in bed.

Now, reader, dismiss from your mind all prejudice; all bias; and ask yourself, whether it be possible for such a story as this is all through; so many concurrent circumstances, flowing from so many quarters, to unite by mere accident; or by any thing short of the power of one great and prevailing truth. Ask yourself, whether the evidence of Mr. Adam to character, and the evidence of Ludovick and Colonel Gordon to fact, is sufficient to weigh against all that has been laid before you in support of this charge.

CASE OF CAPTAIN MALING.—Mr. Wardle, when he brought forward his charges, stated, that there was a man, in the office of Greenwood, the Agent, who had risen to the rank of *Captain* in the army without having ever done one day's military duty, and without having even joined any regiment. Upon the examination taking place, in the House, it appeared, that Mr. Wardle had made a mistake; not, however, as to the nature of the case, or the name of the person: but as to the office in which that person was, it appearing, that the person was a clerk in the office of the Duke of York and not in that of Greenwood.

And here we have an instance of the manner, in which *Colonel Gordon* gave information to the House. When first called in, he was asked: "What were the merits and services that obtained Capt. Maling his rapid promotion, and the gift of his three commissions?" His answer is; "*I will state them to the House.*" He then goes on to show, from documents in his possession, that he was recommended thus and thus, and that he had served thus and thus; and though the promotion was very rapid indeed, and seems not to be unaccounted for upon the score of service, it does appear that the person in question had been engaged in actual military service.

Upon this being made appear, Mr. Wardle was disposed to *withdraw* this charge: "No, no!" said the friends of the Duke. No. It shall not be withdrawn; it shall stand for us to decide upon it.

The *Colonel* was then examined as to other matters; and, before he was ordered to withdraw, it occurred to some one, that a mistake, as to the office, had been made: and the *Colonel* was asked: "What were the services of Captain Maling's brother, who is, I believe, a captain in the army, who is in the War-office?"

Now, mark the answer; mark this answer well. "*There is a Captain Maling*, an assistant of mine, in the office of the Commander-in-Chief; I take for granted that is the person referred to. What his services are as a Lieutenant I really do not know; I found him as a Lieutenant in the office of the Commander-in-Chief; and in consideration of his extraordinary good character, and more than common abilities, the promotions of the army going through his hands under mine, I did recommend him to his royal highness the Commander-in-Chief, to be placed upon the half-pay as a captain, upon which half-pay he most assuredly will be placed as soon as an opportunity offers; but the Commander-in-Chief has it not in his power."

He is then asked: "Do you know whether, or not, that Captain Maling ever joined, or did duty with, any regiment?"—His answer is: "I do not know that he did; and I do not think that he did."

Whence we may conclude with perfect safety, that he never did; so that the charge of Mr. Wardle is completely established, the circumstance of a mistake in the office being of no importance at all.

This is a case, which involves no direct pecuniary corruption; but it is worthy of as much attention as any one of the whole; for here, we see, that the offices of the army have been made *sinecures*, and, if this be tolerated, let the reader judge to what a length it may be, and, perhaps, already has been, carried, in an establishment consisting of from 12,000 to 15,000 commissioned and staff officers. I, in my last, observed upon the consequences of *leaves of absence*; I noticed the particular case of the younger *Sheridan*; but, what must we expect if the rank and pay, as military officers, are given to clerks in offices? If to clerks, why not to any who are not clerks? Why not to butlers and footmen? Why not to any body? There is no knowing where the terrible abuse will terminate.

This man never joined any regiment? Yet he must be a Captain of some company in some regiment, and, perhaps, in one of those regiments which were serving in Spain. Is not this pretty encouragement for officers who actually do serve? Is not this a shameful injury to that service, for which the people so dearly pay?

He has been thus promoted for his "extraordinary good character, and more than common abilities." Abilities in what? In what; why, "the promotions of the army going through his hands under mine," says the *Colonel*, with singular modesty. But, what have these abilities; this more than common abilities in copying letters, filling up blank commissions, and making memorandums, in pencil, in the margin of applications; what have these "more than common abilities" to do with military command, which demands not only abilities of quite a different description, but requires also the presence of the person with the army? Besides, has not Captain Maling his salary as a clerk? Aye, and a salary, too, quite adequate to his services. We pay him that salary, and he ought not to be suffered to step in and take military rank and pay from men, who venture their lives for their country. He lies snug at the Horse Guards, while the person, who is supplying his place in the regiment, the

person who is doing that duty for which Captain Maling has rank and pay, has his head exposed to the sabre or the bayonet of the enemy. Can there be an instance, more complete than this, of crying injustice? Is it possible that the real officers of the army should be content under such a system of distributing the benefits of rank and pay? Is it possible, that an army, thus treated, should be what it ought to be? And, is it not impudence unparalleled, to praise the management of the army, while such a case as this stands recorded in evidence, at the bar of the House? Oh! Colonel Gordon! Colonel Gordon, you who require a man of "uncommon abilities" to manage the promotions "under you;" what do you think would be the answer of the Emperor Napoleon, if his war-minister were to say to him: "There is a man who is uncommonly "clever at filling up blank-commissions and making memorandums and "copying letters; and, therefore, I would recommend him to your Majesty as a mightily proper person to command a company of foot, letting him still remain a clerk in my office?" What do you think would be, in such a case, the answer of Napoleon?

It is not thus that *triumphings* are managed, Colonel Gordon.

But, observe, the curious account that the Colonel gives of what was intended to be done with this Captain Maling of "uncommon abilities." He recommended him, he says, to the Commander-in-Chief, to be placed upon *half-pay* as a Captain. But, he is upon *full-pay*! The Duke, he tells us, has not the power to place him upon *half-pay*; but he has had the power to place him upon *full-pay*, where he now is! Oh! wonderfully fine regulations! Oh! the "excellent *regularity*" of conducting things in the office of the Commander-in-Chief! I am delighted with this idea of "regularity." It does form, as Mr. Cripps seemed to think, such a famous set-off against all the thumping charges relating to jobbing and corruption.

CASE OF FRENCH AND SANDON.—This case opens to us a most extensive field of corruption and profligacy. In the evidence relating to this case, we have a view of the whole system; and, therefore, it is worthy of particular notice, not only in its substance, but in the whole of its detail.

It is proved by documentary evidence, that, on the 30th of April, 1804, Colonel French and Capt. Huxley Sandon obtained a Letter of Service, as it is quaintly called; or, in plain English, an authority, to raise 5,000 men for the army; and that this authority, and bargain, was granted and made through the power of the Commander-in-Chief, the transaction being one that originated in his office.

The proposition of a *loan* to the Duke comes out incidentally.

Capt. Huxley Sandon states, that a Mr. Cockayne, his attorney, having told him that if he wanted any thing done at the War-office, he knew a person who could do it, he was led to the transaction in question, in conjunction with Col. French; that there was an agent of Mrs. Clarke, a Mr. Corri, a music-master, who was to introduce them; that the original bargain was, that Mrs. Clarke was to receive 525*l.*, and Mr. Corri 200*l.* for the introduction, the former sum to be increased, at his discretion, if they were successful in their levy, to 2,000*l.*

Mr. Corri states, that Sandon did apply to him, and commissioned him to offer Mrs. Clarke 2,000*l.* for her assistance; that he, in consequence, did apply to Mrs. Clarke; and that, in June, 1804, he received

two hundred pounds for himself, from Sandon, which 200*l.* he gave to Mr. Cockayne, to whom he was in debt.

Mr. Dowler states; that he saw Col. French and Capt. Sandon at Mrs. Clarke's; that, by desire of Mrs. Clarke, he spoke to them, several times, upon the subject of the levy; that Mrs. Clarke told him, that she was to receive 1,000 guineas, and a guinea a man, until the levy of 5,000 men should be completed. To this he adds: "I was also present: when Colonel French or Captain Sandon, I don't know which, gave Mrs. Clarke 500*l.* of it. I afterwards saw Colonel French at Mrs. Clarke's, when he stated to her, that it was not possible to procure the number of men at the usual bounty, and begged that the number of boys should be increased in the levy, which, as I understand, was afterwards done."—Upon being asked, what cause she assigned for doing such things? he says: "She said the Duke of York was so distressed for money that she could not bear to ask him for any, and that that was the only way by which she could support her establishment."

Mr. Grant (agent to Colonel French and Captain Sandon's levy) states, that French and Sandon told him that they had got the levy through the influence of a friend, which friend he afterwards found to be Mrs. Clarke; that they told him this; that he understood she was to receive 500 guineas at first, and afterwards a guinea a man for every man raised; that he was told, by French and Sandon, that she actually received several sums from them; that he accepted a bill of 200*l.*; that they told him they had actually paid her 1,700*l.*; that he recollects that Colonel French applied to him about a loan of 5,000*l.* to the Duke of York, but that he took no steps upon it; that he recollects, that an observation was made, that it might be advanced, provided the arrears of the levy were paid up by government, but does not recollect, whether the observation came from himself, or from Colonel French.

It was now, when Mr. Grant's examination was closed, nearly two o'clock in the morning of the 8th of February, and, upon the propriety of calling Mrs. Clarke, the following very interesting and memorable discussion took place in the House, as reported in the newspapers.

LORD FOLKESTONE called the attention of gentlemen to the exhausted state of the hon. member who brought forward the motion, the state of the House, and the lateness of the hour, and proposed an adjournment. (*A cry of "Go on! go on!"*)—Mr. PERCEVAL observed, that many members appeared to be impressed with the belief, that the purposes of justice required that Mrs. Clarke should be examined to-night, and in that sentiment he was much inclined to concur. As justice was the object of all, he hoped that Mrs. Clarke would be called in and examined. Without her evidence, the whole that had been said was nothing, as the Duke of York had not been implicated.—Mr. WARDLE said, that the right hon. gentleman need not have so strongly urged upon him a regard to justice. If the Committee thought that justice required it, he was ready to proceed.—Mrs. Clarke was then ordered to be called.—Mr. WHARTON (the Chairman) stated that Mrs. Clarke was so exhausted, that she begged to be indulged with a chair. [A chair was accordingly ordered.] He then said, that he found from the Sergeant at Arms, that he had misstated the message, which was a request from Mrs. Clarke that she might not be examined to-night. Mrs. Clarke, however, was called in. She stated that she had attended for eight hours, that her feelings had been excessively harassed during this examination, and that she was so excessively fatigued that she could not give her evidence to-night.—The CHAIRMAN told her, that the Committee, in consideration of her fatigue, had ordered a chair for her.—Mrs. CLARKE. "*A chair will not relieve the fatigue of my mind.*"—

The witness was then ordered to withdraw.—Mr. YORKE adverted to the necessity, with a view to *the purposes of justice*, that the witness should be examined, lest some undue communication with the witnesses already examined should take place. He thought, therefore, that she ought to be examined, or kept in the custody of the Sergeant at Arms, and none of these witnesses admitted to her presence till the House met again. He did not know but there might be precedents for keeping witnesses in this way.

The SPEAKER said that there were certainly no such precedents in modern times, and the House ought to pause before they came to a decision upon a point in which the liberty of the subject was so much concerned.

Mr. SHERIDAN said that after what the witness had said under circumstances that certainly added weight to her assertion, it was impossible for the Committee to proceed to the examination. The idea on the other hand, of locking her up, was contrary to every principle of propriety. The only remaining course was to do neither; and this was an inconvenience incident to their proceedings. Gentlemen ought to recollect, that justice was concerned in her giving her testimony in a state in which she could give it properly; and unless the House took care that this should be done, they would be considered rather as Parties than as Judges.

Mr. WARDLE read a note from Mrs. Clarke, requesting that he would come to her, as she was extremely indisposed.

Mr. ADAM said, that in the dilemma to which they were reduced, there appeared no proper mode of acting but agreeing to postpone the examination, and to allow any communication with the other witnesses to go to her credit.

Mr. CANNING agreed in what had been said by the last speaker, but added that she might learn in the interval what the other witnesses had said without any direct communication, and the only way to bring this to a question of credit, was to call her now, and ask her whether any such communication had taken place. To this point she could undoubtedly answer, however much exhausted.

Mr. WHITEHEAD conceived that the House would best consult its dignity, by allowing the hon. member to pursue the course of proceeding which he had a right to act upon. But even though it was unwilling to accede to such a principle, he begged leave to ask the House, whether a female, in attendance for eight hours, and of course suffering much suspense, had not some claim upon the generous feelings of the House, without any reference to the immediate person to whom that feeling was extended. To speak under such circumstances of committing Mrs. Clarke, he trusted would not meet the support of any man in that House. (*Hear, hear.*)

Mr. CANNING deprecated any such severity (*hear, hear*), at the same time that he was alive to the necessity of putting certain questions to Mrs. Clarke, relative to any communication which she might have received from any of the witnesses examined that night. He still thought that a more preferable method might be pursued, to which on any side he could see no objection, namely, to call Mr. Dowler again to the bar, and examine him relative to any communication with that lady. (*Hear, hear, from all sides.*)

(*Mr. Dowler was then called to the Bar*) - He stated that the only communication he had with Mrs. Clarke, since he had left the bar, was an acquiescence with her wish to procure for her some refreshment. He had abstained from any conversation, not from any advice communicated to him, but from a consciousness that it was the line of duty which he ought to pursue under such circumstances.

Mrs. Clarke (the proceedings being resumed) states, that French and Sandon did apply to her for the levy, but, though she has read the newspapers, she cannot perfectly call to her mind the sums she received from them; that they certainly promised her a pecuniary reward; that, in consequence of that promise, she applied, in their behalf, to the Duke; that she informed the Duke that she was to receive a pecuniary compensation; that the Duke, upon this, promised that the parties should have the levy; that she recollects one sum of 500*l.* that she received, which went in part payment of a service of plate for the house in Gloucester

place; that the Duke told her he paid the remainder of the money for the plate; that the parties did apply to her for alterations in the conditions of the levy, and that she always gave their notes to the Duke, but did not always know what they meant; that French told her, that if the Duke would pass his accounts, which were correct, and expected to have been passed some time before, he and his agent would *accommodate him with a loan of 5,000l.*, on proper security and at legal interest; that she spoke of this to the Commander-in-Chief; that the Duke said, that he could not demand money from the different officers, that besides, that it was a delicate business, as the thing might be known; that the loan was not made.

Miss Taylor was next called, and, as her evidence is of such very great importance, I shall give in the question and answer, as I find it reported in the *Morning Chronicle*.

Mr. WARDLE. Were you in the habit of visiting at Gloucester-place when Mrs. Clarke was under the protection of the Duke of York?—Frequently.

Have you ever heard the Duke of York speak to Mrs. Clarke relative to Col. French's levy?—Once.

Relate what passed at that time.—The Duke's words were, as nearly as I can recollect, "*I am continually wearied by Col. French about his levy. He is always wanting something more to be done in his favour. How does he behave to you, Darling?*"

Does the witness recollect any thing further passing than what she has stated?—Mrs. Clarke replied, "*Middling; not very well.*"

Was that the whole of the conversation?—No.

Relate the rest.—The Duke said, "*Master French must mind what he is about, else I will soon cut up him and his levy too.*"

By THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL. How long have you known Mrs. Clarke?—Ten years.

Not longer?—I cannot exactly recollect.

Where did you know her first?—At her house at Bayswater, near the Gravel Pits.

Where do you live yourself?—At Chelsea.

With whom did you live when you first knew Mrs. Clarke?—With my parents.

What was your father?—A gentleman.

Do you live with her now?—No.

Is he living?—Yes.

Is your mother living?—Yes.

Do you live with her?—No.

With whom do you live?—With my sister.

Is she married?—No; she is a single woman.

Where resident?—At Chelsea.

In a lodging or a house?—In a house.

In what line of life is she?—She keeps a boarding-school.

In what part of Bayswater did Mrs. Clarke live?—She lived in Craven-place.

Who lived with her?—Her husband.

Did he always live with her?—He did when I first knew her.

Did you know any other person to live with her?—Yes.

Whom?—His Royal Highness the Duke of York.

Do you not know that she has lived with other persons since?—Not to my knowledge.

Are you intimately acquainted with her?—Yes.

Not related to her?—My brother is married to her sister.

Did you know her at Tavistock-place?—Yes.

Did her husband live with her there?—I never saw him there. I understood that Mrs. Clarke lived in Tavistock-place with her mother.

What time elapsed between her leaving her husband and her living with the Duke of York?—I cannot recollect.

How long ago since she knew Mrs. Clarke at Bayswater?—About ten years.

Had her husband left her before she left Bayswater?—I do not know.

Are you prepared to stand by that?—Yes.

What was her husband?—I always understood him to be a man of some fortune.

Do you not know that he had only 50*l.* annuity, and that paid weekly?—No.

Did you ever see her husband with her during the latter part of the period she lived at Bayswater?—No.

Where did she go to reside from Bayswater?—I do not recollect.

Does the witness recollect her living in Park-lane?—Mrs. Clarke called upon her one day and said she lived then in Park-lane?

Did you ever live with her in Tavistock-place?—I never lived with her at all.

Did you never sleep in the house?—Yes, frequently.

Do you know that any body lived with her, but her husband?—Yes.

You took her then for a modest decent woman?—She lived with her mother, and I knew nothing then to the contrary.

What is your father's name?—The same name as mine.

His Christian name?—James.

Where does he live now?—I should rather be excused answering.

A Debate intervened here, of which I shall give the report, from the same paper.

Lord FOLKESTONE said, that the whole of the learned gentleman's examination appeared to be for the purpose of catching the witness tripping. As to any reference to the investigation, he could see none in the question which the witness expressed her unwillingness to answer.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL defended the propriety of his examination. A person was produced, of whom no person knew any thing, unless that she was the sister-in-law of a very questionable witness. In such a case, was not inquiry into the character and connections of such a witness necessary? Would not much of her character for credit, *depend upon a knowledge of the situation of life in which herself and her connections moved?* (*No! no! Order! order!*) He by no means insinuated, that poverty or humility of life was to be construed into objections against the validity of statements, where the persons making them had *uniformly supported a good character*; but he had still a right to contend, that when persons wholly unknown, except by the good accounts they gave of themselves, were brought forward upon serious inquiries, he or any other member had a right to inquire into every circumstance of their previous life, and of their connections.

Gen. STEWART begged to say one word, viz. that if there was one member who took up more of the time of the Committee by numerous questions, it was the Noble Lord (Folkestone) opposite.

Lord FOLKESTONE. If he had taken up the time of the Committee unnecessarily, he would feel extreme regret. At the same time that he could not surrender his own opinion, that the Attorney-General's examination did not at all bear upon the point. Indeed, from his own observations, it was obvious that the only thing he pretended to know about that witness, he could not know, namely, that she was the sister-in-law of Mrs. Clarke, as he asserted, but which she denied.

Sir G. WARRENDER supported the propriety of the questions put by his Noble Friend (Folkestone)—they were, in his opinion, of the most vital importance.

Mr. SHERIDAN trusted, that unless the Attorney-General felt the absolute necessity of the question, he would not trespass on the private feelings of the witness by continuing to press it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL. I must repeat my question. Where is your father now? I do not know.

Mr. PERCEVAL. Does the witness mean to *rest her credit* upon the veracity of that answer?

Mr. BRAND. There may be circumstances of real and serious difficulties, where it would be inconsistent with the best feelings of the heart, and a violation of parental duty, not to deny the residence of a father. The question may be a legal one, but he trusted, other motives of equal urgency would operate on the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to press it.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER conceived, That honourable gentleman had assumed difficulties, which he had no right to do. He could only attribute the disinclination of the witness to state certain circumstances, to

her anxiety to evade that discovery, which would be fatal to the credit of her testimony.

Mr. WILBERFORCE had a strong objection to the *manner* in which the question was put, it appeared like BROWBEATING THE WITNESS. He by no means attributed such an intention to his right hon. friend, although a system may be contracted from legal habits. He recommended that the answer of the witness should be left to the opinion which the Committee would subsequently pronounce.

Mr. KENRICK stated, that he had heard from another person, that the person to whom the question referred, had been arrested within a few hours.

Mr. YORKE justified the question, as put by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Every means should be exerted to ascertain the character of the persons produced in support of those accusations. If such vigilance was not exercised, *street-walkers* from off the Strand, would probably be introduced at the bar of that House to criminate the character of the Duke of York.

EXAMINATION RESUMED.—When did you see your father last? About a fortnight ago.

Where did he live last? At Chelsea.

In what street? I do beg to decline answering.

For what reason? I do not like to tell so large an assembly where I live.

What objection can you have to tell where yourself and sister live, representing yourselves, as you do, to keep a boarding-school? I stated my reasons before.

What fears have you from so large an assembly? They will find me to be poor, and will therefore doubt my veracity.

Mr. PERCEVAL. Be assured your veracity will not be doubted on account of your poverty. I live at No. 8, Cheyne-row, Chelsea.

Do you and your sister keep a boarding-school? My sister and I do.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL. Did you often see Mrs. Clarke in company with the Duke of York? Yes.

How often? I cannot recollect; three weeks seldom passed but I did.

How long have you kept the boarding-school? Two years and a half, altogether, in Kentish-town and Chelsea.

When you were at Kentish-town, where did your father live? I have an objection to say any thing about my father.

Where did witness live at the time she heard his royal highness speak to Mrs. Clarke about Colonel French? Cannot positively say; but that it was before she went to live at Kentish-town.

Where did you live before that? At Islington, to which place we went from Bayswater.

What part of Islington? Dalby-terrace.

Do you know Mr. Wardle? Yes.

How long? Two or three months.

At whose request do you attend here to-night? At Mrs. Clarke's.

Did you ever see Mr. Dowler at Gloucester-place? Yes.

Did you ever see him in company with the Duke of York? No.

Did you ever hear from Mrs. Clarke, that she introduced Mr. Dowler to the Duke of York as her brother? No.

Do you believe your father's affairs to be in a state of embarrassment? Yes.

Mrs. Hovenden (who is proved to have been a regular trader in commissions and the like) being called on a subsequent day, respecting the affair of Col. Shaw, and being incidentally asked about *Miss Taylor*, states, that she saw her *once* with her brother Capt. Taylor; that of her own knowledge, she can say nothing of Miss Taylor's reputation; that she did *once* say, that she should not return her visit, as she had heard *something unpleasant*. Being put to the test as to what this unpleasant thing was, she says: "Being hear-ay, I believe, I should not tell what I hear. I know nothing of myself." She was then asked: "Of your own knowledge of Miss Taylor, would you believe her evidence?" She answers: "I declare I do not see how I can answer such a question as

that. It is mere matter of opinion. I cannot say." Being asked how her delicacy permitted her to *visit* Mrs. Clarke, she answers, that she did not *visit* her; she went to her on *business*.

Mr. WHITBREAD observed here, that, from what he had seen of the two ladies, he should be inclined to ask Miss Taylor *her* opinion of Mrs. Hovenden.

Pierson, the butler, is asked, whether he recollects to have seen Miss Taylor at the house in Gloucester-place? He states that he saw her there very frequently, and that she dined there often; but, that he does not recollect her dining there when the Duke did.

Thomas Walker, late coachman to Mrs. Clarke, saw Miss Taylor frequently at Gloucester-place.

Mrs. Favourite, the housekeeper, states that Miss Taylor very frequently visited at Gloucester-place, and when the Duke of York was there.

There is no need at all of adding Mrs. Clarke's testimony to that of this crowd of witnesses, as to the fact of Miss Taylor being upon terms of intimacy at Gloucester-place, and of her being frequently there at the same time with the Duke; but, as Miss Taylor's evidence is of such vast weight; as it goes to the very vitals of this case, and, indeed, by corroboration, of all the cases, we must not omit a record of the following occurrence, which took place on the 17th instant:—

Mr. WARDLE stated, that he had that morning received a letter from Miss ANN TAYLOR, complaining of the conduct of another witness, which he asked permission to read. The hon. gentleman then read the letter to the following effect:—"SIR, I understand that Mrs. Hovenden, on her examination at the bar of the House of Commons, stated that she had not returned me a visit I paid her, in consequence of some imputation upon my character. In contradiction to that, I have to state *that she visited me twice*; once at Bayswater, and again at Dalby-terrace. She also said, she would not intrust me with a child of hers, but yet *she sent her niece, of 14 years of age, to visit me*. I am, &c. ANN TAYLOR."

Mr. WILLIAM SMITH begged leave to recal the attention of the Committee to the letter produced by an honourable member, and signed "Ann Taylor." If there was any proceeding in the course of this business, marked with peculiar and *unmerited harshness*, towards an individual, it was in the treatment this poor unprotected girl had met with. (*Hear, hear, from several members.*) There could be *nothing more unjustifiable*. The only shadow of disgrace that attached to this girl's conduct, as far as fell within the knowledge of the Committee, was her knowing such a—

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER rose to order. The hon. gent. was, in his opinion, pursuing a most disorderly course. He might, if he pleased, call the witness to the bar to disprove any evidence that had been given which she conceived to be inimical to her, but he could not enter into the discussion of the hardships she had undergone. If he had been inclined to do this, *he ought to have done it at the time she was examined*, when the impression was fresh in the minds of every one, and not at such a distance of time, when it was likely to provoke reply, and retard more material business. For if the hon. gent. was allowed to go into this argument, those who were accused of imposing the hardships complained of would have an equal right to defend themselves, and thus the time of the House would be consumed.

Mr. SMITH contended that, the letter being read, he had taken the most proper time to ask if any proceedings were to follow upon it.

Why, Mr. Perceval, this was "*material business*;" it was by far more material than the inquiry about the *alleged forgery*! Aye, or the statement about the sums, which *the Duke says* he expended upon Mrs. Clarke's establishment! Aye, a vast deal more *material* than either.

Mrs. *Hovenden*, the regular trader, was called upon for her opinion of Miss Taylor's *credibility*; if what Miss Taylor now states be true, that which Mrs. Hovenden stated even respecting her opinions of Miss Taylor, is false; and, Sir, the people are, I can assure you, all alive as to the credibility of Miss Taylor.

Having now stated the substance of the oral testimony, it only remains to be observed, that Colonel Gordon came again, with an abundance of documents, and most clearly proved, that with respect to the levy of French and Sandon, *all was PERFECTLY REGULAR again in the books at the War-office, and in the office of the Commander-in-Chief.* The reader is, indeed, told, by Sandon, one of the principals, that he made a bargain with Cockayne to give Corri 200*l.* for an introduction to Mrs. Clarke, and that a bargain was made with Mrs. Clarke to give her a sum in cash, and a guinea a man, for the letter of service; he is told by Corri that he got the 200*l.*; he is told by Dowler that he saw French and Sandon give Mrs. Clarke some of the money; he is told by Grant, the agent to the levy, that French and Sandon told him, that they paid her in all 1,700*l.*; he is told by Mrs. Clarke that the Duke granted the letter of service upon her telling him that she was to have money for it from French and Sandon; and, lastly, he is told by Miss Taylor, whose character and credibility remain unimpeached, that she heard the Duke say to Mrs. Clarke, that he was continually wearied by French about his levy, who was always wanting something more to be done in his favour! that she then heard the Duke ask Mrs. Clarke, how French *behaved to her*, and upon Mrs. Clarke's replying, "Middling, not very well," the Duke said: "Master French must mind what he is about, else I will soon cut up him and his levy too." All this the reader is told by witnesses, for the far greater part, *unwilling* ones. If he regards the *regularity* of Colonel Gordon's books as sufficient to destroy all this evidence, then he must acquit the Duke; but if he does not, he must conclude that the Duke is guilty.

With the above cases (enough, probably, for one week's reading) I shall, for the present, content myself, especially as there appears to be fresh matter still coming forward, connected with some of the other cases.

In my next I shall continue the *analysis*, and never quit it till every case is fairly before my readers, and safely placed beyond the power of oblivion, or of misrepresentation.

There will also be to be performed another task of this sort, to wit, an analytical view of the *conduct of the House of Commons*, upon this important occasion. It will require much time and patience to go over the whole of the proceedings, draw together and to put upon record, the conduct and sentiments of the different members who have taken part in the discussions. Yet, this is absolutely necessary to be done.

In the meanwhile, there is one particular debate, which has arisen, incidentally, out of these proceedings, and which debate calls for immediate attention, as involving statements and principles of a general and very interesting nature. I would beseech the reader to bear in mind, that it is not merely the conduct of the Duke of York that is now before the public, but *that system of corruption*, of which the facts, now brought to light, now *dragged* out by the hair of the head, after having been discovered by accident; that system of corruption and of public robbery, of

which these facts are but a *mere specimen*. This the reader should always bear in mind. He never should, for one moment, lose sight of this object. He should have it continually before his eyes.

The debate, to which I have alluded, and which I shall give as I find it reported in the newspapers, relates to *the treatment received by Mr. Wardle from the House*, at the outset of, and during the investigation.

On the 15th instant, at the opening of the day's proceeding, Lord FOLKESTONE said.—

"I do most sincerely hope, that this House will remember, and that the country will never forget, that my hon. friend (Mr. Wardle), and happy am I in calling him my friend, was not allowed the course of proceeding in this investigation which he had originally determined upon, but was forced into the line of conduct which was recommended by the personal friend, and *professed adviser*, of the accused. I believe, upon reference to any former parliamentary proceedings, or, indeed, upon a review of all the forms and precedents of any judicial inquiry, this case will be found the only one where the person originating the charges was denied to take the course he wished, particularly when that course was neither incompatible with the forms of the tribunal to which he appealed, or inconsistent with the justice that was required. Let the House also recollect, and the country never forget, that my hon. friend (Mr. Wardle) has been pressed, day after day, nay, hour after hour, to the prosecution of his charges, without intermission, or even time to prepare the necessary arrangements. Nor has he until within these few days, that I felt it my duty to offer to him my services, had the power of employing any agent to assist him in his arduous but honourable pursuit.—No, on himself alone has depended every exertion to meet the pressing desire on the other side of the House, of proceeding without the slightest relaxation. He has not been able to avail himself of the services of a *Lowten* or a *Wilkinson* to arrange his documents, and to marshal his witnesses. Let the House also recollect, and I hope the country will never forget, that my honourable friend has prosecuted this accusation under an express *threat of infamy*, contingently attaching to him, a threat virulently and acrimoniously urged, (*hear, hear!*) which has been repeated and re-echoed by more than one member in this House, and which, up to this moment, has never been withdrawn, never rejected, nor even modified. It is under these circumstances, first refused the course of proceeding which he desired, next pressed without intermission, and under the terror of a menace, that my hon. friend has followed up the charges which he has so manfully introduced. These general observations I have thought it necessary to premise, conceiving, as I do, that in the proceedings of this inquiry my hon. friend has not been fairly used.—[His lordship then came to the business of *Kennel's loan*, and, in stating the difficulties, which he had met with in getting at the papers relating to it, he said that the person who had those papers was afraid of offending the government in bringing them forward. His lordship's words were these.]—But the gist of his objection was, that as *the defence of the Commander-in-Chief appeared to be taken up as a ministerial measure*, he was apprehensive that he would incur their displeasure, and the displeasure of those immediately under them, which would probably operate to the *ruin of himself and his family*. I hear some murmurs of disapprobation from gentlemen in this House, but I do assure them that this is not the only case where similar apprehensions have prevented persons in possession of strong testimony from coming forward, particularly officers in the army, and where information was withheld, from the manner in which it was taken up by the King's servants in that House."

Mr. PERCEVAL said, the noble lord had been particularly strenuous in calling on the House and on the country, to hold the way in which the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) had been treated in opening this business, and the way in which the noble lord himself had been treated yesterday, in everlasting remembrance. If so, he (Mr. Perceval) hoped it would also be held in correct remembrance. The noble lord was correct in saying, that it was the anxious wish of gentlemen on that side of the House, out of regard, not to their own feelings only, but to those of the royal Duke, that every thing should be as fair, open, and public as possible. But did it from thence follow, that the mode of proceeding, which had been followed, had been forced on the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle)? Except the noble lord himself there was not a dissentient voice in that House against the

mode of proceeding which had been followed. The plan adopted, therefore, was not one pressed on the hon. mover (Mr. Wardle), or on the House, by his hon. friend (Mr. Adam), or himself, but was one on which there was not a contrary opinion, but in one or two instances, in the House. A gentleman behind him had opposed the mode adopted for the very reason, if he at all understood the opinions of the noble lord and the hon. mover of the Inquiry, that they would have supported it, namely, that it was too public a mode of investigation, not, as it was now insinuated, that it was calculated to obstruct public justice. If his memory, however, did not fail him, the-hon. gent. himself had not stated, that he wished for a Select Committee, but only for a Committee. The noble lord had indeed proposed a Select Committee; but no reluctance had been shown by the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) to the mode of proceeding since adopted. It had not been pressed on him reluctantly, but had been acquiesced in by the unanimous and consentient voice of the House. Was it then fair conduct to be observed towards any member of that House? Was it fair towards the House of Commons itself—that they should be represented as guilty of harsh, improper, and unparalleled conduct towards the mover of the accusation—or should he be held up to the public as impeding, what every one was more anxious than another, to investigate and bring to light? If they were to be tried for such an offence, it was only necessary for their acquittal, that their conduct should be fully known! There never was a case in which more fairness, or a greater desire to afford every assistance in the investigation of truth, manifested itself. It was no wonder, therefore, that his feelings were excited when he heard the conduct of their proceedings so arraigned. He could not forbear, however, referring to one proof of the approbation of the hon. gent. himself (Mr. Wardle) of the whole of the conduct of the cause. During the whole of the proceedings there had not been a single division. Not a single proposition had been insisted on by the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle), and in which he persevered, which had not been conceded to him, or in the negative to which he had not acquiesced, by waving a decision upon it. The noble lord would not take it amiss that he (Mr. Perceval) declared his conviction, if there was a member of that House who would not acquiesce in any thing of which he did not approve, without pressing the question to the only means by which its merits could be properly decided on, the noble lord was that person. In addition to the feeling which naturally attended an adherence to what a man thought right, the noble lord would here have had the peculiar pleasure of holding up his boasted minority, however small, to the applause and admiration of the country—a gratification of which he would not willingly have deprived himself, had a favourable opportunity presented itself. The noble lord had also complained that things were not allowed to take their natural course, but that the business had been pressed forward with unbecoming rapidity. He did not recollect any instance of this kind. It was but fair that in so momentous charges, no delay should take place, but the hon. gent. himself could not have forgotten that on one occasion, when one day seemed more convenient to the hon. mover than another, the more remote day, because the more convenient to him, was fixed on. As to the charge of infamy attaching to one party or another,—all that was meant, or had been said, was, not that infamy must attach either to the hon. gent. or to the royal personage; but that, if the accusations were false, and a conspiracy should be found to exist, infamy would attach to those who had been the cause of stigmatizing his royal highness; and if the gentlemen, who brought forward the accusations, should be found to have too easily lent themselves to an unprincipled conspiracy, that they would not, by their conduct, have added to their own credit. [He afterwards spoke as follows, in answer to the last part, above-quoted, of Lord Folkestone's speech.]

The noble lord, however, went too far in stating that there were various instances in which the investigation had been obstructed in this case. He (Mr. Perceval) should not put it to his everlasting recollection, but he put it to his candour, to say what impression such a statement was calculated to make in the public mind? What then would be said, not that there might be charges, which if gone into might implicate the character of the royal person alluded to; but that there was something which prevented the sifting the charges to the bottom, and that many others could be adduced if required. Would it not be equally fair and candid to suppose, as the hon. mover must have felt, that the investigation into some of the charges at least did not support him in his original statement,

that those which remained unopened were of this description, and would be found equally defective? He submitted to the noble lord, if it would not be better before moving for a Select Committee, similar to that which had already been appointed, to try what the summons of the House would do, and if he himself could not in the mean time procure inspection of the papers. He was sorry to have delayed the House, but it was impossible for him to have remained silent after what had fallen from the noble lord.

Mr. ADAM said, that it was customary in the House to give to the different members the character which belonged to them : to a baronet the appellation of "the worthy baronet"—to a member of the learned profession that of "the learned gent.," and to the unprofessional members of the House that of "the hon. gent.," It was most irregular and unjust to use any descriptive epithet but such as he had mentioned. He complained therefore, in the strongest manner, of the term "*professed adviser* of the Duke of York," used towards himself by the noble lord. If the noble lord had said, that to the suggestion of "a learned gent." the line of conduct adopted by the House was owing, he should have had no observation to make; but when it was to go forth to the public that he, a member of Parliament, acted in a parliamentary proceeding as the *professed adviser* of the Duke of York, he had reason to complain of such an expression, and endeavour if possible to counteract its tendency. He begged the House would excuse his calling their attention to a subject wholly personal; he owned he was actuated by the most serious feelings on this subject. He was anxious in the most solemn manner to repel the imputation which that appellation might cause.—He knew how unpleasant it was to the House to listen to personal observations, but it was important to him that he, whose life had been passed in the discharge of a variety of public duties, should endeavour to preserve the character which he trusted he had acquired without touch or stain. He was not aware that on any occasion he had failed in the discharge of the various obligations which had from time been imposed upon him; whether during his parliamentary life of above twenty-five years, or in the private concerns of his family, exposed as he had been to increasing pressure, to the *res angustæ domi*; by which, however, he had never been tempted to deviate from the strict line of political or moral integrity. Although the hon. gent. by whom those charges were originated had intimated that the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate them would accord with his opinion, he had not thought proper to move for such a committee. An hon. gent. opposite had suggested proceeding by a parliamentary commission; with those two exceptions, he did not recollect a dissenting voice against the course ultimately adopted by the House. He appealed to the House whether there had been the least interruption to the most free and unrestrained inquiry. With respect to himself, he was in the judgment of the House, whether he had ever said or done any thing that gave a colour to the appellation of "*professed adviser* of the Duke of York." He hoped that the country would be satisfied that this matter which had been introduced publicly, had been conducted openly, and in a manner that was in the highest degree honourable to the House of Commons.

Mr. CALCRAFT blamed the noble lord for the censure which he had chosen to pass on the House, and for the assumption which he had chosen to make in stating that his hon. friend, in the charge which he had brought forward, had been supported by himself alone. Had that hon. gent. been so deserted as his noble friend described him to be, *he should not have wanted his aid*; but having on a former occasion, upon an inquiry into the conduct of the Medical Board, witnessed that hon. gent.'s ability, he should have thought it highly indelicate had he thrust himself into his councils *unasked, and uncalled for*. That hon. gent. had evinced the utmost manliness and delicacy in standing on the ground on which he had chosen to stand, single and unsupported. He had rested his character on the event, and the event would justify him; but it was not becoming any member to *arrogate to himself* peculiar praise on this occasion. The noble lord ought to give credit to others for acting on principles similar to those on which he had himself acted. With respect to the noble lord's panegyric, he thought he had *read it in some publication*; if not, perhaps *he might yet do so*. He could not however but be of opinion, that it would have proceeded with more propriety from any other lips than his own."

This is a debate full of interest. We will go backwards in our re-

marks, because Mr. Calcraft's charge against Lord Folkestone is of a sort to demand immediate comment. What *arrogance* did his lordship discover? How did he pronounce a panygeric on himself, in stating, that, until within a few days, Mr. Wardle had received no assistance from any member out of the 658, and that all he had now received, *out of doors* (for such was the manifest meaning), was what little he, Lord Folkestone, had been able to give him? Was it not the well-known *truth*, and was it not necessary to state that truth, in a manner that it might be imprinted upon the minds of the injured and insulted people? That it was *out of doors* that his lordship meant is certain, because he says, that Mr. Wardle has had no "*agent*" to assist him; and then he goes on to say, that Mr. Wardle has not had the assistance of "the services of a *Lowten*, or a *Wilkinson*, to arrange his documents, and to marshal his witnesses."

It is true, notoriously true, and is universally seen and acknowledged, that, since Sir Francis Burdett was disabled by the gout from attending the House, Lord Folkestone has been the only man, who has actually appeared as an *assistant* of Mr. Wardle.

As to the panegyric that Mr. Calcraft has read, or expects to read, upon the noble lord, *in some publication*, he may be disappointed, for the conduct of his lordship needs none: nor is there any pen that can do justice to the subject. Mr. Calcraft was safe, here, in one respect; for there was no fear of *retaliation* on the part of his lordship.

One thing, respecting Lord Folkestone, however, I must state, and that is, when the late ministry (under whom Mr. Calcraft had a fat post) came into power, they offered his lordship a place of fifteen hundred pounds a year, of which he declined to accept; though, it will be remembered by most men acquainted with politics, that he all along, except upon particular occasions, continued to support them. There is no man, who knows my Lord Folkestone; who is acquainted with that steady adherence to truth and to principle which is innate in him, and with that modesty which is so prominent a part of his character, with his fidelity to his word and to his friends; there is no man, who is at all acquainted with his character, who will ever believe, that he has, upon this occasion, acted from any other motive than that of a conviction that his duty required him to do what he has done.

Oh, oh! it seems, then, that there were many members ready and willing to assist Mr. Wardle *from the first*, had they not been convinced, that so great were his own individual powers, he wanted no assistance; and even *Mr. Calcraft himself*, would have tendered the use of *his* abilities, had he not entertained this conviction. Come, this is some comfort. But, if I mistake not, at the first opening of the business, there was only Sir Francis Burdett (who seconded Mr. Wardle's motion) and my Lord Folkestone, from whom Mr. Wardle received even the smallest degree of countenance. And when, at a later period, the charge about Captain Maling, owing to a mere error in words, *appeared to have failed*; at this period, if I mistake not, the party, to which Mr. Calcraft belongs, did, in a most formal and solemn manner, *disclaim all connection with Mr. Wardle*, with respect to these charges, and that one of that party did distinctly say, that he had sent a message to him *not to bring forward the charges*, adding, that he had been *imposed upon* by the actors in a *foul conspiracy* against the Duke. That this was the case the public well knows; and, therefore, this declaration, that there were many members

ready and willing to assist him, had they not been convinced that his own abilities rendered their assistance unnecessary, comes a little too late in point of fact, and a little too soon in point of time; because the formal and solemn disclaimer is still fresh in the memory of every man, who is not an idiot.

Now, as to the phrase, which appears to have given so much offence to Mr. Adam, Lord Folkestone says, that he by no means meant it in the way of reproach; and, I must think, that the reader will agree with me, that, when Mr. Adam's first speech upon the subject is recollected; when it is recollected, what he said about the 20 years that the pecuniary affairs of the Duke had been in his hands, and about the unreserved communication between them; when it is recollected, that he then took upon himself to say, that the charges would prove unfounded; when it is recollected, that he has since held (as he acknowledges) conferences and consultations with the Duke and Colonel Gordon and Mr. Perceval, relative to matters connected with the inquiry; that he has had a witness, if not witnesses, in favour of the Duke, sent to him, who put questions to them, previous to their coming to be examined by the House; that (as he acknowledges) he was apprized of similar previous examinations going on at Mr. Lowten's office; and, finally, that he was consulted and did advise relative to the time and manner of producing the circumstance of the pretended forgery: when all this is recollected, was there any thing unjust, any thing harsh, any thing overstrained, in Lord Folkestone's calling Mr. Adam the "*professed* adviser of the Duke of York?" Besides, observe the *occasion* on which the phrase was used. It was in reference to the *mode* of inquiry, and bore, upon the face of it, a proof, that it was not meant to convey to the world an idea, that Mr. Adam had, while a member of the House, while a *judge* in the case, acted, at the same time, as the *advocate* of the Duke. There was nothing in the words to convey such a meaning; and, therefore, it does seem strange to me, that Mr. Adam should have felt so sore upon the subject.

I shall, hereafter, endeavour to give a fair view of *Mr. Adam's case*, who, at present, certainly does not stand so well with the public as I could most sincerely wish; and I cannot refrain from observing now, that, we must be involved with such people, by slow degrees, as Mr. Adam appears to have been; we must be exposed to the solicitations of the all powerful; we must experience their importunities and feel the weight of influence, pressing from so many quarters, before we can say, that we should not have acted as Mr. Adam has acted. All that he says, respecting his general character and conduct, is, I am convinced, perfectly true. It was *integrity*, and not *sycophancy*, that recommended Mr. Adam to the selection of the Duke of York, because the repair of dilapidated affairs wanted integrity; but, it does not follow, that, because I choose such a man to husband my means, on the one hand, I should not profligately waste them on the other; or, that I should be at all the more scrupulous in the way of providing for my pleasures.

But, it is now time to come to the *complaint* contained in Lord Folkestone's speech.

And, is it not true, that the *mode of proceeding*, pointed out by Mr. Wardle, the maker of the charges, was *not* adopted? Is it not true, that this is *quite novel* in the history of parliament? Was not the mode Mr. Wardle proposed overruled? Did not the House refuse him that mode, which he wished to be adopted? Is not all this well known to the people,

and ought not the people to hold it in everlasting remembrance? Mr. Wardle, we are told by Mr. Perceval, *did not object to the setting aside of his proposed mode of inquiry; there was no division of the House upon the question.* Very true; but, did not Mr. Wardle clearly see, what must have been the result of such an objection, or such a division? As it *has happened*, the mode which has been adopted is more advantageous to the public, than the mode proposed by Mr. Wardle would have been; and, I must confess, that, morally certain that what has come out, would come out, I was glad to see the examination at bar determined on. But, still, Mr. Wardle's mode *was overruled*; and this being something, as Lord Folkestone says, unprecedented in the history of the parliament, it was, and is, just ground of complaint, on the part of Mr. Wardle, who, it cannot be denied, did meet, at the very outset, with a hostile reception. What other construction can possibly be put upon the outcry about "*a jacobin conspiracy*," and "*the libellousness of the press?*" Mr. Wardle comes and says; "*I accuse the Duke of York of this and of that.*" What is the answer? why, that there has long existed a conspiracy, of which the public writers form a part, to write and talk down the Duke of York, the army, the church, and the monarchical branch of the constitution. This was the answer to Mr. Wardle, from the servants of the King and their supporters; and, from the other side, in a few days after, it was flatly stated, that Mr. Wardle had been *imposed upon by a foul conspiracy.* Was not this giving him a hostile reception?

Then, as to *pushing him on*; and leaving no time for search, or for reflection; is it not fresh in the recollection of the public; is it not written in the reports of the debates, that he was pushed on? And that, when Mr. Wardle complained of this, and wished for a day or two to look about him and to think, was it not represented as unjust, and was he not asked: "*Is it to be endured, that charges like these shall hang, from day to day, suspended over the head of a son of the crown?*" When Lord Folkestone, upon one occasion, stated the exhausted condition of Mr. Wardle himself, was he not silenced by the cry of "*Go on, go on?*" To say, as Mr. Perceval does, in answer to Lord Folkestone, that there have been no *divisions* in the House, upon any of these points; good Lord! what is it! what does that circumstance make against the fact?

The other complaint of Lord Folkestone is, that Mr. Wardle had proceeded with the threat of *infamy* contingently attached to him, and that this threat had neither been withdrawn nor modified up to the present moment.

In answer to this Mr. Perceval says, that: "*All that was meant, or had been said, was, not that infamy must attach either to Mr. Wardle or the Duke; but that, if the accusation were false, and a conspiracy should be found to exist, infamy would attach to the conspirators, and that if the gentlemen who brought forward the accusations, should be found to have too easily lent themselves to an unprincipled conspiracy, they would not, by their conduct, have added to their own credit.*"

Oh, dear me! Lack-a-day! Here are an abundance of very nice qualifications, not one word of which was to be seen, in *any one* of the reports of the famous debate, the ever-memorable debate, the everlastingly-to-be-esteemed and preserved debate, of Friday the 27th day of January in the year 1809. In the report of that debate, there appeared these words, as uttered by Mr. Canning, the King's secretary of state for foreign affairs: "*The hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) surely must be aware,*

“ that having undertaken the *responsible* task of submitting to a British House of Commons such a serious accusation, whatever may be the result of its deliberation ; in *whatever view* the House shall consider the transactions which he has disclosed, whether they be refuted or substantiated, *infamy* must attach *somewhere*, either upon the ACCUSED or the ACCUSER.”

These were the words, and these words, Lord Folkestone now, in the face of the House, after Mr. Perceval's speech, asserts to have been used, and no one contradicts him ; therefore, we must conclude, that the reports of the several newspapers, which all agree as to these words in particular, were correct. That, by ACCUSER, Mr. Canning *might* mean the “ conspiracy ” is certain ; but, taking in the former part, the “ *responsible* ” part of the sentence, there is room to believe that he might, and did, mean Mr. Wardle ; and, by the ACCUSED, it is utterly impossible, that he could mean any other person than the Duke of York.

Mr. Perceval, when, in the close of this part of his speech, he complains of Lord Folkestone's saying, that the inquiry had manifestly suffered from the fear of people capable of giving information, that their doing so might *offend the government* ; when Mr. Perceval thus complains, and says, that such a statement is calculated to create unfounded *suspensions* in the country, he appears to have forgotten, that his lordship has spoken of a *fact* ; that he had stated, that he himself had applied to a person to give up certain papers ; that this person was unwilling to give them up ; “ that the jet of his objection was, that, *as the defence of the Duke had been taken up as a ministerial measure*, he was apprehensive that he would incur their displeasure, and the displeasure of those immediately under them, which would probably *operate to the ruin of himself and family.* ” To this his lordship added : I do assure the House, that this is not the only instance where similar apprehensions have prevented persons in possession of strong testimony, from coming forward, *particularly officers in the army*, and where information was withheld from the manner in which the thing had *been taken up by the King's servants in that House.* ” And, is not this very natural ? Was there any need of the positive fact, stated by Lord Folkestone, to make the country believe this ? Is there one man amongst us, who would not have anticipated what Lord Folkestone expressed ? When the ministers and their friends began, when they received the charges, with denouncing as *conspirators* all those who had wrote and talked against the Duke of York, was it not to be expected, that all those persons, who were, in any way, dependent upon the government, would, if they possessed information upon the subject, take special care not to let it be known ? And would not this, in a particular manner, apply to officers in the army, whose *sole* means of preserving their rank in life, and even of obtaining bread, depended upon the ministry, including that very person against whom the charges were preferred ? A conclusion so obvious could have escaped no man with unaddled brains in his head.

It is useless to endeavour to stop the spreading of this way of thinking. It has, long ago, reached every soul in the country. The mind of the country is completely settled as to this point ; and, indeed, upon the whole of the proceeding ; all that is now necessary to be done being to place the facts upon record, in a way that they may be with facility referred to.

The diversions, in Spain and Portugal, will be of little avail. There is nobody that cares, or need care, a straw about them. The interesting scene is *at home*, where the taxes are laid and collected. To this scene the people's eyes, after twenty-four years of blindness, are, at last, open; and, though it is possible, that they may be induced to wink for a while, all the arts in the world will never be able to blind them again.

This is good. It is a great thing done. It is a firm step gained in the way of national restoration; and, for this great good, we have to thank, and the whole of the uncorrupt part of the nation most heartily do thank, Mr. WARDLE.

Botley, Thursday, 23rd Feb. 1809.

DUKE OF YORK.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, March, 1809.*)

BEFORE I proceed with my Analysis of the cases, I shall offer some observations upon the *Letter* with which the Duke of York has treated the House of Commons and the public; but, previous even to those observations I feel myself called upon to notice the re-examination of *Miss Taylor*, who, as the reader will recollect, was a principal witness in the case of French and Sandon's levy, and whose testimony, he will also recollect, remained unshaken, up to that part inclusive, which was wrought into the analysis of the case, in my last number.

This re-examination appears to have arisen from a man of the name of *Frederick Schmidt*, or Smith, having given information to some one, that Miss Taylor's father was, at one time, called *Chance*; and, from a discovery, which had been made, that she was not a legitimate child; that her father and mother were not married. I shall now give this re-examination as I find it reported, including the intervening observations of the several members who spoke upon it.

Mr. BRADSHAW. Do you recollect your paternal grandfather?—I do not, he was dead before I was born.

Might not your father have taken the name of CHANCE without your knowledge, and from pecuniary embarrassments?—How then should I know it?

Mr. PERCEVAL. Is your father alive?—He is.

Has not your mother been confined under an execution for debt in the Fleet prison?—[The witness, much agitated, drew back from the bar, with these expressions—“*My mother's misfortunes have nothing to do with the object of the present inquiry.*”]

Has not your mother been in custody for debt?

Witness. I appeal to the protection of the Chair.

Mr. WHARTON. “It is my duty to call upon you for an answer to the last question.”

After some moments the witness, in tears, replied—*Yes.*

How long was she confined?—Two years.

The witness was ordered to withdraw.

Mr. PERCEVAL stated that gentlemen opposite, when ready to depreciate his mode of examination, appeared to forget that the witness had represented her-

self, in her former examination, as *the legitimate daughter of married parents*, although it was now clear, by the imprisonment of her mother, that she never was married to the father of Miss Taylor.

Mr. W. SMITH did dislike the tenour of the examination which was followed by the opposite side. It had in the previous part a tendency to cast imputations upon the character of the witness herself; but, *that having failed, her veracity was to be questioned*, because she had the misfortune to be the offspring of an illicit connection. Her delicacy in endeavouring to conceal that circumstance, in his opinion, instead of weakening, strengthened her yet unshaken claims to credit.

Mr. WHITBREAD considered the question for the decision of the Committee was not, whether Miss Taylor's birth was respectable, but whether her testimony was credible? Besides, he believed the Chancellor of the Exchequer *had assumed more than the evidence would justify*, when he asserted that Miss Taylor had represented herself to the Committee as the daughter of *married parents*.— [Her former evidence was then read, and it appeared that *no such statement was made by her.*]

Sir JOHN SEBRIGHT declared, that the impression which the first answer of the witness, on her former examination, namely, that she was the *daughter of a gentleman*, made on his mind, was, that she was an illegitimate child.

Mr. W. WYNNE said, it was not to be endured, that because, from an amiable reluctance, the explanation of the witness did not run before decorum and sensibility, that, therefore, a suspicion was to be entertained of her veracity.

Mr. BARHAM. Really this is an attempt to discredit a correct witness, not upon her own testimony, but upon the errors of her parents.

Frederick Schmidt, upon being examined and cross-examined, gave no testimony, that Miss Taylor ever knew that her father went, upon any occasion, by the name of Chance; so that, there was nothing now came out, which did not tend to confirm, rather than to weaken, her former claims to credibility. In her former evidence, she did *not say* that she was a legitimate child; she did *not say*, that her father and mother were married; but, suppose she had said so; good God! would that have impeached her general veracity? Because she, whose very bread depended so much upon the character of her connections; who had a sister keeping a boarding-school, in partnership with herself; who had two brothers in the naval, and three in the military service, all bearing commissions; was her general veracity to be impeached, because she did not state, because she disguised, a fact not at all connected with the matter upon which she was examined, and a fact, the proclaiming of which must, at once, greatly injure, not only herself, but her father, mother, sister, and brothers?

It is but justice to the House of Commons to say, that they do appear to have received, with great applause, the sentiments of Mr. Smith, Mr. Whitbread, Sir J. Sebright, Mr. Wynne, and Mr. Barham; and, in this respect, at least, the voice of the country is decidedly with that of the House. There is but one sentiment upon this subject. The treatment of Miss Taylor is in the mouth of every person, who talks upon matters connected with the inquiry. The press, with the sole exception, I believe, of the *Nabobs' Gazette*, has been unanimous in endeavours to do her justice; and, I do hope, that, when the affair is all over, if she shall still be found to have adhered to the truth, the public will consider the ruin, to which she has been exposed, and will yield her other protection than that which is given by words; for, as far as I am able to judge, an object more worthy of compassion and of support never presented itself to the people of this kingdom, who, whatever faults they may have, do

not number amongst them that of a want of compassion, or of justice towards the injured.

The Letter of the Duke of York, to the House of Commons, we must now insert. It is a document of a very curious nature, and the proceedings upon it must, and will, be, in the end, of the greatest consequence to the country.

“ To the Speaker of the House of Commons.

“ Horse Guards, February 23, 1809.

“ Sir,—I have waited with the greatest anxiety until the Committee appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into my conduct, as Commander-in-Chief of his Majesty’s Army, had closed its examinations, and I now hope that it will not be deemed improper to address this letter, through you, to the House of Commons.

“ I observe with the deepest concern, that in the course of this inquiry, my name has been coupled with transactions *the most criminal and disgraceful*, and I must ever regret and lament, that a connection should ever have existed, which has thus exposed my character and honour to public animadversion.

“ With respect to my alleged offences, connected with the discharge of my official duties, I do, in the most solemn manner, upon my honour, as a prince, distinctly assert my innocence, not only by denying all corrupt participation in any of the *infamous* transactions which have appeared in evidence at the bar of the House of Commons, or any connivance at their existence, but also the *slightest knowledge or suspicion* that they existed at all.

“ My consciousness of innocence leads me *confidently* to hope, that the House of Commons will not, upon *such* evidence as they have heard, adopt *any proceeding prejudicial to my honour and character*; but if, on *such* testimony as has been adduced against me, the House of Commons *can* think my innocence *questionable*, I claim of their justice, that I shall not be condemned *without trial*, or be deprived of the benefit and protection which is afforded to every British subject, by *those sanctions* under which alone evidence is received in the ordinary administration of the law.

“ I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

“ FREDERICK.”

Now, I will venture to assert, that, of the fourteen millions of people, of which this nation consists, there is not one, except those who are the advisers of the Duke of York, who would have expected, under such circumstances, such a letter from him. It really would appear, that he looks upon the evidence that has been given against him as being discredited, not only by the House, but by the country; and, that his simple denial, upon his “*honour, as a prince,*” is quite sufficient to do away the effect of all that has passed in the House of Commons, within the last interesting month. Here we have a most striking instance of the blinding effects of long-enjoyed power, and long-continued flattery. A person, so circumstanced, does not see with the eyes, or hear with the ears, of men whom no one has an interest in deceiving. Blessed advisers he must have, who, while such a mass of positive and corroborated and strongly presumptive evidence lay against him, took up his pen to give it a simple negation, upon his bare word; who, in the face of his two letters, wherein Clavering’s application is mentioned, and wherein, in consequence of a request of Mrs Clarke, it is stated that he will endeavour to procure O’Meara an opportunity of preaching before royalty; who, in the face of these letters, tells the House of Commons, that he never had “*the slightest knowledge or suspicion,*” that these corruptions existed at all. Blessed advisers that man must have, especially after the

inquiry into the origin of the short note respecting Tonym's promotion, and which note does, at last, set at defiance all the attempts to make it out "a forgery." Blessed advisers, to say, in the face of all this, that he never had even a *suspicion* that such things existed; and to appear *confident*, that, in consequence of this bare assertion, upon "the *honour* of a *prince*," the House of Commons should, with their month's examinations of witnesses before them, stop short, in a moment; or, at least, that they should come to no decision, upon that evidence, prejudicial to his honour and character! Blessed advisers that man must have!

Why, upon reading this assertion, as opposed to the evidence taken at the bar of the House, the observation that starts from every mouth, is this: "Oh! then, why was there *any inquiry at all*? If the Duke's "assertion, upon his *honour* as a *prince*, be sufficient to knock down all "this evidence, why not have appealed to that word, when Mr. Wardle "brought forward his charges? And why not have brought the Duke's "denial; the Duke's "*distinct* assertion," to set against Mr. Wardle "and his charges, and thereupon voted the charges to be false and "malicious, and the work of a jacobinical conspiracy against the 'illustrious House of Brunswick?'"

But, it has been contended, that there is nothing, in this letter, trenching upon the *privileges* of the House; no attempt to deter them from proceeding, in their own way, with respect to the charges and evidence against the Duke. Mr. Whitbread, on the day after the letter had been read to the House, spoke of it as an attack upon its *privileges*, and observed, that the Duke might as well have written a letter to the House *before any proceedings had taken place*, asserting his innocence, and suggesting, that they ought not to proceed.

Mr. Perceval denied this, and said, that the Duke *merely* asserted his innocence, and *requested* that, should that innocence still be doubted, he might be allowed to go to trial, without any further *previous proceedings against him*; and that he (Mr. Perceval) saw nothing unconstitutional or improper in this.

No? Well said, Mr. Perceval! It may be "constitutional," for that is a very accommodating word; and, it may be "proper" too; but, if the letter has any meaning at all in it, it is this; that the House will *do wrong*, that they will be guilty of an act of injustice, if they take *any step* in the business, *prejudicial* to the Duke; and, that, at most, they ought to leave his conduct to be judged of by others than themselves. This, indeed, is admitted by Mr. Perceval; it cannot be denied; and, if this be not dictating to the House what they ought, or rather, what they ought not, to do, I know not the meaning of the word *dictate*. There may have been letters, sent, by accused persons, to the House of Commons; but, I defy Mr. Perceval to produce an instance of such a letter as this; a letter, expressing a "*confident hope*," that the House, who have taken evidence upon the case, will not, to the *prejudice* of the accused, proceed to any step, grounded upon that evidence.

Then, observe, the whole of the evidence, taken by the House, and many parts of which great numbers of the members have expressly declared to be unshaken; the whole of this evidence, in a lump, not excepting even that contained in his own letters and note, is branded as false by the party accused. He presumes, before the summing up has taken place in the House, to tell them how they ought to decide upon

the quality of the evidence; he, upon his bare word, and without pretending to possess the means of *proving* what he says, takes upon him to tell the House, that they ought to regard as a liar every person, who has given evidence against him.

Nay, he further presumes to say, that, if the House *can* believe the accusatory evidence; if they *can* think his innocence *questionable*; what then? What is then contingently pointed out to them? Why, to leave him to be tried elsewhere; and, in the meanwhile, not to adopt *any* proceeding, prejudicial to his honour and character. Now, it will be recollected, that, in other cases of impeachment, the House have, the moment they found *cause* for impeachment, addressed the King to remove the accused persons from his councils and presence, and especially from any places of *trust*, or *command*, that they possessed at the time; all, or any one, of which, the Duke has now the modesty to "*confidently* hope," that they will not attempt to do, in this *his* particular case, notwithstanding all the evidence that they have before them; and this "*confident* hope" he expresses, too, at the same time, that he talks so fluently of the protection afforded to *every other* British subject.

That, upon this occasion, all possible delicacy towards *the King* should be shown, I am quite willing to allow. It is enough in all conscience for a father to know that such grounds of charge exist against his son, without being told any thing about them in a harsh manner. An address for removal from his *presence* for ever, or at all, would sound hard; but, from *employment* and *councils*, until a final decision take place, is what reason, is what the necessity of the case points out. Indeed, what must those advisers be, who would render even this necessary? Perhaps they will not. To *lay the evidence before the King* seems to be the *first* step; and then to wait to see, whether any further step be required.

One cannot, however, make these observations, without suffering to intrude the reflection of how dangerous it is to place members of the royal family in *responsible* situations. It is true, that, in the eye of the *law*, the Duke of York is no more than a *subject* of the King; but, let law, and even philosophy, say what they will, the practice will set their maxims and their principles at defiance.

Reader, has it not struck you as a question to be asked, How the Duke, who appears to be so full of that "*conscious innocence*," of which the Nabobs' Gazette speaks, came to think it necessary; how he, who so boldly asserts his innocence, and who seems to hold the evidence against him in such hearty contempt; how he came to think it at all necessary to tell the House, that he hoped they would not adopt any proceeding *prejudicial to his honour*? Why should he suppose they would? How came such a thought into that head of his? It seems to me, that if I had been in his place, and conscious of innocence and contemning the evidence against me, I should have let my judges alone to acquit me, in their own good time and manner. If, indeed, I have *evidence* on my side to produce; then, I say, "*Wait; hear me too, before you decide*;" but, the Duke has produced all his evidence. A whole levy, an army, of lawyers and attorneys have been at work for him, during the whole of the proceedings, which, at last, closed with the examination of General Officers (*members of the House, too*), as to his talents and industry in the *disciplining* of the army. He does not ask to be *heard*; he does not even pretend that he has any thing to produce in his defence; he merely brands all the evidence against him as falsehoods, and, as the COURIER

(which has acted a most manly part in these times) well observes, "desires complete acquittal, without producing any evidence other than mere assertion."

Well, but how came he to think an expression of his "confident hope" necessary? It is not, I think, too much to presume, that the answer to this question must be to this amount, namely, *that he thought it probable, at the least, that the House looked upon the evidence in a light different from that, in which he viewed it*; for, unless he thus thought, it is evident, that he would not have written a letter, containing words expressive of such a hope; and, if this be our conclusion, it necessarily follows, that we must believe, that the letter was intended to induce the House to come over to his way of thinking, or to the opinion expressed by him, relative to that evidence. The main point for the reader to consider here, however, is, how far this running before his judges, in their decision upon the evidence, *corresponds* with that solemn assertion of "innocence," contained in the letter. This is the point for the public to consider. The inquiry had been gone through. Every thing that could be produced, on the side of the accused, had been produced. There had been no want of advisers, or of assistants, of any sort, or of any size. The whole case was before the House, and, owing to the Duke's friends, before the public also. It was, it appears to me, the part of "conscious innocence" to wait, with impatience, no doubt; but with confidence, for the decision; and not to run before the judges with a request, that they would come to no decision at all, or at least, to no other decision than that of an acquittal. This is not the part usually acted by "conscious innocence."

Extraordinary as the whole of the letter is, the close has still so much of this quality in it, as to make it a conspicuous object even in such a group of extraordinary propositions. The Duke claims of the justice of the House, that he shall not be condemned without a trial, or be "deprived of the benefit and protection which is [are he means] "afforded to every British subject, by those sanctions, under which alone, "evidence is received in the ordinary administration of law."

By "those sanctions," he means oaths, I suppose; and then, the first observation to make is, that the evidence in his favour, as well as that against him, has not been taken upon oath.

The House of Commons is in the habit of taking evidence in this way, and in deciding upon it too; and, there appears to be no sound reason, why the Duke of York should be exempted from the effect of its power in this respect.

But, that which is most striking here, is, that the mode which has been adopted, in the inquiry, is the very mode pointed out by his friends, in opposition to the mode pointed out by Mr. Wardle, who, to his immortal honour, brought forward the charges, and who, after having preferred the charges, moved for the appointment of a committee to inquire into them, and, before a committee, so appointed, the witnesses would have been examined upon oath. Mr. ADAM opposed this, and conjured the House not to appoint a committee of this sort, but to have the inquiry open at the bar. He said (see page 37 of this vol.) that, "in justice to its own privileges, and to the dignified character of the illustrious personage, "the House ought not to surrender its inquisitorial powers, nor delegate "to any Select or Secret Committee that inquiry, which, to be efficient,

“ must be public, and for the publicity of which there was no person more anxious than the Duke of York.”

Mr. WILBERFORCE wished for a committee, capable of examining the witnesses upon oath.

Mr. PERCEVAL was for an inquiry at the bar of the House; and he said (see page 38), that “ some consideration ought to be extended to the wish of his royal highness. That wish, he could positively state, was that the investigation should be the most complete and public. (*Hear! hear! hear!*) There was nothing that his royal highness so particularly deprecated as any secret or close discussion of those charges. Standing, as that illustrious personage did, on the fairness of his character, and the fulness of the evidence which he was enabled to produce, he was desirous of being acquitted by the most public investigation.”

Lord FOLKESTONE wished for a select committee, seeing how difficult a matter it was to carry on a fair inquiry at the bar of the House.

Mr. CANNING was for the examination at the bar; he said that the history of parliament was replete with precedents for it; and, he called it “ a species of trial which united earliness with publicity.”

Thus, was this mode of inquiry, upon the suggestion of Mr. Adam, the twenty years gratuitous adviser of the Duke, adopted, in opposition to the course pointed out and moved for by Mr. Wardle; and, the Chancellor of the Exchequer states positively, that it is *this mode of inquiry, that the Duke of York wishes for*.—Well, he has had his wish. The inquiry is over. It has taken place. It is closed. And, what does he now, in his own name, and under his own hand, tell this same House of Commons? Why, that he has, thus far, been “ deprived;” aye, “ deprived,” of what Mr. Wardle and Mr. Wilberforce and Lord Folkestone, contrary to his wishes, expressed by Mr. Perceval, wanted him to have; and, upon the ground of this deprivation, amongst other grounds, he desires the House not to adopt any proceeding *prejudicial to his honour*; though he appears to have no sort of objection to their *acquitting* him. This, I think, does very far surpass every thing of the sort that I ever heard of in all my life. I have seen many remarkable instances of the presumption of power; but any thing like this, or nearly approaching a resemblance to it, I never before witnessed.

The Duke's wish, the wish of the accused, prevailed over that of the accuser. The accused has had the mode of trial which he chose; and now the trial is over, he seems to think it no trial at all, unless the decision shall be that of *acquittal*. Upon evidence, not taken upon oath, he is willing to be *acquitted*; but, he is not willing to be *condemned* without “ a trial.” Why, Mr. Canning called this a species of *trial*; but it was not called a trial for acquittal only.—Let us look upon the thing on the other side. Suppose the House had found no evidence in support of the charges; would they not instantly have voted the charges false and groundless, and accused the accusers of infamous calumny? To be sure they would; and, are we to be told, that they ought not now to condemn, or censure; that they ought not now to adopt proceedings *prejudicial to the honour of the accused*, upon the evidence received in the same way? If they were *now* to acquit the Duke, and any one of us were to tell them that they had done wrong, would they not send us to Newgate for a gross breach of their privileges? Oh, God! it makes one's flesh creep upon one's bones.

They may acquit, but they cannot condemn. A strange court, indeed, this! Mr. Canning talked of the House in its *judicial* capacity; but he certainly had no idea of this sort. Mr. Perceval talked of *acquittal*, or of *condemnation*; Mr. Canning again talked of *infamy* upon the head of the *accused* or the *accuser*, as the necessary result of the inquiry; but, if we adopt the doctrine of the Duke's letter, the only person in danger of infamy was the *accuser*.

People of England, you who pay the taxes, and you who are to fight for your country, have your eyes steadily fixed upon what is now doing in the House of Commons.

Seeing that, at the present moment, the *whole of the case*, of the Duke of York, is fresh in the public mind, I think it will be best to defer a continuation of my analysis of the separate cases, till we have taken time to examine some very important matter, that presses forward for observation, connected with what appears to be, by some, regarded as a *set-off* to the charges and evidence.

During the examinations, Colonel Gordon was frequently asked questions touching the excellence of the Duke's regulations as to promotions, and so forth; and as to the good effect, which they were calculated to have upon the discipline and efficiency of the army. The Colonel's answers were, all through, calculated to produce a great idea of the good which had been done, owing to the Duke of York being Commander-in-Chief.

When the whole of the examinations, at all *relating to the charges*, had been gone through, recourse was had to the evidence of general officers, who were members of the House, in order to show how much benefit the army had derived from the chief-commandership of the Duke of York.

Now, before we enter upon this part of the interesting scene, let us ask, *why* this sort of evidence? why evidence as to the discipline and state of the army was called for, in a case, where the charges were of *corruption*? If a shepherd be tried for sheep-stealing, is evidence ever brought respecting the healthy and excellent state of the flock? The fact about the *stealing* is the only thing to be inquired into in such a case. It has always a bad look to see an accused person, or the advocates of an accused person, *fly off* from the point at issue. Meet that point first. Get a decision upon that; and then urge your claims upon other accounts. When you accuse any one of being a *liar*, and he answers, "I am no *thief*," all the hearers know very well what to conclude as to the charge of his being a liar.

Now for this famous evidence, the task of bringing out which was undertaken by Mr. CHARLES YORKE. General NORTON was asked, whether "the army had been improved, or not, since the Duke of York had had the chief command;" to which he answered, "I think the discipline was as good before the Duke of York had the command." Being asked nearly the same question again, he answers: "I should suppose it may have improved. Still, I think, the troops were as good in General Wolfe's time."

Sir JAMES PULTENEY said, that "the condition of the army had improved; that the discipline had improved; that the facility of manœuvring had been greatly improved, since the Duke of York took the command."

Sir ARTHUR WELLESLEY corroborated the evidence of Sir James Pul-teney, and added this very striking part of his statement: "I know that his royal highness has given general satisfaction in the promotion of officers, and I have never found that he departed from any rule laid down for a promotion in the army."

General FITZPATRICK said, that the good which the army had derived from the command of his royal highness was so great, as well as so notorious, that any appeal, upon the subject, to general officers, was unnecessary.

Now, first as to *discipline*, where have we, in the experience, any proof of such improvements? Discipline, like every thing else, ought to be estimated by the *effects* which we see it produce.

Dunkirk, the Helder, Ferrol, Buenos Ayres, Cintra, Galicia, &c. &c. ! Aye, very true ! There *may* have been *no fault* in either case ; but, still, the excellence of armies is proved by their victories, and by their victories *only*. Why have we so high an opinion of our fleet ? *Only* because it is so constantly victorious. Read the account below of the actions of Lord Cochrane.* Do we hear of such things in our army ? Not that I would cast a reflection upon the officers of the army, many of whom are, doubtless, made of as good stuff as Lord Cochrane, and had they had his naval education, would have been doing what he is doing ; but, what I say is this, that we must judge of the excellence of an army as we do of the excellence of a fleet, and that is *by its deeds*. And this, I beg the reader to observe, was the principle, upon which Sir Arthur Wellesley first met the charges against the Duke. He then said, that the victory of Vimeira was owing to the excellent state of the army, and that the House in thanking him for that victory, was in fact, though indirectly, thanking the Duke of York also. Now, then, pray let the argument be as good on the one side as it is on the other. If the Duke is to be thanked for the victories, pray let him have his share of the blame for the defeats. Sir Arthur does not appear to have been aware, that he had got hold of a two-edged argument ; but, it does not follow that no one else should perceive it.

Discipline, in the view of some people, seems to mean nothing more than the regulations respecting the movements upon parade, or at a field-day. The dressing to right and left ; the quick and slow step ; the locking-up and the opening of ranks ; the wheeling and facing and the tossing of the firelock ; the queuing of hair and the polishing of arms

* The GERONA Gazette of Jan. 4, in inserting a letter from his lordship to the Junta of that city, pays the following tribute to his conduct:

"This gallant Englishman has been entitled to the admiration and gratitude of this country, from the first moment of its political resurrection. His generosity in co-operating with our earliest efforts, the encouragement we received from the interest he took with the Commanders of the Balearic Islands to induce them to succour us with troops and ammunition, can never be erased from our recollection. The extraordinary services which we owe to his indefatigable activity, particularly this city and the adjacent coast, in protecting us from the attempts of the enemy, are too well known to be repeated here.—It is a sufficient eulogium upon his character to mention, that in the defence of the Castle of Trinidad, when the Spanish flag, hoisted on the wall, fell into the ditch, under a most dreadful fire from the enemy, his Lordship was the only person who, regardless of the shower of balls flying about him, descended into the ditch, returned with the flag, and happily succeeded in placing it where it was before."

and accoutrements. Why, these are the science of drill-sergeants, hundreds of whom there are, who would beat even the Duke of York at any branch of these important affairs, which are all forgotten the moment an army takes the field, and which serve merely to fill up the leisure hours of officers and soldiers, when they have no real military duty to perform. They are most of them very proper; but, they have nothing to do with what, in a comprehensive mind, is viewed as the *discipline* of an army, which consists in great and general regulations, relating to obedience, to the administration of justice, to the talents and experience of commanders, to the distribution of duty and of power, all which require much experience as well as much reflection, much solidity of head as well as much integrity of heart. To hear Sir James Pulteney, upon a question of *discipline*, talk of the putting six regiments together to *manœuvre*, is truly astonishing. This has nothing to do with the discipline of an army, any more than with the house in Gloucester-place.

But, even, in point of look, of mere parade look, and movement, I put it to any man, who can bring his mind back to what the army was 20 years ago, to say whether it has, even in this respect, improved. In the year 1789 I remember seeing the sixth regiment of foot, in New Brunswick, and I have never seen such a regiment since that time. I saw the 12th regiment of foot about the year 1785; they had no Austrian caps on, no black leggings, and no short faceless coats. They had the old grenadier caps and the old battalion hats; except on duty, they wore any coloured stockings, and any sort of buckles; their coats had good warm skirts to them, and they were not much of the tight and truss-looking sort. They were commanded by old Major Picton, who had, I believe, been a private in the regiment, in which the present General Picton was then a lieutenant of grenadiers. But with all this old-fashioned work about them, they were the finest regiment I ever saw in my life; and, during about a year that I knew them, I do not believe, that there were above two men punished at the halberts. Will any man persuade me, then, that such a regiment as the 12th was then, would not have been as efficient in the field as if they had been screwed up in tight Austrian jerkins? It must be allowed, that the very great augmentation of its numbers has rendered it impossible to keep the army what it formerly was, either in point of morals, or of the size of the men. This I am willing to allow; but, really, when, on the one hand, I see the poor dirty-looking things that now wear, after the German fashion, sashes twisted round them every day in the week; and, on the other hand, look back to the sergeants of 20 years ago, I am astonished to hear any one say that the army has *improved*. Still, I do allow, that it is quite impossible to have so large an army what the army was, and what it might be again if reduced to 30,000 men. I do not blame the Duke of York, because the army is not now what it then was; nor do I blame him because 12 or 15,000 officers are not so select as 2,000 officers were; but, I greatly blame his friends for endeavouring to make us believe, that the army formerly was bad, compared to what it is now, which I say is not the fact, and which, from the nature of things, cannot be the fact.—But, something has been said about the Duke having bettered the *condition* of the soldier. I have no wish to deny him a disposition to render the soldier's lot more comfortable, nor the merit of having taken a proper part in any measure of that sort; but, I believe, no one will deny, that the augmentation of pay was absolutely necessary to the bare existence of the

men ; the *time* when the augmentation took place must, too, not be forgotten ; and, at any rate, the *means* came out of the pocket of the public and not of the Duke of York. Still, however, I do not wish to withhold from him any part of the praise due to this consideration for the then wretched state of the soldier ; but, I must insist, and I am pretty sure, that the public will be of my opinion, that let who would have been the chief commander of the army, the pay, at the time referred to, must have been augmented, or that starvation, absolute starvation, would have driven the men from the ranks. Then, again, who will venture to assert, or to suppose, that what has been done for the comfort of the soldier, would not have been done under *any other* commander-in-chief ? When the salaries of the Judges were augmented, did they receive the augmentation as a boon, as a *gift* from the *minister* of the day ? No ; but as an act of justice at the hands of the country ; as something due to their services and their rank ; as no more than a just compensation for the use of their great talents, and for their arduous and almost unremitted labours. It is not at all agreeable to my notions, nor, I hope, to the notions either of those who pay, or those who receive, to look upon what is given in the way of augmentation to the income of any servant of the public, as a gift on the part of those, be they who they may, that propose, or support, the making of that augmentation.

Now, we come to a part of this evidence, which has some slight bearing upon the charges before the House, namely, what Sir Arthur Wellesley says about that “ great and general satisfaction which the Duke “ has given as to matters of *promotion*, and about his inflexible adherence “ to the *rules* laid down *relating to promotions*.” This is all very well, but the worst of it is, that we have the cases of *Captain Maling* and of *Sammy Carter* before us ; not in hearsay, not in assertion, but in *proof*. *Sammy* we will leave till another time ; but, there is a part of Colonel Gordon’s evidence which we must here take particular notice of, as it will, in a twinkling, give us a most correct idea of all this boasted *regularity* and *inflexibility* about promotions.

(Page 47.) Colonel GORDON says, I conceive it *my particular duty* to take care and report to the Commander-in-Chief, that any Officer whose name is submitted to his Royal Highness is a fit and proper person, duly qualified in all respects as to character, as to *points of service*, and as to his Majesty’s regulations for the service into which he is so recommended.

It is a regulation of the army, his Majesty’s regulation, that no Subaltern can be promoted to a *company*, either by purchase or without, under a *service of two years*.

(Page 49, he says). The regulations are briefly these : An officer must *serve* as a Subaltern two years before he can be a *Captain*, and he must have *served* six years before he can be a Field Officer. *I never knew an instance of those rules being broken through*, always, as in merchant’s accounts, saying *errors excepted*.

(Page 53, to Col. GORDON.) Has it ever come within your knowledge that any officer has been promoted *without any service* whatever ? *No, it has not*.

(Page 55, to Col. GORDON.) What were the *services* of Captain Maling’s brother, who is, I believe, a Captain in the army, who is in the War-office ? There is a Captain Maling, an assistant of mine in the office of the Commander-in-Chief ; I take it for granted, that is the person

referred to. What his services are as a Lieutenant, *I really do not know*; I found him as a lieutenant in the office of the Commander-in-Chief; and in consideration of his extraordinary good character, and more than common abilities, the promotions of the army going through his hands, under mine, *I did recommend him* to his royal highness the Commander-in-Chief to be placed upon the half-pay as a captain, upon which half-pay *he most assuredly* will be placed as soon as an opportunity offers; but the Commander-in-Chief has it not in his power.

(Page 56, to Colonel GORDON.) Do you know whether or not that Captain Maling ever *joined and did duty* with any regiment? *I do not know* that he did; and *I do not think that he did*.

"This case," adds the COURIER, "speaks so plainly for itself, that it requires no comment. Most surprising it is that Colonel Gordon has impressed many persons with an opinion of the great accuracy of his memory, and his rigid conformity to the rules of the service. Now, the Colonel's memory, poor man, seems as fallible as that of any other person who has been examined. During an examination into the undue promotion of the brother of Captain Maling of the War-office, he does not know of any officer being promoted without any service whatever, though in a few minutes afterwards he owns he himself has lately recommended to be promoted to a Company, Maling's brother, a gentleman daily employed under him, *who never served in any Regiment whatever, or even joined one*. How unlucky that the man he had the most concern with in the world (the Duke excepted), and whose brother's case was under consideration at the moment, should thus have slipped altogether out of his memory, though he, the Colonel, had lately recommended him for promotion, for lately it must be. And how unlucky that the Colonel, so very nice in inquiring into the qualifications of Officers *as to points of service* before he submits their names to the Duke, should himself have recommended a gentleman *who never served at all!* But let this military paragon take the advantage of his 'errors excepted.' If he cannot justify himself in the field of Mars, he has fortunately put in a saving clause, which must secure his acquittal in 'Change-alley."

This case alone gives us a pretty good view of the rigid adherence, the inflexible adherence, to the rules laid down about promotion; and, whatever Sir Arthur Wellesley may think of it, it will weigh most lumpingly against any general assertion, founded upon the observation of any General in the army.

But, let us take another case, containing a contrast; and though the facts may be dry in detail, they cannot fail to be useful. FREDERICK

ADAM (son of Mr. Wm. Adam) was an	DATE.	AGE.
<i>Ensign</i> in the 26th Reg. of Foot.....	1797	- 14
<i>Lieut.</i> in the same	1798	- 15
<i>Lieut.</i> with rank of <i>Capt.</i> Guards	1799	- 16
<i>Major</i> in the 5th Bat. Reserve	1803	- 20
<i>Lieut.-Col.</i> in the same	1804	- 21
<i>Lieut.-Col.</i> in 21st Foot	1805	- 22

Now, mark, reader; I beg you to mark it well; that Colonel Gordon says, that the rules of the service are, that an officer must *serve six years* before he can be a *field-officer*, that is to say, a Major, a Lieut.-Colonel or a Colonel; but, we here find, that Frederick Adam became a field-officer in *four years* after he entered the army; at the age of 20 years; and that of these four years, a part, at least, according to his father's own statement, was spent, not in *service*, but *at school*.

No comment is necessary; but now let us see the contrast.

ANTHONY FRENCH, who was a Captain in the 21st Reg. of Foot, at the period when Frederick Adam entered the army, and

was put to school at Woolwich, is *still a Captain*, and, in that same regiment, is of course under the command of Frederick Adam.

FREDERICK JONES, J. G. FORTH, JAMES CONNOLLY, who were Lieutenants in the 26th Foot, in 1798, at the time when Frederick Adam was a Lieutenant in that Regiment, hold, at the present moment, the rank of *Captain* in that corps.

MONTAGUE WYNYARD, CHARLES PHILIPS, who were *senior Lieutenants*, in the Coldstream Guards, to Frederick Adam, when the latter was serving with them, are *Lieutenants in that regiment still*.

These facts have been stated to me, in a letter, in which I am referred to the army lists, published by authority. I have not those lists at hand ; but if the statement be incorrect, the error can at once be rectified by a reference to those lists.

Now, then, what are we to think about the *inflexible* adherence to the rules of promotion? What are we to think about that "general satisfaction," which we are told, that the Duke's management of promotions has given?

I am of opinion, and so must, I think, every reasonable man, that a strict rule of promotion by *seniority* would be a very bad rule ; that it would damp all emulation ; and that little that is brilliant, daring, glorious, could be expected in such a service. But, then, seniority must be a *rule*, and a departure from it the *exception* ; else all would be mere favour, caprice, and intrigue. That there ought to be the *power* of departing from the rule we all allow ; reason says it should be so ; but, then, reason, united with justice, say, that this power never should be exercised, except in cases where the *good of the service* demands such exercise ; and, in cases, too, where that demand is so obvious that there can be *no doubt* upon the point. *Length of service* is, of itself, a military merit ; such it has always been deemed ; and it has been a rule to reward accordingly. When, therefore, there exists no particular, no special and *obvious* reason for preferring one man to another, the rule of seniority ought to be strictly adhered to. Now, in the case of Frederick Adam, to say nothing about his rank and promotion, while *at school*, there does not appear any such special and obvious reason for a preference. His father says, he behaved very bravely and skilfully in Holland at the age of 16 years ; but, will he pretend to say, that there were not many other officers, his seniors, whose good conduct was not equal to his? No, no ; it is not on account of an act of *ordinary* merit, that will warrant a departure from the rule of seniority. Had it, indeed, fallen to the lot of Frederick Adam to go, as we see Lord Cochrane has done (and which, had the occasion offered, I have no doubt he would), into the ditch of a rampart, and, amidst a shower of balls, bring up the flag of the fortress, and again set it flying defiance against the enemy ; had a case of this sort occurred, the whole army would have seen the rule of seniority departed from, not only without pain, but with pleasure. But no such case appears to have existed ; we never till now heard of any extraordinary merit in the son of Mr. Adam ; most of us never heard of his name before ; nay, for my own part, I am amongst those, who did not know that Mr. Adam had a son in the army. Besides, we see Frederick Adam, not only promoted over the heads of his seniors, at the outset, and in one regiment ; but, we see him going from

corps to corps, and we see his good fortune still follow him, wherever he goes; we see him still and still jumping over the heads of his seniors.

It must, I think, be manifest to every man, that such preferences cannot fail to be greatly injurious to the service. When officers see their juniors get the start of them, without any such claim as I have before described, it is impossible, decidedly impossible, that their zeal should not be damped; that they should not have a cold heart for the service; and that, in the end, they should not care to have any care beyond that of mere self. This is so obvious, and there are so many thoughts connected with it, which will at once, strike the reader, that I shall not longer dwell upon it.

I do not know whether it occurred to any body else, but to me it immediately did, upon reading General Fitzpatrick's evidence, in praise of the Duke of York's commandership, to express a wish to know, according to what "*rule of promotion*" it was, that the General, who had not been in any military service, I believe, for above twenty years, and who, I believe, had not actually served since he was a *Captain* in the Guards, came to have a *regiment given to him*, the moment Mr. Fox and his party came into place, in 1806. We see, that in the case of Major Brooke, a stoppage of the proposed exchange took place, the Major having been upon *half-pay for six years*. This circumstance required an inquiry, one of Colonel Gordon's *inquiries*. The colonel does not (what a pity!) keep any *minutes* of his inquiries, or I should certainly be for asking him to oblige us with a copy of the *inquiry*, made with respect to General Fitzpatrick, who had, for so many years, I believe a full *quarter of a century*, been, not upon half-pay, but upon no pay at all, at least, I mean, as an officer in the army. Perhaps, if we were to search through the whole of the army list, we should not find a more complete instance of the excellent arrangements at the Commander-in-Chief's office, than this instance of the promotion of General Fitzpatrick. It is notorious; it is a thing not to be denied by any one, that he had, for many years, been living in and about London, with not the smallest appearance of any thing military about him, with the sole exception of the rank prefixed to his name; nor have I ever heard, that he ever actually served, either abroad or at home, except in the Guards, as far as the rank of *Captain*. And, yet he not only came into the army all at once, as soon as Mr. Fox was in office, but had the Colonelcy and the *profits* of a regiment given to him. This is not for *life*, indeed; it is not so good as a patent place, which has been compared to a freehold estate; it is not so good as that, because, if the King pleases, he can, at any time, without reason assigned, *take the regiment away*. But, it is a good thing, as long as the general has it; and the reader will readily suppose, that, in the whole of our army, containing from 12 to 15 thousand officers, a person *might* have been found with *as good* claims to a regiment as General Fitzpatrick.

And yet, we are desired; in the face of all this, we are desired to believe, that nothing in the world can be better managed than the promotions of the army have been; that the rules of promotion are most religiously adhered to; and that the Duke's conduct, as to promotions, in particular, has given "*general satisfaction*." We are a *believing* nation. There is hardly any thing too much for us in this way. But, I really do think, that our belief is not quite equal to this.

After all, however, the conduct of the Duke of York, in the general management of the army, has, the reader will clearly see, nothing at all to do with the *specific Charges* against him. Those charges must stand,

or fall, upon their own merits; and, unless the Duke can produce evidence to rebut the evidence brought against him, all the efforts of his supporters, in any other way, are perfectly useless.

We now come to a matter, which, though not relating to any of the charges against the Duke of York, is so nearly connected with them as never to be lost sight of when we are making observations, as to the effects of the transactions stated in those charges.

I allude to the *general traffic for Offices and Places under Government*, which, as the reader will remember, has before been a subject of observation with me upon many occasions. At page 25 of the present volume, are several advertisements relating to the sale of such offices and places, and, in the half-month's papers, from which I collected them, I found one for a *Writership*, one for a *Cadetship*, and several relating to commissions in the *Militia*; but, as no money was spoken of in the latter case, I did not insert it, and really, as to the East India sovereigns' offices, I thought they were *always* bought and sold; and how should I think otherwise, when I saw, in the course of every year, so many hundreds of advertisements like those here spoken of; nor was it without the most agreeable surprise, that, when Mr. Donovan's disclosure came forth, I found that the East India Directors took the thing to heart, and called for "*a committee, up-stairs,*" to inquire into "so serious a matter." This was a most agreeable surprise to me, who had seen their offices advertised for sale for so many years, without one word having ever been said against such advertisements, or such sale.

As to the offices and places under the government of this country, I had, more than once, and a long while ago, taken advertisements, relating to them, for *mottos* to my Register; and, in one Number, having such a motto, I appealed to Mr. Perceval, whether such things were proper; whether they were not calculated to disgust the country; and I asked him *why the authors were not prosecuted*.

This statement, intended to refresh the mind of the reader, is by way of preface to the very curious matter that came out in the House of Commons, from the lips of Mr. Perceval, on the 24th of February, relating to a prosecution of that sort, which was so long ago recommended by me.

"He," the report of the proceedings says, "informed the House, that although he had taken the address of the house in Threadneedle-street from the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle), who alluded to it in opening his charge against the Duke of York, as if he (Mr. Perceval) had been a stranger to its existence, yet that he was perfectly aware of the circumstance at that time. The reason of his pretending ignorance, on the subject, was owing to this:—A gentleman had written to him on the 12th January, stating that on reading an advertisement for the sale of an office under government, he had answered it to the persons who kept this office, and was then in treaty for it. He was sent to the Solicitor of the Treasury, who had instructions to furnish any sum of money necessary for a deposit, and to proceed in the business till the parties were entrapped beyond the possibility of escaping the law. The business was in this state at the time the hon. gentleman had brought forward his charges, and he thought it imprudent to appear as if at all acquainted with the subject. An indictment was now filed against Messrs. Pullen and Haylock, and a lady of the name of Harvey, as well as against the Banker (Watson, it afterwards appeared) who received the deposit.—From what he had said, it would be seen that government had determined to inquire into and proceed against these abuses a considerable time before the hon. gentleman brought the subject of inquiry before the House."

Oh! no, no, no!—No, no! Not "*a considerable time.*" Mr. Wardle

brought forward his *charges* on the 27th of January; but, he gave notice of his intention so to do about *a week before that*. Well, this leaves but eight days between Mr. Perceval's receiving "the gentleman's" letter, and the notice of Mr. Wardle, which notice, observe, must, in this case, be coupled with the threat of Mrs. Clarke, sent to Mr. Adam so long ago as the month of *June* last. *Eight days* is not what we mean by a "*considerable time*," in such cases; nor must we allow Mr. Wardle thus to be deprived of this part of the effect of his exertions.

Besides, though Mr. Perceval got the "gentleman's" letter (Mr. Wardle always mentioned *names*) on the 12th of January, it does not follow, that he set the Solicitor of the Treasury to work *before Mr. Wardle gave notice of a motion*. This does not follow; and, if I had been one of the House, I would have called for names, dates, and papers of all sorts.

The great object, in this most curious movement, evidently was, to cause the public to believe, that the government was, of itself, disposed to put a stop to these shameful transactions, and that *it would have done it, if Mr. Wardle had never been born*; and, the *proof* is, that it had actually set to work, even *before his notice of any charges was given*.

To believe this, we must also believe that there has been a very wonderful concurrence; a wonderful jumping of judgment. Yes, we must believe; it does not signify talking about "a gentleman's" letter; we must believe it to be very strange indeed, that, *just at this time*, the government should have taken the first, the *very first step*, in the detection and punishment of those who buy and sell offices and places; and that an advertisement, too, should set them to work, though thousands of such advertisements have appeared, during the last 10 or 15 years. Very strange, indeed!

But, though Mr. Wardle did not give his notice till the 20th of January, or thereabouts, will Mr. Perceval say, that he did not hear of Mr. Wardle's *intention so to do*, long before the 20th or even the famous 12th of January? Will he say, that he did not hear of this? *I did*. I heard of it in the *first week* of January, and, I believe, on the 2nd day of the month; and the intention, as being publicly rumoured, was mentioned to me in a letter, the day after my return home, which was on the 9th of *January*. Nay, *must* it not have been known to the ministers before the 12th of January? Must not this have been the case, from the *inquiries* of Mr. Wardle? He says, that he had been about a *month* at work to get at his facts; and, will any one believe, that the ministers were not well acquainted with all his movements? Aye, from the first or second day of them, at the latest. The moment Mr. Wardle began his inquiries, the whole gang of jobbers would, of course, be in alarm, and like a nest of hornets, disturbed by the intrusion of the spade, would begin to fly about, in all directions. Such a thing could not be kept secret for half an hour; and, are we, good souls as we are, to believe, that the ministers would be *the last* to hear of it?

Now, then, let us look back again at what this very Mr. Perceval said in the debate, the ever-memorable debate, of the 27th of January. Having read that passage, having recollected the "*loud and general laugh*," which the House set up, when they heard Mr. Wardle's description of the office in Threadneedle-street; and having also called to mind the *scoffs*, which, on account of this part of his statement, the ministerial

papers, and particularly the Nabobs' Gazette, uttered against Mr. Wardle, having thus refreshed his memory, the reader will be the better able to judge, whether the prosecution, now mentioned by Mr. Perceval, would ever have taken place had it not been for Mr. Wardle's most admirable conduct.

Again. As Mr. Perceval was in possession of such facts, before Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges, how came Mr. Perceval to speak, generally, as to that gentleman's charges, as he did? Might not one have reasonably expected to hear him, who was in possession of such facts, speak more on Mr. Wardle's side, and not oppose him in his mode of inquiry, not hold the language of defiance, language calculated to throw discredit upon all that Mr. Wardle said?

It remains to be accounted for, too, why this acknowledgment of the ministers, as to the existence of the traffic, was kept back *till after the inquiry was over*, till after such damning *proofs* had been produced? This is a very important circumstance. Being in possession of such facts, one would have expected to hear Mr. Perceval taking the first opportunity to state them, and to acknowledge that Mr. Wardle had but too good grounds for his statement respecting the Threadneedle-street Office. But, on the contrary, Mr. Wardle had to go through the whole inquiry, with the *denial*, the flat *denial*, against him, that the ministers knew any thing of any such practices.—The concise view of the matter is this: That Advertisements, for the purchase and sale of offices and places under government, have appeared, in all the newspapers, for many years past, to the number of many hundreds in every year, with as much boldness as the advertisements for Mr. Packwood's razor-strops, or Doctor Spilsbury's drops; that more than a year ago, and more than once, I took such advertisements for my motto, and in an essay, or in essays, upon the subject, called upon Mr. Perceval himself, to know why such offences were not punished by law; that it now appears, that the government has always had the power of punishing such acts by law; that no such punishment, and that no prosecution for any such offence, has ever taken place, nor have we ever heard, that the government has ever made any inquiry into the matter; that in *June*, 1808, Mrs. Clarke sends letters to Mr. Adam, threatening an exposure of her practices under the Duke of York; that in *December*, or in the first days of *January* last, Mr. Wardle sets to work making inquiries, as to the practices of Mrs. Clarke, and as to the practices of other dealers in offices and places under government; that, on the 20th of *January*, Mr. Wardle gives notice of a motion respecting the Duke of York; that, on the 27th of *January* he brings forward his charges against the Duke, and states, at the same time, that there is an office in Threadneedle-street for the sale of offices and places under government; that Mr. Perceval (*one of the King's ministers*) treats this statement in a manner whence it appears that he discredits the existence of such practices; that Mr. Wardle, between the 27th of *January* and the 23rd of *February*, pursues his charges against the Duke, and produces *undeniable proof* of the existence of such practices to a great extent; that, *after all this*, and on the 24th of *February*, out comes Mr. Perceval with information to the House, that he knew of such practices *on the 12th of January*, that the parties in one instance, are under prosecution by the government, that the preparation for this prosecution was going on before Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges, and that he

(Mr. Perceval), on the 27th of January, "*pretended ignorance*" of such practices, only for the purpose of keeping from the parties any suspicion of the measures that were taken to *entrap* them.

From these propositions; this chain of undeniable facts, the reader will easily decide, whether the prosecution, now said to be undertaken, has proceeded purely from the disposition of the government to punish such infamous practices; or whether it has proceeded from a desire, on the part of the government, to save itself from the effects of a suspicion that it had participated in, or, at least, winked at, such practices, and that it never would have attempted to put a stop to them, had it not been for Mr. Wardle.

This question the reader will easily decide, and as he must be convinced, that it is a question of great importance, I trust the decision will remain *deeply imprinted on his mind*. It must be, I think, clear to every man of only common discernment, that what is now going on, must, sooner or later, lead to momentous events. To, I hope and trust, a great, a radical, and a salutary change; a change that shall *destroy* no branch of our excellently formed government, but that shall *renovate* them all. The great misfortune of other governments has been, that, while the *higher* classes have "*indulged*," as Burke calls it, "*in all their vicious humours*," the *second class* have been, by one tie or another, induced to remain in inactivity, and that at last, the work of reform has fallen to the hands of the *lower* class; and, then, need we wonder at the wild work they have made? That we now stand in need of reform, there is no man, not even a trading Anti-Jacobin, will attempt to deny. That a reform must and will come, is, I think, as evident; and, is it not, then, the duty of persons in the *middling* rank of life to act in such a manner as to prevent the danger of this work of reform falling into the hands of those, who cannot be supposed capable of managing it well? To *talk* of a love of country is as easy as to talk of any thing else. The country calls for *deeds*, not *words*. The excuses of her professed lovers are exactly those made by the Calf, to "*THE HARE WITH MANY FRIENDS*."

"*Older and abler* pass you by;
 "How *strong* are those! How *weak* am I!
 "Should I *presume* to bear you hence,
 "Those friends of mine might take offence.
 "Excuse me, then,—you know my *heart*;
 "But dearest friends, alas! must part.
 "How shall we all lament! Adieu!
 "For, see, the hounds are just in view."

But, to the *coldness of the Calf's friendship* (to give it the mildest term) we, if we remain inert, add the grossest of *folly*; because in the fate of the country, *our own* fate is inextricably involved. Evils, when taken *in time*, are deprived of half their mischievous qualities. Yet, though this is so manifestly the time for the people to beseech the King to adopt such measures as shall effectually guard them, in future, against the effects of a system of corruption like that which now stands exposed before them, not a county, not a city, not a town, not a village, not a *single man* do we see bestir himself. The whole population of the kingdom seem to stand by as *unconcerned* spectators; or, at best, to discover little more than mere curiosity; and this, too, at a moment, when, by a constitutional exercise of their rights, their opinions, the opinions which

they *all* entertain, respectfully but plainly expressed, might, and would, speedily produce a reform equally advantageous to their sovereign and themselves, and hurtful to none but the domestic and foreign foes of their happiness and of their country's independence.

It was not thus that our forefathers acted towards us; and it is not thus that we ought to act towards our children.

Botley, Thursday, March 2, 1809.

DUKE OF YORK.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, March, 1809.*)

“That they may do evil with both hands earnestly, the prince asketh, and the judge asketh for a reward; and the great man, he uttereth his mischievous desire: so they wrap it up.”—MISAN, chapter vii. verse 3.

IN all the books of the Holy Scriptures; amongst all the strong descriptions of prevalent corruption, contained in those writings, I know of none more impressive, more characteristic of a rotten state of things, than that which I have taken for my motto to this article. I have, however, not selected it under an idea, that it will be found at all applicable to the result of the proceedings, which have, for so many weeks past, wholly occupied the attention of the public; but, on the contrary, with the confident hope, that the reader will be able to draw a pleasing contrast between that result and the sort of actions, to which the prophet alludes, and at which he expresses the displeasure of the Almighty Ruler of the universe, “the God of *truth and justice.*”

I trust the House of Commons, and every individual of that House, will dismiss all prejudice from their minds, whether it be *against* or *for* the Duke of York; and, I will go further, and say, that I do *believe* that *now*, whatever may have passed before, whatever symptoms of prejudice may have appeared, on the one side or the other, substantial justice will be done, without any regard to the feelings of either the high or the low.

Upon no occasion, perhaps, since the Revolution in 1688, has there existed, in this country, so great an interest, as to what would be the conduct of its government, as that which exists at the present moment. People, in all ranks of life, have, from the beginning of the late Inquiry, been alive, in an unusual degree, to all that was passing. The open statement of the Charges against his royal highness had been preceded by numerous rumours and reports, which, though, by the impartial and considerate, were looked upon as including, in many cases, at least, great exaggerations, had produced, as it was natural they should, a very great degree of latent discontent; and this discontent was, assuredly, not at all diminished, by the means that were taken to check the freedom of public discussion, with respect to the subjects of those rumours and reports. The charges were, too, received in a manner, well calculated to heighten the interest naturally attached to the intrinsic merits of the case. Instead of opposing them by a direct or implied negative, the friends of the

illustrious personage resorted to recrimination, and dealt their charges about so roundly and so widely, and in a manner so little discriminating, that they compelled all those, who were connected with the press, to wish that the result might show the charges not to have originated in that traitorous conspiracy, which was asserted to exist, of which the press was alleged to have been the organ, and in the fate of which the fate of the press appeared to be completely involved. Hence the press has not failed to participate in the public feeling, nor to gratify the public impatience, in the doing of which, with the greatest possible effect, the form of proceeding, injudiciously chosen by the friends of the Duke of York, has afforded it perfect facility; so that, at this moment, even now, before the discussion upon the evidence has taken place, in the House of Commons, there is scarcely a single person in the whole kingdom, who has not weighed the several cases in his mind, with as much care as if they had come before him, he being in the capacity of a juror. Not only, therefore, are there, in this case, the circumstances of the accused party being the Commander-in-Chief of the Army, a Son of the King, and so near to the Crown as to have but two lives between him and the wearing of it himself; not only are there, in this case, these circumstances, of themselves sufficiently interesting, but there are the additional circumstances, mentioned above, rendering, all together, the sum of interest now excited far greater than what has ever been felt, in this kingdom, since the era of the Revolution.

The eyes of the nation are directed towards its rulers in general; towards the whole of its Government, King, Lords, and Commons. Many persons, accustomed to take little or no interest in public affairs, take interest in this affair. The whole mass of the national thought has been set in motion. What will be the conduct of the several branches of the government, is the question that now engrosses every mind; but, in a more direct and particular manner, are the eyes of the nation, for reasons too obvious to point out, fixed upon the House of Commons; and I am persuaded, that every man will agree with me, that, in almost whatever light it be considered, the result of the discussion of Wednesday next, will be the most important that this nation has witnessed for more than a hundred years past.

It must have struck every man, who has been long in the habit of contemplating political motives and actions, that the interest and the importance, which discussions in the House of Commons formerly owed to considerations of *party*, now exist but in a comparatively trifling degree. The death of the two great opposing leaders, under whom the people, as well as the members, ranged themselves, may have contributed towards this result; but, the fact is, that, long before the death of Pitt, the attachments of party had become greatly enfeebled, and are now dwindled almost to nothing. Indeed, there is now in existence nothing that resembles party but the name. There are men, who are in place, and others who, upon all occasions, whether right or wrong, censure the measures of ministers, with the sole view of supplanting them. But, in any other sense, the word party has now no more meaning than has the word *Tory*, which no man has any longer the impudence to use. Parties were formerly distinguished by some great and well-known *principles* of foreign or domestic policy. Now, there are no such distinguishing marks; and, as a natural consequence, the people have become quite indifferent as to all considerations connected with party. Whether, as a general

proposition, this indifference be a good or an evil, I will not now attempt to discuss; but, I venture to state, not without confidence of its meeting with general assent, that this change in the mind of the nation has not been favourable to the House of Commons, both sides of which united have not now to boast that warmth of popular attachment which each side before possessed. Another consequence of this change, is, that the discontents of the nation do not now, as formerly, operate in a partial direction. It is not upon a part of the House; it is not upon this or that ministry, that the blame now falls; but upon the whole House, and upon all public men: a consideration of great moment, when we consider the crisis in which we now live, and as to the final event of which so much must depend upon the conduct, and, of course, upon the opinions of the people, supposing, which we must, in this case, suppose, that the people will still remain free. Formerly what was disliked by the nation was, by one half of the nation, imputed to one half of the parliament and one half of the public men. Hope was kept alive in the other half, and resentment was counterbalanced by hope. This is no longer the case. There are still persons wishing for a change of ministry, because there are always persons who wish to obtain possession of power and emolument; but, beyond that circle, which, though extensive, is nothing when compared to a whole nation, there are very few persons indeed to be found who have even a wish upon the subject, and absolutely none at all, who sincerely believe that such a change would be attended with any substantial national benefit.

It has long been the opinion of many, that the present state of the representation is such as to leave the people little or no check upon their rulers. Since the year 1780, when the late Pitt and the late Duke of Richmond were the partisans of reform of parliament, this subject has become very familiar to the public. Those who deny the necessity of reform have not, as far as I have observed, actually justified the public advertising of *seats for sale*; but, they have contended, that the House of Commons, constituted as it is, is quite sufficient for all the purposes for which the constitution intended such a House; and that, though it does happen, somehow or other, that every ministry, as long as they remain in place; that every set of men, who are *the servants of the King*, have a *majority* in that House, and do carry every question that they please to carry, if it be of any importance to them, or to the crown; though this be allowed, still it is contended, that, somehow or other, the representation is a sufficient check upon the power of the crown. In opposition to this doctrine of invisible influence, of effects without causes, and of causes without effects, various instances might be quoted, wherein the power of the crown has been suffered to bear down all before it. But there has been no occasion since the reign of James II., on which the personal interests of any part of *the family of the King* have been so directly brought within the scope of parliamentary power, as the interests of the Duke of York now are; and, therefore, now, more clearly than upon any former occasion, the people have had, and will have, an opportunity of ascertaining the degree of power which the House of Commons possesses independent of the Crown.

The long and expensive and bloody war, in which we are engaged, and to which no man can see the prospect of a termination, has caused an extension of the taxing system, almost beyond the compass of an ordinary mind's conception. In answer to all our complaints on this

score, we are told, that the burdens are necessary to preserve us against the inroads of the enemy. The argument, carried out to its full length, is this: If you do not give the King the means of keeping up an immense fleet and army, Napoleon will conquer the country and will make you more miserable than you now are. As to the words, loss of our *constitution*, and making us *slaves*, we will lay them aside for the present, as not being definite enough for any six men to come to an agreement about their meaning. By the necessity of sacrifices for our own good, we must understand it to be meant, that Napoleon, were he to become our master, would make our situation *worse than it is under the sovereignty of the family of Brunswick*; for, unless this be the case; unless this be the jet of the argument, there is no motive for our resistance, and, of course, none for the sacrifices which we make, and which, by law, we are compelled to make, in order to render that resistance efficient. For, as to *loyalty*, it is an empty sound, unconnected with the *general good*. Kings, like other individuals, have their personal friends; but personal friendship for a king forms no ingredient of loyalty, which means fidelity to the king *as king*; as the guardian of the nation's interest, honour, and renown. Subjects in general know nothing of the King but through the *laws*, and every man, as long as he obeys those laws, is a loyal man, whatever may be his opinion or his feelings with regard to the person, or the family, of the King. Thus, then, it is, I think, evident, that the motive to resist Napoleon, and to make sacrifices for that purpose, will, at last, come to this: *to save ourselves from being in a worse situation than we are in under the family of Brunswick*. Amongst the means are, of course, the keeping of the family of Brunswick upon the throne; maintaining all the just prerogatives of the King, and the like; but the great end in view, is to prevent ourselves from being made worse off than we now are. Well then, this being the case, let us examine a little, *how* we should be worse off. And here it must be first observed, that "*we*," thus used, does not apply to a few thousands of courtiers and placemen and pensioners, for, if it did, no examination would be necessary. It applies to the whole of *fourteen millions of people*. He would, it is said, take away our property; but, *what would he do with it?* He could not carry the land to France, nor the goods; nor could he take from the land its productive quality; nor could he unstring the arms of a labourer; nor would it be his *interest* so to do. No, it is not in *this way* that we should experience much of a change, the manifest interest of the conqueror being to leave the people in general, in the possession and enjoyment of all the property in land and in trade, that they now possess and enjoy. But without supposing a danger to property, there is quite a sufficient motive for resisting Napoleon, and for making *any* sacrifices that are *really* necessary for that purpose. There is no doubt, that, if he were to succeed in the conquest of England, he would treat us as a conquered people; he would take from us our laws, and give us his edicts in their stead; he would rule us as an absolute monarch; his soldiers would be our masters under him; and we should not dare to complain of any act of his, however oppressive, or however insolent. Yet, notwithstanding this powerful motive to resistance, it is necessary that the people of this country should be convinced; that they should see, daily, proofs, *of the value of what they now possess*; that they should be able to draw a triumphant contrast between what *now is*, and what *would be* in case they were conquered by Napoleon; that they should want no

one to *tell* them, that their *constitution* is worth being defended with their last shilling, and the last drop of their blood; that they should feel this from the bottom of their hearts; that they should stand no more in need of being reminded of it, than they do of being reminded of the necessity of eating when they are hungry, or drinking when they are thirsty.

Now, connecting these more general observations with the subject immediately under contemplation, is it not, with a view to the stability of the throne as well as to the permanent internal peace and happiness of the country, a thing of vast importance, that the decision, upon the case of the Duke of York, should be such as to convince the whole nation, that they have now got; that they possess and enjoy, a system of government, the loss of which would be greatly injurious to them? Is it not of incalculable consequence, that every man should, by this decision, be induced to exclaim: "What would have been the proceedings and what the decision, if Napoleon had been our master, and if one of his relations had been thus accused!" The mere circumstance of their being a House of Commons now, and of its being possible that there would be none then, is nothing at all. It is the real effect which only is worthy of attention. Napoleon has his *Corps Legislatif* in France. It is the power which this body possesses, not in theory, but in *practice*, which we are to look to. It is not what it might do, but what it actually does do, that we are to consider. Men do not give their money, or lay down their lives, for a theory. When we are called upon to spend our last shilling, and to shed the last drop of our blood in defence of the constitution, it surely never is meant, that we should do this for something theoretical; for a thing that exists in name only! No, but a thing which is our shield against oppression; a thing that secures justice to us; a thing necessary, in short, to our safety and happiness; and, therefore, upon this occasion, where the constitution is to be *put to the test*, it is of the greatest consequence, with an eye to the future as well as the present, that it should stand that test; that it should give proofs of its excellence; that its practice, upon this great occasion, should give the lie to all its enemies. There is nothing which mankind in general dislike so much as partiality in the administration of justice; there is nothing so grating to the mind. As justice is the first attribute of power, so the abuse and perversion of its name and its forms are amongst the wickedest, if not the very wickedest, acts, of which a government can be guilty. When we would give instances of the badness of a government, we are sure to wind up the climax of its sins by saying, that it has one law for the rich and another law for the poor:

"Law grinds the poor, and rich men rule the law,"

forms the close of a long list of national evils, the cause of national degradation and ruin. Partiality even in the distribution of *favours*, when those favours are paid for by the public, is mischievous and hateful enough; but, not a millionth part so mischievous and so hateful, so detestable in the eyes of every just man, and of virtue, as partiality in the distribution of *punishments*. It is mortifying enough in all conscience to see the parasite pampered with the means of rewarding the meritorious; but, to see the great villain braving the laws, while the petty are hanged in chains, is what no man can bear without feeling a desire to see overturned, torn up from the foundation, utterly destroyed and scattered to the winds, the whole of the system and fabric of that government, where

such partiality has proceeded. I state this as a general proposition ; I say it merely by way of illustration, and not at all in allusion to the case of the Duke of York, or to any anticipated decision of the House of Commons ; but, on the contrary, with a confident hope and reliance, that the decision of that House will be strictly just ; and, that the House will now prove to the world, that it is not to be swayed, on the one side or the other, by any influence but that which fairly and obviously arises from the evidence taken at its bar.

I presume not to dictate to the House ; I presume not to say, what ought to be the substance of its decision, or the mode of its proceedings, on this momentous case ; and, indeed, what I am now writing cannot be read by the public till after the discussion and the decision have taken place ; but, I cannot refrain from offering my opinion, as to the *importance* of the case. It is a thing not to be disguised, that the present situation of the throne, in this country, has in its circumstances very peculiar, to describe them by no epithet of more strong or distinct meaning. In the natural course of things it must require great wisdom at the head of affairs to prevent those circumstances from having an injurious operation towards the throne itself. It has been observed, that long and quiet reigns have, almost always, been followed by times of a different description. The reasons for this are obvious enough to the reflecting mind ; and, when we consider the peculiar circumstances, above alluded to, taking into view the general degradation of royalty upon the continent, it is impossible not to be impressed with very serious thoughts with respect to our own prospects in this particular. From the first, I was of opinion, that wise counsellors would avoid every thing which was likely to give rise to a belief, that the King, or any part of the royal family, wished to use any endeavours whatever to obstruct the course of justice ; because, if the people, who would not fail to be extremely jealous upon that score, once imbibed a suspicion of the sort, it would be very hard to remove it, and the consequence of its remaining in their minds is too manifest to need pointing out. Whether the King's ministers have so acted, I must leave the public to judge ; but, I am sure, that if all wisdom has not fled from their counsels, they will so act now, now when all the evidence is before the public, and when the only point, of any interest, that remains, is, to know how the ministers, how *the advisers of the King* and their friends in the House of Commons will act.

It is the habit of courtiers and men in power to regard as their enemy, and, what is more, as the enemy of the existing government altogether, every one who opposes any of their measures, or censures any part of their conduct. It is their creed, and that all those, who wish to gain or preserve their friendship, well know ; and know it so well, that they are sure never to hear a painful truth from their lips. All those who praise them are friends, all who censure are enemies, of the government. Hence it is, that they never take warning in time ; and hence the fall of so many governments and dynasties ; a fall sudden to them, but long foreseen and foretold by others. With all the talk about " a conspiracy " in this country, not the smallest proof, not the most distant ramification, has been found during the whole of the long and rummaging inquiry, that has just taken place. But, if there be any such conspiracy ; if there be any set of men in this kingdom, who wish to see the House of Commons held in universal contempt, trodden down, and spit upon, and along with it the kingly government and royal family ; if there be any such

men, the first wish of their hearts must be, that the conduct of the House of Commons should, on this trying occasion ; on this occasion when every man in the country is in possession of all the merits of the case, and has his eyes first fixed upon the House, be marked with that bare partiality, which, more than any thing else, excites the hatred and resentment of mankind, and of which, I trust, their conduct will not bear the smallest trace. Men, in possession of power, are too apt to rely wholly upon the means which that power affords them, for the preservation of the power itself. But, that which is not to be accomplished to-day, may be to-morrow. A thousand unexpected events take place in the course of a few years. Few important effects have been produced by one cause, and still fewer have immediately followed the first existence of its real cause or causes. The match is all that meets the eye ; but, the match is not the great efficient cause of the explosion and destruction. A government to be suddenly destroyed, must have a people well prepared ; amply charged with mortifications and heart-burnings. If, therefore, the King's ministers are wise ; if their love of their country, their regard for their master, and their desire to preserve the throne, be as great as they ought to be, they will not, in the approaching discussion and decision, make use of any influence, other than that of truth, fairly applied. They should bear in mind, they should never lose sight of the fact ; that they are *the servants of the King*, with this additional and peculiar circumstance, that they came into power, that they were chosen by the King. for this reason openly avowed, that *they would do*, at his request, what his late ministers *would not do*. It becomes them, therefore, to be doubly cautious upon this particular occasion. Their conduct, whether good or bad, and I do not presume it will be the latter, will admit of, and will receive, a very wide construction and application ; they will now, the day after to-morrow (this is Monday), do more good, or more harm, to the government of England, than all the ministers, for a century past, have had it in their power to do.

With what will be done on Wednesday I cannot become acquainted many hours before this sheet will be in the press ; but, these observations I have thought it my duty to offer to my readers, and there is, perhaps, an advantage in their having been written while the event, to which they relate, was, as yet, unknown.

I shall now return to my Analysis of the Cases ; and shall take those cases, which appear to me to be of the most importance, as connected with the conduct of the King's servants in the House of Commons. I allude particularly to the cases of SANDON and CLAVERING, and shall begin with the former.

CAPTAIN SANDON'S CASE.—I do not mean his case, or any of his cases, as a jobber, but solely as the possessor of the paper, which was attempted to be made out a *forgery*, which, of the whole of the very interesting proceedings, is certainly the most interesting of all, involving a greater number of persons, and making greater and more clear disclosures as to transactions and motives, which it appears to have been intended to keep from the world.

On the 16th of February, when all the cases had been gone through, as far as Mr. Wardle appears to have intended to go at that time, Mr. Perceval, the King's principal servant in the House of Commons,

stated to the House, with a most solemn and pompous introduction, that he was in possession of a *fact*, which he had known of for ten days, and which, he was sure, when it was heard, it would be the general opinion, that it ought to be made known. It was the wish of his royal highness, that it should be made known to the committee, the *time* being left to his (Mr. Perceval's) discretion. The fact, the important fact, was this; that, in the case of Major Tonyn, a *material point in the evidence had been suppressed*.

Now, we must take the report of Mr. Perceval's speech; and I do beseech the reader to pay attention to it; I do beseech him to weigh well every sentence, as he proceeds; for he will find, in the end, that this is the very pivot upon which no small part of the merits of the whole case turns.

" Mr. Perceval said, the fact to which he alluded was of the utmost importance; and though it had not yet been made known to the House generally, it was well known to many honourable gentlemen on both sides, not only among his friends, but among those who acted with the hon. gent. who brought forward this charge. He had been acquainted with it for ten days, but for the reasons he would hereafter assign, had thought it right not to bring it forward till after the evidence was closed. He was sure when it was heard, it would be the general opinion that it ought to be made known. It was the wish of his royal highness the Commander-in-Chief that it should be communicated to the committee; the proper time to do so being left to his (Mr. Perceval's) discretion, so that if any blame was due for the delay, that blame was his. The fact to which he alluded was, the suppression of material evidence in one of the cases before the Committee (Major Tonyn's), which as it now stood was as follows; (here the right hon. gent. stated the evidence of Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Donovan, and Capt. Sandon, in this case, particularly of the latter, which related to the interview he had with Major Tonyn, who wanted his money returned, when he persuaded him to let the matter rest for a short time, to see whether or not his promotion was gazetted.) He could not explain the matter he now wished to bring forward, better than by relating what had happened. On Saturday sennight, Col. Hamilton called upon him with a letter from Mr. Adam, saying he had business of importance to communicate. The communication was to this effect, that on their arrival from Spain (Col. Hamilton and Capt. Sandon were in the Wagon Train), Capt. Sandon had made him acquainted with circumstances which were very material to the investigation now before the House. When Capt. Sandon was called to the bar, he was desired to inform them of all he knew on the subject, which he had done with this exception—he had suppressed the fact that when Capt. Tonyn had pressed him for a return of his 500 guineas, he acquainted Mrs. Clarke with the circumstance, who told him to go back to Capt. Tonyn with a note, purporting to be written by the Duke of York, in these words: 'I have received your note, and Tonyn's business shall remain as it is.' This note was shown to Capt. Tonyn, in order to convince him that Mrs. Clarke and Sandon possessed the influence they pretended to, and that the promotion would remain as it was, unless he suffered the money to remain to purchase their exertion. Another note, also purporting to be written by his royal highness, was sent on the day when Major Tonyn was gazetted, in these words—'Tonyn will be gazetted to-night.' When making this disclosure to Col. Hamilton, Sandon said he might destroy this paper, on which Col. Hamilton told him by no means to do that, but to go to the bar and tell the whole truth, pointing out at the same time, the danger he would incur in telling any falsehoods. The latter note had been delivered to Tonyn. Col. Hamilton, as advised by Mr. Adam, after giving him this information, went back to Capt. Sandon, repeated his injunctions as to the line of conduct he ought to pursue, and got a copy of the first note. Col. Hamilton also advised him not to attend either to Mr. Lowten, or Mrs. Clarke and Mr. Wardle, who had sent for him on his arrival in town, to undergo an examination previous to his being examined at the bar, but to keep aloof from all parties. After some consultation, it was resolved, that Mr. Adam should inform his royal highness of this

“circumstance, that we, as members of parliament and judges in this case, could not be made depositaries of it, but that it must be made public, and that Col. Hamilton should again visit Capt. Sandon, and discover whether, as a strong impression had been made on his mind, the note really was in the hand-writing of the Duke of York. Mr. Adam had accordingly waited on his royal highness, who, on being told of the circumstance, expressed himself convinced, that the note must be a forgery, and wished extremely that the matter should be thoroughly examined into. As for the note respecting the gazetting, his royal highness could not positively say it might not be his, as he would have written such an answer to any letter making an inquiry on the subject. The next day (Sunday) Col. Hamilton saw Capt. Sandon, who said to him, ‘You will be very angry with me, for since you saw me. I have destroyed the Note.’ ‘Good God!’ exclaimed Col. H., ‘you have not surely done any thing so rash.’ — ‘It was not of so much consequence (returned Capt. Sandon), and besides they have forgot it.’ He had thus submitted to the House all he knew of this important affair. The destruction of the note rested on Capt. Sandon’s word. If it was still in existence, and could be proved a forgery, it would show how people had been imposed upon by Mrs. Clarke and her agents; while on the other hand, if proved to be the hand-writing of the Duke of York, it would be necessary to call on his royal highness to explain how it happened.— After some general concluding observations, he moved to call in Captain Sandon.”

After this Sandon was called to the bar. But, before we proceed any further, I ask the reader, the impartial man, whether it does not strike him as something singular, that Col. Hamilton should go to *Mr. Adam*? Perhaps not; but was it not odd, that Mr. Adam should send him (*with a letter*) to *Mr. Perceval* instead of to Mr. Wardle? Why, that may not be so very unaccountable. But, how can you account, reader, for Mr. Perceval’s keeping the matter, a matter so very important, from *Mr. Wardle*? From Mr. Wardle, and from the House in general? He told it to Mr. Whitbread and Lord Henry Petty and General Fitzpatrick; but he did not tell it to *Mr. Wardle* or to *Lord Folkestone*, though it related to evidence the most material that could possibly be conceived to exist.

Sandon was now called in, and being questioned about the existence of the note, prevaricated in so flagrant a manner, that he was committed to Newgate; but previous to that, the Sergeant-at-Arms was sent with him to his house, whence the original of the note, together with many other papers, were brought, and delivered to the House.

Mrs. Clarke having, in the absence of Sandon, been questioned as to the giving, or sending to Sandon, any note in the hand-writing of the Duke of York, says that she does not recollect the Duke’s writing any note to her upon the subject, and that none was necessary, because he saw her every day of his life at that time; and, she states, that she never either gave or sent any such note to Sandon, because she was so very careful not to let any of the Duke’s writing go out of her hands.—After Sandon came back with the note, he was examined again, and, in this examination, he said that Mrs. Clarke had given him the note to be shown to Tonym, in order to pacify him, and to prevent him from withdrawing his money.

Then Mrs. Clarke (who, the reader will observe, had been kept from all knowledge of what was going forward) was called in again. The note, addressed to “*George Farquhar, Esq.*,” was shown her, in these words: “*I have just received your note, and Tonym’s business shall remain as it is.— God bless you.*” She was then questioned as follows:

Do you recollect ever seeing that paper before?—I suppose I must have seen before, for it is his royal highness’s writing.

What reason have you to suppose you have seen it before?—I do not know how it could have got into that man's possession unless I gave it to him, and it was a direction I used very often to get from his royal highness, "George Ferguhar, Esq."

Do you now recollect having given to Capt. Sandon a letter upon this subject?—No, I do not, nor do I recollect giving him that; but I think I must have given it to him, because it must have been in my possession first.

After this, she was questioned a good deal, as to whether she always wrote the same hand; whether she had never imitated other people's hands; and the like; and her answers were, that she had, with other women, in laughing, imitated the hands of various persons; but that she never in her life wrote any thing to send out as another's writing.

One *Town*, a Jew, who had been employed by her in the capacity of a painter on velvet, was brought, and said, that he had seen Mrs. Clarke imitate the Duke's signature, but could not recollect, whether it was in the word Frederick, York, or Albany. He said, that Mrs. Clarke told him she could *forge* the Duke's name, and had done it; and that when he told her it was a "serious affair," she laughed. He said that he first mentioned this matter to *Lady Haggerstone* (a sister, I believe of Mrs. Fitzherbert), and that he supposes she mentioned it somewhere, and that, therefore, he was called up to give evidence.

From a subsequent examination of this man, on the 20th of Feb., he denied that an indictment for perjury, at the Middlesex Sessions, was hanging over his head; but, acknowledged that Mr. Alley had made use of strong language towards him; and that either his sister or his brother was now under some proceeding of the sort.

After this the note, the dear little "God-bless-you" billet was shown to Col. Gordon, who said, "it bore a very strong resemblance to the Duke's writing, but whether it was so or not, he could not positively state." Upon further questioning, he said, that, if he had received a note in that writing, he should, if it had the Duke's signature, have acted upon it.

General Hope said, that it appeared to him like the hand-writing of the Duke; but whether it really was so or not, he could not undertake to say.

General Brownrigg did not think it very like the Duke's writing.

Mr. Adum did think it like the Duke's hand-writing, but could not speak more positively than that.

Five persons, from the Post-office and the Bank, whose profession it had been, for years, to compare hands writing, with a view of detecting frauds and forgeries, were examined, on the 20th of Feb.; and, let it be observed, that they were called in upon motion of one of the King's servants, Mr. Perceval.

The first, *Mr. Johnson*, from the Post-office, upon being shown the two letters of the Duke, about O'Meara and Clavering, and also the note, and after having had time to examine and compare them well, was asked, whether he thought the note to be in the same hand-writing as the letters, to which he answered: "It resembles it so nearly that I should think it was."

Mr. Searle, from the same office, being asked the same question, answers, "I think they are the same hand-writing."

Mr. Nesbitt, from the Bank, was of opinion, "that they were not in the same hand-writing."

Mr. Bateman, from the Bank, says, "There is a marked similarity,"

and that, if two instruments had come before him, one in the character of the letters, and one in the character of the note, "*he thinks he should have passed them as the same.*"

Mr. Bliss, from the Bank, first answered, that "*he should suppose the hand-writing to be the same;*" but afterwards said, that he had some doubts, owing to certain letters that he had since seen in the hand-writing of Mrs. Clarke, which varied a good deal from other letters of hers.

Now, we must go back, and beginning with the evidence of Col. Hamilton of the Wagon Train, trace this curious proceeding down to the moment, when Mr. Perceval drew out, and, as it were, discharged the important discovery upon the House.

Col. Hamilton says, that he had no idea of a forgery, for he thought the note to be in the hand-writing of the Duke of York; that he has frequently seen letters which he supposed, of course, to be the Duke's writing; that he went to Mr. Adam, because he had long known him to be a very honourable man; that he did not go to Mr. Wardle, because he was not acquainted with him; that he took a copy of the note at the request of Mr. Adam; that, afterwards, when Sandon told him he had destroyed the note, *he went and informed Mr. Adam of that too*; that upon the 16th of Feb. some time in the afternoon of the day when Sandon was committed for prevarication, Sandon informed him, that he had *not destroyed the note*; that, upon finding this to be the case, he went and informed Messrs. Adam and Lowten and Harrison of the fact; that he is *not quite certain* that he did mention it to Mr. Adam, but that he certainly desired Mr. Harrison (the Horse-Guards lawyer) to mention it to Mr. Adam.

This brings us down to the evening of Sandon's commitment, and to the conduct of the friends of the Duke on that memorable evening.

Mr. Harrison being called in, said, that he, who was employed as a lawyer, in military matters, at the office of the Duke of York, the War-office, and the Barrack-office, had been desired to attend and give his assistance with Mr. Lowten, during the inquiry; that Col. Hamilton told him, on the 16th, that *the note was not destroyed*; that immediately upon that, he came to the House, and, as he thinks, informed Mr. Huskisson of the fact; and that he gave this information before Mr. Perceval made his speech about the supposed forgery.

Mr. Huskisson (who was one of the persons in the original secret) says that he, upon receiving the information from Mr. Harrison, communicated it to Mr. Perceval.

But, now we must take the examinations of Messrs. Perceval and Adam from the Minutes, published by the House; for they are of a degree of importance, which leaves almost all the others far out of sight. But, we must first take their Evidence of Monday, the 20th of February, and then come to that of Wednesday, the 22nd of February.

Let the reader pay attention to every single word of it.

Examination of the 20th.

MR. ADAM. When did you first hear of the note in the possession of Capt. Sandon?—On Saturday morning, *the 4th of this month*, between ten and eleven o'clock.

From whom did you hear of it?—I heard of it from Col. Hamilton; Col. Hamilton came to my house on Saturday morning, between ten and eleven o'clock, before I was out of my bed.

State to the Committee what passed upon that occasion.—Col. Hamilton came

to my house between ten and eleven o'clock on Saturday morning, and was shown up to me. He immediately mentioned to me that he had seen Capt. Sandon at Portsmouth; that Capt. Sandon had communicated with him upon the subject of this inquiry; he said, that Capt. Sandon had asked him how he should conduct himself; that he had told Capt. Sandon that there could be no rule for his conduct but one, which was to adhere strictly to truth, to tell every thing he knew; that it would not at all avail him to do otherwise, even if he should have an inclination, because he would be examined, I think he said, by the united ability of the country. He then told me, that Capt. Sandon told him that he had some letters upon the subject of his transactions with Mrs. Clarke, and that he had a note, which is the note in question, *which he believed to be in the Duke of York's hand-writing*; that that note he had shown to Capt. Tonyn before he was made Major Tonyn, in order to induce him either to keep the deposit which he had made, or to replace the deposit which he had made, I cannot exactly recollect which; that deposit he had threatened to withdraw in consequence of the delay between the first interview he, Capt. Sandon, had with Capt. Tonyn, on the subject of his promotion, which he represented, I think, as being nearly two months; that there was likewise another note, which note had been delivered, as he stated, to Major Tonyn, which was a note saying he was to be gazetted to-night, or in words to that effect. Col. Hamilton told me he had given strict injunctions to Capt. Sandon to preserve the note which he represented as in the Duke of York's hand-writing, and which I understand now to be the note about which there has been so much inquiry here, the original of which has been produced, and every paper. I said to Col. Hamilton, that nothing could be more correct than his instruction; that it still remained to be seen what the terms of the note were, and to be judged of whether it was the Duke of York's hand-writing; I desired Col. Hamilton, therefore, to go to Capt. Sandon, and to desire to look at the note, *and to take a copy of it*, and to repeat his injunctions in the strongest manner, to preserve all the papers, and among the rest the note. Col. Hamilton returned to my house, I think it must have been considerably before one o'clock; it was after twelve or about twelve; he told me, that he had repeated those instructions, that he had taken a copy of the note, which he brought to me, which I perused, and found to be in the very terms of the note which has been since produced; and he added, that *according to his opinion and belief, it was the Duke of York's hand-writing*. I then told him that such circumstances must be immediately communicated, and I wished him, therefore, to go to Mr. Perceval, with a note which I wrote, and that I would follow as soon as I could. Col. Hamilton went to Mr. Perceval which I know, because I found him there, and had told Mr. Perceval the story before I arrived. Mr. Perceval and myself deliberated upon the course to be taken, and having understood from Col. Hamilton's representations (for I believe neither of us ever saw Capt. Sandon till he came to the Bar of this House) that Capt. Sandon had been applied to by Mrs. Clarke, and I think he said Mr. Wardle, but I will not be sure, and Mr. Lowten, to go to them, it was Mr. Perceval's suggestions, and my own, I believe mutually almost, that the most advisable course for us to direct Col. Hamilton to take, was to instruct Capt. Sandon to hold *no further communication with any person whatever till he appeared at the Bar of this House*, and likewise to instruct him, to preserve the note and all the papers he had spoken of. Col. Hamilton received those instructions at Mr. Perceval's house, and went, as I presume, to make the communication immediately to Capt. Sandon, which was to be done before two o'clock, because Sandon had promised, as we understood from Col. Hamilton, to give his answers, to the persons who had desired to see him, at that hour. After having given these directions to Col. Hamilton, it was agreed by Mr. Perceval and myself, that this matter *ought to be communicated to the Duke of York*; and it was further agreed by us, that the matter should be brought before the House of Commons by us, in case it did not make its appearance in the evidence of Capt. Sandon. I went in search of his royal highness, but it was the evening before I saw him; I communicated the matter to him, he expressed his surprise and astonishment, and declared the *impossibility* of his ever having made any such communication, and wished immediately to go to Mr. Perceval; we went to Mr. Perceval's together, where he made a *similar asseveration*, and again at Col. Gordon's. I did not see his royal highness again till between three and four on Sunday the 5th, and I did not see Col. Hamilton until Sunday at one o'clock, when I saw him for the pur-

pose of learning whether he had executed the delivering the instructions to Capt. Sandon in the manner that Mr. Perceval and myself had required; Col. Hamilton told me that he had delivered them in the very terms; that Capt. Sandon had said, that he, Col. Hamilton, might depend upon his, Capt. Sandon's, obeying his instructions; but that he would be extremely angry with him, or extremely enraged with him, I am not sure which was the expression, for he had already disobeyed one of his instructions, *he had destroyed the note*; upon which, according to Col. Hamilton's representation, he said, Good God! have you destroyed the note? Of course, I expressed myself to a similar effect to Col. Hamilton when he made the communication to me respecting the destruction of the note. I went to Mr. Perceval, according to appointment made the day before, and communicated to him this fact, as stated by Col. Hamilton; this became again *the subject of our deliberations*, and we again determined that it was our duty, *as Members of Parliament*, to bring the matter forward, leaving it to ourselves to judge in some measure, with regard to the *time* of bringing it forward; and in order that there might not be a *possibility of supposing* that we brought it forward or kept it back according to circumstances, it was determined to make the communication to certain Members of this House. Accordingly the facts, as I have now stated them, were communicated to Lord Castlereagh, to Mr. Canning, to the Attorney and Solicitor-General, to Lord H. Petty, to Mr. Whitbread, and to Gen. Fitzpatrick. This brings the fact down to the transaction in this House.

When you stated the circumstance of this note to the Duke of York, did the Duke state that *he never had written such a note* with a view of influencing Capt. Tonyn, as it has been represented by Capt. Sandon, or that *he had never written such a note at all to Mrs. Clarke*?—The Duke of York stated, that he was *perfectly sure that he had never written such a note*; that he had not a recollection of it at all.

Did he state to you, that he had never written to Mrs. Clarke upon the subject of military affairs?—He always stated to me, that, to the *best of his recollection*, he had never written to Mrs. Clarke on the subject of military affairs, and that, if he had done it, it must have been *very rarely*.

Have you any objection to state what were *the grounds* of your withholding this communication from the House, till the period it was brought forward?—The ground that influenced my mind was, that I thought if the communication had been brought forward at an earlier period, it might have *embarrassed the course of proceeding* in the Inquiry, at the instance of the gentleman who had set it on foot, and that, in considering the whole circumstances of the case, justice would be better obtained, whatever the effect of that note might be, by keeping it back till the period when it was allowed to transpire. I can only say now what were my motives and reasons for that conduct; that was what influenced me in the opinion I gave in consultation with Mr. Perceval upon that subject. I mentioned that I did not see the Duke again till three or four o'clock on Sunday; at one o'clock on Sunday I was informed, by Colonel Hamilton, of Sandon's having declared the note to be destroyed. Between three and four o'clock on Sunday I informed the Duke of York of that fact. I think it right to state that as a material fact in the case.

You have stated, that one motive which you had for keeping back the mention of this note to so late a period, was, lest you should *embarrass* the gentleman who brought forward this inquiry, by the premature disclosure of the note; explain to the Committee *how* that disclosure would have *embarrassed* him *more than the cross-examinations which took place, when the Witnesses appeared at the Bar*?—I considered this note, and the transaction respecting it, the disclosure respecting its destruction, to form one of the most *extraordinary features* that I had ever known of in any case. If I had been in the course of examining Witnesses much in this proceeding, I should have avoided cross-examining to that fact, thinking the mode that was adopted a more satisfactory means of bringing it forward; and I believe it will be found, that there was no cross-examination of Sandon to that fact, nor any thing that could lead to it; and therefore, answering to the motive, and not to the fact, I can only say it does not strike me that this stands upon the same footing as the ordinary cross-examination of Witnesses, according to my conception.

Why should its being an *extraordinary feature* prevent its being presented at an early period; is it *usual* for extraordinary features to be kept back in evidence

in Courts of justice, when they relate to the evidence that witnesses examined in chief, are giving to the Court?—I conceive, that being possessed of a fact of this sort, which I found it my *bounden* duty, in conjunction with Mr. Perceval, to bring before the public, whatever its consequences might be, and which the Royal Duke, I believe, had expressed a desire to Mr. Perceval, should be brought before the public, that I had a right to *exercise my discretion*, in conjunction with Mr. Perceval, to bring it before the public at the time that, according to that discretion, we should think the best, meaning *honestly* and distinctly at all times, to bring it before the House.

You have stated, that you thought that the purposes of justice would be best answered by not bringing this fact before the House sooner than it was brought; will you explain *how the purposes of justice were likely to be best answered by the delay in bringing forward the circumstances respecting this note?*—I can only state how I think the purposes of justice would be best answered; I cannot be so presumptuous as to say that the purposes of justice were best answered, but in my opinion they were, because it brought this particular feature of the case distinctly, clearly, and unembarrassed, before the House; that if it had been mixed up in cross-examination, or brought forward in that shape, it neither would have appeared so distinct, nor have appeared so clearly the determination of the persons bringing it forward.

MR. PERCEVAL examined.

Have you heard the statement of the hon. gent. lately under examination, and do you wish to add any thing to that statement?—I am not quite certain that I heard the whole. If it is wished that I should state the motives that influenced my mind, not in keeping this back, but in not bringing it forward before, I conceived the case that was to be made against the Royal Duke *was closed*. When the communication was made to me, I thought at the first it was a very extraordinary circumstance; and when I found that the note was, as the Witness represented it, destroyed, coupled with the *direct assertion of the Royal Duke*, that this note *was a forgery*, I thought it to be a forgery, and I determined to act upon the supposition of its being such, and upon that impression, and with a view the better to detect it, if it were so, I thought it better that all the Witnesses that could in any degree have been concerned in that transaction, should have told their own tale to the Committee, before they were in any degree informed, by me at least, or by the course that we took, of our being in possession of any fact, or inclined to make use of the information we had of any fact; it might break in upon their own plan of narrating it to the Committee; if it had been a single case, instead of a variety of cases, that were brought before the Committee, I apprehend that there could be no question; that on the part of the defence to that charge, *those who interested themselves in the defence*, could not be called upon to produce any part of the evidence which they thought material, till they had the whole of the case that was to be brought against *them* laid before the Court; and considering how the whole of these cases are, by means of the same Witnesses, more or less, being brought forward upon them all; considering from that circumstance how they were all connected, I conceived it would be better that this information should not be given till it was closed.

Was the introduction of this evidence settled, upon the supposition *that the note was actually destroyed?*—Certainly my impression was, that the note *was actually destroyed*, and it was *after* that impression was conveyed to me, that the note was actually destroyed, that I concurred with my hon. and learned friend in thinking that it was equally necessary that fact should be brought before the Committee; and perhaps I might be permitted to add that, feeling there was a *considerable degree of awkwardness in the appearance of being backward* to bring forward at the earliest period a fact so important as this fact was, we did think that *our own honour would hardly be safe*, unless we made a communication not only of the fact, but of our determination to produce it in the manner in which we did.

This is very good, indeed. I beg every one to read it over twice, at least, every day for a month. If I had but a parrot, I would make her learn to say it over a thousand times a day.

Mind, they thought the note was *destroyed*, before they told any soul of its existence, except *the Lord Chancellor*.

Now, let us hear what they said on the 22nd of February.

Examination of the 22nd.

MR. PERCEVAL. Would you wish to correct or alter any part of the evidence you gave on Monday, relative to this transaction?—I do not recollect any part of the evidence I gave on Monday that I would wish to correct or alter; if the noble lord, in consequence of the information he has now collected, would wish to ask any other question, I will give an answer.

When you made the statement to this Committee, of the destruction of this note, had you heard that the note was not destroyed?—When I made the statement to the Committee, I had received such a communication as my hon. friend has just mentioned, and I did, in the statement that I made to the Committee, if my recollection does not extremely fail me, state that I did by no means know whether the note was destroyed or not, and that statement I certainly did make in consequence of the information I had but recently received; for, except from that recent information, I had strongly impressed upon my mind that the note was destroyed.

State who the persons were to whom you had given information respecting this note?—I can state several, but I cannot undertake to be certain that I can state them all; I communicated it to the Solicitor-General, to the Attorney-General, to my Lord *Castlereagh*, to Mr. *Canning*, and I think I mentioned it to Mr. *Yorke*, and I am pretty confident that I mentioned it to others; I mentioned it likewise to the *Lord Chancellor*, I mentioned it to my Lord *Liverpool*, and I mentioned it to Mr. *Huskisson* and Mr. *Long*, and they concurred in the opinion that Mr. Adam should communicate it to some friends of his on the other side of the House; and I believe that to every one of the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned, I did state at the same time my opinion, that from the first moment that I had heard of the existence of this note, I felt it to be my clear duty not to be the depositary of such a secret; that I formed that opinion upon the first day that it was communicated to me, before I understood it to be destroyed, and that *as soon as I did know that it was destroyed*, which was the next day, I THEN communicated it to the different persons that I have mentioned, but I believe that no person did know of the existence of the note *till I heard that it was destroyed*, except I believe *the Lord Chancellor*, when I had reason to believe it was in existence. Before I heard that it had been destroyed, *I determined* to communicate the fact, so that the note, if it was not destroyed, should be extracted by the evidence at the bar; and when I heard that it was destroyed, I still continued to act upon that determination, and made that determination known. In the examination that I made of the witness (Sandon) at the bar I had in my mind, the whole time of that examination, the various points of fact which the witness had communicated to Col. Hamilton; and if the witness had not at last confessed that the note was not destroyed, I should, unquestionably, have asked him, whether he had not communicated to Colonel Hamilton, that very morning, that it was not destroyed.

Now, reader, you have the whole of the evidence, or, at least, all that is in any wise material, of this Case, fairly before you. It divides itself into two distinct branches; that which relates to the *origin of the note*, and that which relates to the conduct of those, who, being in early possession of the fact, *kept it from the House until so late a period*.

As to the first, there are only two persons, namely, Gen. Brownrigg and Mr. Nesbitt, who discover any dissimilarity at all, between the Duke's acknowledged hand-writing, and the hand-writing of the Note. Other evidence against the authenticity of the Note there is none; and it cannot have escaped the observation of any reader, that the manner, in which Mrs. Clarke gives her evidence relative to the Note, is strongly indicative of conscious truth. As to what Town says, it amounts to

nothing, even if there were no ground to doubt of his general veracity. It will be observed, too, that when a person *forges*, it is for some weighty purpose, and with a desire to make sure as to the effect. This Note, as evidence, is of great importance; but, as a thing intended for the purpose of pacifying Major Tonym, it was very poor indeed. If Mrs. Clarke had thought it worth her while to forge, would she not have forged something more full and satisfactory? Would she not have put the Duke's *name*; and, above all things, would she not have forged an address to *herself*, and not to "George Farquhar, Esq.?" How was Tonym, the person to be imposed upon by the forgery, to know that this was the address, under which the Duke sent his letters to Gloucester-place?

Against the internal evidence of the hand-writing, evidence quite sufficient, of itself, for conviction in the ordinary course of law, and evidence unshaken by any of another sort that has been produced; against this evidence, we have, indeed, the *positive assertion* of the Duke of York, conveyed to the House through Mr. Adam, which Duke of York solemnly avers, that he never, in his life, wrote any such note.

The reader will duly weigh the one against the other, and I have not the smallest doubt, that he will not be long in coming to a just conclusion.

But, important as this Note is, as matter of evidence; important as it evidently is in settling the point, whether the Duke had the "*slightest suspicion*," of jobbing for promotion being carried on by his mistress; still it is beyond all measure, more important, as having given rise to a series of actions, on the part of the King's servants and others, such as that which have been brought to light in the examinations of Mr. Perceval and Mr. Adam.

The facts speak so plainly for themselves, that no commentary, or summary, is necessary; but, I cannot refrain from giving a short view of the case.

On the 4th of February, we see Col. Hamilton, of the Wagon Train; a person in the army, and in the receipt of a monstrous income from his office; in possession of the important fact, that Sandon has a note, *is the hand-writing of the Duke* (for such Hamilton says he thought it), relating to the promotion of Major Tonym, and said by Sandon to have been shown to Tonym, in order to prevent him from withdrawing money destined for Mrs. Clarke. This note was a thing of the very first importance; and Hamilton saying he so regarded it, went to communicate the knowledge of its existence to to whom? Not to Mr. Wardle; not to the gentleman who brought forward the charges; but, to Mr. Adam, the avowed, the gratuitous adviser, of the Duke of York.

Well, the fact, the important fact, is now in the breast of a *member of parliament*, of one of the *judges* in the case. And what does he do? Why, he sends Colonel Hamilton to to whom? Not to Mr. Wardle, not to the gentleman, who brought forward the charges, and who had the "*heavy responsibility*" of proving them hanging over his head; no, not to Mr. Wardle; but, to Mr. Perceval, one of the *servants of the King*.

Mr. Adam and Mr. Perceval (both members of parliament, both judges in the case) now hold a consultation, and what is the result of that consultation? Why, that Hamilton should advise Sandon to hold no com-

munication with any other person till he came to the bar of the House; that the matter should be brought before the House of Commons; but, *first of all*, that it should be *communicated to the Duke of York*, to the party *accused*, by two of his *judges*, before it was communicated to the *House*, which was accordingly *done*.

Stop here, reader; pause a while; think well of this before you go any further. They thought it quite right to communicate this very important fact to the *accused*, though they tell you that they expressly advised that Sandon should keep it and every thing else from the *accuser*.

Oh! faith, I had like to have forgotten, that they charged Digby Hamilton, expressly charged Digby to tell Sandon to *preserve the note*; to be sure to *preserve* the note; not to fail to *preserve* the note, which Digby thought was in the Duke's hand-writing. Digby was, indeed, to repeat all his own former salutary advice to Sandon, but was to be sure to tell him to *preserve*, that is to say, *not to destroy*, the note, which Digby Hamilton thought to be in the Duke's hand-writing.

Alas! see how frail poor human nature is, and how unavailing, in certain cases, are all the precautions of wisdom! Digby comes to Mr. Adam, on the 5th of February, the very next day, with the sad tidings, that the note, the important note, is *de-royed*, and of his having exclaimed to Sandon — "Good God! have you destroyed the note?"

In to council again upon this. Away goes Mr. Adam to . . . to Mr. Wardle? No. To the House? No. But to Mr. Perceval again. *Again* they deliberate, and again *determine* to bring the matter before the House; but reserving to *themselves* to judge of the proper time; but, in order that there may not be a possibility of supposing that they ever, in any case, meant to suppress it, they *now* determined to make the communication to certain members of the House. One of them made the communication to certain members of his side, and the other to certain members of his side; but, neither of them ever communicated it to any soul, except the Lord Chancellor, TILL AFTER THEY BELIEVED THE NOTE TO HAVE BEEN DESTROYED. Reader, write that fact up over your mantlepiece. Read it a hundred times a day.

Well, did they now communicate the important fact to Mr. Wardle? No. To Lord Folkestone? No, no; the *accuser*; the person with "*heavy responsibility*" hanging over his head; the member to whom "*infamy*" was to attach, if he failed to prove his charges, had not the fact communicated to him.

At last the hour arrives; the fulness of time arrives, and the great fact of the *destroyed note*, the *suppressed evidence*, the *forgery*, is to be poured out upon the devoted heads of Mr. Wardle and Mrs. Clarke, when (as if the father of lies himself had exhausted his skill in vain upon Sandon) Mr. Adam and Mr. Perceval, but a few minutes before the statement is made, learn, and, doubtless, to their inexpressible satisfaction, that the note *is not destroyed*.

"All ye gods, who rule the soul;
"Styx, through all whose waters roll," &c.

Well, in plain prose, out came the note; aye, the very identical note; the dear little God-bless-you billet; the sequel of which production we have already seen.

Now, then, I shall leave the reader to make up his mind upon this everlastingly-to-be-remembered transaction ; and trouble him with only one observation, as to what would have been the consequence, if the Devil had insinuated into the mind of Sandon to destroy the note *in reality*. In that case, the flat denial of the Duke ; his positive assertion ; his solemn asseveration, that he had never written any such note, would have been placed, not in opposition to the hand-writing of the note itself, as it now is, but in opposition to the bare assertion of Mrs. Clarke, which assertion would have come discredited by the very suspicious circumstance of her associate Sandon having destroyed the note, and that, too, in direct opposition to the injunctions laid on him by the friends of the Duke, through Col. Hamilton.

DR. O'MEARA'S CASE.—The case of General Clavering will require more room than I have, at present, to spare ; for, on various accounts, it is a case of primary importance. I shall, therefore, take the case of the Doctor, which lies in a smaller compass.

Mrs. CLARKE, in her evidence of the 9th of February, stated amongst other things, that she was applied to for a *deanery* and a *bishoprick*. Having so said, she was, as usual, pressed on, with the apparent prospect of detecting her in falsehood, till she came to state the name of Dr. O'Meara, who applied to her to get him made a *bishop*. At first, this fact rested upon her bare word ; and while that was the case, many persons disbelieved, or affected, at least, to disbelieve her statement ; but, as usual, this attempt to throw discredit upon her evidence only tended to put her upon her mettle ; to set her to work to rummage out other testimony than her own.

She stated, on the 9th of February, that Dr. O'Meara, who wanted to be a bishop, applied to her ; that she communicated the Doctor's offer to the Duke of York, together with all the Doctor's documents ; that the answer of the Duke was, that the Doctor had preached before the King, and that the King did not like the great O in his name ; that she does not recollect the precise sum that the Doctor offered, but that she might recollect, though not at this moment ; that the Doctor's application to her was made in 1805, the very night that the Duke was going to Weymouth ; that the Doctor called upon her the moment the Duke had left the house, at midnight ; that she thinks he must have watched the Duke out, as he had seen his horses waiting in Portman-square, and then, coming in just as she was upon the stairs, said it was a very good opportunity, for he was going to Weymouth immediately, and asked her to come down stairs again, and write him a *letter of introduction* to the Duke, which she did.

On the 13th of February, she brought to the bar a letter of the Duke of York, written to her from Weymouth, which letter tells her that Dr. O'Meara had applied to him (the Duke) in order to be allowed "*to preach before royalty* ;" that he, the Duke, will put him in the way of it if he can ; and that, as the ground of this, the Doctor has delivered to him *her* letter.—Not content with this proof of her influence as well as of the intercourse, she rummages out a stray document of Dr. O'Meara, which had accidentally remained in her hands, which document is no less than a testimonial in favour of Dr. O'Meara under the hand of *the Archbishop of Tuam*, which testimonial states, that the writer has received satisfactory assurances, that the Doctor is "a gentleman of most unexceptionable

“character, in every respect, of a respectable family, and independent fortune.”

Thus the proof, in the Doctor's case, is quite complete, unless the reader should be of opinion, that the positive evidence, as to the fact of a tendered bribe, be not sufficiently corroborated by the letter of the Duke of York to Mrs. Clarke, and by the letter of the Archbishop of Tuam being found in her possession.

To the Doctor's case there hangs a tail, and for the sight of which tail, at the present moment, the public are indebted to the COURIER.

My readers will not blame me for having been sparing in dissertations upon *puffs*. I have, not less than a hundred times, had to point out the shameful, and scandalous, the infamous deception of the people through the means of the press. The most complete puff I ever heard of, one that far surpasses any thing that Mr. Sheridan had an idea of when he wrote the Critic, or, to go still farther, any thing that either he or his son has ever practised in reality, was a puff of a Lord, who is now no more, and whose name I will not mention. This lord, who had written a pamphlet about Ireland, under a feigned name, and who was very anxious to get some employment under government, was continually puffing himself off in the newspapers, and at last he got so completely the master of all inward shame, as to prepare, with his own hand, a paragraph in nearly these words: “While others of comparatively trifling merit, are eternally thrusting themselves forward to public notice, and puffing off their petty pretensions to place and power, it is Lord ——'s lot, to do good by *stealth*, and *blush to find it fame*.”

Reader, do you not feel for the man? Can you conceive how a man could bear his existence, under the contemplation of such a paragraph, written with his own hand? Yet, I assure you, that the fact is as I have stated it.

From this we come to the famous puff of Dr. O'Meara, who did get in the way of “*preaching before royalty*,” at Weymouth, and who had no mind that the thing should remain unknown, as you will see when you have read the following article, inserted in the Morning Post, or Nabob's Gazette, under the head of Weymouth, Oct. 3, 1805 :

“The Rev. Dr. O'Meara preached on Sunday an excellent sermon (from Rom. ch. xii. v. 5.) on Universal Benevolence. He explained with great eloquence on the relation which the *public* and *private* affections bear to each other, and their use in the moral system.—He inveighed with peculiar energy against the savage philosophy of the *French Deists*, who propose to erect a system of universal philanthropy upon the ruins of the *private affections* which regard kindred, friends, benefactors, and the poor, thus inverting the eternal order of nature, by violently transferring all the lovely train of social affections from our relatives and friends to distant and unknown myriads. Whilst under these vague terms of attachment to, and of advancing the general good, the practice of every debasing vice finds a shelter, and the perpetration of every horrid crime a subterfuge.—We wish our young ecclesiastics would arouse themselves, and shake off that mental languor which oppresses them in the pulpit, and show themselves in earnest.—*Sacred eloquence* is certainly in *this country* feeble and unimpressive; no other excellence can supply the want of animation.—That sweet charm, that *celestial unction*, which Christian oratory demands, this gentleman possesses in an eminent degree. ‘*His lips are touched with the live coal from off the altar*.’—The King was very attentive, and stood for nearly the whole of the sermon (which we never observed before), and expressed his high approbation to the Earl of Uxbridge and others, whilst the Queen and Princesses, and the whole audience, were melted into tears.”—“Now,” says the COURIER, “connecting the application of Mrs. Clarke to the Duke in favour of Dr. O'Meara,

“with the letter from the Duke, stating that he will endeavour to accomplish the Doctor’s wish of preaching before royalty, and the above sketch of the discourse which the Doctor did preach before royalty, *Mrs. Clarke will have the credit of having been the cause of a sermon upon universal benevolence having been preached before the Royal Family, which produced a great effect upon the King, and melted the Queen and all the Princesses into tears.*”

Amongst other things, which the Conspiracy, the Jacobin Conspiracy, wishes to accomplish, is, we are told, the overthrow of the *Church*, including of course Dr. O’Meara, who possesses the *celestial unction*, and whose “lips are touched with the *live coal* from off the altar;” aye, those very lips, through which had passed the offer to Mrs. Clarke. Why, John Bowles and Redhead Yorke may say what they please about “our holy religion” being in danger of a Jacobin plot; but, will they have the impudence to say, that transactions like these ought to be tolerated, let *what will* be the consequence of removing the means of their existing? Perhaps they will; but, they may be assured, that that impudence will only tend to hasten the cutting-up of the corruptions.

Dean Swift gives us a caution against your gentry with “the *celestial unction*;” and it is no small compliment to the discernment of *the King*, that he was not to be imposed upon in this case; for, though he might express his objection merely to the great O, yet there is no doubt, that he saw the whole drift of the preacher, and pretty fairly estimated his character as well as his talents.

It should further be observed here, that the Duke does not speak with any great *confidence* even of being able to get the Doctor the opportunity to preach before the King. When it came *there*, the way was full of difficulty. The matter was delicate. *And this, in justice to the King*, the people should bear in mind.

MISS TAYLOR’S CASE.—And here I have to beseech the attention of the public, and the exercise of their best feelings, towards, and in behalf of, a person, who appears to me to merit not only their compassion, but their efficient protection.

The evidence, which she has given, is before them. They will have seen, that, from first to last, it was clear, precise, consistent, and bearing all the features of truth and honesty.

They will also have observed, that Mr. Wardle declared in the House, that, when he told her, he should want her evidence, she said, that, “*if she told the truth, she knew it would be to the ruin of herself and her dearest connections, and that she hoped he would not force her forwards.*”

After every effort that was made to find out grounds of imputation against her, it is notorious that not the smallest grounds were discovered, and that while she stood ornamented with truth and sensibility, the only fault of her life was her having lived upon terms of intimacy with Mrs. Clarke, with that Mrs. Clarke, with whom a prince was living, and with whom we find a *countess* in the closest habits of friendship.

What Miss Taylor foresaw, as the consequence of her evidence, has (*I state it upon unquestionable authority*) actually come to pass.

She and her sister, after much pains and difficulty, had succeeded in establishing a school, at Chelsea, by which they hoped to be able to support themselves. Since she appeared at the bar of the House, she has lost all her scholars, the number being *twelve*; her goods have been

seized for rent and taxes due, and she is now actually in danger of a prison, though the whole of her debts do not exceed *a hundred and fifty pounds*.—It is true, that the rent and taxes and debts were due previous to the inquiry; but, the forcing of her before the House of Commons, caused the loss of her scholars; that is to say, the loss of the only means which she had, or could be supposed to have, of ever paying any of those demands. Viewing her in this state, not only of insolvency, but of *irretrievable* insolvency, her creditors would naturally fall upon her, and therefore, to the circumstance of her having been *compelled* to give evidence, and to make a full exposure of all her connections and acquaintance, and to that circumstance *alone*, she owes her ruin, and her present danger of actual imprisonment.

It is not for me to point out, nor is my local situation calculated for the carrying into execution, any precise plan for the relief of this unfortunate and hardly-treated young woman; but, I think it my duty to recommend her case to the public, who, I am sure, will not suffer her to sink into the lowest depths of misery. The payment of her debts is the first thing necessary; because upon that, perhaps, even her life may depend; and that, I think, ought to be followed by the raising of money sufficient to secure her a small annuity. There have been few appeals of this sort made to an English public in vain; and, as far as my recollection serves me, there never was one made with fairer or stronger claims upon public justice.

Botley, Thursday, March 9, 1809.

DUKE OF YORK.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register*, March, 1809.)

Mr. SPENCER PERCEVAL, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, receives 2,600*l.* a year, in that capacity; for his office in the Treasury, 1,600*l.* a year; as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, 4,525*l.* a year; as Surveyor of Meltings and Clerk of the Irons in the Mint, 126*l.* a year: besides which, he has the grant in reversion, after the death of his brother, Lord Arden, of sinecure offices, or offices executed by deputy, of the *clear* value, according to their own statement, of 12,562*l.* a year.—These facts, which are stated upon the authority of a Report, laid before the House of Commons, in the month of June last, show, that this gentleman receives now, 8,851 pounds a year of the public money, and that, if his brother were now to die, he would be in the receipt of 21,413*l.* a year of the public money.

THE anxiously looked-for discussion of the Evidence, relative to the charges against the Duke of York, has, by this time (Tuesday), taken place; and, it will naturally be expected of me, that I offer some remarks upon that discussion. This I shall do; but, to go much into detail is impossible, and, indeed, would be useless. The general turn and complexion of the discussion, particularly noticing some characterizing features of it, is all that can be the subject of remark here; but, I think it necessary to state, that the whole of this important Debate, and also the whole of the Evidence and Documents produced by the Inquiry, will,

in the fullest manner, be inserted in my PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, where the several Speeches will be recorded, in my usual manner, with the most scrupulous impartiality; and, I take this opportunity to notify, that any member, on either side, who may have a wish to have his speech recorded with particular accuracy, shall find his communications punctually and readily attended to.

Before I enter upon my observations upon the debate, as it relates to the great merits of the case, I cannot refrain from noticing a passage, in the speech of Mr. Adam, relating to *my own conduct*. It will be remembered that, at page 57, in referring to the extraordinary rise of his son in the army, I pointed out the almost inevitable evils that must arise from the making of very young men commanding officers of regiments. In alluding to these remarks, Mr. ADAM, in his speech of the 10th instant, “adverted to the pain, which some remarks, which had been made, in a weekly publication, upon his son’s promotion, had occasioned him, and regretted, that he had it not in his power to show the House, that the *imputation* founded upon what had been represented as a scandalous circumstance, ‘that the backs of a thousand men should be submitted to a youth, who had not yet attained the age of twenty-one years,’ so far from being justified in fact, was most *illiberal* and *unfair*, and that there was not a battalion in his Majesty’s service, in which fewer corporal punishments were inflicted, or in which better military regulations were established.”

Now, I need not tell the discerning reader, that, when men find it difficult to rebut what *is* said, they not unfrequently are led to attack what *is not* said; and, in the first place, with respect to this complaint of Mr. Adam, after a careful examination of the passage complained of, I do not find, that I have denominated the speedy promotion of Colonel Adam “a scandalous circumstance.” But, in the next place, I am quite sure, that my words will not, in any hands upon earth, admit of being strained to mean, that the regiment, under the command of that gentleman, was cruelly treated, or that it suffered, in any way, from the circumstance of *his* having the command of it. The words were these:—

“At twenty-one years of age *no person in the world* can be fit for a Lieutenant-Colonel. He has the absolute command of a *thousand men*. The comfort, the happiness, the morality, the *backs* of a thousand men depend upon his wisdom and integrity. A person to be intrusted with such a charge, ought to be sober, considerate, compassionate, and yet firm to execute justice. Where are these to be found united with the passions inseparable from youth? Besides, is it possible, that the other officers, captains old enough, perhaps, to be his father, and who have every fair claim to prior promotion, can cordially submit to the command, and, occasionally, to the *reproof*, of a boy of twenty-one? What would Mr. Adam say, if he had to plead before a *judge* of twenty-one years of age? Yet, the Lieutenant-Colonel of a Regiment (for the Colonel *never* commands) has powers still greater than those of a judge. He has, in the course of a year, to decide upon the cases of, perhaps, two thousand offences. He has to judge of characters; to weigh the merits of candidates for promotion; his smile is encouragement, and his frown disgrace; it depends upon him, whether the soldier’s life be a pleasure or a curse. Is not all this too much for the age of twenty-one years?”

Now, what “*imputation*” is there here upon Colonel Adam? Are not all the arguments *general*? And do they breathe sober common sense; dispassionate reason; or illiberality and unfairness? I am ready to allow, that there is a very great difference in young men; that the

days of wisdom begin with some at an age when others ought still to be in leading-strings; and, I believe, judging from the character of the father; considering the sort of education, the early habits of sobriety, and of all the moral virtues, which Col. Adam would, in all likelihood, have derived from the example of so good a man and so kind a parent; considering these things, I believe, that Col. Adam may have been as fit for the command of a regiment at the age of twenty-one, as many others at a much more advanced age. But, then, it is the danger of the precedent; and, the small chance that a youth of twenty-one should be so endowed. Besides, the *passions* of youth who is to quench, or to qualify? That *zeal* for the service, which is so necessary to constitute a good officer, may become mischievous, and greatly mischievous, if unrestrained by wisdom, and this sort of wisdom is not to be obtained without *experience*, which experience must, again, be indebted for its existence to years, and many years, of actual service. I myself, by a combination of rare circumstances, became possessed of great power over the greater part of a regiment, at the age of *nineteen*, I think it was; and, though I always acted for what I deemed the good of the service, I did many things, which I would not now do, if possessed of similar power. Always sober, always in good health, always up long before the sun, with limbs that never felt weary, with a body of iron, and a mind wholly wrapped up in the military service, I made no allowances for the weaknesses, or lukewarmness, of others. That zeal which I felt, I was disappointed at not meeting with in every other breast. Not to run *with pleasure* at the call of the drum appeared to me as a sort of crime; when I should have considered, that the stimulus which I had, others had not, and that, therefore, to them should have been left other enjoyments. Greater application and zeal than I possessed; a more ardent and sincere desire to do good to the service, I defy Colonel Adam, or any man breathing, to possess; there was nothing that affected the credit of the regiment, which I did not feel more acutely than if it had affected myself. Yet, as I have grown in years; as I have experienced the feelings of husband and father, and as I have had occasion to contemplate the characters, the tempers, the causes of the vices and virtues of men, I have, many times, had to look back with sorrow at many of those acts, which proceeded from the best intentions; therefore, I am qualified to speak upon this matter, and think myself fully justified in the observations that I have made, not believing it to be at all likely, that, out of ten men of twenty-one years of age, the nation should afford one more sober, more vigilant, or less likely to have his mind improperly biassed, than I was.

I have thus gone into my own case as an illustration, because I would leave nothing undone to show, that I was not, in the remarks which appear to have given pain to Mr. Adam, actuated by any motive of "*illiberality* or *unfairness*," but solely by my conviction of the injurious consequences, which must arise, almost necessarily, from the committing of regiments to the command of such very young men. The law, which, in such matters, contains the accumulated wisdom of ages, denies to persons the possession of their own property, till they be twenty-one years of age; it denies them the liberty of choosing for themselves husbands and wives, until that age, before they have arrived at which, it denominates them *infants*; and, be it observed, that Mr. Adam's son was a *Major*, and, as such, was, of course, frequently the *commanding officer*

of a regiment, at the age of twenty; for, it is notorious, that it seldom happens, that the Lieutenant-Colonel and the Major are both present at the same time.

I shall conclude with declaring my sorrow at having given Mr. Adam pain; and, I think, that the public must be convinced, that I have, as far as my duty would allow me, avoided so doing. He is a gentleman, of whom I have heard much good; of whom, from no party or person, I never heard a word of harm in my life; there are many circumstances in his progress through public life, which are highly honourable to him, and I myself am under great obligations to his wisdom, his talents, and his disinterestedness: but, if Mr. Adam will, for a moment, put himself in my place, I am sure he will say, that I could not have left unnoticed that which, with regard to him, I have noticed, and that my observations could not have been more lenient than they have been, without justly subjecting me to the charge of base partiality.

In entering upon the Debate, the first thing necessary is, to state, as correctly as it can now be done, the several propositions, that have been submitted for the adoption of the House. On the 8th of the month (Wednesday) Mr. WARDLE, at the close of a speech, in which he most ably summed up the Evidence upon all the separate Cases, made a motion in the following words:

“That an humble Address be presented to his Majesty, humbly stating to his Majesty, that information has been communicated to this House, and evidence produced to support it, of various corrupt practices and other abuses having prevailed for some years past, in the disposal of Commissions and Promotions in his Majesty's Land Forces—that his Majesty's faithful Commons, according to the duty by which they are bound to his Majesty and to their constituents, have carefully examined into the truth of sundry transactions which have been brought before them, in proof of such corrupt practices and abuses; and that it is with the utmost concern and astonishment his Majesty's faithful Commons find themselves obliged, most humbly, to inform his Majesty, that the result of their diligent inquiries into the facts, by the examination of persons concerned, together with other witnesses, and a variety of documents, has been such as to satisfy his faithful Commons, that the existence of such corrupt practices and abuses is substantially true.

“That his Majesty's faithful Commons are restrained by motives of personal respect and attachment to his Majesty, from entering into a detail of these transactions, being convinced that they could not be stated without exciting the most painful sensations of grief and indignation in the breast of his Majesty: That the proceedings of his Majesty's faithful Commons upon this important subject have been public, and the evidence brought before them is recorded in the proceedings of parliament; and that they trust his Majesty will give them credit, when they assure his Majesty, that in the execution of this painful duty they have proceeded with all due deliberation. That without entering into any other of the many obvious consequences which may be expected to follow, from the belief once generally established, of the prevalence of such abuses in the Military Department, there is one great and essential consideration inseparable from the present subject, which they humbly beg leave, in a more particular manner, to submit to his Majesty's gracious consideration, namely, that if an opinion should prevail amongst his Majesty's Land Forces, that promotion may be obtained by other means than by merit and service—by means at once unjust to the Army and disgraceful to the authority placed over it, the effect of such an opinion must necessarily be, to wound the feelings and abate the zeal of all ranks and descriptions of his Majesty's Army.

“That it is the opinion of this House, that the abuses which they have thus most humbly represented to his Majesty, could not have prevailed to the extent in which they had been proved to exist, without the knowledge of the Commander-in-Chief; and that even if, upon any principle of reason or probability, it could

" be presumed that abuses so various and so long-continued could, in fact have prevailed without his knowledge, such a presumption in his favour would not warrant the conclusion that the command of the Army could, with safety, or ought in prudence, to be continued in his hands.

" That on these grounds and principles his Majesty's faithful Commons most humbly submit their opinion to his Majesty's gracious consideration, that his royal highness the Duke of York ought to be deprived of the Command of the Army."

Mr. PERCEVAL, with the intervention only of Mr. BURTON, followed Mr. Wardle, and proposed, in the way of amendment, to leave out the whole of Mr. Wardle's motion, with the exception of the word "*That*," and to substitute the following in its stead :—

" That an Address be presented to his Majesty, humbly representing, that in consequence of charges against his royal highness the Duke of York, his faithful Commons thought it their indispensable duty to inquire into the same, in the most solemn and public manner; and after the most diligent and attentive inquiry, his most faithful Commons, considering the lively interest his Majesty must feel in any inquiry respecting the conduct of his royal highness the Duke of York, thought it their duty to lay before his Majesty the following Resolutions :—

" Resolved, That charges having been brought against his royal highness the Duke of York, imputing to him *personal corruption* and criminal connivance in the execution of his office; and this House having referred the said charges to a Committee, &c. feels it its duty to pronounce a distinct opinion upon the subject.

" Resolved, That it is the opinion of this House, after the fullest and most attentive examination of all the evidence adduced, that there is *no ground for charging his Royal Highness with personal corruption or connivance* at such practices, disclosed in the testimony heard at the bar.

" And his Majesty's faithful Commons think it their duty further to state to his Majesty, that while the House has seen the *exemplary regularity* and method in which business is conducted in his Royal Highness's office, and the salutary regulations introduced by him, some of which were intended to prevent the very abuses complained of, and which have been brought under review, they cannot but feel the greatest regret and concern that a connection should have existed which has thus exposed his Royal Highness's character to public CALUMNY. and that frauds should have been carried on, with which his Royal Highness's name has been coupled, of a most disgraceful and dangerous tendency; but it is, at the same time, a great consolation to the House to observe the deep concern his Royal Highness has expressed, that such a connection should ever have taken place; and on the expression of that regret the House is confident that his Royal Highness will keep in view the uniformly virtuous and exemplary conduct of his Majesty, since the commencement of his reign, and which has endeared his Majesty to all his subjects."

On the 10th (Friday), after Messrs. Bragge and Whitbread and the Attorney-General had spoken, Mr. BANKES spoke, and concluded with saying,

" That he was decidedly of opinion, that the House would not do its duty, if it did not communicate to the King their opinion, that the Duke of York could no longer continue an useful servant of the public. The Address proposed by Mr. Perceval, was, he observed, a mere extract from a Letter recently presented to that House, in a very extraordinary, and, in his mind, in a very exceptionable manner. It was the custom to say, that the Address of the House to any Speech from the throne, was generally the echo of the Speech; but he never could suppose it possible to be said, that the Address of that House should be the echo of a letter. In this case, however, it might be said with justice; and he never could persuade himself to subscribe to such an echo. He hoped the House would manifest an equal unwillingness to do so. If the House could not only endure to receive a letter, which was itself an infringement on its privileges, but could submit to send an Address to his Majesty, in obedience to that letter, it must be contented to sink in its own estimation and that of the country. Let the proceed-

ing of the House be guided by proper motives, and spring from a pure source, and the country would do justice to its conduct, while it must retain its own good opinion. Differing so decidedly as he did from his right honourable friend, in the conclusions to which his mind had come upon the evidence, he could admit nothing more than that it was barely possible his right honourable friend might be right. But that he was not so, that House would, he hoped, and trusted, for its own credit and character, prove by the decision it pronounced upon this important question."

Mr. Bankes then proposed a further Amendment, in the following words :

"That information had been laid before the House, with respect to certain abuses and corruptions which were alleged to be prevalent in the disposal and purchase of commissions and promotions in his Majesty's land forces. That the House had accordingly instituted the most diligent examination into the grounds of such charges; and that they felt the deepest concern that the result of that inquiry was such as to convince them *that such corruptions and abuses had prevailed*. That they had, at the same time, great satisfaction in being enabled to declare, that there appeared to them to be no ground for charging the Commander-in-Chief with *personal corruption*; but while they were glad to do this justice to his Royal Highness, and to acknowledge the good consequences that had resulted to the army from the regulations he had introduced, and the improvements he had adopted in advancing their discipline and conduct, still they felt themselves obliged to express their opinion, that such abuses could not have prevailed, to the extent they had done, *without exciting at least the suspicion of the Commander-in-Chief*; and that if such abuses had existed without the knowledge of his Royal Highness, that House *had great reason to doubt whether the chief command of his Majesty's forces could with propriety, or ought with prudence, remain in the hands of the Duke of York*. That the House had discovered, with the deepest concern, that a connection had subsisted fraught with injurious consequences to the cause of religion and morals, and of a character the most opposite in its nature to the bright example of morality given, throughout a long reign, by his Majesty to his people."

Of these three propositions we will first notice that of Mr. Perceval, which is, as Mr. Bankes described it, the mere *echo of a letter*, but with the addition of a declaration, that the Duke of York has been found free from *personal corruption* and from any *connivance* at such corruption.

There is nothing better calculated to bewilder and mislead the public, than an artful *selection of terms*. If the people had put to them this question: "*Do you think that it is proved, that the Duke of York knew that his mistress took money for using her influence with him, regarding promotions, &c. and that he used his authority to further her views in getting such money?*" If this question were put to the people, they would know how to answer at once, without a moment's hesitation; but, by the invention of the term "*personal corruption*," to which vast importance is attached, some people are puzzled; a distinction is erected; a doubt is excited, whether there be not one sort of corruption which is criminal, in the eye of the law, and another *not* criminal in the eye of the law.

But, what is *corruption*? The plain meaning of the word, as applied to persons in authority under the public, is this: the doing of any thing, in his public capacity, for money or money's worth, or for a private consideration of any sort; or the procuring of any thing, from such consideration, unlawfully given, to be done by another person. The minister who should give a place, or a pension, to the son of a rascal (if any such rascal could be supposed to exist, and if any minister could be found to

be so base), who, in consideration thereof, should vote for him, would be guilty of corruption, as well as the wretch who should, in that manner, sell his country and his soul; and the corruption would not be the less real because neither of the parties fingered any money, on account of the infamous contract.

Well, then, what is meant by "*personal corruption*;" why this, that the party must actually *touch the cash*, give or take the money himself; that it must go from him, or *come into his pocket*, literally into his pocket. But, reader, is there any thing solid in this distinction? Is there any thing in it, which reason says ought to have any weight in a decision upon a subject like that before us? If I stand by and see my neighbour robbed, and say nothing at all about the matter, am I not as criminal as the robber? How much *more* criminal must I be, then, if the goods stolen be applied to my use, and if I, by any means that I possess, enable the robber to commit the act, and encourage him to do it, especially if the party robbed be my employer? I do not, observe, state this as a case parallel with that of the Duke of York, upon whose *guilt or innocence* I have left, and shall leave, my readers to judge; but, I state it as a general proposition, in the way of illustration of my argument; and, I think, it will leave no doubt at all in the mind of the reader, that corruption may be as base, nay, a great deal *more base*, when the party does not actually *touch the money*, than when he does; and, it will readily occur to every man of reflection, that what is called "*personal corruption*," by which is meant, I suppose, the plain downright direct *giving and taking of bribes*, is, as to its dangerous extent, nothing at all, when compared to corruption of a more roundabout and covert nature.

The truth is, that it is this latter sort of corruption, which is really dangerous to a state; and this is the sort of corruption, which now is eating away the heart of this country. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, in his most admirable speech of the 13th instant, speaking of the case of KENNETT, said, that from the evidence given in this case,

"It appeared that the Duke of York was actuated by a greedy desire of getting money almost by any means, and accordingly undertook to recommend a fraudulent bankrupt to an office under government for the sake of a loan. Here he could not help saying a few words on the subject of corruption. The right hon. gent. (Mr. Perceval) seemed to consider corruption as synonymous with the actual taking of money for improper purposes; and, with this idea in his mind, he said that corruption was not so prevalent in our days as in former times. He thought the golden age was returned; and that, with respect to corruption, our days might be considered as a 'paradise regained.' What did the hon. gent. think of the multitudes of offices at the disposal of ministers and their underlings; the colonial places; the situations created by the increase of the various establishments in the country, and the immense amount of the taxes? Of the taxes which had risen to such a height, that men looked up to government in order to get back a part of their own. By the reduction of their incomes, men were first driven to mendicity, and then bribed with their own money. True, there were not times when a member of parliament could take a bribe of 500*l.* in the lobby, nor when he dined with the Speaker could he expect to find a sum of money under the cover of his plate. We saw little in our times of the open and barefaced corruption of ruder ages. Corruption was now gilded with the name of Office, which was greedily snatched at by him who, as the right hon. gent. had observed, would be ashamed to take the value of ready money into his hand. The Duke of York certainly did not, when acting corruptly, take so many guineas in hand. This was too gross for the times, especially when corruption could be so easily gilded. Corruption had no necessary connection with money,—corruption consisted in the corrupt motive, in swaying the mind from truth and justice. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, therefore,

" might say, that there was less of open bribery in our days than in former times —but he seemed entirely to misconceive the meaning of the term, when he said there was less corruption."

A bribe in hard cash upon the nail is not half so dangerous as a bribe in the way of office; the former is a transaction which has a speedy end, the latter binds the corrupted party for life, or for a considerable time, in all human probability.

Mrs. Clarke told the House, with her usual frankness, that she was desired to ask some of the persons, whom she patronized, to *get members of parliament to vote* thus and thus upon certain occasions; and she mentions one particular instance, wherein the Duke of York told her, that he had informed Mr. LONG of her success in this way, who was much pleased at it. This passed, at first, for one of her sallies; nobody believed, or, at least, nobody, in the House, appeared to believe her; but, by-and-by, out comes a bundle of her sprightly and careless notes, which were in the hands of Sandon, and which the lawyers had, with their usual judgment, of themselves, of their own seeking, brought forth; and in these notes, she is found to talk as familiarly of *getting votes for Pitt*, as one talks of getting a hare or a brace of birds for a friend. In one of these notes, she says to Sandon, "Will you, my good Sir, drop me a line on Monday morning, saying if *you* have been able to influence any person who is with Pitt, to attend the House on Monday and give his *vote*." The word *vote* is in italics. She knew what was the thing wanted.

In another note, to the same person, she says: "Do you think it possible to *get me a vote* on Monday for Pitt's motion? It will, if carried, be of some consequence to us hereafter; try all you can."

Now, are we to believe, that Mrs. Clarke would have written thus, if there had been no such thing as "getting votes" going on? Or, are we to believe, that this is a mere specimen, accidentally come to light; forced out, as it were, while the Devil was asleep, by the lawyers themselves, to prove to the world, the existence of a generally-pervading system of corruption?

I leave these questions to the reader, and beseech him, while yet there is time, to think of the remedy.

The money taken by Mrs. Clarke, and by others under her auspices, for promotions and the like, ought by no means to be considered as applied to *her* or to *their* use. The Duke kept her not for *her* pleasure, or for any purpose of *hers*; but solely for *his* pleasure and for *his* purposes. Therefore, whatever he gave her, he gave from a selfish motive; and, whatever she obtained, no matter in what manner, *in consequence of her connection with him*, arose from the gratification of his selfish feelings and pleasures. If I were, therefore, to leave out of sight all the evidence relating to *his knowledge*, that she trafficked in commissions, and that the net proceeds went towards the support of her establishment; if I were to blast, in a lump, all the evidence of *Mrs. Clarke*, *Miss Taylor*, the *two Letters*, and the *Note*, with all the scores of corroborations verbal and written, still I should say, that it was owing to the existence of the connection; that it was owing to the establishment in Gloucester-place; that it was owing to the adulterous intercourse; that, in short, it was for the gratification of the Duke of York's lust, and for that purpose solely, that all the infamous acts, which have come to light, were committed.

As to the other parts of Mr. Perceval's proposition, I will not stop to

notice them. They are, as Mr. Bankes well observed, a mere echo of the Duke's letter to the House. Any thing much more adulatory was never tendered to any of the Tudors.

Mr. WARDLE's proposition does, in my opinion, either not go far enough, or it goes too far. It is true, as Lord Folkestone observed, that the Charge upon the Journals does not contain an allegation of personal corruption, or of *corruption* of any sort or degree; but, I think, the Address should have contained an explicit opinion upon *that point*; or, that it should have contained *no opinion at all*. If the person accused had been any other than a near relation of the King, I should have been decidedly for a decision upon that point; but, he being a son of the King, I should have been for merely *laying the evidence before the King*; for, as to "*throwing the odium*" upon the King, by such a step, what do those mean, who talk of that? The "*odium*" of *what* do they talk of? The *odium* of dismissing his son from his office? The odium of doing that of *himself*, whatever it may be, which the House of Commons will, or would, advise him to do? The inquiry has taken place; the whole of the evidence is before the public; the people understand the whole matter. Every man in the kingdom understands it as well as it is possible for him to understand it. The King has the same means of judging laid before him. And, why should it be called "*throwing the odium upon him*," to leave the decision to his sole breast? In short, to give any rational interpretation of these words, you must suppose, you must conclude beforehand, that the King's decision would be *unjust*, or, at least, that *so it would appear to the nation*; and that, therefore, it is, for the sake of the King, necessary to keep from him the office of deciding. And here again is a dilemma; for, if you talk of "*odium*," as the Nabob's Gazette does, it must fall *somewhere*; and, where will it fall? where can it fall? Indeed, it is nonsense to talk of the odium attached to the decision, unless you presuppose, *that the decision will be unjust*, to justify which supposition I shall leave as a pleasing task for the trading, the regular trading, Anti-Jacobins, in town and country.

For these reasons, I would have simply moved to submit the evidence to the King, without being at all afraid, that his decision would have exposed him to public reproach. But, at any rate, if I had not done that, I would have brought before the House the direct question as to the *corruption*. There was, in my opinion, no medium to be adopted, consistent with the ends of justice, or with the character of the House.

If the latter had been rejected, and such a motion as that of Mr. Bankes, which is only one degree removed from that of Mr. Perceval, had been adopted, the original motion would have only shared the fate, which, in all probability, Mr. Wardle's motion will now share; while he would have avoided the possibility of an imputation of having shrunk from the question. I am convinced, that he was actuated solely by the motive of sparing the feelings of the King, and this, indeed, is, by Lord Folkestone, stated to have been his motive; but, experience will teach Mr. Wardle, that, however well *forbearance* may be calculated to operate on the mind of the King, and there to produce a reciprocity of feeling, forbearance is not the way to obtain the concurrence of *his servants*, in the House of Commons, who are sure to advance upon you two steps for every one that you recoil. If Mr. Wardle was convinced, that the Duke of York had, knowingly, participated in the profits of the corruption, carried on under his name, he should have made that a distinct

question; and, having brought the House to decide that, *yea*, or *nay*, he might, then, very consistently, have supported the next best proposition that should have been made, leaving the country to judge for itself between him and those who opposed him. This, or what I should still have, in this case, preferred, simply laying the evidence before the King, was, in my humble opinion, the path to pursue.

With regard to Mr. Bankes's proposition, much need not be said. It has, though not quite so much of adulation as the proposition of Mr. Perceval, a great deal of the smooth and the sweet in it. It is a mixture of oil and vinegar and molasses; it is a compound certainly, but the pleasant ingredients are not only two to one in number, they predominate also in the quantity of each. There is, indeed, an expression relative to the *dismissal of the Duke*, which, by-the-bye, appears, after all, to be *the thing most dreaded by his friends*, and against which all their efforts have been bent; but, this expression has in it so little of the positive, that, to disregard it could not well be looked upon, by those who use the expression, as a subject of very serious complaint. To me, I will frankly confess, that the dismissal of the Duke appears to be an object of no very great importance. In fact, and to speak out plain, I do not care a straw about the matter, unless the dismissal were accompanied with measures, which should *effectually* prevent similar corruptions in future; and, as no such measure appears to be in agitation, I think it of no consequence whatever to the nation, whether the Duke be dismissed, or whether he remain.

I cannot, however, agree in the opinion, now expressed by Mr. Bankes, and before expressed by several of the ministers, or their friends, "that this Inquiry will do *no good*." On the contrary, I think, and I am convinced, that it already *has done* a great deal of good; and that it will continue, with other things, "to work together for good," until the day of perfect purification shall arrive; until the whole of the system of corruption shall be rooted out; until *all* the vermin, who prey and who fatten upon the vitals of the nation, shall have been caught and made to regorge; and until the throne, as well as the people, shall have been secured from the consequences of their wide-spreading depredations. What! has this inquiry done "no good"? This inquiry, which has *discovered* to the East India Directors such an extensive traffic in *their* offices; and, since the commencement of which by Mr. Wardle, Mr. Perceval has set to work to prosecute the regular traders in offices and *livings*? Good God! not done any *good*?

While, however, this is contended for, on the one hand, in order to lessen, or to deny altogether, the merit of Mr. Wardle, it is as strenuously contended, on the other hand, that the Inquiry will do a wonderful deal of good, as to the future conduct of the Duke of York. The Attorney-General, on the 9th of the month, after stating, that he was for a decision that should fall short of making his royal highness retire, or be removed, concluded thus:—"Could any man, after this Inquiry, believe that things would grow worse? Did any man believe that the Duke of York was insensible to the perils and dangers with which he was surrounded, and that he would not *profit by the lesson he had received*? Did any man think he would not be sensible of his acquittal, and of *the reproof accompanying it*? Did any man believe that he would not be sensible of all these things, and *careful to avoid a similar situation*?"

Well, then, whatever may be *our* opinion upon these points; whatever *we* may think of the disposition of the Duke, taking into view his letter to the House, and not forgetting the company he has been *proved* to delight in; whatever may be *our* opinion, *your* opinion is, that he will "*profit* from this lesson;" that he will be sensible of "*the reproof*;" which, it appears, that even you would now give him; and, that he will be in future, "*careful* to avoid such a situation." Indeed! But, *to whom*, then, will he be indebted for this profitable lesson? Whom will he have to thank for this affecting reproof? Not you, nor any of those, who are to be numbered amongst his defenders and friends. No, for you, from the first, flattered him with complete acquittal; you scouted the charges against him; and, one of you, in the apparent confident reliance that those charges could not be supported; that the means would be found of hooting them down, asserted, that *infamy* would alight somewhere, upon the *accuser* or the accused. No, it is not by you, or any of you, or all of you together, that this great good, as you appear to esteem it, would have been done; but, by Mr. Wardle, and solely by Mr. Wardle; it is he (supposing your proposition to take effect) that will have produced all the good, which you anticipate from it; it is he, and he alone, that will have produced the *lesson* and the *reproof*. Let it be repeated by nobody, then, and particularly by you, that this inquiry has *done no good*, and that the author of it is not entitled to the highest marks of honour that the people can bestow upon him.

Upon the quality of the evidence, or any part of it, I shall not here offer any remark; but, there are two or three *presumptions*, which have been set up by the defenders of the Duke of York, and which I think it proper to point out to the attention of my readers; first observing, what, I dare say, they will all have observed before, that, though it is common enough for a judge to set aside *presumptions* when opposed to positive testimony, there never was a judge, an English judge, at least, who ventured to set aside positive testimony upon the ground of opposing *presumptions*.

The first of these *presumptions* is, that the Duke would not have given into these transactions for the sake of so paltry a sum as 2500*l.*, which, it is *asserted*, was all that Mrs. Clarke gained and brought into the firm at Gloucester-place, by the corruptions in which she had a hand. But, as to the sum, is it not more likely to have been 50,000*l.* than 2500*l.*? Look at her Letters to Sandon; hear the evidence of Sandon and Donovan and Hovenden and Cowrie and others, and you find the trade of jobs and loans and bills *continually* going on. You hear of many transactions, which have not been at all explained. She forgets scores of people that she has had dealings with. After all that could be done, it remained unproved, that the Duke paid to Gloucester-place more than from twelve to fifteen hundred a year. Lord Folkestone, in a speech which he made on the 10th, and which makes good all the expectations of his greatest admirers, has said, that he kept house at the same time, and that he is clearly of opinion, that he, *without any waste or extravagance*, could not have maintained such an establishment for 10,000*l.* a year.

But, be the sum what it might, why, in the face of positive testimony, are we to *presume*, that the Duke would not, for a paltry sum, do what was wrong, when we find him, for the paltry sum of 400*l.* a year, breaking his promise, to the woman to whom he had written the *two letters*, but a few months before, the existence of which promise Mr. Adam has

proved, and the *condition* upon which it was made, has not been proved to have been broken by her? After this proof has been laid before us, *why* are we to presume, that the *smallness* of any sum should be considered as an objection to his using means to obtain or withhold it?

If the Duke had gone as far as the evidence states him to have gone, it is said, *why had he not gone farther?* If he participated in, or connived at, the sale of some commissions, we are asked, *why* he did not do so with respect to more? *Why* did he not raise hundreds of thousands of pounds in this way?

A very good answer might be given; an answer quite sufficient for such a question, that we do not, and, as yet, cannot, know to what extent the traffic may have been carried; for, as Mr. WHITBREAD observed, the wonder is, not that *so little*, but that *so much*, has come to light, through that mass of obstructions, which every word of evidence against him, except the evidence of Mrs. Clarke, has had to work its way.

But, is not this the first time, that it ever has been attempted to prove, that a man has not done one thing, because he has not done another, the two being in no wise dependent upon, or connected with one another? Were your servant, upon positive testimony, accused of stealing your spoons, should you expect to hear a presumption urged against the testimony, upon the ground of his not having stolen your mugs and the rest of your plate? *Why*, if such presumptions were, in the usual course of justice, admitted to have weight, no man would be hanged for sheep-stealing, till he had got half the flock. Poor sheep! They would, under such law, stand but a bad chance in a hard winter.

The Crown lawyers have, in this case, as in many others, completely inverted the usual and settled course of arguing. That course is, to presume, that, when a man has *one* fact proved against him, there are *others* behind, which are not proved. Mr. Whitbread very finely observed here, that it was, with common culprits, always "the *first time*;" but, the Crown lawyers, in place of arguing thus, would have us believe, that, *because* there have been only *four instances*, relating to which positive testimony respecting corruption has been produced, while there has been fifteen or sixteen thousand promotions in the army, there has been *no corruption at all*. To continue my old illustration of the sheep-stealers, what would a Judge, sitting at Dorchester, say, if a lawyer were to argue, that because the testimony against his client related to only four sheep, stolen from a down where there were fifty thousand feeding every night, it therefore was to be presumed that he had stolen *none at all*? What would the Judge say? *Why*, he would say nothing; he would smile, and be looking over his notes; and, in his charge to the jury, would certainly think it unnecessary to allude to such an argument.

The second presumption that I shall notice is this: that the Duke, when informed of the charges, expressed his desire that the Inquiry should be *public*; that he would not have done this, and that he would not have before *set Mrs. Clarke at defiance*, unless he had been conscious of innocence.

As to the *mode of inquiry*, the choice was certainly a bad one; it was not favourable to him; but, it gave him much of support, which he could not have had elsewhere; much of legal and oratorical talent; and he had had opportunities of witnessing the result of such inquiries, as in the case of the ill-fated Mr. Paull against Mr. Sheridan. He was acquainted with the person of Mrs. Clarke, but he might be no judge of her *cha-*

racter, or of how she would act in such a perilous case ; a case so perilous, that Lord Folkestone tells us, that rumours of *expulsion* were, at one time, afloat with respect to Mr. Wardle himself.

As to the setting of Mrs. Clarke at defiance, he had so long been in the enjoyment of so much power ; he must have presumed that nothing was to be done without the testimony of *officers in the army* ; he could not reasonably have supposed, that she would be assisted so ably by the Lawyers ; how was he to imagine, that they would *goad* her on to go and hunt out his letters, absolutely goad her till she did it ; that Mr. Lowten, his own attorney, would be set to work to force Nicholls to bring a whole package of proofs in support of her, which she had ordered to be burnt ; that accident had placed in her careless hands, and what is more, kept there, the letter of the Archbishop of Tuam : and that, at last, as it were for a *grand coup de théâtre*, just before the curtain dropped, his friends, with the manifest expectation of proving a forgery upon *her*, should *force* from Sandon, should draw from him, as if it had been the last drop of his heart's blood, that NOTE, which, of all things in the whole world, she must have wished to see produced against *him*, and, at the sight of which, according to the description of Mr. Whitbread, her eyes might well beam with joy ?

How was the Duke to have expected all, or any part of this ? Nobody could expect it. Mr. Wardle ; nay, Mrs. Clarke herself, could not possibly have expected any such thing ; and, does not the reader clearly perceive, that, if there had been none of these unexpected discoveries, her evidence, that very evidence which these discoveries have so fully corroborated, would have been set down as a tissue of falsehoods ?

How long would her word have stood against Clavering's, if Mr. Lowten had not kindly forced Nicholls to bring the General's own letters, to give the lie direct to what he had said with a view of blasting the credit of her, who had so long and so disinterestedly been his benefactress ?

Besides, it was, *after Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges*, a little too late to attempt to silence Mrs. Clarke. Any overture to her, at this period, for that purpose, ran the manifest risk of failing ; and, if it failed, there was the proof of guilt at once. It was too late to recoil, though it was not too late to forbear *goad*ing her on to search for proofs of her veracity.

When a man is asked, " Is such a thing *true*, that they say of you ? " he is very apt to say *no*, if he sees that *yes* would be injurious to him ; and, when he *has* said no, it is not very easy to say *yes* to the same question. It is an old saying, that " one lie makes many." When once a man gets into falsehood, he generally goes on. It is so difficult to retrace his steps ; indeed it is impossible, without confessing that he has told a falsehood ; and this is what few men are found able to bring their minds to. When they make the first denial, they do not see all, nor scarcely any part of the consequences, which are likely to follow ; and hence it is, that we invariably see the guilty contribute, in this way, towards their own conviction and condemnation.

There appears, therefore, to be nothing solid in this presumption, founded on the Duke's *setting Mrs. Clarke at defiance*.

The third *presumption* is of a nature still more strange than either of the others. It is this : that, if the Duke had had any knowledge of these corruptions, it is not to be believed, that he would, in so solemn a manner, have denied the fact.

This is, in the tone of the Duke's famous Letter, setting "the honour of a prince" in opposition to the evidence taken at the bar, and giving it the preference to all that body of evidence; and, as I observed before, in speaking of that letter, the short way of going to work, if this reasoning be allowed, would have been, to show Mr. Wardle's charges to the Duke, and to pronounce an acquittal immediately upon his simple declaration that the charges were false. We are asked, with great emphasis: "Can any man believe, that a prince of the illustrious House of Brunswick would have denied these allegations, in so solemn a manner, if he had not been certain of their falsehood?"

Yes: many men, and I am one of the number. I can believe it, and thoroughly believe it too; and, my reasons for so believing are these. 1. Because the allegations are supported by a great body of evidence as good and much fuller than what the law requires for the taking away the life of a common malefactor; 2. Because it has been stated by Mr. Adam, that the Duke of York declared to him, that he never corresponded with Mrs. Clarke upon military matters, while, by a letter in the Duke's own hand-writing, it is proved, that he did correspond with her on military matters; and, 3. Because Mr. Adam has stated, that the Duke of York declared, that he never wrote to Mrs. Clarke the note touching Tonym's promotion; while, by indubitable testimony, it is proved, that the note extracted from Sandon, was in the Duke's hand-writing, which note was sent to Mrs. Clarke, and which note related to Tonym's promotion.

For these reasons, if there were no other, I should scout such a presumption as the one above described; which presumption, indeed, if it were, for one moment, admitted to have any weight, would go to establish a precedent the most dangerous in the world, namely, that the words, and, of course, the evidence of persons are to be estimated according to rank, birth, or wealth. Upon this subject Sir Francis Burdett asked:

"What had been the Duke of York's conduct with regard to Mrs. Clarke? He separated from her, not certainly for having taken money for commissions. His excessive love for her was the only circumstance that could at all have extenuated his offence, and yet it appeared that she was shaken off like an old shoe, and threatened with infamy. This she had asserted, and her testimony stood unrebuted, although the means existed by calling the messenger. She begged for money to pay her debts, and on condition of receiving this she had offered to give up the claim to her annuity; but even this was refused. Where was 'the honour of a Prince' then? This was, surely, no great settlement, considering the terms on which she had lived with the Duke of York, and all the circumstances. He said, 'You have no bond, no legal demand,' and there was 'the honour of a Prince.' If this was honour, it was a sort of honour which scarcely included the ingredients of honesty and fair dealing, and which could not weigh a feather in opposition to the evidence before the House."

Mr. Whitbread, upon the same subject, was still more impressive; and, indeed, the whole of his speech was one of the best that ever was heard from any man.

"Why," said he, "has the Duke of York written such a letter to the House? I speak not now of its trenching upon our privileges; but, why did he reduce us to the melancholy situation of believing the evidence we have heard, even against 'the honour of a Prince?' The honour of a prince! Alas! we must all come to that fatal period, when death, which knows no distinction, will class the prince with the peasant; and yet, if we turn our eyes to that awful spectacle, shall we not find the wretch, with a rope about his neck, protesting that innocence which he knows he is not possessed of? *Protestations*, then, I never will heed: in this case I hear of them with horror."

Of that letter, that intolerable letter, enough will be to be said hereafter ; but, in what it relates to the subject before us, it must be asked, what the Duke means by the *distinction*, which his words clearly convey. Does he mean that the honour of a prince is of *superior quality* to that of a man in private life, and entitled to the same degree of precedence as he himself would be in a public procession ? If he would impress us with an idea, that his honour is of quality superior to that of an earl, or a gentleman, we must ask him where it was, what was its influence, when his declarations were made to Mr. Adam, relative to the not corresponding upon military matters, and to the writing of the note about Tonym ; that note ; that note, which was thought to be destroyed, and which, good God ! Mr. Perceval, in his speech, presumed to be a *forgery* by Mrs. Clarke ; a crime, affecting the life of the woman, to whom the Duke had vowed everlasting love ?

I have noticed these presumptions a little more fully (though not so well, perhaps) than I find them noticed in the reports of the speeches, not because there was any danger of their producing effect upon the public mind ; but because they are all, absolutely *all* that has by the combined ingenuity of so many ingenious men, been found out to weigh against the evidence taken at the bar. Upon that evidence the public is well able to judge ; and I have now laid before my readers all that I can discover, which has, *taking it as a whole*, been opposed to it. As to the nature of the evidence, and the characters and credibility of the witnesses, the public is in possession of all the means of judging ; and, when they have attended to the *presumptions*, above noticed, they see all, eye all, that has been opposed to the great mass of evidence taken at the bar.

To those, who have read the speeches of Lord Folkestone and Sir Francis Burdett, not a word need be said upon the treatment which Mr. Wardle and his witnesses have received, nor upon the general and uniform conduct, through the whole of this affair, of the *King's servants* in the House of Commons. Indeed, no man of common observation could stand in need of the remarks made, as to these matters, in those speeches ; and, if there be any part of the conduct of Mr. Wardle at which I feel regret, it is his having stated, that he had received indulgence and assistance at the hands of the ministers and their friends ; in which statement, if meant ironically, the irony is imperceptible to common discernment ; and, if not so, does not well square with that character of *sincerity* and *plain-dealing*, which has distinguished Mr. Wardle from the outset, which at once gained him the hearts of the country, and which, in fact, it was that carried him safely through all the perils, with which he was encompassed. *Complimenting*, I never knew succeed in gaining over, or in softening, any ministry ; while I never knew it fail to weaken, more or less, the confidence of the people. It is so much in the style, in the common cant, of professed fee'd advocates, that it never fails to excite some degree of suspicion as to the sincerity of those who use it. There is, honest nature tells every living soul, a fit antipathy of *right to wrong* ; and, if we would be not only right, but thought to be so in sincerity and in earnestness, we must take care that the fashion of the times does not lead us into that sort of refinement, which must excite a doubt as to the existence of such antipathy. There is, on this account, a great drawback from the excellence of Mr. Whitbread's speech, who sets out with almost fulsome compliments on that of Mr. Perceval, which he

praises for qualities, not only which, it is evident, he perceives it did not possess, but of which he is prepared to show, and of which he actually does show, that it is completely destitute. This may, for aught I know, be refinement; it may suit the manners of the times; but, I shall, I hope, always continue to look upon such refinement as but a very bad exchange for simplicity and sincerity; and I am sure, that such refinement, though it may be considered ornamental in an orator, and may tend to smooth his intercourse in life, will never be compatible with earnest and efficient efforts to rescue the nation from the effects of corruption, which is a monster not to be dealt with courteously, not to be even smiled upon without the danger of contamination, or, at least, of suspicion of such contamination. There is no occasion for brutal manners, or rough language; and Mr. Wardle has gained much by his mildness and good-nature; but, these may exist in the highest possible degree, without any of that overstrained civility, that refinement, which is at war with sincerity, and, indeed, which is at war with *truth*. It is this very refinement, this fashionable refinement, this prevalent desire to keep smooth the intercourse in high life; it is this, and this alone, that has prevented these and similar corruptions from being blazoned forth long ago. There have not been wanting men, and men enough, of talents more than sufficient, and of integrity too, who have seen these things, and who have felt indignant at their existence; but, they have wanted courage, that sort of courage which is much more rare than the courage necessary to mount a breach bristled with bayonets, namely, the courage to overcome solicitations, to encounter the frowns of all the fashionable host, and to see the world of your acquaintance turn their backs upon you. This sort of courage Mr. Wardle has been found to possess, and, I trust, that nothing upon earth will induce him to deviate from the plain path, in which he set out.

Much has been said, in the debate, about the "*clamour out of doors*," and about the people having been misled by "*garbled statements*."

When the popular opinion is for any measure adopted by the government; when it is in *approbation* of the conduct of the King's ministers, then it is termed the "*voice of the people*," or the "*sense of the nation*;" but, when it runs in *opposition* to their wishes, then it is "*popular clamour*." It could not fail to be observed, in the debate, in answer to this charge against the people, that those who now urge it, advised the King "to appeal to the *sense* of his people," when they came into power, under the cry of *no-popery*. Then the people had *sense*, it seems, but now their wish is mere *clamour*, though it is pretty clear, I think, that they understand this subject *full as well* as they did that, to say the least of it. Why is *this* not called an "appeal to the *sense* of the people?" One of the *advantages*, which the Duke's friends expected, and said they expected, from an examination at the bar, was *publicity*. What did they mean by publicity, if it was not the communication of the evidence to the people? and what *end* was that to answer, unless it was that the people should *express their opinions* upon the case? Their opinions, it would seem, from this charge of "*clamour*," are pretty distinctly expressed *against* the Duke of York; but whose fault is that? They might have been expressed as loudly in his *favour*; and yet, in that case, I very much doubt, whether we should have heard a word about "*popular clamour*."

As to *garbled statements*, it is, as Lord Folkestone observed, quite wonderful to see the fulness and the accuracy, with which the evidence has, from day to day, been given in the newspapers. One must actually see it to believe the thing possible; to believe it to be within the compass of human ability; nor is the fact a little creditable to the literary talents of the country. Gentlemen of the House of Commons now complain of *their* fatigue of body and mind. This complaint is reasonable enough; but if their fatigue is great, their fatigue, who sit at their ease; who can walk out and return at their pleasure, and who can be absent for half the night or more; what must be the fatigue of the gentlemen, who report the proceedings; who are sometimes squeezed, from eight o'clock in the morning to three in the afternoon, into a close and hot passage, there compelled to *stand* all the while; who thence remove into a not less crowded gallery; who have no convenience for writing other than a book in their hand and an ink-bottle at their breast; who are obliged to attend to *all* that passes, the fingers moving, while the ear is constantly upon the stretch to catch the often inarticulate sounds that proceed from below, and amidst a buzz of whispering and noises of various sorts; and who have had to follow this, night after night, with little cessation, for six weeks past: what, I ask, must be the fatigue of these gentlemen, and how great ought our admiration to be at what they do actually perform?

But, as was observed, the garbling, if there has been any, has been reciprocal, at worst; and, I am sure, that every candid man will say, that, of all the London Daily papers, the only one guilty of flagrant and base partiality; nay, the only one which has *pronounced judgment*, has been the Morning Post, which has pronounced the *acquittal* of the Duke of York, and which has loaded *all* the witnesses against him with every term of reproach contained in our language.

I hope the reader will bear this in mind. No other paper; no other editor; no other public writer, that I know of, or that I have heard of, has attempted to anticipate the decision of the House of Commons; but, the editor of this paper has told them how they ought to decide; and, not only that, but has told them, that if they do not *acquit* the Duke, and consider all the evidence against him as lies, *they will not do their duty*.

Yet, do the *friends* of the Duke, and they alone, complain of partial and garbled statements!

No: never were the people, upon the whole, so amply and so faithfully informed, upon any subject, within my remembrance. To impose upon them would, indeed, have been very difficult; but, except in the case of the Morning Post, I have not seen an attempt so to do. There is, indeed, extreme *anxiety* prevailing; but, as Sir Francis Burdett observed in the closing part of his speech, the people ask for, and *wish* for nothing but *justice*.

"Many," he said, "had been the warnings which the House had received against *popular influence*. It might be unparliamentary to say, that the House could be swayed by any undue influence—but of all influence that could possibly operate, that of the people he believed was the last to be feared. There were, indeed, other kinds of influence, which would weigh more with ordinary men, although they could not be supposed to have any effect on the minds of Members of Parliament. But the anxiety in the public mind was, that the decision should be just. The people of England had *always been remarkable for their love of justice*, and *justice alone* was what they required. If their

"minds were divested of the opinion of the prevalence of undue influence in that House, the decision would readily be received as just, whether for or against the Duke of York. *If the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Gentlemen who held places under him would walk out, and leave the rest to decide, whatever might be the result the people would be satisfied.*"

This virtue, this love of justice, is so deeply rooted in the hearts of Englishmen, that nothing can extirpate it. Their enemy, be he who he may, the moment he is arraigned, loses, in their eyes, the character of enemy. If the *whole* nation could be impanelled, and had the Devil upon trial, they would, if left to themselves, use him fairly.

The plain truth is, that all this querulousness, on the part of the Duke of York's defenders, arises, not from any thorough persuasion, that there is really what might properly be called a "popular clamour" against him; that the people have been misled by garbled statements; but, from a feeling of uneasiness and impatience to see, that the people, upon a clear understanding of the whole of the case, are steadily fixed in opposition to their views; and that, at last, they have been roused, beyond the power of all the soporifics in the world, to a sense of the existence of a system of corruption more extensive than they could, with reason, have supposed to exist.

Yet, I think, it is as clear as the noonday sun, that, if this nation is not to be conquered; if this government is not to be overthrown; if England is not to share the fate of Holland and Italy, as I trust she is not, she will owe her salvation to those, who have set about, and shall set about, and shall effect, the rooting out, while there is yet time, those corruptions, and all those abominations, which, more than the armies of Napoleon, have contributed towards the fall of the old governments upon the continent of Europe. Mr. COKE of Norfolk, in his speech of the 14th, which, to obviate the charge of *garbling*, I take from the Morning Post newspaper, is reported to have said—

"That, though the original Address may not be carried, yet in conscience he would say, from the evidence, *that there was corruption in the extreme, personally attached to the Duke of York.* Circumstantial evidence he built upon, and this he felt to be much stronger than positive evidence, at least it had carried more men to the gallows. Had any doubt remained on his mind in the matter, the speech of his hon. friend Mr. Whitbread would have removed it all. (*Order! order!*)—He (Mr. Coke) was determined to oppose corruption, whatever form it may assume; and its defence he would leave to those who were likely to thrive by it. (*Order! order!*)—If the country were to be saved, it could only be by opposing such corruption. When he looked to the situation of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, he would no longer pay any degree of attention to what they said on the subject. (*Loud cries of order! order!*)—The hon. gentleman concluded by returning his thanks to the hon. mover, Colonel Wardle."

Yes, if this country is to be saved, it must be, as Mr. Coke says, by opposing corruption. The people must be brought to a conviction, that they are fairly dealt by; that the means collected from their earnings are honestly and judiciously, or, at least, honestly disposed of; and, surely, this conviction they ought to have, if it be possible to give it them, which it is, by letting them see that the parliament and the servants of the King are ready to co-operate cordially in bringing to light, and in punishing, all corrupt practices, let the guilty parties be who they may.

Mr. PLOMER (the Solicitor-General) and some others, spoke of the pain, which a sentence against the Duke must give to him and to the King. Those gentlemen are not the only persons that feel this.

The people in general feel it as they ought, and every one is anxiously desirous to spare the feelings of the King. But, it is here a question of *justice*, and that is to be done at all events. There is nothing *vindictive* in the feeling of the public. All they ask is, security for themselves; and this they are convinced they cannot have without justice being now done.

The "*conspiracy*" has again been mentioned, but, I observe with pleasure, in a feebler tone of voice; and *Jacobinism*, poor *Jacobinism*, has fallen into such disrepute, as no longer to be deemed worthy of assisting to swell out a period. Nobody will believe *Mr. Coke* to be a Jacobin and leveller, and yet, we see, that *he* has a very decided opinion upon the conduct of the Duke of York. His short speech is worth many a long one; worth whole volumes of some speeches, and will tell for more throughout the kingdom. These outcries about a *conspiracy* and *Jacobinism* did, at the first, indicate no confidence of the goodness of the cause of those who made use of them. Nor did they indicate much of that which the world calls wisdom. From that moment to the close of the Inquiry, they gave us proofs of no wisdom. Wise men would not have goaded Mrs. Clarke; wise men would not have done many other things, which were done, and every one, aye, to the very last, operated against themselves. But, in fact, there is nothing that is a match for Truth, if she has only a small portion of fair play.

In my next I shall, I doubt not, be able to record the result of this long and interesting inquiry and discussion. The public have, as I wished, fixed their attention wholly and exclusively upon it; they have thought and justly thought, that, until this question was decided, it was time wasted for them to attend to any other matters of a public nature; that, until this was decided, they knew not how to feel, what to wish for, or what to fear. The campaigns of the Continent; the views of courts! what were they, what could they be, to us, until this great question at home, at our very doors, was settled? This is the light, in which the people have viewed the matter; they have, at last, fixed their eyes upon that which is to them the only interesting object; having so done, there is little fear of their being deceived in future; and let all those who have lived upon corruption, who have thriven only because the people were blind, *take warning in time*.

Botley, Thursday, 16. March, 1809.

DUKE OF YORK.—Continued.

(*Political Register*, March, 1809.)

"That all who profess *want of confidence* in the chiefs of the people, or of the *army*, who *make pasquinades*, excite riots or disturbances, shall be immediately apprehended, and carried before the newly-appointed judge of the police, Don Santiago Penicela, who will pass judgment *according to the times and critical circumstances of the country*. Imposing the punishment of *death* he shall consult *me*.—PALAFOX'S Proclamation to the Arragonese.

BEFORE I proceed with my commentary upon the published reports of the proceedings in the House of Commons, I cannot help directing the

attention of the reader to the passage which I have taken for a motto. He will find in it the *practice* of what the venal herd of writers amongst us, are so strenuously inculcating in principle; and, he will not fail to recollect, that, every where, the French have been opposed by similar practices. Is it any wonder, then, that the French should have succeeded? If a *want of confidence* in the chiefs of the people, or of the army, was to be a crime; if to *make pasquinades*, that is to say, to *ridicule those chiefs*, was to be punished with death, perhaps; if such were the powers of Don Santiago Penicela, and Don Palafox, the poor people had quite enough to do to keep themselves out of *their* clutches. It was useless, entirely useless, to endeavour to *scare* them with descriptions of the character and conduct of the French; for, how were they to form an idea of any thing worse than what they had? King Joseph might be very ingenious in his inventions for keeping the people down; but, was it possible, that the people could conceive, that they could possibly fall lower than that state, in which to profess *want of confidence* in their chiefs was to subject them to a fair chance of the halter? And *why*; for *what reason*, should Palafox be afraid of the effect of *pasquinades*? It has always an ugly look, when men, in power, set that power to work to stifle remarks upon their characters and conduct. The Supreme Central Junta, that is to say, the general government of Spain, began their operations by a proclamation, or decree, against "the licentiousness of the press;" and, we see, that, notwithstanding this, Joseph Napoleon is on the throne of Spain. He *may* establish, all over the country, judges, armed with powers similar to those of Don Penicela; but it is not easy to conceive, that he will be able to surpass those powers.

This is not the way to fight the French; this is not the way to preserve countries from being conquered by Napoleon; this is not the way to engage *the people* in a hearty co-operation with the government; and, those, I think, must be blind indeed, who do not *now* see, that, without such co-operation, no government will be able to stand against the arms of a powerful invading enemy. There is no one so blind; every one sees this; but, there are, and will be, some, who will affect not to see it, and which affectation they will persevere in to the very last.

"Hate the French, or we will *punish* you." "Oh, O! say you so," answer the people in their minds, "Why, then, *what have we to fear* from the French more than from you?" Thus it has been all over the continent. Men do not like to be threatened with the dark cell, or the halter; and they will, because it is in nature that they should, not only run the risk of sacrifices, but will actually make great sacrifices, in order to obtain vengeance upon those, who keep such threats suspended over their heads.

In returning, now, to the discussion, relative to the Duke of York, I will first endeavour to give a clear statement of what has been *done* by the House of Commons, whose acts, in this respect, owing to the length of the debates, and the many motions that have been made, have been rendered confused.

FIRST, Mr. Wardle proposed an address to the King (see it, page 151), which address expressed the opinion of the House THAT THE DUKE KNEW OF THE ABUSES, WHICH HAD BEEN PROVED TO HAVE EXISTED, AND THAT HE OUGHT TO BE DEPRIVED OF THE COMMAND OF THE ARMY; for which motion, when it came to be put, there were 125, and against it 363. This, though not *directly* and *explicitly*, contained the charge of corruption,

and for this one hundred and twenty-five members *voted*, not including Sir Francis Burdett, who was so ill as to be compelled to leave the House previous to the division. The names of the members, who voted for this motion, I here record, in the hope, that my work will hand them down to the knowledge of their and our children.

Adams, Charles	Howard, Hon. William	Peirse, Henry
Althorpe, Viscount	Howard, Henry	Pelham, Hon. C. Anderson
Antonie, W. Lee	Howorth, Humphrey	Pochin, Charles
Astell, Wm.	Hughes, William Lewis	Porcher, Josiah Dupre
Aubrey, Sir John, Bt.	Hume, William Hoare	Portman, E. B.
Bagenall, Walter	Hurst, Robert	Prittie, Hon. F. A.
Baillie, Evan	Hussey, William	Pym, Francis
Baring, Thomas	Hutchinson, Hen. Chr. H.	Ridley, Sir Matt. White
Baring, Alexander	Jackson, J.	Romilly, Sir Samuel
Bastard, John Pollexfen	Jacob, William	Scudamore, Rich. Philip
Bewicke, Calverley	Kemp, Thomas	Sebright, Sir John S.
Biddulph, Rt. Middleton	Kensington, Lord	Sharp, Richard
Bradshaw, Hon. Aug. C.	King, Sir J. Dashwood	Shelley, Henry
Brand, Hon. Thomas	Knapp, George	Shelley, Timothy
Brogden, James	Lambton, Ralph John	Shipley, William
Browne, Anthony	Langton, William Gore	Smith, Samuel
Byng, George	Latouche, John	Smith, John
Calcraft, John	Latouche, Robert	Smith, George
Coke, Thomas William	Lefevre, Charles Shaw	Staniforth, John
Colborne, N. White Ridley	Lester, Garland	Stanley, Lord
Combe, Harvey Christian	Lloyd, James M.	Symonds, Thos. Powell
Cooke, Bryan	Lloyd, Sir Edward Pryce	Talbot, R. Wogan
Craig, J.	Longman, George	Taylor, Charles William
Crevey, Thomas	Lyttleton, Hon. W. H.	Taylor, William
Curwen, John Christian	Madocks, Wm. Alex.	Thomas, George White
Cuthbert, Jas. Ramsey	Mahon, Viscount	Thompson, Thomas
Daly, Rt. Hon. Den. Bowes	Markham, John	Tighe, William
Dickenson, William	Martin, Henry	Townsend, Lord John
Fellows, Hon. Newton	Maule, Hon. William	Tracey, C. H.
Ferguson, R. C.	Maxwell, William	Turner, J. F.
Fitzgerald, Rt. Hon. M.	Milbanke, Sir Ralph	Vaughan, Hon. John
Foley, Hon. Andrew	Mildmay, Sir Henry	Walsh, Benjamin
Foley, Thomas	Milner, Sir. Wm. Mord.	Wardle, Gwillim Lloyd
Folkestone, Visc. (Teller)	Moore, Peter	(Teller)
Goddard, Thomas	Morris, Robert	Western, Charles Callis
Gordon, William	Moseley, Sir Oswald	Wharton, John
Grenfell, Pascoe	Mostyn, Sir Thomas	Whitbread, Samuel
Halsey, Joseph	Neville, Hon. R.	Wilkins, Walter
Hamilton, Lord Archibald	Noel, Charles Noel	Williams, Owen
Hibbert, George	Ord, William	Winnington, Sir T. E.
Honeywood, William	Osulston, Lord	Wynn, Sir Wat. Williams
Horner, Francis	Parnell, Henry	Wynn, Ch. Wat. Williams
Horrocks, Samuel		

In this list ; this list, which is always to be kept in view by the country, there is one military officer, GENERAL FERGUSON, and one naval officer, ADMIRAL MARKHAM. SIR SAMUEL ROMILLY, and MR. C. W. WYNN, are the only lawyers, that I know of, in the list.—Mr. Wynn's conduct has been very good indeed ; and Sir Samuel Romilly has confirmed all the good opinion which all men entertained of him.

The next division, not the next in point of order, but in point of importance, was that upon the motion of Mr. BANKES, for which, at full length, see page 153 of this volume. Upon this motion, which expressed, that the Duke *must have had a suspicion*, at least, of the *existence of the corrupt practices, and a doubt, whether the chief command*

of the army could with propriety, or ought with prudence to remain in his hands; upon this motion, there were 199 for, and 294 against; so that, here were 199 members of the House, who voted, that the Duke must have had a suspicion, at least, of the corruptions, and that it was neither proper nor prudent to leave the chief command of the army in his hands.

After this, the House adjourned until Friday, the 17th of March, when a motion by Mr. PERCEVAL, in the form of a resolution, was decided upon.

Mr. Perceval, as will be seen by a reference to p. 152, proposed certain resolutions, to be followed by an address, which address will there be seen.

On the day to which we are now come, he new-moulded his resolutions, making one out of the two, and stating in that one, "That it was the opinion of the House, that there was no ground to charge his royal highness with personal corruption, or with any connivance at the corrupt and infamous practices disclosed in the evidence." There was an amendment to this, proposed by Sir THOMAS TURTON, which being negatived, a division took place upon Mr. Perceval's resolution, when there appeared ayes 278, and noes 196, leaving the King's servants a majority of only 82. So that, to the proposition, that the Duke had NOT been guilty of personal corruption, or connivance at such corruption; to this proposition, to this acquittal of the direct criminal part of the charge, there are 196 members to say NO.

The next division to be recorded is that, which took place upon the motion of Mr. BRAGGE; but, before we come to that, it will be better to stop, and look a little at the discussion, which took place on the 17th of the month.

It was again, in this debate, urged, that the Duke, after the intended reproof, would reform; and, what sort of reproof Mr. Perceval had in view, the reader will have seen. As there is a most monstrous deal of cant in this, I wish to notice it somewhat particularly.

This idea of a hope of reformation does, indeed, harmonize perfectly with all the talk about the Duke's being imposed upon; about his having fallen into the snares of an artful woman; about his being infatuated by her; and about his being blinded by the excess of his passion for her. The passion was not, however, so excessive as to prevent him from casting her off, aye, and that, too, without paying her the promised pension, without redeeming her body from imminent danger of a jail, in about seven months after he had vowed everlasting love to her; nor was it so excessive as to prevent Taylor from carrying a message to her (said to be from the Duke) threatening her with the pillory or the Bastille. But, how stand the facts, as to the probability of his being imposed upon by this artful woman? To read these speeches, expressing confident hopes of amendment; to read the whining, snivelling expression of sorrow for the existence of the connection, which had led to these disclosures; which had led to this exposure; which had led to this what Mr. Perceval, in his Address, calls calumny on the Duke; to read these, who, that was unacquainted with the real state of the case, would not suppose Mrs. Clarke to be another Millwood, and the Duke another Barnwell? Who would not suppose him to be a youth of 17 or 18 years of age? An infant-at-law? A mere chicken? Who would suppose him to be nearly forty-six years of age, and to have been a married man for about twenty

years? The Duke is three years older than I am; and he is two years older than a brother of mine, who has been a *grandfather* these two or three years past; while Mrs. Clarke, the artful Mrs. Clarke, is now, I believe, little more than *thirty years* of age. It may be, that the race of royalty, like trees and plants of the superior kind, require more time to bring them to maturity; but, then, let it be observed, that the Duke has had the *command of the army* for 12 or 13 years past, and that the argument of superior kind cuts deeper against him than for him.

If I were, at my age, to set up a defence upon the ground of *infatuation*, of being blinded by the *passion of love*, would not the world laugh in my face? Would they not hoot me off? Would they not turn up their noses and the palms of their hands against me?

As to the *confidence*, which Mr. Perceval, in the close of his Address, expressed, "that his royal highness would keep in view the *uniformly* " *virtuous and exemplary* conduct of his Majesty, since the commencement of his reign," not knowing any thing personally of the conduct here spoken of, I do not pretend to offer any opinion with respect to the general power and tendency of that *example*, upon the efficacy of which Mr. Perceval seems to place so much reliance; but, taking it for granted, that the example is what Mr. Perceval describes it to be, it can have escaped no one, that *the Duke has had this example before him for the last forty-six years*; and, whether it is likely, that the example will now begin its operation upon him, is a question that I readily leave to the reader.

Before I quit this part of the subject, I cannot suppress the regret that I feel at perceiving, that, amongst many people, and those, too, who ought to know much better, the Duke is thought *worse* of for keeping a mistress than for any other part of the conduct imputed to him. This argues a most miserable, unmanly, pitiful way of thinking; it argues, that we are, as a correspondent expresses himself, "a dwarfed nation; that our virtues, as well as our vices, are all diminutive." Not that I would justify, or excuse, or palliate, the conduct of an adulterer, and especially of an open adulterer, and one, too, whose example was likely to have so mischievous an effect; but this vice, great as it is, under any circumstances, and especially under such circumstances, sinks out of sight; it becomes not worthy of notice, when compared to the smallest of the acts of corruption, of low, villanous, dirty corruption, that have been, with what truth the reader will judge, imputed to the Duke of York. As to the former, there may, in some cases, exist causes that the world cannot know; but, there can exist no cause, other than that of sheer baseness of nature, for a man's doing that which has been imputed to the Duke, with regard to the trafficking in commissions and the like.

In the debate of the 17th, Mr. ELLISON is reported to have "declared" his conviction, upon the whole of the evidence taken together, that the "Duke had been *priry to the whole of the transaction*." Now, if this was the conviction upon the mind of any man, of what consequence, compared to it, could be the circumstance of the *adultery*?

Amongst the speeches most admired by me, during the prior discussion, was that of Mr. CURWEN. It was bold, and yet temperate. It led the way in good sentiments, and did the speaker infinite honour.

In the debate of the 17th, the public will not fail to have seen a proof of great public virtue as well as of excellent good sense, in the speech of General FERGUSON, who is an officer of great merit; who, for his con-

duct at Vimeira, recently received the thanks of the House; and who plainly said, that, in his opinion, "it was *not for the honour of the army*, "that the chief command should remain in the hands of the Duke of "York." This opinion; aye, this single opinion, will weigh down a thousand addresses from the "*Military Club*," in London, and of which Club we shall see more by-and-by.

I wish to notice, in a most particular manner, the speech of Mr. LYTLETON, on the 17th; but, I must, in order to show the application of a very interesting part of it, first go back to Mr. CANNING's speech of the 15th, in which there are several things to notice.

"A noble lord (Folkestone) had, on a former night, spoken with some asperity "on what had fallen from him on the outset of this inquiry. He DENIED "that he had said that infamy must attach to the *accused* or the *accuser*, though "he did say that it must rest *somewhere*; and it did rest with *that confederacy*, "of which the Duke of York had been the dupe and the victim. As he had in "one instance been misrepresented by addition, he had in another been misrepresented by curtailment. When he said that some men might be led to doubt "whether the licentiousness of the press did not overbalance its benefits, he had "added, that the *evil was temporary*, but the *good permanent*."

Now, whether the reporters did, or did not, misrepresent Mr. Canning as to these two points; these two very important points; I cannot take upon me to assert, because I was not present to hear the words uttered; but, in the newspapers, which I saw, there was a perfect agreement in the reports as to these points; and, the public will have observed, that, it is *not once or twice*, but many times, that the words, respecting the charge of *infamy*, have been repeated; have been thrown in the teeth of Mr. CANNING; and that, until in this last speech, he has never denied them, or given any explanation of them. On the explanation now given Lord Folkestone said:

"With respect to the *supposed* assertion of the right hon. gent. of the charge of "infamy attaching to the *accuser* or the *accused*—in what I said, I argued on the "supposition that such an expression *had* escaped the right hon. gentleman. As "however he has so pointedly *disclaimed* and *disavowed* the expression, my observation must naturally fall to the ground. I, however, beg leave to say, that "it was not from any *document* that I founded the presumption of his having "used the expression—but upon what *I thought I had heard with my own ears*; "it however appears *from the statement of the right hon. gentleman*, that I must "have been mistaken, and therefore I shall not notice the subject further at this "time than to express my surprise and regret, that the right hon. gent. did not "take the *earliest* opportunity of denying the use of the expression, especially as "I have not been wanting in *affording him such opportunities*."

Indeed, his lordship had frequently called upon him; and once, in a more particular manner, as the reader will have observed, at the opening of Kennet, the *loan-maker's* case, when he complained, that Mr. Wardle had proceeded with the threat of infamy hanging over his head, in case of failure, and that that threat remained *unretracted* up to that very hour. Again, in his speech in the debates, he repeated what he had said before. Sir Francis Burdett in his speech also noticed it, and that, too, in a manner to move a stone to speak. Yet, *not a word of denial* did we hear from the lips of Mr. Canning.—So! He said, it seems, that the *infamy* must rest "*somewhere*," he did say *that*; and now it does rest, he says, "with the *confederacy*, of which the Duke of York had been the dupe and the victim." Dupe! Oh, O! what, a commander-in-chief a "*dupe*!" A man a dupe, old enough to be a grand-papa! A dupe at 45 years of age! A gray-headed dupe! This must be another

“ misrepresentation,” to be sure, especially after all that we have heard of the great vigilance of the Duke of York, and of his surprising capacity for managing great affairs, and for discriminating characters.

Conspiracy is now become *confederacy*. A milder term; for a confederacy may exist for very wise and good purposes. But, really, it is somewhat sickening to hear, in this case, even of a confederacy, after not the smallest traces of any combination, of any sort, have been discovered to have existed against the Duke of York. Every exertion has been made to discover such traces, and all have failed. Not a single jacobin has been ferretted out, though all the old regular traders in anti-jacobinism have been put in motion. No, no, Mr. Canning, there is no confederacy. Mr. Whitbread gave you a true and very beautiful description of the *cant of jacobinism*. There lies the source of the danger, and you may be assured, that you will find no trace of it any where else. To have found out a club of politicians, with *books and papers*, would have been worth a Jew's eye, just at this time; but, there is no such thing. There are not the means even of hatching a plot. The old, scrubbed, battered writers about anti-jacobinism cannot earn salt to the meat that is given them. Nobody will read their trash; and, in time, they must absolutely die of hunger. They have made many attempts to revive jacobinism; but they have all failed. They had found anti-jacobinism such a thriving trade, that they were loath to give it up. Buonaparte, when he put a crown upon his head, put an end to their calling. It was impossible, after that, to keep it up. They laboured hard to do it; but it was too disgusting, when all the world saw that the tide was turned into the current of military despotism.

As to the expressions about the Press, there might be a *misrepresentation*; but, then, we must allow, that the agreement of the reports was unfortunate here again; and, what is more material, that the expression was, if it was as it now stands explained, without any meaning; absolutely without common sense. “The evil was *temporary*, but the good *permanent*.” We say this of taking medicine; we say it sometimes of political commotions; the existence of which is temporary. But, the press is *always* in existence, and *always* liable to be “licentious.” Unless, therefore, Mr. Canning should be able to make it appear, that there are certain periodical returns of “licentiousness” in the press, his amended expression, or explained expression, has no meaning. He gets rid of the offensiveness of it; but he also gets rid of the sense.

As to the case of the Duke of York, as treated by Mr. Canning, if the several reports be correct, it received very little benefit indeed. The gentleman dealt most in the high strain of rank and prerogative. He approved of Mr. Perceval's Address, because, he said:

“It was couched in language at once respectful to the dignity, and tender to the feelings of his Majesty. That alone was sufficient to recommend it. For on such an occasion, when the father as well as the sovereign was to be addressed, would not every loyal mind figure to itself the peculiar circumstances of the monarch on the throne? On submitting such a consideration to him, must they not be impressed by the idea of the *advanced age*; of the *inseparable infirmities*; of the exemplary life, and the many virtues of that illustrious personage, who, during the whole course of a long reign, had evinced towards the country such *paternal feelings*?”

These are topics, upon which to touch with a tender hand; but, these words I find published, in print; upon these words I will comment; and,

if they elicit any thing that may give pain, let the consequence be upon the head of the publisher. Mr. Tierney, when they were uttered, did, it seems, call to order, observing, that the King's name was used, in order to influence the House; and, will not the same objection apply to the publishing of them?

Let me ask, then, *how*, in what manner, a King can evince paternal feelings towards the country? It is easy to talk of paternal feelings; to call a King the "father of his people;" and so on; but, let us come to the point of practice; let us come to the acts. Now, the only way, in which, as far as I am able to discover, for a King to evince such feelings, is, in sparing the purses of the people, and in most carefully watching, that they be not robbed and plundered by any of those, who are in authority under him. I do not, under this interpretation, contradict the article I have quoted above; I do not say, that the King has *not*, thus, evinced his "paternal feelings" towards the country; but, I do say, that, when the having evinced such feelings was advanced as an argument in discussion, when it was used as an argument in justification of one Address proposed to the House, I could have wished to see a statement of the premises.

As to age and infirmity; if these are to weigh in the decision of great and important matters before the House, uncertain and lamentable indeed is our situation! "The King never dies;" nor can the law know any thing about the King's age and infirmities. The objectors to kingly government, when they dwell upon the dangers to be apprehended from age, infirmities, and illness, are answered, that they are to leave all these out of the question; for, that the constitution takes care, that no wrong shall arise from them, the King always having "responsible" ministers; but, here, we see, that these fine theories are cast aside, and the House is desired to look at the age and infirmities of the King. What would the people say, if you were to tell them, that they were under the rule of age and infirmities? What would be the sentence upon any one of us writers, if we were to tell the people, that their affairs were left to be directed by age and infirmities? We deny this. We say, that the constitution gives us a security against the effects of age and infirmity in the King; but, Mr. Canning, one of the King's servants, bids the House of Commons look at the age and infirmities of the King, when they are about to pass a resolution relative to one of his own family; and, what is to be remarked is, that the measure he recommends, he does recommend upon the ground of its being calculated to please the King; that is to say, to please a person, whom he describes to be labouring under age and infirmities.

Towards the close of his speech, Mr. Canning is reported to have alluded to some anecdote relative to an ancestor of Lord Folkestone. The speech appears to have been much abridged; but the words, as I find them, are these:

"In the whole history of Addresses, such a one as this had never been framed by the heart of man, nor had the like ever before been presented to the House. It said no more nor less than this, 'We believe him to be guilty, but if he should happen to be innocent, we will still punish him as if guilty.' He hoped, however, such an Address of negatives would not be permitted to stand on the Journals of the House. The hon. gentleman who brought forward the charges had devised one of his own; but he had suffered others to interfere; and to inoculate or vaccinate it with matter of their producing; which had warped it from its natural purpose, and made it differ from itself. Some of those who

" had thus interfered, might have derived their *presumption* and *pertinacity* by " an *inheritance* of the splendid vices of *one of the mistresses of George II.*"

Upon this part of the speech, Lord Folkestone said :

" On the subject, Sir, of the insinuation which the right hon. gent. has made " respecting transactions that took place before those from whom I derive my " existence were born, it would be affectation in me to pretend that I do not " understand the force and tendency of this allusion. The House showed, by " the general laugh which followed, that it was generally understood. That " allusion, sir, has been grounded not on any *fact* that *has been proved*, but on " *mere rumours*, the truth of which those most interested and most desirous to " discover the truth, have never yet been able to ascertain. He has thrown out " these insinuations, either to influence my conduct or to attach some blame " upon myself. If the motive be to influence my conduct, and that, too, by the " allusion to transactions which took place before those to whom I am indebted " for my existence were born, I beg leave to ask the House in what view my " conduct ought to be influenced by transactions, in which I thus had, and could " have, no concern? If the object be to attach blame to me, I will only say, that " we are told, that the Almighty visits the sins of the fathers upon their children " to the third and fourth generation, but that I did not expect, that even that right " hon. gentleman would have arrogated to himself such a power. I will leave " it to the House to judge, not only of the fairness, the candour, the liberality, " of the right hon. gent., but even of the *decency* of—[Here the Speaker inter- " ferred, by stating, with great mildness, that he would put to the noble lord the " propriety of desisting from the course of explanation he was pursuing, as it " certainly had for its object *direct personality* against the right hon. gent.—Much " tumult ensued, and the Speaker expressed his hope that the House would inter- " pose in such a manner as to express its opinion.]—Lord Folkestone resumed. " Sir, I will merely add, that I will put it to the judgment and moderation of this " House to decide upon the fairness; the candour; the liberality; the decency; " and the justice, of the *personal allusions* made by the right hon. gentleman."

Thus this matter dropped for that time, and somebody, I forget who, complimented Mr. Canning upon the *temper*, which he had discovered in the debate. His speech, it was observed, had in itself, nothing very rich or rare, but the temper, with which it was delivered, was admirable.

On the 17th, however, the HONOURABLE MR. LYTTLETON revived this topic.

" He adverted to some expressions which had fallen from the Secretary for " foreign affairs the other evening respecting the origin of certain gentlemen " in that House. The right hon. gent. had assailed them through the medium " of *old and obscure anecdotes respecting their ancestors*. Mr. Lyttleton beseeched " the right hon. gent. not to attack them by a species of warfare, in which " they met him ON SUCH UNEQUAL TERMS (*loud laughter*), considering " the PECULIAR SPLENDOUR of his own ancestry (*a roar of laughter*). He " was really forced to guard himself against the attacks of the right hon. Secre- " tary in this way, as, from what he said on a former night, he knew of what he " was capable."

What could Mr. Lyttleton mean? I cannot say, that Mr. Canning is any favourite of mine: but, really as to his *birth*, I must say, that, from what I have always heard, he is descended from persons, who filled very exalted stations, and who acted their several parts as well as most people. But, if, instead of being so descended, he had been the spurious offspring of some filthy blackguard amour, what would that tell against him; especially in the liberal minds of the House of Commons, who had appeared to think, that Samuel Carter's being a natural child, was a circumstance that told greatly in favour of his promotion to the army from behind the chair of Mrs. Clarke, who, by so many of the members, has been called an " infamous woman?" I wish, therefore, that Mr. Lyttle-

ton had *explained himself a little more fully*; or else the reporters have not done their duty; for, what was that "*roar of laughter*" for? What was the meaning of it? And, I must say, that Mr. Canning's remarks of the propensity of the world to *carp at high rank* had but too much force in it. Kings and Dukes and Queens and Princesses, so many of whom he has, from his very infancy, been accustomed to see and to know, must be more justly estimated by him than by the low and vulgar herd. Hence, too, we may easily account for the uncommon zeal, which he has discovered in the cause of Spain, or, rather of Ferdinand VII. It is quite delightful to hear his sentiments against the usurpation of the *upstarts*, who have been endeavouring to enslave "the universal Spanish nation;" the ardent, I had almost said, the holy zeal, which he has displayed against the *men of yesterday*, who wished to overturn every thing ancient and noble. He appears to have been very properly impressed with the truth of the French proverb, "*Il vaut mieux qu' une cité périsse qu' un gueux parvenu la gouverne*;" which, indeed, contains little more than our own old saying: "Set a beggar on horseback, and he'll ride to the devil." He seems to have made just observation upon the cause as well as consequences of the ruling by upstarts, for which, indeed, the fate of Spain, under Godoy, has furnished him with an excellent opportunity; no wonder, therefore, that we are called upon to "*spend our last shilling and shed the last drop of our blood*," in order to keep out the upstart Buonapartes, and their upstart generals, who were born nobody knows *where, when, or of whom*; those "*children of many fathers*;" those "*spurious pledges, of beggars, littering under hedges*;" creatures actually dropped and left, like the young of the cuckoo, to be nurtured by the compassion of others. There are few things that sting the soul more sharply than to be obliged to submit to the insolent sway of these "*gueux parvenus*;" and, there are few sacrifices that men of any spirit will not make to avoid, or get rid of, such degrading submission.

Mr. LITTLETON'S speech, except in the want of explicitness upon the above point, was very good indeed. He expressed his conviction,

"That these charges against the Duke of York were fully proved, if not according to the technical forms of the law, at least according to the plain sense of every unprejudiced man. The evidence, upon the whole, he considered as conclusive; and in opposition to that there was nothing on the other side but *surmises and hypotheses, and the assertion of his royal highness*. He could not but feel the weight of the testimony of his gallant friend behind him (General Ferguson), with respect to the improvements in the management of the army, effected by his royal highness the Duke of York; but he must observe, at the same time, that *mere evidence to character* could only be urged with effect in *mitigation of punishment*. He could not erase from his recollection the methods taken by the other side to counteract these accusations in *raising the cry of Jacobinism*, and in prejudging the question. This was suspicious; but it was not very judicious, and he doubted whether if that eloquent magician (Mr. Pitt) who first raised the *phantom of Jacobinism*, could again be equally successful. An attempt, let what would be done to explain it away, has been made to decry the liberty of the press. He allowed that the House was not to be actuated by popular clamour. But, at the same, it was very unreasonable in ministers to say, that those were influenced merely by popular opinion who did not concur with them. It would have had a better appearance if the *ministers had not been quite so unanimous* on this question. Our ancestors had a salutary distrust of persons in office; and in order to prove this, he read some resolutions passed in former times, to render members of parliament incapable, while acting in that capacity, of holding any other situation.—If it were in the power of the House to send down to posterity the character of the

"Duke of York unsullied, if their proceedings did not extend beyond their journals, he should be almost inclined to concur in the vote of acquittal, even in opposition to his sense of duty. But though the House should acquit his royal highness, *the proofs would still remain*, and the public opinion would be guided by them, and not by the *decision* of the House. It was in the power of the House to save *its own* character, but not *that of the Commander-in-Chief*. The character of the House depended essentially upon the result of this inquiry. If it was contrary to what the public conceived the justice of the case, they would be apt to lose all confidence in the members, they would imagine that the ministers had it in their power to carry every thing—that there was no security for them in the House of Commons against the arbitrary disposition of the servants of the crown—and perhaps they might be driven by other means to seek those ends of justice which their representatives had denied them. He however hoped better of the virtue and wisdom of the House, which he hoped would, like the fountain of justice, prove itself to be no respecter of persons."

This speech was received with great applause, which I look upon as a good sign. Aye, the magician Pitt, would surely fail now, in any attempt to conjure up the phantom of jacobinism. That man of words would now find that the public mind is no longer so to be led. That the people of this country are no longer to be made believe, that every man is a traitor, who suspects that there is corruption on foot; that every man ought to die on a gallows, who does not cheerfully subscribe to the infallibility of the minister of the day. There is no want of the *talents* of Pitt; they are possessed by many of his followers, who can speak as *long* and full as well as he; but, there are wanted the materials to work upon. The nation has betaken itself to *thinking*; it has become a fashion, among the people, to be no longer amused by sounds; things, ideas, and not words, are now the object of their attention. Within these ten years, there has been a *mental revolution* in this country. I should like to see what Pitt would be able to do, with all his talk, now. Indeed, he tried the thing in the last years of his life, and he failed. Death snatched him from as complete discomfiture and mortification as ever man experienced. His budget had been all tried, over and over. There was not a trick left, that the people had not blown upon.

In this debate of the 17th, there is a published speech attributed to a Mr. FULLER, who is reported to have said, that if there was any one "who did not *like England*, damn him, let him *leave it*." The mind of the person, who uttered, or who wrote, these words, appears not to have partaken in the revolution above spoken of. It seems to have remained stationary, like the sterile and unseeded clod, amidst the improvements, the beauties, and the delights of heaven-bestowed vegetation. He, though his body has increased in age, and has advanced towards the hour of dissolution, seems to be, in mind, still living in the days of Pitt, in the days when anti-jacobinism was a thriving trade, and he one of its best customers.

Aye, this was the old cry: "If you do not *like the country*, leave it." But, the words must be explained: by *the country* they mean the *government*, and by the government they mean the *ministry*, and, in Pitt's time, by the ministry, they meant *Pitt*; so that the sentiment should stand thus, fairly reduced to its true meaning, "If you do not like the ministry, quit the country." No, Mr. Fuller, I will not leave the country, I will not leave England, upon any such principle as this. I like *England* very well; and, to say the least, I show full as much love for it as you do. But I do not like *corruption*; I do not like to see the

offices under the government, and the seats in the House of Commons, openly advertised for purchase and sale. The corruptions, "damn them," to borrow a phrase of your own; the *corruptors* and the *corrupted*, "damn them," I hate them most cordially! But, I do not hate England; on the contrary, it is my love of England that makes me hate them. Why, Sir, what would you think of the logic of a gang of thieves, who should have got possession of a man's house, and who, upon hearing him complain of their conduct, were to say, If you don't like the *house*, "damn" you, leave it? Now, mind, I do not compare you, and those whom you support, to a gang of thieves; mind that; let me not be misunderstood; but, I use the illustration merely to show to what length this abusive argument, which the newspapers, with one accord, have attributed to you, would naturally, and necessarily go.

If, indeed, you could bring me a man, who should say, "I do not like *England*," without any qualification of his meaning, I should then say, without the "damn him," perhaps (though I will not be very positive about that), "let him leave it." But, my opinion is, that you never heard an Englishman make use of this expression; and, give me leave to say, that the occasion, and the context, of this sentiment of yours, as published in the papers, lead me to conclude, that by *England*, you did not mean our *country*, as being the object of any one's dislike.

I have noticed this speech, not on account of its intrinsic importance, but as affording an occasion of pointing out the intolerance, the injustice, and the insolence of the principle (first broached in the days of Pitt), that all those, who are discontented with the mode of managing public affairs, may *leave the country*; have the precious liberty, the glorious privilege, of seeking *redress* in voluntary transportation for life. I wonder what Hampden and his associates would have said, if the besotted Charles's courtiers had answered their complaints by telling them that they might leave the country. Why, they would have said what was said to his bigot and profligate of a son. "No: England is ours and *not yours*: leave you England to us." They were not so to be answered. They knew their rights, and had the courage to assert them.

This doctrine ascribed to Mr. Fuller, would, if generally applied, save a great deal of trouble to ministers; it would furnish a standing answer to all petitions, all remonstrances, all complaints of grievances of every sort. "Oh, you don't like England, don't you," why then, "*damn you*, leave it." It would be a complete stifler; a choker equal to a halter at least.

It appears to have been, through the whole of the debates, admitted, that the people of this country in general, if not quite without exception, thought the continuance of the Duke of York in the office of Commander-in-Chief of the army, a grievance. This, called by one side, popular clamour, appears to have been urged by some, and to be denied by none.

It is not impertinent, or unnecessary, to ask, *why* the people should have set up this clamour, if clamour it must be? *What* should have produced this unanimity of voice and of wish in the nation? For *what reason* a whole people should have thus combined against one man? Well, supposing there to have been no reason at all; supposing this whole nation to have been, and still to be, in this respect, under the influence of senseless caprice; still it must be, that this dislike to the Duke has arisen out of the Inquiry, or that it existed before: if the former, it shows what effect the evidence has produced upon the minds of the

people; if the latter, that they never had any confidence in him. This dislike, too, might have no other foundation than senseless caprice; but, yet, if you allow it to have generally existed, it comes, at last, to the same thing, with regard to the application of Mr. Fuller's argument, which would go to the bidding of them all, "damn them," to leave the country.

Lord William Russell, in the debate of the 17th, regretted the loss of that laudable custom of our forefathers, who, *before* they voted money to the King, insisted upon a *redress of grievances*; but, upon the principle of Mr. Fuller's speech, the King should have said to them, "If you don't like England, damn you, leave it." It is not long since another speech, published under the name of this Mr. Fuller, told us, "That the Chancellor of the Exchequer had proved, that the Duke of York had, during the space of two years and a half, spent *sixteen thousand pounds* upon a profligate baggage, and if that would not *satisfy* the House and the people, he did not know what would." If this did not satisfy them, "damn them," they might leave the country, I suppose?

Mr. Fuller's language, *openly* used at least, has something singular in it; but, I, by no means, believe, that he is singular in his opinions, or in his language, as used not before the public. There are, in my opinion, many who think what he says, and who, to one another, give utterance to their thoughts. But, I trust, the time is now come, when no one will be able to act with impunity upon such a principle; when no one will dare to spurn the people, when they make their complaints of grievances, and to tell them, either in acts or words, that, "damn them," they may leave the country.

In the debate of the 17th, there came out, through Mr. Whitbread, a statement relative to a certain MILITARY CLUB, who were preparing an *Address to the Duke of York*. This being a matter of great importance to the public, as a practical illustration of the arguments that have been frequently used relative to the influence of so large a standing army, all the officers of which are not only appointed solely by the King, but any one of whom can, at any moment, and without cause assigned, be dismissed, deprived of his profession, and, perhaps, of his bread, by the sole will of the King, no minister whatever being held, even nominally, responsible for any act of this sort; this instance of the military club affording such practical illustration, I shall insert, in the fullest manner that I find it reported, what was said upon the subject in the House of Commons.

Mr. WHITBREAD said—

"There was a very strange circumstance had come to his ears, with which he felt it incumbent on him to acquaint the House, and that was, that within these few days a *meeting had taken place of General Officers*, at which meeting it was proposed to *address the Duke of York*, on the present occasion, and to assure his Royal Highness of their gratitude and attachment. To what could the proceedings of such a meeting lead? If a number of General Officers were allowed thus to hold meetings and deliberate, why might not common soldiers imitate their proceedings, and sit in deliberation also? Was this a circumstance to be overlooked by the House? Was it not one of the most dangerous tendency? Was it not an attempt to erect an *imperium in imperio*, to interfere in the deliberative proceedings of that House, and to *answer its arguments by fixed bayonets*? He trusted it would be sufficient thus to have warned the House of the existence of such a meeting. The hon. gentleman concluded by observing, that what had transpired in the course of the present investigation into the conduct of the Duke of York, furnished a new proof, if any additional

“proof were wanting, of the necessity of a temperate reform, a reform which would extend not only to the administration of the army, but to the Government in Church and State.”

This last observation we must reserve for a future opportunity, with just observing now, that to this many men who never thought much of the matter before, have now made up their minds. They see, that without such a reform as was here spoken of by Mr. Whitbread, there can very little good arise from any inquiry; any partial detection, exposure, or even punishment of corruptions and peculations; that you may cut down a shoot here and there, and even the whole stem; but, that it will throw out again, and even with renovated vigour; and that nothing worth prizing is done, until you have laid the axe to the root.

In answer to what Mr. Whitbread said about the *Military Club*, the Secretary at War, Sir JAMES PULTENEY, said—

“That he thought himself called upon to say a few words respecting the meeting of General Officers to which the honourable gentleman had alluded. There was some foundation for the statement of the honourable gentleman, but it was only this, that there existed in this town a club of Military Gentlemen, of which he was an unworthy member. That club had lately met; and, at the meeting, some conversation had arisen, respecting the conduct of the Duke of York, as Commander-in-Chief. That conversation turned upon the services rendered by his Royal Highness to the army; and the members of the club thought themselves bound in gratitude to testify to his Royal Highness the high sense they entertained of the eminent advantages which the army had derived from his able administration of the military affairs of the country. These sentiments they had resolved to express to his Royal Highness in the form of an Address, but their proceedings in this respect, had no reference whatsoever to the circumstances of the present moment, or to what was now passing in that House.”

No! “No reference whatsoever to the circumstances of the present moment!” This is very strange indeed; still stranger than the existence of an intention to send the address. Did the Club ever address him before? Did they ever think of this upon any former occasion? Oh! So the Club had lately happened to meet; and some conversation had arisen respecting the conduct of the Duke of York, as Commander-in-Chief of the Army. Yes, to be sure, all about soldiering, as the Volunteers call it; all about soldiering; and then the conversation, amongst these military men constituting a Club in London, turned, aye, it happened to turn, upon the services rendered by his Royal Highness to the army. That is all very good; very good, very “correct,” as the new phrase is. But, I cannot help stopping here; “I cannot help interrupting my argument,” as Lord Castlereagh sometimes facetiously observes, to notice that these military gentlemen are always talking about the Duke’s services to the army. What is meant by this? We should like to hear of services to the country, performed by means of the army. These men themselves make a part of the army, and a part, too, which was not out of the way when the services were shared, I will warrant you. Well; but, “to go on with my argument,” as Lord Castlereagh says; and so, the conversation happening to have turned upon the services rendered to the army, by the Duke of York, in his capacity of Commander-in-Chief, the Club, amongst whom were the Secretary-at-War, one of the ministry of the day, and a member of parliament, thought themselves bound in gratitude to present an address to the Duke; and, though this resolution of theirs was taken just at the time, that a ques-

tion respecting the Duke's removal was before the House of Commons, this proceeding of the Club had "no reference whatsoever to the circumstances of the present moment, or to what was now passing in the House;" and so, it was all very well, and the fighting gentry were doing very right, and certainly meant nothing at all, not the least in the world, in the way of *dragooning*.

This puts one in mind of SCUT's *ex-parte* examination of his client in the Village Lawyer. "And so, the sheep run after you, and would insist upon being killed. . . . Ye—s, yes, I see, I see. And did you carry away the sheep, or the sheep carry you?"

After all, however, it appears, that there is, in London, an establishment, called "the *Military Club*;" that the members of that club do meet and deliberate; and that, amongst their deliberations, there has been one, the result of which was, a resolution to present an Address to the Duke of York, expressive of their *approbation* of his conduct. Now, it will hardly be contended, that, if they have a right to do this, and it be proper for them to do this, the soldiers, in their several regiments, have not a similar right; and, as it would be too base to be tolerated for a moment, to contend that the right of expressing their sentiments, in this manner, to their superior officers, extended only as far as they went in the way of *approbation*, it follows, of course, that, unless this basest of base principles be avowed, that the soldiers have as good a right to meet, to deliberate, and to pass censure upon the commanding-officers of their several corps, as these men have to address the Duke of York, which men, observe, in presenting an address of *approbation*, tacitly assert their right to express their *disapprobation*, of the conduct of the same person. We have heard a great deal of the surprisingly excellent *discipline*, which the Duke of York has introduced into the army. The Secretary of War was himself one of the witnesses to character upon this score; and now, I think, he has obliged us with a practical instance of the truth of his statements.

In the debate of the 20th, Mr. Whitbread brought the subject forward again. This part of his speech, together with what was said by others, on the same subject, I shall now insert.

MR. WHITBREAD said, "that he had a few words to state on the subject of a meeting of General Officers, to which he had referred on a former night. He said, that the idea of the resolution which he had understood to have been come to by that meeting, was not so entirely put down as had been stated, though indeed, he confessed, he had now no dread from it. He was now informed, that the proposal made at that meeting had been grounded on a letter from a Garrison Commander, and was drawn out in the *hand-writing* of Sir David Dundas. He was now even given to understand, that the proposition had been seconded by the right honourable general opposite (*the Secretary at War*), and that it was in consequence of the opposition of one General Officer present that it was withdrawn for the moment; not entirely set aside, but to be brought forward again on some future opportunity. The hon. gent. had been informed yesterday, by a very respectable person, a bookseller, who, he believed, was known to most of the gentlemen on the other side, that a clergyman had called on him, requesting that he would recommend to him a literary gentleman, to correct a letter to be addressed to his royal highness by the Club of General Officers, telling him that he would do wrong were he to resign his situation. The bookseller, however, very properly desired the reverend gentleman to take back the address to the General Officer from whom he had received it, assuring him that the publication of such a paper was the most foolish step that could possibly be adopted. He had been told that there could no harm result from such meetings. He dared to say the fact was so, and that, as Cæsar stopped his tumultuous legions, simply by using the word 'Quirites,' it would be only

" necessary to remind them that they were soldiers. The hon. gent. declared his opinion, that a national sentiment prevailed *that the son of the King was not a fit person to be Commander-in-Chief*. The present inquiry had demonstrated that it was not fit that the son of the King should hold that situation. The House had been engaged in this inquiry from the 1st of February to the 20th of March. We, of course, saw the ease with which the son of the King could be removed from his situation. When the charges were first brought forward, gentlemen on the other side had stepped forward, and challenging the hon. mover to the inquiry, had said, 'Oh! now at length you have come in a tangible shape; and we thank you for giving us an opportunity of meeting the charges.' When the hon. gent., however, had proved his charges, he was told he was to have no thanks at all. *For these reasons he thought the son of the King was not a fit person to hold such a situation*. There was a time when the favourite son of a King had not been so treated. In a former reign, when the Duke of Cumberland gave offence by concluding the convention of Closter Severn, he was at once removed and disgraced. Though he (Mr. Whitbread) was not prepared to say, that the hon. gent. who brought forward these charges ought to receive the thanks of the House, because in so doing he had only discharged his duty, he was satisfied that he had the thanks of the great majority of that House, and of 999 out of every 1000 individuals throughout the kingdom.

" The SECRETARY AT WAR said, he had only to repeat what he had said on a former night on the subject of the Club of General Officers. From the statement of the hon. member, that the proceeding was founded on a letter of a Garrison Commander, one would think that a formal address had been proposed; this, however, was not the case. It was merely the subject of conversation, whether it might be proper to pass a resolution of thanks to the Duke of York then, or at any other time. Nothing farther was done; so it was unnecessary for him to say that he did not second a proposition which had never been made. So far from it, no intimation of such a proposal was made till the cloth was removed from the table. It was then talked of, and it was agreed that at all events such a measure would not be advisable till the conclusion of the discussion now going on in the House of Commons. There were at the time only thirteen gentlemen present, and the proposition was not received with acclamations. As to any thing further on the subject, he was as ignorant of it as if he had not been present.

" Mr. WHITBREAD said, he understood the paper, on which the proposition was founded, was in the hand-writing of Sir David Dundas. There were gentlemen now in the House who were present when the information was given to him, and they could state that this was the fact as he had received it. He begged to say one other word. He should be happy to hear from the Secretary at War, if the proposition was now abandoned?

" The SECRETARY AT WAR said, he had seen no paper in the hand-writing of Sir D. Dundas. As to the other question, he could not say if the proposition was abandoned or not.

" Mr. CANNING said, when he first heard of the circumstance alluded to by the hon. gent. (Mr. Whitbread), he stated, that it had his most decided disapprobation, as being one of the most improper steps which the army could adopt. If there did exist an attempt on the part of any Military Officers to protect the Duke of York against the Commons, a more culpable idea never entered into the heads of men. But, on the other hand, if it was only a simple conversation at a convivial meeting, he saw no occasion to swell it up into a matter of importance. If, however, the idea of making it a formal resolution of Military Officers as a deliberative body should at any time be entertained, the hon. gent. (Mr. Whitbread) should find him one of his most determined supporters in inquiring into the business.

" Mr. WHITBREAD again stated, that he had been informed the paper had been read before dinner; and, if thought necessary, this fact might be inquired into.

" Gen. LOFTUS, referring to the club of General Officers, stated that he himself was not present, but that he had inquired into the particulars of a friend who was present, and the information he received was, that there was no paper produced, that the subject was started in a moment without any formality, and was carried on and dropped like any other conversation."

This comes as nearly up, as it can well come, to one of those arts, described in the vulgar but most beautiful and forcible figure of *drawing in the horns*. One can almost see the head drooping, and the soft member, gently, and, as it were by stealth, retreating to its intrenchments, and coiling itself snugly up.

There is one thing, however, which I would wish the public to bear in mind, in connection with the existence of this Military Club; and that is, that a very considerable part of the army, officers as well as men, consists of *foreigners*; I say, *consists of foreigners*. Now, if these foreign officers compose, in part, this club, and if this club (held in *London*) is to deliberate in the way that has been described, I leave the public to say what is the nature of our situation. Had I been a member of parliament, I should certainly have called for the names of all those composing this association. Societies amongst *the people of England*, for deliberating upon public matters, are, I believe, forbidden by one of the laws, passed in the time of Pitt; and, are these officers of the army to meet, then, and deliberate? And deliberate, too, upon such important questions, as that which was then before the House of Commons? This Military Club should recollect, that they are paid by the nation for the purpose of obtaining from them *military services*; that the army costs this burdened people 23 millions of pounds sterling a year; and that it is, or ought to be, expected from its generals, that they will busy themselves about other matters than making addresses to the sons of the King.

Having now noticed such parts of the Debates, up to Friday, the 17th, inclusive, that appeared to me the most worthy of immediate attention, I shall come to the proceedings of the 20th, beginning with the statement of Mr. Perceval respecting the Duke of York's having resigned the office of Commander-in-Chief. He said, that this took place on Saturday last, and that it was the Duke's own "*spontaneous motion*," founded upon the motives set forth in a paper, which Mr. Perceval then read to the House in the following words:—

"The House of Commons having, after a most attentive and laborious investigation of the merits of certain allegations preferred against him, passed a *Resolution of his innocence*, he might now approach his Majesty, and might venture to tender to him his Resignation of the Chief Command of his Majesty's Army, as he could no longer be suspected of acting from any apprehension of the result, nor be accused of having shrunk from the extent of an inquiry which, painful as it had been, he trusted he should appear, even to those who had been disposed to condemn his conduct, to have met with the *patience* and *firmness* which could arise only from a conscious feeling of innocence.

"The motive which influenced him arose from the truest sense of duty, and the warmest attachment to his Majesty, from which he had never departed, and which his Majesty had, if possible, confirmed, by the affectionate and paternal solicitude which he had shown for his son's honour and welfare upon the present *distressing* occasion. To his Majesty, as a most kind and indulgent Father, as a most gracious Sovereign, he owed every thing; and the feeling of this alone would have prompted him to forego all considerations of personal interest in the determination which he had taken. It would not become him to say that he should not quit with sincere regret a situation in which his Majesty's confidence and partiality had placed him, and the duties of which it had been his anxious study and his pride, during fourteen years, to discharge with integrity and fidelity. Whether he might be allowed to add, with advantage to his Majesty's service, his Majesty was best able to decide."

Mr. Perceval then suggested, that the motion of Mr. BRAGGE was become unnecessary. Mr. Bragge did not think so; but, before we go any further, let us take another look at this statement of motives.

For my part, I have had no opportunity of witnessing the conduct of the Duke, during the Inquiry and discussion; I have seen nothing of him but in his Letter to the House, and in that I certainly discover neither *patience* nor *firmness*, though I discover enough of qualities of a very different sort.

But, "the House has," it seems, in his view of the matter, "passed a resolution of his *innocence*." We have seen, in the former part of this article, p. 168, how many there were to say NO to the resolution alluded to, and the world is not ignorant of the circumstances under which the vote was given. But, was there ever, in all this world before, such a *reason* given for a man's quitting his office? Certain charges are preferred against him, as Commander-in-Chief; "a resolution of his *innocence*" of those charges is passed, and, this *having been done*, this resolution having been passed, he resigns! Wonderful! Why, the world is turned upside-down.

If, indeed, the proceedings had been *quite* finished; then he might, with some show of plausibility, have said: "There; they have completely "acquitted me; they have passed no vote for my removal, or having that "object in view; and I will now let them see that it was not for my "office, but for my *honour*, that I made a stand." But, the fact was otherwise; the proceedings were not over; there was Mr. Bragge's motion for Monday, and it was almost reduced to a certainty, that that motion, after the passing of which he could not have remained in office, without an open rupture between the advisers of the King and a majority of the House, would have been carried by a decided majority. These were the circumstances, then, under which he resigned.

So, the occasion has been a "*distressing*" one, has it? This does not correspond well with the bold language, assumed in his name, by Mr. Adam and Mr. Perceval, when the charges were first made. There was, then, a great show of hackle; there was nothing, amongst his partisans, but strutting and crowing. They were a main against one cock; but, they have turned tail, and that, too, upon their own dunghill. "*Distressing* occasion;" well, then, the Duke knows, at last, what it is to feel distress himself. "*Distressing* occasion!" One cannot help hanging upon the words. There was nothing of this in the letter to the House. Alas! I see very little of firmness here.

The expressions of *attachment to the King* have no harm in them, to be sure; but, I do not see the use of them, upon an occasion like this. No one had ever, that I know of, accused the Duke of a want of attachment to his father. It was of a want of attachment to the *public good* that he was (with what truth the reader may decide) accused; and, in this statement of reasons, one might, without being very unreasonable; without entertaining any wish to see a member of the royal family degrade himself in the eyes of the world, have expected to meet with some expression of gratitude towards that public. To his *Majesty*, both as father and sovereign, he says he *owes every thing*. I do not wish to strain this sentence to mean, that he *owes the public nothing*; but, when I recollect how much he owes to that public; that good-natured, that generous public, I cannot say but I think that the public should not, in a paper like this, have been wholly omitted.

Mr. BRAGGE, after a speech of some length, in which there was nothing worthy of our particular notice, made his motion in the following words:

“ That while this House acknowledges the beneficent effects of the regulations adopted and acted upon by his royal highness in the general discharge of his duties as Commander-in-Chief, it is observed with the deepest regret, that in consequence of a connection the most immoral and unbecoming, a communication on official subjects and an interference in the distribution of Military Appointments and Promotions has been allowed to exist, which could not but lead to discredit the official administration of his royal highness, and to give colour and effect, as they have actually done, to transactions the most criminal and disgraceful.”

To this motion LORD ALTHORP moved an amendment, after a speech which is too good not to be inserted here as far as, at present, I am in possession of it. This conduct in Lord Althorp, Lord Milton, Mr. Lyttleton, Lord Folkestone, and several other young men of distinguished families, must give great hope to the country.—He said :

“ That there were one or two positions advanced by the right hon. gent. who had just sat down, in which he could not entirely concur. With regard to the regret of the right hon. gent. for the resignation of the Duke of York, he admitted that it was a great loss to lose the services of those who had while in office efficiently discharged their duty, but the loss of the services of the Duke of York was considerably lessened, when they recollected in what manner it had been proved at the bar that Royal Duke discharged his duty. He differed also from that right hon. gent. as to the great use and importance he thought proper to attach to the elevated rank of that illustrious person. He (Lord Althorp) was rather disposed to think that such high rank and affinity to the throne were not the most recommendatory qualifications for the most responsible situation under the crown, and he appealed to those who heard him, if, in the course of the late proceedings, their debates were not, in some degree, influenced by considerations of delicacy, inseparable from any discussion, involving the character and honour of one so near his majesty ; and therefore, it did appear to him to be of the greatest importance that no person should ever, for the future, be called to such high situations but such as could be completely responsible. Another assertion of the right hon. gent. went to the total acquittal of the Duke of York, as to corruption or connivance. It was not necessary now, perhaps, to go into this, but as it was mentioned, he would state, that he did think the Duke of York had been proved guilty of connivance at the corrupt practices which had taken place ; and if his royal highness had continued in office, he thought that the House must have gone farther, and passed a sentence upon him that would have rendered his resignation unavoidable. With regard to their subsequent proceedings, he was of opinion, that the question stood in a state in which the House of Commons ought not to suffer it to remain. He wished to place it on the Journals, that the Duke of York had resigned. This notification would give consistency to the entire character of their proceedings, and bring it to its proper close, at the same time satisfactorily accounting why it was closed. Not, however, that he would be understood to say that he considered removal from office a constitutional punishment ; but it would be in this case so far effective, as to preclude the possibility of that royal Duke being ever re-appointed to a situation he has proved himself so incompetent to fill. No man can, or ought to hold that important situation, who was not in full possession of the confidence of the country. *The Duke of York has forfeited that confidence.* He has lost the confidence of the country for ever, and by consequence he must abandon all hopes of ever again returning to that situation. This was a severe lesson, but it was as salutary as it was severe ; it would prove to all who may succeed that royal Duke hereafter, that it is not within the power of any sovereign, however beloved or confided in, to protect his most favoured servant from the just consequences of the mal-administration of his public duty. The noble lord then concluded with moving, ‘ That his royal highness the Duke of York having resigned the command of the army, that House did not now think it necessary to proceed any further in the consideration of the evidence before the Committee appointed to inquire into the conduct of his royal highness as far as that evidence related to his royal highness the Duke of York.’ ”

The debate then went on. Mr. Perceval objected to the word *now*; and, after a debate of considerable length, the Resolution was passed, leaving out the word *now*, which, to me, does not appear of very great importance; because, the sense seems to be fully expressed in the previous words, which contain the *reason* why the House does not think it necessary to proceed any further. The Duke *having resigned*, &c. is quite sufficient. The sentence, in common language, says this, "We do not think it necessary to go on any further, *because* the Duke *has resigned*." NOW could hardly be intended to mean, that it was meant to keep the thing in waiting, to see whether he again took the command. If it was, it was useless; because, proceedings can be adopted in such a case, and reference can be made to all the evidence, which has now been taken at the bar. Not that I, either, would be understood to insinuate, that *loss of office* is to be regarded as "constitutional *punishment*," as the Nabob's Gazette would fain make us believe it to be. This would be a pretty doctrine indeed; a pretty distinction between the service of the public and the service of an individual. The paper, which I have just mentioned, and which is, I believe, the only one in all England that has had the barefaced profligacy to justify all the acts of the Duke of York, says he has been "*severely punished*;" forgetting, apparently, the other column of its dirty sheet, in which it contends, that the Duke's resignation was *perfectly voluntary*, and that he had no desire to retain his office. A bad cause or a bad memory is, either of them, bad enough; but when they unite they are sure to make a most ridiculous figure.

Mr. Whitbread, during this debate, charged Mr. Perceval with having *deserted* the Duke; this the latter denied, asserting that the Duke's resignation was his own "*spontaneous motion*." But, let any one look at the Address, prepared by Mr. Perceval, and read to the House, in the first day's debate; let him look at that address, which was little more than an echo of the Duke's letter to the House, and then say if there has not been desertion. The public must have observed, that Mr. Perceval, Mr. Yorke, Mr. Canning, the Attorney-General, Mr. Plomer, Mr. Burton, Mr. Leicester, and, indeed, all the set ministerial members, who spoke in the debate, dwelt upon the great *injury* the country would sustain in *losing* the Duke of York, as Commander-in-Chief. "But, it was his *own spontaneous motion*." He would not stay in. But, why did they not get him to remain, *till they had negatived Mr. Bragge's motion*? They, surely, who had got him to wait so long, could have prevailed upon him to wait two days longer. The motion was to be made on Monday, and they could not get him to wait that time. Zounds, then! don't let him boast so much of his *patience*. Why, he must have been as impatient to get out of office as most men are to get into office, and as he himself was, according to his pretty letter from Sandgate, to get into the arms of Mrs. Clarke, poor woman!

When the Duke sent his letter to the House, did any one suppose, that he would have made a spontaneous resignation of his office? Did that letter, either in its tone or matter, indicate the most distant idea of this sort? On the contrary, did it not, in every line, breathe defiance? Look again at Mr. Perceval's proposed Address, which is an echo to that letter, and see whether its object, its chief object, be not to tell the King, that the House will go with him in keeping the Duke of York in his place. Again, look at the several speeches, on the ministerial side of the House, and see whether they did not labour principally to this point.

Recollect the concluding words of the Attorney-General, who gave such strong reasons for believing, that the Duke would not abuse his powers for the future. The Solicitor-General said, that you might as well *stab the Duke of York to the heart*, as to pass a vote for his removal; and, though he explained this away a little afterwards, it is clear, from the remarks upon it, in the House, that so he was understood. It is, then, as clear as noon-day, that the settled purpose was to keep the Duke in his place; and, there can be no doubt, that this purpose was, at last, given up only when it was perceived, that there would have been a majority for the motion of Mr. Bragge, after passing which motion it would have been impossible for him to remain without producing an open war between a majority of the House and the King's servants.

Well, be this as it may, whatever might be the motive, *out he is*, and, so far the public wish has been gratified. But, how much better would it have been, if he had resigned at an earlier period? How much better would it have been, if, at the outset, the *servants of the King* had acted in the manner which I formerly pointed out, and which was, indeed, pointed out by the nature of the case? If they had so acted, instead of fighting the charges, inch by inch; instead of causing a clear line of distinction to be drawn between them and those persons who were not hostile to the inquiry; if they had so acted, there would not, as there now is, be a guide to direct the public resentment whereon to fix itself. The public are pleased that the Duke of York is out of office; they are convinced that this is for their good; they are satisfied that this is a happy event. But, *whom* do they *thank* for it? Towards *whom* are their grateful feelings directed? Aye it is in this that the ministers have been highly blamable. It is their fault that the public gratitude is not directed, in part, at least, in that way, in which it was their first duty to have caused it to be directed, and to produce which cause they had it completely in their power, unless it be true, that, as Mr. Whitbread stated, they were not the efficient ministers of the King. What the public has *now* gained they *thank themselves* for, next after *Mr. Wardle*. They see that nothing has been conceded to them, without reluctance; and even in the motives stated by Mr. Perceval, for the Duke's resignation, they find no expression, not a single word, which is calculated to awaken in them sentiments of a description, which wise ministers would have bent their whole minds to keep alive.

Jacobins, indeed! Those are the jacobins; those are the true destroyers of thrones, who omit nothing that may tend to irritate and disgust the people; who push them on to the utmost stretch of their patience.

It is useless to tell us, that the ministers *had nothing to do with the Duke's resignation*. We should as soon believe, that Mr. Perceval had nothing to do with the keeping of the secret about the note in the hands of Sandon. In short, it is quite in vain to endeavour to palliate their conduct, which, towards the people, has, from first to last, been any thing but gracious; and that the people most sensibly feel.

There was a part of the speech of Mr. Whitbread of the 20th, that did not at all square with my ideas upon the subject. It related to those *great allowances*, which we are to make for the *failings of princes*; and it did, to me, appear very much like courtly flattery, and, that, too, of the worst sort.

"An hon. gent. proposed to read the Duke of York a lecture on morality.

“ He (Mr. W.) did not think this a very fit time for such a lecture. A sufficiently long and grave one had been read to his royal highness in the course of the examination. The situation of princes was a very difficult one. They were exposed to greater temptations than others, without the same means of resistance. They almost always wanted that valuable acquisition—an admonishing friend. Such a friend was with them so rare, that to speak the truth to a prince had been always considered as a characteristic of extreme boldness. ‘He is a bold man this,’ it had been said, ‘for he has spoken the truth even to the King.’ Some allowances in a moral point of view were due to persons in such a situation. Another strong reason why the House should not read the Duke of York a lecture on morality was, the situation in which the princes were placed, from the necessity of the case, of not being allowed to form those connections of the heart which were permitted to every other subject. He did not say that this was a case in point with respect to his royal highness. The observation was general; but he thought it was a reason why the House should not readily throw stones at princes on account of their improper connections. We had, he observed, one Royal Duke whose character for morality and correct conduct, stood as high as that of any man; and, considering the circumstances to which he had alluded, the greater temptations and the difficulties attached to the situation, it would not be an easy matter to prize such a character higher than it deserved.”

A nicer dish of flattery than this I do not recollect to have ever seen, even in a romance; it must, one would suppose, be relished even by him, who was so very delicate in his palate, that Mrs. Clarke found it frequently necessary to change her man-cooks, of which she had a brace at a time. “A difficult situation?” In what is the situation of one of our princes difficult? Do they want money? Do they want for any thing, which other men have? I can see nothing that they want for, which this world can afford. Instead of being exposed to greater temptations than others, they seem to me to be exposed to none of those temptations, which form the apology for the vices of men, in common life. They have not, he tells us, “the same means of resistance.” I wish he had attempted to show this; to give us reasons for what he asserted. For my part, unless we admit their impunity to be legalized, I can see no check upon the vices of other men, which does not exist with respect to them. Indeed, this doctrine of Mr. Whitbread would go much further than he appears to have perceived. If it be sound with respect to princes, it must, in due degree, be equally sound with regard to nobles; and, in short, rank and riches will become, in themselves, an apology, if not a justification, for vice. “From him to whom much is given, much shall be required,” says the Gospel, which, let it remain untortured by priestcraft, always speaks the voice of justice and of common sense; but, Mr. Whitbread would reverse this great maxim, and would have us believe, that, because much is given, little ought to be required. “Difficulty” indeed! What difficulty is there in a prince’s living a sober, a regular, and a decent life? In well-ordering his affairs; in choosing for his companions men of sense and of good character; in keeping his expenses within the bounds of moderation; in regularly and faithfully discharging all demands upon him; in keeping his word upon all occasions; in carrying himself towards the public in a manner at once gracious and dignified? What “difficulty” is there in this to a person, who has no care about providing the means of his present, or his future support, and whose income is as sure as his existence? So far is this from being difficult, that it appears to me to come to a man as naturally as his teeth or his nails; and, that, if we suppose his nature not to be radically bad, the difficulty must be in avoiding it.

As "to the want of an *admonishing friend*," whose fault must that be? His own. If, indeed, the princes of England were, like those of Barbary, shut out from the world, there might be some force in this observation; but here they mix in society; they are free to *choose* their companions; there is neither law nor custom to restrain them, and they have shown us, that they know how to exercise this freedom. If, then, their friends, or the persons that approach them, the persons in whose society they delight, and whose virtues, or vices, they will be apt to imitate, be not such as Mr. Whitbread could wish, the fault is with themselves, and with themselves alone.

I think the *moral* part of the apology equally deficient in sound reason. Shall they, because the law restrains them from marrying whom they please, urge that as an excuse for not observing the obligations of matrimony, when they have *voluntarily* entered into it? For, there is no law to *compel them to marry*; and, therefore, if they ever do marry without that affection of which Mr. Whitbread speaks, so much the greater their shame. At any rate, when once married, they have, leaving the solemnity of the *vow* out of the question, entered into a compact; and, to break that compact is an act of dishonour in itself, an act of injustice and of cruelty towards the weaker party to the compact, and an injury committed against the public, against every father and every mother, who have children liable to be led into vice and consequent misery by such an example. Mr. Canning has told us, in his usual high manner, that, the characters of princes are *public property*. Indeed, not only has this been said, in varying phrases, twenty times, during the debate; but, we constantly hear it, especially in cases of *libel*, from the Bench; and that, too, as applied to all men in high situations in the state. With reference to the latter use, which is made of this notion, one cannot refrain from observing, that that is a very odd sort of *property*, which the *proprietors* dare not touch, even so far as to ridicule it. But leaving this to remain along with the other consistencies of that curious law, let us see a little how the notion squares with the doctrine of Mr. Whitbread. The character of princes, being *public property*, ought, one would naturally suppose, to be the more carefully guarded. What is a man's *own*, he may do what he pleases with; but that which is the property, wholly, or in part, of *another*, he is bound to manage according to certain rules of equity and propriety. Mr. Whitbread, however, seems to think, that this property, which is held in trust, is to be less attended to by the actual possessor; he thinks, that, though the immoralities, though the adulterous life of the Duke of York, stands proved, and, on all hands, confessed, the House should not "*throw stones*" at him; that is to say, should not give him "a lecture on morality."

With respect to princes *not married*, and the temptations they may be exposed to, whatever apology may be found for their departure from the strict letter of the law, there can be none found, discovered, or invented, for their departure from the rules of *decorum*. Here passion can put in no plea. Their character, we are told, is to be specially *protected* by the *law*, because it is public property; what *right* have they, then, to set an example of dissoluteness of manners, injurious to the nation at large? I do not say, that they do this. Mr. Whitbread's argument is general, and so is mine. There can be no "*temptation*," other than the invitations of a really vicious heart, to outrage public decency. Nature, in her best form, dictates to us to draw a veil over the gratifications towards which

she most strongly impels us. The manners of this country have been formed under this amiable and unerring guide ; and, against those manners, he who commits an open outrage, is guilty of a very grave offence. He discovers not only a want of moral virtue in himself ; but a want of respect for it in others. He reverses the qualities of the magistrate : he is an example to evil-doers, and a terror to those who do well.

True, the situation of unmarried princes has something peculiar in it, in regard to female connections ; but, if we find a hardship here, do we find nothing of peculiar advantage to weigh against it ? Celibacy, in the legal sense, may be their lot ; but it is also their lot to enjoy, without any exertions or cares, on their part, almost every thing which men desire in this world ; besides, let us not forget, that the *law* does not impose celibacy on them. They (like all other children, till 21 years of age) are left, in this respect, to the will and pleasure of *their father*. It is not *the public*, nor any law, on the part of the public, that prevents them from marrying. The matter is left wholly in the Royal Family.

I can see, therefore, but very little excuse to be got out of the peculiarity of their situation, for any departure from the strict letter of the law, which excuse would not apply to every other man ; while, on the other hand, I can see abundance of reasons, why an open defiance of decency should be regarded as *more* criminal in them than in other men ; why the restraint should be greater, and why the temptation should be less. While they have all the means of making the least disgraceful selection of their connections, they have also all the means of rendering the connection as little scandalous as possible. They have, in this respect, many advantages, which men in general cannot possess ; and if, instead of profiting from these advantages ; if, instead of drawing a veil over their connections of this sort ; if, instead of keeping them in the back ground, any prince were to expose them to the public ; were to intrude them upon the notice of the people ; were to boast of his bastardizing deeds ; were to exhibit, as it were in triumph, the pledges of prostitution ; would Mr. Whitbread still say, that we should not " throw stones " at him ? I will put it to Mr. Whitbread, as a husband and a father (in both which characters he is said to be eminently good), what he thinks must be the effect of such an example ; and, whether he does not think, that, by the force of such an example of triumphant vice, the gray hairs of many a father would not fail to be brought with sorrow to the grave ? The happiness of the people ; the fidelity of husbands and wives, the innocence of children, and the comfort of parents ; these, forming the great features of happiness, are full as much "*public property*" as are the characters of princes and men in high offices of state ; nay, they are, in truth, a great deal more so ; and, shall the public have no means of redress, when this inestimable property is assailed, and that, too, through the misuse of those means, which are furnished by the public themselves ? Shall they, when they return from church, and from hearing " the King's Proclamation against Vice and Immorality," be drily told, that princes are under " great temptations ?"

Of the endeavour to chip and shave and scrape and rub and polish down the charges against the Duke of York to a mere matter of crim. con., I think as Mr. Whitbread does ; but, while, considering the Duke in his high public capacity, as Commander-in-Chief, I lose sight of this, when I am contemplating the Charges and the Evidence before the

House; I cannot, when this is made a subject of separate discussion, think it a matter to be treated in the light manner, in which Mr. Whitbread attempted to treat it.

In the close of his speech, Mr. Whitbread did justice to the conduct of Mr. Wardle. In alluding to what Mr. Canning said, about a *Vote of Thanks* to that gentleman, and which vote, if brought forward, the latter declared himself ready to oppose; Mr. Whitbread observed, as the public will remember to have been the fact, that, when Mr. Wardle first brought forward his charges, the ministers, with one accord, expressed their joy, that the imputations against the Duke had, at last, assumed a "*tangible shape*." The *COURIER* newspaper, to which the public are infinitely indebted for its exertions upon this occasion, and particularly for its good, plain, thumping arguments, rallied them most delightfully upon this "*tangible shape*;" but, still they appeared insensible. They *thanked* Mr. Wardle too. Yes, they *thanked*, the "d—d good-natured friend," as Sir Fretful does in the play, for having told the parliament what the wicked world said of the Duke. They might, indeed, grind the word between their teeth; but they really did say, one and all, that they *thanked* him. Well, now the affair is over; for a few days, at least (for Lord Folkestone has given notice of a motion about the Duke for the 17th of April, and his lordship is not given much to joking); Mr. Wardle's Charges are now over; and, it seems but reasonable, since he has had so much labour, and has really done much more than could be expected of him or of any human being, that these Thanks of the ministers should be moulded into a "*tangible shape*," and put upon the records of parliament; and the intention, as expressed by Mr. Canning, of opposing such vote, if proposed, does appear to me to be capable of no consistent explanation; unless, indeed, the ministers are prepared to assert, that, owing to their clever mode of proceeding, the Duke owes his fall to *them*, rather than to Mr. Wardle; and, that, therefore, in voting thanks to him, they should be loading him with their own trophies. Upon any other ground, I cannot see how they can have the face to oppose such a motion. Whatever they may do, the *nation* will thank him, and will esteem and love him as one of its very best friends and greatest benefactors; as one of the few men, who, in these times of corruption, have shown themselves uncontaminated.

The *people* will thank him. They have begun to thank him, some proofs of which I here insert.

"A JUST TRIBUTE TO COL. WARDLE.—As a wish has been very generally expressed by the inhabitants of this city and its neighbourhood that COLONEL G. L. WARDLE, M. P., should be publicly acknowledged, for his manly and disinterested conduct in his present arduous undertaking, an opportunity will be afforded them of doing so, by subscribing an ADDRESS to that independent member of the British Parliament, of which the tenor follows:—We, hereunto subscribing, Inhabitants of the city and suburbs of Glasgow, hereby testify our unbiassed and unprejudiced opinion,—*That COLONEL WARDLE, by first stepping forward, and by his conduct throughout the whole of the Investigation now pending in the honourable the House of Commons relative to his Royal Highness the Duke of York, has proved himself to the world, to be one of the most Magnanimous, Patriotic, Firm, and Candid Men in his Majesty's Dominions.*'

"All those who wish to mark and distinguish the conduct of this intrepid and persevering Representative of the People, and who concur in the plain and obvious sentiment contained in the above Address, will have an opportunity of joining in expressing it, by signing subscription papers, which will be opened

on Thursday first,—At the shop lately possessed by Mr. Steel, Shoemaker, No. 97, Trongate; D. Grieve's Stocking-shop, No. 468, at the Cross; The Session-House, head of Havannah-street; both the Burgher Session-Houses, Campbell-street; Bridgetown Session-House; the House of John Low, Grocer, Cross-Loan-street, Calton; and at the Relief Session-House, Anderston.

"Glasgow, March 14th, 1809."

The City of Canterbury has also, in the most formal manner, voted him their *thanks*, and the freedom of that City, as appears from a Letter, which I have this day received, enclosing a copy of their Resolution, in the following terms:—

"CITY OF CANTERBURY, AND COUNTY OF THE SAME CITY.—At a Court of Burghmote, holden at the Guildhall of the said City, the twenty-first day of March, 1809,—Resolved: That this Court duly considering the very laudable and patriotic conduct of G. L. WARDLE, Esq., M. P., in calling the attention of the House of Commons to the conduct of the Commander-in-Chief, do return him their grateful and sincere thanks; and in testimony of the high approbation this Court entertain of the able, manly, and spirited manner, in which he conducted the proceedings, that the FREEDOM of this ancient and loyal City be granted to him.—And it is ordered by this Court, that the City Seal be affixed to the above Resolution.—By the Court, HAMMOND, Town-Clerk."

This, upon which, probably, Mr. Wardle will set as much value, as he would upon a vote of Thanks from *Mr. Canning*, is, I dare say, a mere beginning, in an official way, of giving utterance to an expression of what is felt by every impartial and independent man in the country.

I was surprised to hear Mr. Whitbread say, that *he* was not prepared for a vote of thanks. It would be curious to hear his *reasons* for this; and I do hope, that he will have an opportunity of stating them. I am certain his objection to such vote (if, indeed, he has one) has not arisen from any little motives of personal pique, or which would be still worse, envy: I fully acquit him of that. But, if he does oppose such a vote, I shall ascribe his opposition to those motives of *party*, which have so long been the bane of this country. The good, the very brightest gem, of this affair, is, that it has been unsullied by the smear, the ugly smear, of party. If it had been brought forward by a party, it would have failed. Mr. Sheridan did the cause, by his disclaiming it, a service never to be sufficiently praised; and, not less because it was the furthest thought from his heart to wish to render the cause such service. In *him*; in his closing acts, Mr. Wardle, and this nation, have an instance of what *party* leads to.

One would think, that those who call themselves the Opposition, must be blinded by infatuation equal to that ascribed to the Duke of York, not to see, that the nation cares not a straw for them, their motions, or their speeches; nay, that to cool the indignation of the people at any act of the ministers, the effectual way is for *them* to appear to participate in that indignation. Their blindness must surpass the blindness of moles, if it prevents their perceiving, that, into such disrepute have they fallen, that their acting in a body is sure to blast their individual exertions. Mr. Whitbread regretted that princes "*wanted an admonishing friend*;" and so do parties. The Opposition, like the Archbishop of Granada, do not seem to perceive the effects of the apoplexy; but, good Lord! is it possible, that such a man as Mr. Whitbread should not see the indifference that prevails; the total, the worse than death-like indifference, that

prevails, with regard to all their motions and debates? Is there, in the whole kingdom, one town or city containing a dozen men, free from all views of gain, who would give the toss-up of a half-penny for their return to power and place? From my heart I believe there is not. The public mind has taken a new turn; the farce of *Opposition* no longer captivates or amuses. It is a stale trick. The mockery of patriotism is not calculated any longer to impose upon a public that pays fifty millions a year in taxes. The *Morning Chronicle* calls this a new era in the history of the parliament; but this is only the effect of a new era in the popular view of politics and politicians; and what has been done is but a mere beginning, a mere breaking of the ice, in that salutary and constitutional change, which, without *destroying* (as the Anti-Jacobins would fain have us believe it will) any part of the King's just prerogatives, will be a great blessing to his people. *The dismissal of the Duke of York!* I, who have taken openly, and who have inwardly felt, as much interest as any body in the proceedings, have never cared one farthing about it; that is to say, unless it was to be the forerunner of some general measure, some effectual check, some radical change of a great constitutional nature. I should hate myself, if I could have written so many papers, with such a pitiful object in view. I would as lief the Duke of York should now be at the Horse Guards as Sir David Dundas, if no effectual remedy be to follow; and, though I think Mr. Wardle entitled to the thanks of the nation, I should not be very eager to give him mine, if I thought it possible for him now to stop.

"Think nothing gained, he cries, till nought remain,"

must be the maxim of the man, who means now to render his country service. He must give corruption no rest, till he has destroyed her and the very spawn of her. And, are seats like these to be expected from a prating, pleader-like Opposition? A disciplined corps; a set of hunters after office; who like and dislike in a body? No, it never can be and never will be; and of this the country is as well assured, as I am of this pen's being in my hand.

Mr. Whitbread seems *satisfied*; I am not, and never shall be, as long as I see an Apothecary-General, *who meddles with no business whatever*; who rides in his coach-and-four, deriving 12,000 pounds a year out of the taxes, and who (oh! indelible shame!) pockets ten shillings a day, *as an officer upon the staff*, and who declares this, at the same time that he declares that he *never meddles with any business*. This is upon record, in a Report before the House of Commons; no measure has been taken upon it; and, while this is the case, I am not satisfied, nor can I be satisfied. To those who merit pensions for *real services to the public*, or for *real losses sustained for the sake of the public or the King*, I grudge nothing. But, I do grudge every single farthing that goes in the way above described, or in any such manner; and if it was not that I hope to contribute towards the overthrow of such abuses, I never would write another line as long as I live.

Botley, Thursday, 23rd March, 1809.

DUKE OF YORK.—*Continued.*
 (*Political Register, April, 1809.*)

And now, perhaps, the glorious hour is come,
 When, having no stake left, no pledge t' endear
 Her int'rests, or that gives her sacred cause
 A moment's operation on his love,
 He burns with most intense and flagrant zeal
 To serve his country. Ministerial grace
 Deals him out money from the public chest;
 Or, if that mine be shut, some private purse
 Supplies his need with an usurious loan,
 To be refunded duly when his vote,
 Well manag'd, shall have earn'd its worthy price.
 Oh innocent, compar'd with arts like these,
 Crape, and cock'd pistol, and the whistling ball
 Sent through the trav'ler's temples! He that finds
 One drop of heav'n's sweet mercy in his cup,
 Can dig, beg, rot, and perish with content,
 So he may wrap himself in honest rags
 At his last gasp; but could not for a world
 Fish up his dirty and dependent bread
 From pools and ditches of the commonwealth,
 Sordid and sick'ning at his own success.—COWPER. *The Task.*

UNDER this head I shall continue to place all the statements and remarks, growing out of, or immediately connected with, the recent inquiry; and, this head will, for some months, I dare say, be continued; though we shall now have leisure to attend a little to other matters.

The affair of the *Rev. Mr. Glasse*, has not been cleared up. The public are in the dark with respect to it; and, as it is useful to the public to be rightly informed as to the matter, I will here communicate what information relative to it, I am in possession of.

First, the public will bear in mind, that the name of *Dr. Glasse* was confounded with that of his son, *Mr. G. H. Glasse*, Rector of Hanwell.

Next, that Donovan, whom Mrs. Clarke said made the application to her, said in his examination, that *Mr. Glasse knew nothing of the application* which he made to Mrs. Clarke in his favour.

To this is to be added, that Mr. Glasse has offered to make oath, that what Donovan has said, in this respect, is true, and, that an offer has been made, on the part of Donovan, to make an oath of the truth of what he, in this respect, declared during his examination.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that this is the real state of the case; and, that the charge against Mr. Glasse is fairly reduced to that of being an intimate acquaintance of Donovan, with the addition of the probability of his (Mr. Glasse's) having known, that Donovan did intend to interest himself with some person or other, in favour of the views of Mr. Glasse.

Now, as to the former, Mr. Glasse, in a letter to me, says, that, for years, he "connected with the name of Mr. Donovan every thing that honour, principles, friendship, and gratitude could render amiable in an old soldier." We can, therefore, only, in this case, accuse Mr. Glasse of a want of discernment; but, at the same time, I must say, that one cannot help believing, that he must have known something of Donovan's

intention to make interest for him *somewhere*; and, if that was the case (a point which I leave to the decision of the reader) he was very blamable indeed, however common the practice may be of obtaining church preferment by such means.

I have now to notice what it appears has been done against Mr. Glasse by some authority in the Church; and which will be best explained by inserting his letter, dated 16th March, "TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE SONS OF THE CLERGY," of which Society, or Charity, he was, it appears, the Secretary :

"GENTLEMEN,—In the midst of my indignant surprise at the liberties which on a late public occasion had been taken with my name, I received a very intelligible hint, from a high quarter, that my voluntary resignation of the Secretaryship to your Charity would be an act decorous in itself, and possibly beneficial to the institution.

"My reply was short and simple, and it was this:—'That as I was not aware of any delinquency on my part, either actual or intentional, I would not be accessory to my own dishonour; or skulk meanly from an ostensible situation, under an implied consciousness of guilt.'

"I wish it therefore to be distinctly and generally understood, that in consequence of an authoritative mandate, and of that only, I have this day placed your seal in the hands of my warm-hearted and unshaken friend, your honest, worthy Treasurer.—In times like these, when every wise man would covet and court retirement, it is in itself a matter of relief, rather than of regret, that I am no longer to be called by the duties of a laborious and expensive office, from a home most dear to me. The conviction of my mind, that my zealous exertions were in no small degree advantageous to your charity, was the only consideration that could have made me wish to continue in the exercise of those duties. I am now completely absolved from them. But I do nevertheless protest, before God and you, against the 'armed doctrine,' against the unjust and tyrannous principle, on which I am dismissed from your service—a principle, by the application of which to more important cases, an Englishman would cease to be the guardian of his own honour and character; and must be contented to hold his reputation, his liberty, perhaps his life, at the mercy of friends or of enemies without any act or participation of his own."

This "authoritative mandate" proceeded from I know not whom. Why will not people give us *names*? There is not common sense in this species of delicacy. How are we to know who to blame here, if blame be due?

I will not stop to inquire into the *utility* of this Society (for it is a matter upon which there might be a good deal said); but, supposing it to be connected, in some sort, with the Church; supposing its reputation to be linked, in any way, with that of the Church, I cannot say, that I should disapprove of what Mr. Glasse complains of; because I hold it to have been very improper for him to have been so closely connected with a person like Donovan. The frequency of such connections, and of clergymen obtaining promotion through such channels, does not lessen the fault of Mr. Glasse. He has thus been *censured*; and I really do not think the censure too severe.

Neither can I find, in the measure, any thing contrary to sound principles of justice. All that the Society say to him is this: "We do not wish any longer to have your services." Surely, they may act as they please, in an affair of this sort. There was no need of any trial, or investigation (if that be what Mr. Glasse alludes to); the close intimacy with Donovan having been stated, proclaimed, and acknowledged on the part of Mr. Glasse, there was no occasion for any thing further in the way of proof, especially in a case, where the dismissed party could sus-

tain no injury, except in point of feeling. It is very true, that the proof of that intimacy was no proof of guilt, actual or intentional; but, when added to the fact of Donovan's having made an application to Mrs. Clarke for the preferment of Mr. Glasse, it does fairly amount to a presumption injurious to his reputation, in point of *discretion* at least; and that being the case, I cannot agree with him as to the justice of his complaint against those, who have been the cause of his dismissal, which I look upon as a sort of clerical censure, and as being the only censure of that kind which his superiors, probably his diocesan, had it in his power to inflict.

But, this being the case, where, according to the principle upon which Mr. Glasse has been dismissed and censured, shall we look for a defence of those, who have contended, that the *Duke of York* ought not to have been dismissed; and who were the cause of preventing *his* being formally censured? Where, upon the principle, on which the Bishop of London (for he, I take it, is meant) has acted, shall we look for a defence of those persons? If to be *acquainted with* a trafficker in commissions and preferment, and to have had an application made to Mrs. Clarke, *without his consent or knowledge*, be a ground sufficient for the censuring and dismissing of Mr. Glasse; where are we to look for a defence of those, who have defended the Duke of York? And, above all, where shall we look for a defence of those of the *clergy*, who have acted this part? The Duke of York is, I believe, older than Mr. Glasse, though some people would have us suppose, that he has not yet cut his wisdom teeth, and that Mr. Wardle has been merely lancing his gums. The Duke is too a *Doctor*, though the fact may not be generally known. When he was at Oxford, some years ago, the "Learned-language" men of St. John's College, finding in him, I suppose, the requisite qualities, gave him a diploma of *LL.D.* And, I was told, that by mistake, they were within an ace of presenting it to one of his attendants, instead of himself. This, which was told me in 1806, while I was at Oxford, was one of the circumstances, which set me to estimating the value of the understanding and the principles, connected with the "*learned languages.*"

Well, then, he is a *Doctor of Laws*; and let us not be any longer told, by the base panders of power, that he was "*imposed upon*;" that he was "*infatuated*," and the like. He is a *Doctor*, recollect, and Mr. Glasse is not; let their cases be taken and fairly compared, and let those who can, reconcile the proceedings against them respectively to any principle of impartiality. I do not find fault with the censure on Mr. Glasse; but, let me hear what those, who have censured him, or who have approved of that censure, will say of the Duke of York. Let me *hear* them. Do not tell me of their *thoughts*. Let me hear what they *say*. "How?" I shall be asked. In their *sermons*. They preach against Buonaparte; they preach against rebellion and sedition; and, there was a time, when one half of what they said was about *jacobinism*. If they will not talk about the Duke, let us hear, at least, what they have to say about *corruption*, which leads to every thing that is destructive of the liberty of the people; and of the existence of the throne; or, if they will remain *mum*, let them preach to the bare walls. Let us, "*bold divines*," bear a little of the Church thunder upon this most abominable national sin. Are there no sermons upon it extant? Why, then, write some. Arouse all your pious indignation against this sin, ten thousand times more dangerous than that of *stark-naked jacobinism*. Come, come!

None of your smoothing irons; none of your twisting and wriggling; none of your logic of evasion. Let us hear, in good plain English, what you have to say about what has now come to light. You often enough tell us of the denunciations of God against robbers, and you bid us not to steal. Now, then, when robbery of the public is joined to all the other vices; accompanied with all that is, at once, the most hateful and most contemptible; now let us hear what you have to say. When jacobinism was the order of the day, you were loud and distinct enough. Every newspaper teemed with sketches of your sermons, and every bookseller's window was crammed up with the sermons themselves. Well, then, let us now hear you. Let me see *one* amongst you; even *one*; a solitary individual of you, print a sermon upon this all-important subject, coming, in so many ways, under your immediate province, *Dr. O'Meara*, too, the divine of the "celestial unction," whose "lips were touched with the live coal from off the altar;" he, too, was ready to preach against the principles of the French *Democrats*; and, I would have my readers bear it in everlasting remembrance, that he preached this sermon before the King, under the patronage, cringingly sought for, of a kept mistress of the King's son. This fact is, of itself, a pretty good commentary upon the sermons against jacobinism, and upon all that has been prated and printed about "social order" and our "holy religion," by those who have been pensioned and preferred for their literary services.

That eleven thousand parishes should not afford many clergymen, who hold in abomination the corruptions, which have been brought to light, it were uncandid in the extreme to affect to doubt; and, indeed, I have the honour personally to know some, who do so hold them. But, let us hear their voices *publicly*. Let me witness some little matter of that zeal, which made the *book-shops* teem with sermons against *jacobinism*. Let me see them "in earnest," as *Dr. O'Meara* says; let me see them in earnest upon this subject; or let them, for ever, seal up their lips, not only upon politics, but also upon breaches of the most important of our moral duties. Let us hear them a little upon "the desolation of abomination, standing in high places;" or, let them leave the low to a quiet indulgence in their comparatively trifling sins. Let us hear *Dr. Rennell*, who thundered out upon the poor Nuns; who seemed to be more afraid of a string of beads than a thief is of a halter; who was, it is said, so instrumental in bringing forward an act of parliament to prevent our daughters' minds from being perverted by the said Nuns: let us hear what *he* has to say upon the *present occasion*. The Doctor has been nowadays bashful in his applications for the aid of the press. That press now presents him its best services; it sighs to become the vehicle of his eloquence, and, as a pledge of its friendship, beseeches him to forbear from his logical and polemic contests with *Dr. Milner*; the press loudly and earnestly invites the exertions of himself and his brethren, in the cause of political right and public morals, while, in that respect at least, it sets them an example.

"The Church in danger," was, some time ago, the cry. With what *sincerity* that cry was set up I shall not now inquire; but, certain I am, that the way to preserve the Church from *real* danger is for it to prove itself the friend of the people; of impartial justice, and of public morals. I know, that there are those, who think, that to take part against corruption is, in fact, to take part against *rank and property*. So they have thought all over Europe. Still, in spite of this awful experience, there

are many men, who so think, though they do not participate, or want to participate, in the profits of corruption. Fear, a fear arising from imbecility, has, thus, co-operated with corruption; and, amongst all timid men, none are so timid as the clergy. But, it is strange, very strange indeed, that they see nothing to fear, *on the other side*. It is strange, that their apprehensions never turn towards the consequences of their taking part against the people. It is strange that they appear totally to overlook that maxim of the Gospel, "He who is not *for* us, is *against* us;" and that they seem to forget, that this maxim is grounded in human nature.

Thus it is, however; and thus, it would seem, we are to go on, in spite of all admonition; in spite of all warning; in spite of all experience. Concession to the reasonable wishes of the people, timely reformation, conciliation sought by just and honourable means; these have uniformly been rejected by the old governments of the continent, who have relied upon their power for checking even the progress of the mind.

It is said: "If you go a step, in the way of concession, the people will make you go on, and will never be satisfied, till they have destroyed all." What is there to warrant this assertion? Is there any man, who preaches such doctrine as this? Are those, who wish for reform, desperate adventurers? Have any of us, who write against abuses, any thing covert in our expressions? Do we meet and plot? Is there a man of us, who can *possibly* propose to himself any advantage, but that which he would participate with his neighbours? Besides; what do we wish for? *We wish to destroy no establishment*. We want nothing new-fangled. We want no innovation. All we ask for is, such a reform as would effectually secure us against the effects of corruptions, such as have now been brought to light, and of the existence of which we have long been assured. Is this too much to ask?

There is no danger from *concession* to the people; and where such a fear exists, it is the offspring of knavery begotten upon imbecility; imbecility matchless in quality as well as in degree. The House of Commons lay before the people evidence, proof, of the existence of a system of corruption, under the effects of which it is impossible for any nation long to exist independent. And, the knaves, who fatten upon that corruption, have the impudence to assert, that to put an end to the system is the way to produce the destruction of the establishments of the country, when it is so manifestly the interest of all those establishments to concur, and heartily to co-operate, in putting an end to that system.

I trust that another way of thinking will, ere long, be produced; that knavery will soon lose its power over honest credulity; and that we shall see all men of worth join, leaving the knaves like a boat adrift upon the strand.

General CLAVERING's Case requires very little of statement now.

The chief facts, now, to be borne in mind, relate to the motives and manner of Clavering's coming forward.

It will be remembered, that, after Mrs. Clarke had undergone two or three of those examinations, which gained her so much credit, and her cross-examiners so little, Clavering wrote a letter to the Attorney-General, stating that he had it in his power to prove, *that she had given false testimony*, and that he wished to be called to the bar for that purpose; that, after this letter had been read to the House, it was, upon motion of the friends of the Duke of York, resolved to call Clavering to the bar;

—that, being so called, he denied the truth of what she had said, respecting certain communications with her, and, upon being cross-examined, did distinctly and positively assert, that “*he did not know of any person, who had asked Mrs. Clarke to use her influence with the Duke as to Army promotions;*”——that Mrs. Clarke, in order to show, that she had not been speaking falsehood with respect to Clavering, then produced a letter from the Duke of York to her, in answer to an application of hers in behalf of Clavering, in which letter the Duke desires her to tell Clavering, that his application, in the case in question, is useless;——that, in a few days afterwards, a bundle of Mrs. Clarke’s papers, which she had sent down to light fires with at Hampstead, but which had been preserved by Nicholls, the master of the House, and which papers had been hunted out by the Duke of York’s own Attorney, were brought to the bar, in the apparent hope of affording matter of discredit to Mrs. Clarke;——that, as the evil genius of General Clavering would have it, there were in this bundle of papers, five letters from the General to her, all beginning with the words “*My dear Mrs. Clarke;*”——that, in one of these letters, dated on the 5th of September, 1804, he explains the meaning of his former application, and says, “*you mentioned that the Duke did not comprehend my proposal;*”——that this letter bears date just eleven days after that of the Duke’s letter to Mrs. Clarke, wherein he says, “*Clavering is mistaken, my Angel;*”——that, in the fourth letter, dated the 11th of November, 1804, Clavering says: “*The purport of this letter is to thank you for your attempt to serve me;*”——that, some days after these letters had been published in the newspapers, Clavering again desired to be called to the bar;——that during this second examination, he acknowledged, that he had, upon one occasion, written a letter to her, “*stating, that, in case she obtained him permission to raise a regiment, she should receive a thousand pounds.*”

There were much shuffling and twisting, and many self-contradictions; but here is the pith of the thing. Here we see him self-convicted of falsehood; of voluntary, wilful, deliberate, premeditated falsehood.

For, observe, he comes forward a volunteer, for the avowed purpose of blasting Mrs. Clarke’s testimony; of making her appear to be a liar; and, of course, of nullifying all that she had said, or should say against the Duke of York, who was at the head of that army, in which he was an officer. It appeared from the evidence, that he had been to Gordon, who sent him to Mr. Lowten; and, it was after this; after consulting with the Duke’s Attorney, that he asked to be called to the bar, and, as he says, at the desire of Mr. Lowten, or by his advice.

So we see him here, actually holding council upon the mode, in which he shall proceed to blast the credit of his patroness and benefactress. She says, and, I think, there can be no doubt of the fact, that she got him the command of a district; that she got him his Brigadiership; that, in short, she was his only friend in this way, and the real cause of his promotion. But, at any rate, we find him, under his own hand, thanking her for her endeavours to serve him; we find him making use of the most kind and complimentary expressions towards her; we find him asking her permission to wait on her in boots; and, this same man, when he thinks she was in a fair way of being crushed, voluntarily comes forward, under, as he thinks, the protection of irresistible power, and plots with her enemies for aiding in treading her into the dirt. Oh! how little did he think, that the same Mr. Lowten, with whom he was

holding consultation, was, though unwittingly, hard at work; drawing forth all the resources of his ingenuity, for the purpose of bringing before the House of Commons, proof the most satisfactory, of *her truth*, of *his falsehood*! How little did he think, that, instead of securing himself in what he had obtained by her means, and of paving the way for future advancement, he was digging a pit for his destruction! How little did he think, that, instead of throwing discredit upon her by this act of base ingratitude, he was adding to the secret stings of conscience open and everlasting shame! He has, in the most complete manner that I recollect to have witnessed, verified the words of the Psalmist: "His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violent dealings shall come down upon his own pate." He has been committed to Newgate for prevarication; he is now in Newgate for falsehood, by an undivided vote of that Assembly, before whom he voluntarily came for the express purpose of fixing falsehood upon the character of his benefactress.

If ever man or woman was amply avenged; if ever vengeance was more than glutted; if ever the ever-craving human heart could say, "I am satisfied," such must be the language of the heart of Mrs. Clarke. All; yea all and every one, who have practised, or attempted to practise, injustice or malignity against her, have been punished in a degree, exactly proportioned to the magnitude of their offences. Some have been held up to ridicule, others have been checked in their pecuniary and other prospects; others have been, or must be, compelled to disgorge and uncase; he who, as she says, threatened her with the *pillory or the Bastile*, is in a state that I need not describe; and he who came forward a volunteer to blast her credit, and cover her with infamy, is himself, upon his evidence from his own lips, and under his own hand, *lodged in Newgate*.

Mr. CHARLES WYNN, who made the motion against Clavering, who began with him, and who stuck to him to the last, is entitled to great praise on this account as well as being one of the 125, who voted for Mr. Wardle's motion. There was no case so flagrant as that of this general, who, perhaps, was and is, a member of the famous "*Military Club*." That should be ascertained. The thing is interesting. It is worth coming at. It would be curious enough if he had a hand in the attempted, the Ferrol-like expedition, that Mr. Whitbread brought under the cognizance of the House.

Mentioning this Club puts me in mind of another, introduced, the other day, to the notice of the public, in a newspaper paragraph, thus: "At the *Highland Club*, in Cockspur-street, held at the British Coffee-house, on Tuesday evening, a very numerous company assembled. *The Marquis of Huntley* was called to the chair, and the health of *the Duke of York* was drank with *three times three*."

This Marquis of Huntley, is, I believe, a son of the old *Duchess of Gordon*. I would recommend to this Highland Club, the next time they meet, to finish their projected devices in honour of the Highland corps, for taking that *invincible standard*, which was taken by Lutz, a native of *France*, and who had not the honour to serve in that corps, or any Highland corps. Let this Club give us their *names*, and let us see how many of them are upon the pension and sinecure lists, contained in Lord Cochrane's political bible. Let us have their *names*. They, surely, must have *names* of some sort or other; and, if they stand in clans, let us have them numbered, as we do bales of goods. If it be worth while

to publish their *toasts*, it is worth while to let us know the *persons* who drank the toasts. Will they not come out? Why, then, let them skulk, and let us laugh at their silly toasts and them too.

The excellent disposition, which has been excited and called forth by the disclosures, for which the public are indebted to Mr. Wardle, is manifesting itself in every part of the country; and this is the really valuable part of the thing. It is not the dismissal of the Duke of York, or his resignation, call it what you will, that any sensible man cares much about. Of itself, that is of little public importance. It is the light, the blessed light that has been let in upon a long benighted nation, by the inquiry that has taken place. Many men, indeed, saw clearly before; but that light which before got in upon us through here and there a crevice, has now made a general burst, while all the plastering and patching and rags and clouts and lumps of clay have tumbled down about the ears of those who wished to keep us in darkness eternal. Even the provincial papers, so long the vehicles of dull repetition, of borrowed and insipid reflection; so long "the weed that rots in Lethe's pool;" have now assumed animation and mind; have now begun to have the breath of life in their nostrils, and to indicate the possession of intelligent souls. Many of these papers have, within this month, been sent to me. Many that I never saw before in my life. The parts wished to be read have been pointed out with a mark of the pen: as, if they came to me and said—"See, we have, *at last*, opened our eyes, and no longer merit your reproaches." Vanity may have suggested this idea to me; but, this is the light in which I view it.

There is one thing that gives me particular satisfaction; and that is, to see that the cry of *Jacobinism*, set up before the meeting of parliament by *Richard Wharton*,* who is, I believe, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee with a salary of 1,200*l.* a year, and so loudly echoed since; it does give me particular, and inexpressible pleasure, to see that this cry is universally held in its merited contempt; and that, instead of having answered its intended purpose, it has had no small share in producing that conviction of the necessity of a *reform*, now held to be inseparable from national safety.

As an instance of the effect, which has thus been produced, and as a specimen of the good spirit which has gone forth, I shall here insert one extract from the OXFORD Paper of the 25th of March:—

"The Duke of York has at last tendered his resignation of the office of Commander-in-Chief, to the King; and his Majesty has been graciously pleased to accept it. This resignation had at length become a matter of absolute necessity: to the last stage the Duke was defended with all the power and influence of administration; but although the servants of the crown could command a majority in the House of Commons, the voice of the people could not be suppressed by their authority; and if their representatives would not address the Sovereign for the removal of this great Officer of State, they would themselves, in their public assemblies throughout the kingdom, have petitioned the Throne for his dismissal. To avert this general expression of public opinion, the Duke of York has resigned, but not before an important article of instruction has been given to those into whose hands the elective franchise is confided. We regret that Ministers have not come forward in an open and manly manner, and declared that they have no intention of reinstating his Royal Highness in his former situation. Till this is done, the people,—*nine-tenths of the people of England*,—who suspect that this will ere long take place,

* This is not the *Mr. Wharton* who voted with *Mr. WARDLE*.

“ will continue to be highly dissatisfied with their conduct.—The Inquiry is now terminated by a decision, at which, when we compared it with certain parts of the printed evidence, and particularly with the letters written by his Royal Highness to Mrs. Clarke, we could not help expressing our astonishment. But the decision, however extraordinary and unaccountable it may appear to ourselves and others, is of little importance in comparison with the good effects which are likely to result from the previous most important investigation. *A spirit of inquiry is gone forth, which we hope will scrutinize into every department of the state, and expose to view every hidden abuse.* The people, at length recovered from their *lethargy*, will begin to inquire whether those men who have been so long accustomed to charge others, whose opinions were different from their own, *with disloyalty*, and to brand them *with opprobrious epithets*, did this from a consciousness of superior purity in themselves, or whether they acted thus to prevent any inquiry taking place, which they were sensible would be detrimental to their own individual and personal interests; whether these were not the very men who lived by abuses, and who battered on that corruption which, they very well knew, was sapping the basis of the English constitution. But, above all, this spirit of inquiry will be directed to the *enormous profusion of the public money*: actuated by this spirit, the people will ask their representatives, whether the product of the taxes be *solely* applied to objects which tend to contribute to the safety, happiness, and honour of the British Empire, or whether a great part be not applied to the payment of pensions, bestowed without previous and equivalent services, or of sinecure places; whether a great part be not expended on pensioners who have done nothing, and on placemen who have nothing to do? If such abuses do really exist, who but the interested will deny that *they call loudly for a temperate, but a speedy and radical reform?* ”

Yes, these are the sentiments to inculcate; and to be inculcated particularly by those, whose interest it is to prevent that which is called *revolution*. By *timely reform* the several governments of the continent of Europe might have saved themselves, and along with themselves their nobles and all their establishments. They universally resisted reform. Instead of disarming the philosophers and the demagogues by removing those well-known and undeniable abuses, which gave currency to their statements and their doctrines, what have we seen those governments do? Invariably add to those abuses, and calumniate and punish all those, within their reach, who complained of them. The consequences are before us; and, those who are proof against this 20 years' lesson, will not be convinced, “ though one were to rise from the dead.” There was, in Mr. Whitbread's speech of the 10th of March, a very beautiful and impressive passage upon the lesson, given to the Duke of York, in the circumstance of his mistress having purchased the service of family plate of the *Duc de Berri*. But, have you, Sir, seen *any* prince discover any sensibility of this sort? Have they, any where, shown much feeling for one another? But, I do hope, that *now*, at any rate, the gentlemen of this country; that the nobility; that all men of rank and property will see, that the time is come for them to show, that they have a sense of the danger, to which corruption inevitably leads; and that, after a long season of apparent insensibility to their own consequence, as well as to the interests of others, they will heartily co-operate in producing that reform, which alone can save them and us and all from ruin and disgrace.

There are few things that have given me greater pleasure, than the seeing of the name of *Sir Henry Mildmay* in the list of those 125 members, who voted with Mr. Wardle; and, I trust, that the people of *this county* will neither forget that, nor that neither of the county members, *Chute* and *Heathcote*, is to be found in that list. *Sir Henry Mildmay*

does not, apparently, admire the situation of a tool. He does not appear to be enamoured with the idea of being the under-strapper of an upstart. He does not seem to think it much of an honour to crawl under the canopy of a mushroom. To be sure, it is something so preposterous ; it is something so unnatural ; it is something so much against every good feeling of the heart, to see a man of fixed fortune and estate, of ancient family and of sound mind, become the dependant, the miserable echo, of an echo, and to seek for consequence in being thought to be intimate with those who are themselves miserable dependants ; there is something so shockingly unnatural in this, that the very existence of a single instance of the sort is enough to blast the character of a nation. Yet, there are many instances of the sort ; and, what it can be owing to, unless to the foolish, the cowardly fear of *revolution*, I cannot imagine ; that fear, which, as I said before, the knaves, who fatten upon the public misery, are so industrious in cherishing, by all the means in their power. But, the timid *fools* do not perceive, that the knaves have an interest separate from theirs, and even *opposed* to it. A reform that would be salutary to the *nation*, would be destructive to *them* ; and, when they talk of "overturning *every thing*," that every thing means *their plunder*. To *them* it is no matter whether a reform take place, or whether the nation be conquered by the enemy. They must be ruined in either case. But, it is not so with a man like Sir Henry Mildmay. He would, in all probability, be ruined by the country's being conquered ; but he must, in common with the rest of the country, greatly gain by a salutary reform, especially as that reform would secure the internal peace and order of the country.

But, in all countries that I have ever heard of, the *knaves*, who live only upon abuses, have, to a great degree, at least, succeeded in persuading the *fools*, that, to *stand by them*, was the way to secure themselves and their property.

In like manner have they, but too often, succeeded in working up princes to be on their side, the latter seldom having had the discernment to perceive, that their interest was different from that of the knaves. This has been the fruitful cause of revolutions and dethronings ; of princes reduced below the level of common men, and of nobles extinguished and forgotten in a month.

Let us hope, that knavery will not succeed here ; that those who have the power, will also have the will, to resist it ; and, if this be the case, we have nothing to fear from foes without or demagogues within.

What, but this working of knavery upon imbecility ; what but this can have prevented so many princes, and so many bodies of nobles and rich men, from adopting, in time, measures calculated to regain the confidence and affections of the people, without which, as daily experience convinces us, there is no means of effectual national defence against such an enemy as we have now to contend with ?

The press has, in general, done its duty in scouting the idea of "a conspiracy existing against the House of Brunswick ;" but, there is one paper, the *Morning Post*, which has acted, and is acting, a very base as well as profligate part, and which, I am very glad to hear, has, in its regular decline, given a pretty good proof of the public sentiment. From this paper I shall here insert an extract, first begging the reader to bear in mind, that (as I stated upon a former occasion) during Mr. Paull's contest for Westminster, he accused a Gentleman, of the name of

ROBINSON, who lived then in Devonshire-place, and who had been in some high office in *India*, under Lord Wellesley, of causing paragraphs to be published against him in the *Morning Post*; that he charged this gentleman and other East India people of being *proprietors of that paper*; and that I saw and read a letter from this Mr. Robinson to Mr. Paull, in which letter the writer disclaimed all knowledge of the paragraph complained of, and in which he expressed his disapprobation of all such paragraphs, but in which letter he stated, that he was a *part proprietor of the paper*, and that it was owned by him and others, chiefly East Indians, and was possessed and carried on in the same way as the concern of any other commercial company.

This a fact always to be kept in view, when we are examining the politics of this paper. And now let us hear what this vehicle says upon the subject of *jacobinism* and of a *conspiracy against the house of Brunswick*, bearing in mind, that, for several years past, this paper has been, without a single exception, the defender and the eulogist, of every person, who has been accused of corruption, bribery, speculation, public profligacy, or any other offence against the interests or the morals of the country.

“When the fair domain of common sense and reason is devastating by a torrent, perhaps the wisest and certainly the least dangerous conduct, were self only considered, would be passively to suffer it to exhaust its fury, and to wait the return of the calm, before we attempted to divert its baneful course. But as Britons, as men attached to the glorious constitution of our country, as men dreading the horrors of anarchy and revolution, as participators in the liberty of the press, and in some measure called upon by our writings to maintain its legitimate rights, can we stand idly by nor make an effort to open the eyes of our deluded fellow citizens, to the turbid and impure source from whence this torrent flows, and the dreadful issue to which its progress tends?

“What we have all along foreseen, and what, as well as a sense of justice, induced us to take the part we did, in the inquiry into the conduct of the Commander-in-Chief, is now rapidly fulfilling. The blow was not struck at the Duke of York, but at the House of Brunswick, and the Constitution of England,—it has been to a certain extent, well placed, and (to continue in the scientific language of pugilism) is now to be followed up. But those who aim the blow have no physical power in themselves; known, they are detested by all men, and it is only when they can delude the people to their side, that there is any strength in their arm.—Their art is to hide the cloven foot, and under an assumed form, take the advantage of a popular feeling, excited and fomented by their wild stratagems, and, by working on this fertile soil, turn to their own horrible purposes, passions which are perhaps founded in virtue, and directed to the reform of abuse, not to the overthrow of government. It is to guard against this specious delusion; it is to warn our countrymen against lending themselves, under the idea of correcting errors, to the views of those mercenary and villainous men who plot the destruction of all that is dear to us; it is to open their eyes to the dangers which surround them, that we dare, even contrary to their now ruling persuasion, to call on them for reflection and a short pause, before they plunge into the stream from which in its course there is little hope they will at any future period be able to extricate themselves.—It is with grief and concern we daily witness what twenty or thirty intriguing and Jacobinical spirits can compass with the British public. It is with deep shame and sorrow, that we see the noblest feelings of human nature made subservient to the basest purposes of a detested faction. It is with heartfelt anguish that we behold the real patriot, and in-born love of liberty of the British people, turned by the cunning of those whose idea of liberty is licentiousness, and whose minds are intent on nothing but revelling on the plunder of a nation, overthrown to aid their projects and consummate their plans.—Such do we consider the addresses to Mr. Wardle, whose accusations the representatives of the people have pronounced to be unfounded; such do we consider the subscriptions to Miss Taylor, the associate of the most infamous prostitute of

“ *the age*: such do we consider the instigations to *hold public meetings*; and such do we consider every act connected with or promoting these objects.—Let the public reflect for a moment who the wretches are that set these matters on foot. Can they imagine for a moment that a *base notorious libeller, his associates, or his miserable satellites*, are inspired by a love of their country or of virtue to engage so ardently in these schemes; or must they not rather instantly acknowledge that there is *something ulterior* in view yet hid from their sight, which is to be attained by these means? What is Mr. WARDLE, or Miss TAYLOR, or Mrs. CLARKE, or the Duke of YORK, to *these designing men*, but as so many objects by which they can promote their *grand design against the government of the country*?—Is their duty now *so rarely performed* by our public men—by our opposition virtue-mongers, as seldom as by our ministerial optimists, *that Mr. Wardle must be demi-deified for having done his*? That is, for having, from a suspicious connection with an infamous prostitute, been induced to bring forward charges again the member of the illustrious HOUSE of BRUNSWICK, which, by a signal and triumphant majority of 241, *have been declared to be unfounded*.—Oh, fortune-favoured NAPOLION! even the patriotism of Britain aids thee in the attainment of thy ambitious hopes. Every thing conspires to render thee invincible. The *Chronicle of London* fights thy battles against Austria. The patriots in the British Senate *fight thy battles against established crowns and legal constitutions*.—After this the writer goes on to repeat what Mr. WINDHAM said: “that there was *no act* of which the Duke of York was *accused*, of which he would not rather be found guilty than of having taking away, without her consent, and against her will, the letters taken from Mrs. Clarke by Mr. Wardle.”

Of all that was said, during the whole of the debates, nothing gave me any pain but this; and, I cannot help hoping, that, in spite of this repetition, there must have been some misrepresentation. To be sure, if Mr. Wardle had so acted from any view of advancing his *own interest*; if the affair, to which the letters had related, had been a private one; if it had been between man and man, and had been unconnected with the duty of Mr. Wardle as a member of parliament; if this had been the case, there might have been some doubt as to the propriety of his conduct, though, even then, the question must have turned wholly upon the circumstances of the case. For, suppose you to see, in the hands of any one, papers proving the commission of a murder, are you to let such papers escape you? No, perhaps, it will be said; but go and lay the information, leaving it to others to seize the papers. But, where is the difference between giving this information and seizing the papers yourself? So, then, for any thing that you care, the murderer is to escape; he is to be left with his sharpened knife in his hand, rather than you will be “guilty” of seizing the proofs of his guilt.

So much for this doctrine when applied to a private case; but, suppose you to see, in the possession of a friend; of a brother; nay of that nearest and dearest of all connections, a parent, or a child, papers containing proofs of *treason*, committed, or to be committed? Would you not seize these papers or give information (which is precisely the same thing) of their existence? I put this question home to you; and beg you to remember, that if you failed to do it, you would be liable to be hanged for the failure. And, shall the law tell us this; shall it thus act, in behalf of the King, and be applauded for so acting, while one of the makers of that law tells us, that it is an *offence* to act in behalf of *the public*, upon the principles of that law? We may differ in our estimate of the relative magnitude of *robbery of the public* and of *conspiracy against the King*; but, without entering into any argument upon that point, I think that few persons will be found to deny, that it is impossible to justify the law of misprision of treason, unless you allow,

that it would have been a *crime* in Mr. Wardle not to have availed himself of the best means within his power of securing the proof of public robbery, of the existence of which he had obtained the knowledge.

The system of spies and informers is interwoven with our system of finance, and I do not recollect that Mr. Windham ever made opposition to any of those laws. No, all is good ; all advantages are fair which operate in favour of those who rule ; but if you take advantage of any circumstance in favour of the public, you are accused of acting a *mean* and *dastardly* part ; as if the government was a thing so weak and so very defenceless !

This is like many of the clergy, who were amongst the first ; who were, indeed, the very first, to encourage spies and informers against the *jacobins and levellers*, and to justify all the means, of whatever description, to come at proofs of their machinations. But, behold, when the bitter chalice was put to their own lips ; when, in 1800, or thereabouts, *qui tam* informations were laid against them for having neglected their bounden and sacred duties, they could then set up a loud and general cry against *informers*, whom they represented as the most infamous of mankind ; they could come to the parliament for a law to suspend the operation of these informations ; aye, for an *ex post facto* law to protect them against informers ; and, what is still better worthy of being remembered, they found a parliament to pass such a law.

I will not cram up my space and occupy the time of the reader with any commentary upon what I have extracted from the Morning Post. It is the mere echo of what we have heard elsewhere, and what already stands admirably exposed to public contempt. Yes, it is too late to tell us, that to bring to light, and to execrate corruption and public robbery, it is too late to tell the people, that this indicates a desire to overturn the House of Brunswick and the constitution of England ; that this indicates a plot for the effecting of a bloody jacobinical revolution, and that those who voted with Mr. Wardle, fight the battles of Buonaparte against established crowns and legal constitutions. The people of England, as Mr. LITTLETON (who is one of the jacobins) said, are no longer to be duped ; and, what is still more satisfactory to observe, a very great part of the nobility and gentlemen of England, and that part, too, *who are to live for an age to come*, seem to have now imbibed the same contempt for the means that have been used for the purpose of deceiving them into a belief, *that it was their interest to side against the great mass of the nation*. Completely to eradicate this belief, the folly of which yields to that of no creed that imposture ever invented for the purposes of subjection and of plunder, is all that is wanted to bring about that *general reform*, of which Mr. Whitbread spoke the other day, and without which all but those, who fatten or wish to fatten, upon public plunder, are so anxious to see brought about.

It is not the "rabble," who call for such a reform. The rabble, properly so called (and more or less of rabble there always will be), profit from abuses and corruptions. They are speculators and plunderers of another sort, and different look, to be sure ; but still they are speculators and plunderers. No : it is not the rabble ; it is those who suffer from the rabble, who know them well, and who are so anxious about nothing as to keep power out of their hands.

I cannot refrain from a remark or two upon the passage, relating to Miss TAYLOR, the only accusation that this base writer prefers against

whom, is, that she was the *associate* of Mrs. Clarke, whom he denominates the "*most infamous prostitute of the age*;" forgetting, apparently, that she was so long the great patroness of the army; the Venus of our great and mighty Mars; the "darling" of his affections, the "angel" of his devotions, and his connection with whom this very writer has apologized for, not to say justified, in numerous essays. Oh! pander of incomparable impudence; to vilify the goddess while he extols the votary, and justifies the devotion!

Thanks to Mr. Wardle have, as will be seen below, been voted by the City of *Westminster*.

I perceive, that the *Mayor of London* has, at last, after much boggling, and many difficulties, called a Common Hall, at which his difficulties ought not to be forgotten.

The people of *Glasgow* have shown an admirable spirit, and set an example worthy of general imitation. They have sent, through Lord Folkestone, an address to Mr. Wardle (a copy of which was inserted at page 190) with upwards of *four thousand NAMES* at the bottom of it. This is what I like. That man can never be depended upon; he is not worth a straw, if he is not ready to put his *name* to the expression of his sentiments. In some cases it is inconvenient; in others nearly impossible; but, where practicable, it is always the best way.

This very great inconvenience the people of *Glasgow* have, I am informed, had *forced* upon them. Their intention, at first, was to call a public meeting; but, their requisition was refused by the Provost. The next step determined on was to advertise in the newspapers; but all their newspapers refused to publish their advertisements. They then posted bills, and distributed printed papers; and, in six days, these four thousand names were signed.

These are the sort of men; men, who see no difficulties too great to be overcome. These 4,000 men would, in the defence of their country, be worth ten millions of those balancing, timid, sheep-like creatures, who wait for a bellwether to lead the way. Scotland, I shall honour thee, as long as I live, for the sake of *Glasgow*! Where there are such men for a population, there is no danger to be apprehended from the undue influence of persons in authority, nor even from that base and servile press, which appears to exist in Scotland.

In this work of stifling in the birth, or rather, of preventing the existence, of thanks to Mr. Wardle, *the Whigs* (always excepting those who voted in the 125) are not at all inferior to their political opponents. They plainly see, that their doom is sealed; that the people care about their regular sham-fights no more than they do about the great fights upon Blackheath or Wimbledon-common; that they are fast sinking under the waves; and, seeing this, they are bursting with spleen and envy. Hence they are sulky; they preserve a sullen silence; or unlock their lips only for the purpose of emitting their drivel for the extinguishment of real public spirit. If this worn-out, this decrepit, this dotard, this dying party, had not seen enough before, to convince it, that the days of political quackery were past, it would, surely, see it now, if total loss of sight had not preceded its dissolution. This party, which had raised the greatest of expectations, deceived the people more than they ever were deceived before. They had got into favour by professions about reform and retrenchment: they obtained power: the *first* act of that power was to pass a law to make a great sinecure office tenable

along with a place of 6,000*l.* a year, though the two offices were incompatible in their natures; their second act was to pass a law making an addition to the number of *foreign troops* in the country; and, their last act was, the withdrawing of a bill from before the House of Commons, in consequence of the *King's disapprobation of that bill*; and this, too, for the evident and sole purpose of keeping their places. Can they be so infatuated as to suppose, that there is a single man in the country, out of a madhouse, who will ever confide in them again? They have dug a pit for themselves; their recent conduct has plunged them into it; the nation is now kicking the dirt in upon them; Dr. O'Meara may daub them over with his celestial unction: but, not a tear will be shed for their loss, *except by the ministers*, to whom the loss will, in time, be fatal.

Here follow the RESOLUTIONS passed by a Meeting of ten thousand people in Westminster, on Wednesday, the 29th of March.

Resolved unanimously—

“ 1st. That the inhabitants of this City, from the means of information which their local situation affords them, *have long been aware of the existence of scandalous and corrupt practices in various departments of the State*, and by the late investigation in the hon. the House of Commons, the fact has been made manifest to every part of the United Kingdom.

“ 2nd. That Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, Esq., by his singular intrepidity and integrity in instituting an Inquiry into the conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, and by persevering in that Inquiry, in spite of the greatest difficulties and the most formidable discouragements, has rendered an important service to his country, and merits the grateful thanks and warmest approbation of this Meeting.

“ 3rd. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to our worthy Representative, Sir F. Burdett, Bart., for the independent manner in which, at a very important moment, and under very *critical* circumstances, he seconded the Motion for Inquiry; for the assistance which, as far as his health permitted, he afforded during its progress, and for the able and patriotic Speech which, under the pressure of great bodily pain, he delivered *on the result of the Investigation*: thus adding one more to the many proofs he has already given, that he is the *faithful steward* of that body, by whose free and spontaneous voice he was so honourably elected.

“ 4th. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Lord Viscount Folkestone, for the active, judicious, and firm support he afforded to Col. Wardle during the Investigation; and for his manly, able, and perspicuous Speech on the Conduct of the Commander-in-Chief.

“ 5th. That the Thanks of this Meeting are particularly due to Samuel Whitbread, Esq.; Sir Samuel Romilly, Knt.; Major-Gen. Ferguson; Henry Martin, Esq.; Sir Thomas Turton, Bart.; Thomas William Coke, Esq.; John Christian Curwen, Esq.; the Hon. Thomas Brand; the Hon. H. W. Lyttleton; Lord Viscount Milton; Lord Viscount Althorp; Chas. Watkin Williams Wynn, Esq.; Lord Stanley; and the Minority of 125, who divided in favour of Colonel Wardle's Motion for an Address to the King, on the Conduct of the Duke of York; and the Minority of 137, who supported the Amendment proposed by Sir Thomas Turton, Bart.

“ 6th. That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to the Minority, on the Motion of Henry Bankes, Esq.; and also to the Minority who opposed the Motion of the Right Hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and it is their unanimous opinion, that, after the concurring declaration of so many Independent Representatives of the People, whoever shall, at any future time, advise his Majesty to reinstate his Royal Highness the Duke of York in the situation of Commander-in-Chief, will, by such advice, prove himself an enemy to the country.

“ 7th. That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the discoveries made by this Inquiry, as well as the attention which has been paid in the House of Commons to the investigation of the Charges brought in this particular instance,

ought to animate the people to prosecute Inquiry and Reform in all the departments of the State; and they recommend to every county, city, and borough of the United Kingdom, in which the present state of the Elective Franchise will admit it, to follow the example which it has been the duty and pride of the City of Westminster to set them, of returning, free of expense, honest and independent Representatives; who shall have no interest but that of restoring what is obviously wanted—integrity and economy, in the receipt and expenditure of the public money, and of preserving inviolate the rights and privileges of the people.

“ARTHUR MORRIS, High-Bailiff.”

It was then also unanimously Resolved—

“That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Arthur Morris, Esq., High-Bailiff, for the promptness with which he called this Meeting, and for his able and impartial conduct in the Chair.”

There is but *one word* that I dislike in these Resolutions, and that is the word *Colonel*. Not *Colonel*, but *Mister*. After what we have recently seen, let us, I pray you, have it plain *Mr. Wardle*.

These are good sentiments. It is useless to talk: they must prevail. There must be a salutary, constitutional, legal, loyal reformation; a radical reform, from Christ's Hospital to St. Stephen's Chapel, or this nation sinks into everlasting ruin.

Mr. Whitbread was, I hear, at this meeting, and took an active part. That is good. It shows, that he has broken through the cursed trammels of faction; that he is, at last, weary of an association with the Sheridans and Fitzpatricks. Foh! Oh! it was truly lamentable to see him so yoked.

Well, now, were these *ten thousand jacobins*? Tremble, then, Mr. Yorke, for the “*conspiracy*” is formidable indeed, though you can, I think, no longer complain, that it does not appear in a “*tangible shape*.” Is it not the best, and wisest, and safest way, for the government to set about a radical reform at once, to anticipate all these jacobins, and so spite the rogues? Perhaps you will tell me, that there are millions upon millions of good and solid reasons why this will not be. But, there are 126 men, even in the House of Commons, who demand a statement of these weighty reasons. They, who are almost all of them men of great property, do not seem to fear the consequences of a reform. Poor fools! what, I warrant they do not understand what is good for them half so well as Mr. Huskisson, and Mr. Canning, and Mr. Ward, and General Fitzpatrick, and Lord Castlereagh do? Poor silly young fellows! they are, as the Morning Post says, misled by “*designing men*;” or, as Mr. Perceval has it, by “*cooler heads*.” And so, they, however plain the thing may be, cannot see, that it does them good to take out of their estates immense salaries for Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Ward, and pretty decent pensions for their wives. They cannot see, country cubs that they are, how it is that they and their children are to be benefited by paying 300*l.* to *Lady Louisa Paget*, upon the English pension list, and another 300*l.* a year to the same identical person, under the name of *Lady Louisa Erskine*, upon the Scotch pension list. It is useless to enumerate any more cases; for if they are blind to the benefit here, so they would continue to the end of the chapter, which, by-the-bye, is a pretty long one.

To be serious, these 126 men show that a Reform must take place. Truth has triumphed, and the vile writers, the vile traders, the reptile

and venomous traders in Anti-Jacobinism must be trodden under foot; a triumph, for which, amongst other things, we have to *thank Mr. Wardle*.

Botley, Thursday, 30th March, 1809.

In speaking of the *List of the Minority* upon Mr. Wardle's Motion, I observed, that there were only *two* lawyers in it. I did not know that Mr. HENRY MARTIN was a lawyer, and I overlooked the name of Mr. FRANCIS HORNER. I beg these gentlemen to be assured, that the omission to mention them as gentlemen of the law was not intentional.

A correspondent points out an error in my statement respecting Mr. Adam's son's promotion. Any one must see that, supposing the thing to stand as my correspondent supposes, it was a mere error; because it is *impossible*, that it should have been intentional, as I myself furnished the means of detection.

Nor does it at all alter the merits of the case. But, the thing is even *worse* than I represented it; for, a Captain *in the Guards* ranks with a *Major* of other foot regiments, and a Lieutenant with Captains of other foot regiments; so that, in any Garrison, or Camp, Lieut. Adam, just warm from school, in 1799, at the age of *sixteen*, might have taken the command of other regiments as well as of his own company; for, how often does it happen, that the command of a regiment is left to a *Captain-Lieutenant* ?

AMERICAN STATES.*

(*Political Register, April, 1809.*)

THE debating gentlemen, who live across the Atlantic, have not, for some months, had much of my attention bestowed upon them. They have now, it seems, repealed their embargo, except with respect to England and France; that is to say, they have given their ships liberty *to come out*, under the shabby, the miserable, the despicable appearance of still showing their resentment against us. They *know*, that the cargoes will come to England; they know that they must come to England; they know that our sea orders, preventing them from going any where else, still exist. Aye, and they *intend* they shall come here too; only their silly, their empty pride, will not let them acknowledge it.

Did I not say, that if our ministers held firm, they would be compelled to repeal this embargo law? And did I not say, that they would *sneak out* of the thing in some way or other, which would, as they thought, hide their disgrace? No triumph can be more complete than that of the ministers, in this case. They have not moved an inch from their resolution. They have let the Americans do their worst; they have looked

* The reader will find allusions in this article to the doctrines put forth in the articles headed "Perish Commerce," which he will find at p. 354 of the second volume of those Selections.—ED.

quietly on while America passed her *avenging* acts, which were to bring us upon our knees. We were fast *forgetting* her, when she herself, without any compromise, comes to.

I am not, perhaps, very disinterested in these praises of the ministers; for the truth is, that the measures towards America, were as much mine as they were theirs. I alone supported them, while they were assailed by pamphlets and paragraphs and speeches innumerable. That support lost me the friendship of that worthy fellow, the INDEPENDENT WHIG, who not only cut me upon the occasion, but ripped up all my old sins, and threw them in my face, which hurt me the more as I sincerely respected the writer and admired his writings, which I still do.

What are now become of all the predictions and alarms; all the threats of starvation and ruin; all the laborious calculations of Lords Grenville and Auckland? What talking, what debating there were, this time twelve-months, about the Orders in Council and about the *corn*, which, to poor starving England, would not come from America any longer! Lord Grenville spoke of the prospect of a rupture with America, with such manifest apprehensions in his mind, that I really felt pity for his lordship. Mr. Windham, upon whom it was incumbent to make a speech upon the subject, and whose mind is fertile in resource, left off without having distinctly asserted, or denied any thing.

It is always had to proceed upon a supposition, that there is a natural, inherent deficiency of means of any sort in the country itself; and this was the supposition, upon which the opposition proceeded in the question relative to America. They might, indeed, well be led to act thus; for it was a favourite scheme of Pitt's, who actually acquired and consolidated his power by persuading the nation, that it depended, for its existence, wholly upon *something other than its people and its own resources*. One time it was India, another time it was the funds, another time it was the opening of the Scheldt, another time it was our allies upon the Continent, and all through "England's commercial greatness" swelled out the end of his noisy and empty speeches. Well, the Scheldt is shut, our allies upon the Continent are pretty nearly extinguished, and have long been lost to us, America has had her embargo, and Buonaparte has shut up all the ports of the Continent; and how do you feel yourself, my honest and duped John Bull? Are you starved yet? Do the oxen fat in Devonshire? Do the sheep breed in Dorsetshire? Do the hogs breed and fat in Hampshire, and the bees still collect honey there? Do you get wheat enough to make your loaf of? As to beer, the alarm of the barley-growers is, that they shall not know how to get rid of their corn.

This is the master humbug. Only persuade a nation, that it cannot exist upon its own internal resources, and that nation is your slave. The nation is much indebted to Mr. SPENCE for *proving* the contrary; and much indebted to the ministers for having given us a practical demonstration of the truth of his doctrine. Really the Spaniards, in worshipping dolls made for them by the heretics in Holland, are not much more foolish than were the Englishmen, who were cozened into a belief that they would all die if an end was put to Commerce and the Funds. They appeared, at one time, to believe that Pitt had the power of putting a stop to rains and snows; that it was he who made the grass grow and the corn ripen. But, some how or other, when he got out of place, he seemed to lose these divine powers. Mr. Addington came, and his partisans attempting to make the praises of Pitt apply to their patron, the

thing became ridiculous, and actually the subject of a very smart copy of verses, of which, it was said, Mr. Canning was the author.

The nation is never to be so duped again. The time for that gross duplicity is past. We have now proof, that our own resources are quite sufficient for us, and of this valuable knowledge we shall, I trust, make a proper use.

Botley, Thursday, April 6, 1809.

HAMPSHIRE MEETING.

(Political Register, April, 1809.)

ON Saturday, the 8th instant, the following Requisition was carried to MR. BLACKBURN, the High Sheriff, by MR. COBBETT of Botley, and MR. HOUGHTON of Durley. On Wednesday the 12th, the Sheriff transmitted to them his notice for the meeting, as it will be seen at the bottom of the signatures.

TO THE HIGH SHERIFF OF THE COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON.

Winchester, April 8th, 1809.

SIR,—We, the undersigned Freeholders and other Landholders of the County of Southampton, request that you will be pleased to call a Meeting of the Inhabitants of this County, to be holden at Winchester, on such a day as shall, at no great distance, be convenient to you, in order to afford us, and the Inhabitants of this County in general, an opportunity of publicly and formally giving our thanks to Gwyllym L. Wardle, Esq. M.P., for his upright and public-spirited conduct, during the recent inquiry before the House of Commons; and also of expressing our sentiments upon the subjects of that inquiry.

William Cobbett	Botley.	Peter Jewell	Timsbury.
John Hopkinson	Eling.	Rev. John Webster ..	Bursledon.
Thomas Comley	Rumsey.	Samuel Sharp	Rumsey.
Stephen Leach	Rumsey.	Moses Wilkins	Braishfield.
Thomas King	Eling.	Aaron Barking	Rumsey.
John Comley	Rumsey.	Josiah George	Rumsey.
C. H. Longcroft	Hamble.	Jacob Colson	Braishfield.
Benjamin Goodeve ..	Gosport.	Joshua Short	Brockenhurst.
James Sharp	Rumsey.	John Wilt	Eling.
Christopher Keele ..	Broughton.	James Hayter	Eling.
Samuel Phené	Rumsey.	Thomas Sutton	Southampton.
John Colson	Southampton.	John Goldsmith	Hambledon.
Joseph Jackson	Rumsey.	William Biles	Eling.
John Black	Rumsey.	Edward Houghton ..	Durley.
Edward Toomer	Southampton.	William Metchard ..	Eling.
Charles Godfrey	Rumsey.	Giles Barnes	Tichborne.
Thomas Bernard	Mitchmarsh.	John Saunders	Eling.
Thomas Nichols	Southampton.	William Twynam	Soberton.
William Green	Kimbridge.	Francis Hoad	Soberton.

Peter Knight	Soberton.	John Skeats	Lymington.
Henry Parrott	Droxford.	Matthew Aldridge ..	Throop.
William Powlett Powlett		George Aldridge	Christchurch.
Thomas Hatch	Soberton.	Thomas Gatrell	Lymington.
John Cotman	Hambleton.	Ambrose Daw	Wick.
Francis Godrich	Tichborne.	George Benson	Ringwood.
William Agate	Ovington.	John Clay	Portsmouth.
John Sayer	Winchester.	John Shoveller	Portsmouth.
H. Mulcock	Kilmiston.	Alexander Carter ...	Ringwood.
Joseph May	Bramshaw.	Samuel Blake	Rumsey.
Rev. Thomas May ..		James Traver	Rumsey.
John Stroud	Tisbury.	Robert Moody	Winchester.
James May	Rumsey.	Richard Mills	Beworth.
William Barnett	Rumsey.	James Baverstock ..	Alton.
John Kellaway	Fordingbridge.	F. H. Grey	Alton.
W. W. Wright	Sopley.		

In compliance with the above Request, I hereby appoint a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the said County to be holden at the Castle of Winchester, on Tuesday, the 25th day of April instant, at twelve o'clock at noon.

(Signed) JOHN BLACKBURN, *Sheriff*.

Preston Candover, 11th April, 1809.

TO THE PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

The above Requisition is, as you will see, signed by none of those *Noblemen* or *Baronets*, who have been in the habit of putting their names to papers of that sort; and this circumstance, so far from being unpleasing, is, to me, and, I trust, it will be to you, a very pleasing one. Not that any of us can wish to see those persons hang back upon an occasion in which all the best public feelings urged every soul to step forward; but, because the Requisition, as it now stands, will convince them, and also the King's ministers, who have so long dictated to this county, that there is yet remaining in Hampshire a spirit of independence not so very easily to be subdued. It will show to our countrymen in general, that, though the ministry of the day do cause to be elected whatever County Members they please, there is still a spirit in the people to feel indignant at the wrongs and the insults they endure. It will show to those parties, who have, for so many years, divided the county between them, and who have, by turns, profited from its credulity, that the county is no longer to be held in leading strings; that we have sense to think, and courage to act for ourselves.

What, let me ask, could be more degrading to us, than to see existing a practice of calling county meetings by ten or twelve persons, of each of the *parties* respectively, always nearly the same persons, just as if it was an office they held for that purpose, and just as if all the other Landholders, all the Farmers, all the Tradesmen, and, indeed, the whole of the population of the county, were so many mere puppets, or tools, in their hands, to be called together for the purpose of voting just what those settled and established leaders chose to write down upon a piece of paper, and read to them? What, let me again put it to you, could possibly be more degrading than this?

I have heard, and you, I am sure, will hear it with pleasure, that some of the Noblemen and other persons of great property in the county, who have not signed the Requisition, do nevertheless highly approve of it, and do intend to be at the Meeting; and, perhaps, they may have thought, that, upon such an occasion, it was best to avoid every thing which should give to the origin of the proceeding a *party* complexion. If such was their motive, it is one with which we cannot find fault, provided they now show us, that they are disposed to lend their hand in putting down for ever that system of Corruption, which has been *proved* to have long existed, and by the means of which we have been so mercilessly plundered. For my own part, nothing would give me so much pleasure as to see the leaders of both parties come to the Meeting, and divide between them the honour of proposing to us such Resolutions as the occasion demands; never forgetting, however, that Mr. WM. POWLETT POWLETT, who, unsolicited, came and put his name amongst ours, has, upon us, not only now, but upon all future occasions, a clear and indisputable claim to the precedence.

But, let who will be the proposer, we must take care that what we approve of be *good and sound*; we must take care, that our real sentiments be fully expressed, and not frittered away, until it be hard to distinguish our censure from our praise. Our feelings, upon this occasion, are strong; our opinions clear and fixed; and we shall act a very inconsistent part, indeed, unless our language corresponds with those opinions, and those feelings.

It must be manifest to every man in his senses, that, unless a stop be speedily put to the workings of corruption, one of two things will happen: the complete slavery of us all, or the overthrow of the government; and, it must be equally manifest, that this alternative is to be avoided by no other means than the legal and constitutional interference of the people themselves, and especially the people who are in the middling walks of life, who have property to preserve and who have judgment to direct their actions. It is a common excuse, that, "*one man can do nothing.*" Not much of *himself*, perhaps; but, without *one man* there would be *no men* in the world. *Millions* are made up of *ones*; and, if *every man* were to say, "*What can I do?*" there would, of course, be nothing done. There are few of us, who do not put ourselves to some inconvenience for the sake of our *private* advantage; or, rather, the labours and fatigues we undergo for that purpose, we think nothing of. And, shall we, then, not endure a little labour and fatigue for the *public* advantage, especially as it is impossible for the public to be benefited without each of us having his due share of that benefit? Besides, there is, in the present case, a motive far superior to all selfish considerations. We are now called upon to thank the man, who has risked every thing for us; we are called upon to do an act of justice, and if we do not answer the call, we have nothing of Englishmen left in us but the name.

We should always bear in mind, that the King's ministers declared, that, if a Vote of THANKS to Mr. WARDLE was moved, in the House of Commons, they would *oppose it*, and there is no doubt but they would have had a majority on their side. Well, if the House of Commons refuse him thanks for the inestimable good, which he has done for the people, there is so much the stronger call upon the people to thank him; and, for them to grudge any labour or pains to do it with effect would argue, in them, a want of common sense as well as of gratitude; for, we

may be assured, that, unless Mr. WARDLE be supported by the unequivocal voice of the people, no man will be much inclined to imitate him; and, it is hardly necessary to say, that, unless more and *much more* be done, that which has been done will be worth nothing at all, in the space of a few months.

For these reasons, all persons who are able to attend the Meeting ought to attend it, be the inconvenience what it may, nothing being a good excuse short of actual bodily infirmity.

I shall add a few words as to the part *which I have acted* in this proceeding. There are not wanting persons to hint, that I am actuated by *ambitious motives*, and to draw conclusions of this sort from my name standing at the head of the Requisition. Now, the facts are these. I, in the first place, inquired, whether the Lords and the Baronets intended to send a Requisition, and I found they did not. It was then *proposed to me*, by several persons, to join in a Requisition. When it was drawn up, I did not sign it, till many others had been asked to sign first; and, even then, a space was left *above* my name, in order that the names of any noblemen or gentlemen or yeomen might be placed before mine upon the list. Several gentlemen, amongst whom were Mr. Powlett Powlett and Mr. May, I believe, were particularly asked to place their names at the top of the list, which they declined, and in which they discovered minds superior to that false pride, which never yet was characteristic of a real gentleman. I do, I must confess, feel some pride at seeing my name at the head of such a list; but, not a single name was placed in that list at *my request*; I did not even *ask* any man to sign it; and the pride I feel arises, not from the vain and empty notion that I possess an influence over any man, but that my principles and views correspond with those of so many intelligent, public-spirited, and respectable Tradesmen and Yeomen, to be regarded as *one of whom*, is the utmost bounds of my ambition. I have no silly and stupid pursuit of popularity. I have seen too much of the vexations and the miseries of all such pursuits. I would not shake a knave by the hand, if his vote would make me not only a member for, but the *owner* of, the county; nor would I, if I could, even without asking for, be a member of parliament, or fill any post or employment whatever under, or in, the government. I have, though not yet very old, had quite enough both of censure and applause. Constant observation has convinced me, that happiness is seldom the companion of a pursuit after power; and my taste as well as my reason lead me to avoid all such pursuits. Indeed, I could be well content never to go out of the valley in which I live; but, the duty of a father and an Englishman, calls imperiously upon me not to stand with my arms folded and see my children and my country robbed, disgraced, and enslaved. Our forefathers wrote and strove and fought and bled for us; and, if we can tamely see those rights, which their talents, their courage, and their perseverance entailed on us, taken away, little by little, until there is nothing left as a protection for those to whom we have given life, we are not only amongst the most base, but we are the very basest of all mankind.

I have had too much opportunity of studying men and things to be led astray by any *wild theories about liberty*. I know, that there must be *government*, and that there must be *law*, without which there can be no such thing as property, nor any safety even for our persons. I want to see no *innovation* in England. All I wish and all I strive for, is *The Constitution of England*, undefiled by corruption. I am very willing to

make even great allowances for the neglects and faults of men in power ; because I see, that, even in our own private concerns, we are, the very best of us, frequently guilty of both. But, when I see a system of public corruption, of barefaced public robbery, brought to light, and hear those, who have had the virtue to make the exposure, termed enemies of the country ; when I see my country thus pillaged and thus insulted, I should hate the very sound of my name, if I were not ready to affix it to a protest against such proceedings.

WILLIAM COBBETT.

Botley, Thursday, 13th April, 1809.

TO THE

INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

(*Political Register, May, 1809.*)

LETTER I.

*Lord Castlereagh and Philip Hamlin.**

GENTLEMEN,

When, at our last County-meeting, an objection was made to our introducing into our Resolution the affair of Lord Clancarty and Lord Castlereagh, you had the good sense to overrule that objection, though made by Sir Henry Mildmay, whom you were ready to thank for having done his duty, but, by whom you were not to be induced to resign the exercise of your rights and the use of your reason. Nor, can I refrain from observing here, that we, who have no party or selfish purpose to serve, must, if we mean to profit from the victory we have obtained, be very cautious how we give way to any thing like *thick-and-thin* support of any body. Sir Henry Mildmay did well in voting for Mr. Wardle amongst the 125 ; but, that is only one act ; it is merely a single act ; and is by no means sufficient to induce us to continue our praise of that gentleman, unless we find him steady in his endeavours to serve the country, and especially in his endeavours to rescue the nation from the degraded state in which it has long been. I do not wish to excite any suspicions with respect to this gentleman ; but merely to settle this point—namely, that, for the good he *has done* we have given him our thanks, in terms the most handsome ; but, that, we are not, for this reason, at all bound to praise him in future, and are perfectly free to express our real sentiments, be they what they may, as to his future conduct, and, of course, to *act* upon those sentiments. No, Gentlemen, let us keep ourselves free from all *thick-and-thin* engagements and attachments ; let each of us exercise his own judgment ; let each of us for himself make due inquiry, and act upon the decision of his own mind ;

* The proceedings of the Hampshire meeting were detailed in a former number of the Register ; but we omit them, because they are long and consist of a detail that is sufficiently explained in this and the succeeding Letters. The cases of Lord CASTLEREAGH and of PHILIP HAMLIN will also be found sufficiently stated in the course of these Letters.—ED.

let us not be persuaded or coaxed to do that which our own reason tells us is not right; let us form and preserve an attachment to *principles* and not to *men*; above all, let us despise the watch-words of party; let us thus act, and you will soon see, that this county, in spite of all the dreadful influence of the Dockyards, the Barracks, and the Custom-house, will not only recover its independence, but will set an example to other counties. The reason why your voice has heretofore not been heard, is this; that you had no inclination to attend at county-meetings. The few who did attend saw that the object was merely a party one; that no good purpose was answered by an attendance; that a set of Resolutions, ready cut and dry, were passed without opposition; that the audience consisted, upon one occasion, of the slaves of men in power, and, upon the next occasion, of the slaves of men who wanted to get into power; that, in fact, you were only to give your voice for what one party or the other party sent down from London to be passed, and to be sent back again as being the *decision of the county of Hants*, when it was no more the decision of the real people of the county, than it was the decision of the inhabitants of the moon. No wonder that such meetings had fallen into contempt. The tradesmen and yeomen of the county despised the imposture; and it did not occur to them to take the trouble of exposing it. Recent events, quite sufficient for the purpose, indeed, have roused us. They have brought us together from all parts of the county; made us acquainted with one another; produced an interchange of friendship; and do very fairly promise to make us formidable to any man, or set of men, who shall dare attempt again to consider us as men of straw. Far be it from me to inculcate feelings of disrespect towards rank, family, or learned professions; but, one cannot shut one's eyes to glaring truths, and, it was impossible for any one not to perceive, on the 25th of April last, that the "*great men*" of the county did not appear to be much better able than we were to conduct the business which had called us together; and, to say the plain truth, not quite so able. To myself I take no merit on account of that day's proceedings; for, though I have been much more accustomed to writing than most of you have, and though I necessarily possess more knowledge, upon political subjects, than the greater part of you can have had leisure to acquire, still I am of opinion, that, out of the two thousand of you, who were present, there were at least one hundred full as able to state your rights to the meeting as I was. You, *all* of you, possess sufficient knowledge; and you want only the confidence to do it. This was the *third* county meeting that I had ever been at, and it was the *sixth* time that I ever attempted to speak to a public assembly. No one could do it with greater reluctance; but, it being the duty of some one to assert our rights, and I, seeing no other person disposed to get the better of that reluctance which was common to us all, resolved to do it myself, and in this respect to set you an example. I knew that the county had sense and spirit, and I was determined to give them a fair chance of displaying themselves; and, to your honour, display themselves they did.

Some of the hireling writers, in London, frantic at the result of our meeting, have abused me without measure, and have expressed their utter astonishment, that the "*noblemen and gentlemen*" of the county should suffer you to be *led* by a person like me. Now, in the first place, you were *not led* by me. You assembled without my asking a soul of you to attend. Forty-nine out of every fifty of you were perfect strangers to me;

and, I am sincerely convinced, that not a man of you would have voted for the resolution that I proposed, if you had not approved of it in your own mind. And, in the next place, "the noblemen and gentlemen" of the county have no such power over you as these hireling London writers seem to suppose they have. You stand in no need of their support or assistance, or good offices, in any way whatever. They come, indeed, at every *canvassing* season, and give you a hypocritical smile, and a squeeze of the hand; but this they do to the vilest knave in the county, who has a freehold of forty shillings a year, and whose family, perhaps, you have to maintain out of the poor-rates, while he maintains himself in idleness and drink by depredations upon your property of various descriptions. Besides, there is this wide difference between me and those "noblemen and gentlemen," of whom these writers speak: long experience has convinced you, that they have always some selfish object in view; that they wish you to give them your support, in order that they, by the use they make of the power you put in their hands, may get something for themselves or their families. This you know well; whereas, you are all convinced, that I have no such views; that I do not want, and will not have any thing from the public; and, therefore, you expect, and meet with, from me, plain dealing; that which is for the good of us all, without respect to persons or party. But, at any rate, our abusers are in a very pinching dilemma with respect to me and you; for, they must agree to one of two things; namely, either that *I am a person of very great consequence* in the county; or, that the Resolution which I proposed and you adopted *contained the genuine expression of your minds*. I know that the latter is the truth; but, let those who would fain vilify me and my principles, hitch themselves upon whichever horn of the dilemma they may feel to be the least galling.

I shall now address you, though it need not be at much length, upon the subject of Lord CASTLEREAGH'S conduct, which subject made part of the Resolution passed at the meeting.

Sir Henry Mildmay requested us to stop, *till that matter had received the decision of the House of Commons*. But, as we had before us a copy of the whole of the evidence in the case, printed by order of the House of Commons itself, we thought it not at all necessary to wait for that decision, supposing ourselves to be full as able as that House to decide upon a plain matter of fact; especially as we simply declared what was contained in the evidence itself, and contrasted the conduct of this Lord with the principles of the constitution, as contained in the BILL OF RIGHTS, which is one of our great constitutional laws.

On the same day that we passed our Resolution, the House of Commons discussed, and decided upon, the conduct of Lord Castlereagh; and I beg leave to state to you what was done by the House upon that occasion.

The business was brought forward by LORD ARCHIBALD HAMILTON, who concluded his speech with moving the following Resolutions:

"I. That it appears to the House, from the evidence on the table, that Lord Viscount Castlereagh, in the year 1805, shortly after he had quitted the situation of President of the Board of Control, and being a Privy Councillor and Secretary of State, did place at the disposal of Lord Clancarty, a member of the same Board, the nomination to a writership, in order to facilitate his procuring a seat in parliament.

"II. That it was owing to a disagreement among the subordinate parties, that this transaction did not take effect; and

“ III. That by this conduct Lord Castlereagh had been guilty of a gross violation of his duty as a servant of the crown; an abuse of his patronage as President of the Board of Control: and an attack upon the purity of that House.”

In opposition to these Resolutions, a LORD BINNING, one of the friends of the ministers, moved the *Order of the Day*; that is to say, to *drop the matter*, without any further inquiry or discussion; or, in other words, to decide, that it was a matter not of *importance enough to occupy the attention of the House of Commons!* Most of the members, however, did think that it was a little too bad; and that *some little notice*, some little censure ought to be pronounced.—The question was taken upon Lord Archibald Hamilton’s Resolutions, and it was *negatived*, there being 167 for it, and 216 against it. So, you see it was determined by the Honourable House, that this act on the part of one of its members, was not “an attack upon its PURITY;” in the justice of which determination I most heartily join.

Bravo! Well done, Honourable House! “If this does not satisfy the country,” as Mr. Fuller said, “I don’t know what the devil will satisfy it.”

Well, but what did the House agree to? Why to this:

“Resolved, That it is the duty of this House to maintain a *jealous guard over the purity of election*; but considering that the attempt of Lord Viscount Castlereagh to interfere in the election of a member *has not been successful*, this House does not consider it necessary to enter into any criminal proceedings against him.”

Englishmen, this, this, *this* was what the Honourable House agreed to. They came to a Resolution, that, *because* Lord Castlereagh’s attempt HAD NOT BEEN SUCCESSFUL, it was unnecessary to enter into “*any criminal proceedings against him.*”

Now, then, let us see what was done in the case of PHILIP HAMLIN, the Tinman of Plymouth, who offered a bribe to Mr. Addington when the latter was minister.

The case was this: In the year 1802, PHILIP HAMLIN, a Tinman of Plymouth, wrote a letter to Mr. HENRY ADDINGTON, the first Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, offering him the sum of 2,000*l.* to give him, HAMLIN, the place of Land-Surveyor of the Customs at Plymouth.

In consequence of this, a criminal information was filed, against the said HAMLIN, by Mr. Spencer Perceval, who was then the King’s Attorney General, and who, in pleading against the offender, asserted *the distinguished purity of persons in power, in the present day.* From the Bench great stress was laid on the gravity of the offence of *tendering a bribe*; of the baneful tendency of such crimes, in a moral as well as in a political point of view. The Tinman was found guilty; he was sentenced to pay a fine of 100 pounds to the King, and to be imprisoned for three months. His business was ruined; and he himself died, in a few months after his release from prison.

Hamlin confessed his guilt; he stated, in his affidavit, “That he sincerely repented of his crime; that he was forty years of age; that his business was the sole means of supporting himself and family; that a severe judgment might be the total ruin of himself and that family; and that, therefore, he threw himself upon, and implored, the mercy of his prosecutors and of the Court.”

In reference to this, Mr. Perceval, *the present Chancellor of the Exchequer*, observe, said: "The circumstances which the defendant discloses, respecting his own situation in life and of his family, are all of them topics, very well adapted to affect the private feelings of individuals, and, as far as that consideration goes, nothing further need be said; but, there would have been no prosecution at all, in this case, upon the ground of personal feeling; it was set on foot upon grounds of a public nature, and the spirit in which the prosecution originated, still remains; it is, therefore, submitted to your lordships, not on a point of individual feeling, but of PUBLIC JUSTICE, in which case your lordships will consider how far the affidavits ought to operate in mitigation of punishment."

The Judge, Mr. Justice GROSS, in passing sentence upon this poor, petty, ignorant offender, said: "Such a practice, if permitted, would lead to mischief incalculable; for it might extend to every office in the appointment of the great ministers of the state, *civil, military, and ecclesiastical*, and would supersede men of ability and integrity, and place, in their stead, the ignorant and corrupt."

Now, people of Hampshire; now, Englishmen, who have been taught so highly to prize impartial justice, compare the decisions in these two cases; bear them in remembrance; and let them have a proper weight upon your conduct on all future occasions.

Hamlin's attempt, observe, *was not successful*, any more than that of Lord Castlereagh!

There needs no more than to state these facts to you. Your own minds will furnish an appropriate commentary.

Justice as well as future utility require that we should have upon record the names of those who spoke for, and against Lord Archibald Hamilton's motion. *For it*, the speakers were, Lord Archibald Hamilton, Mr. C. W. Wynn, Lord Milton, Mr. W. Smith, Mr. Grattan, Mr. Ponsonby, Sir Francis Burdett, Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Tierney.

Against it, Lord Castlereagh himself, Lord Binning, Mr. Croker, MR. PERCEVAL (who prosecuted Hamlin), Mr. Banks, Mr. George Johnstone, Mr. H. Lascelles, Mr. Windham, and Mr. Canning.

You will perceive, Gentlemen, that I mean to address a *series of Letters* to you; and the mode I intend to pursue is this. On every Friday, when I have a letter to you ready for publication in my paper of the next day, I shall send by post, copies of such letter, time enough for its insertion in the Salisbury Journal, the Portsmouth Telegraph, the Hampshire Chronicle, and the Reading Mercury, *of that same week*. If you set a value upon these letters, you will, of course, continue to have that paper which shall insert them regularly. I hope, and believe, that all the papers, which circulate in the county, will insert them, the editors appearing to me to be men of sound principles; but, if some of them should insert them, and some not, then those persons who set a value upon the Letters will, of course, take a paper that does insert them. If, contrary to my hopes and expectations, *none* of these provincial papers should insert them, then, I trust, that those amongst you, who take my Register, will *lend* it as widely as possible through their respective neighbourhoods. But, Gentlemen, if this could possibly be the case; if the influence of those, who are sucking away our very blood, could be so great as to obstruct the circulation of political truth in the

county, through the accustomed channels; then we would show them, that we were not to be so baffled, and that we would soon have a provincial paper that should circulate such truths. All that I want to see circulated is *truth*. No falsehood; no calumny; nothing of personal spite. "Truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," without respect to persons, or to selfish interests; but this truth we will have circulated amongst us, in defiance of all that can be done by force or by fraud.

The editors of the provincial papers must acknowledge, that my proceeding is very fair; I shall write these letters for their papers as well as for my own; they will appear, if those editors choose, in their papers on the *Sunday*, and, in mine, they cannot reach any part of the county before that day. Copies of this Letter, for instance, will reach them all on *Friday* next, leaving them plenty of time to prepare it for the press. So that, if they all should, by the enemies of the county and the kingdom, be prevailed upon to endeavour to keep these Letters from your sight, they will have no reason to complain in case we resort to the establishment of a paper, which must be injurious to them.

I am,

Your faithful friend,

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, May 2nd, 1809.

P.S. Once more I beg leave in this particular manner, to request those gentlemen, who take the Register, and who approve of its contents, to *lend* it for the perusal of those of their neighbours who do not find it convenient to take it themselves. Every man, who reads useful truths, is a man made the better for that reading. The pulpit, which, some years ago, made the churches resound with politics, is now as silent as the grave upon political subjects. Smother! smother! smother! is the order of the day. To the *Press* we must now look; and to make the press really useful, those must now read, who did not read before.

Upon looking again over the *Resolutions* proposed by Mr. POWLETT, I perceive, that, owing to an error in copying them, the *three* which stand *first*, should have stood *last*. This is very material; because, by the transposition, *thanks to Mr. Wardle* is made but a secondary and inferior object, and a deeper dye of *party* is given to the whole. In justice, therefore, to Mr. Powlett, who, on so many accounts, is entitled to the respect of the county, I lose no time in correcting this error.

I had nearly forgotten one very material fact. You remember, Gentlemen, when you called out, "Why is not Mr. CHUTE *here to-day*?" the answer was, that he was *attending his duty in parliament*.

Well, then, gentlemen, if he was in the House of Commons on that day, he voted *for* Lord Castlereagh; for his name is not in the list of the minority upon that question; neither is the name of his worthy colleague, Mr. HEATHCOTE, in that list; so that, either they were not attending their duty in parliament, or they were both voting in direct opposition to the opinions of the county, that day expressed.

TO THE
INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

(*Political Register, May, 1809.*)

LETTER II.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

Introductory Address.

GENTLEMEN,

At our last County-meeting, we resolved, with only *eight* or *ten* dissenting voices out of about *two thousand* of the most respectable men in this county, that it would be expedient for us to meet on a future day to consider of the propriety of a Petition to the King, praying his Majesty to be graciously pleased to afford us his royal countenance and support in obtaining a reformation in the Commons' House of Parliament; and, as I look forward with confident hope, that that Meeting will take the matter seriously in hand, I think it may be useful, in the meanwhile, for me to submit to you my opinions upon that interesting and important subject.

This I propose to do in the present and future Letters; and, here, at the outset, I think it due to you and to this great cause of the country to declare, that I shall, at all times, be ready to insert whatever may be sent to me, in the way of *answer* to what I shall address to you; thus securing to truth the fairest possible chance of success, by giving, through the same channel in which my Letters will circulate, circulation to the opinions of those, who may differ from me. This has been the invariable practice of my political life. But, in order to confine the discussion within reasonable bounds, I must notify, that those who may be disposed to answer me must confine themselves to the subject; must state in the head of their performances, which of my letters they are answering, and must take the paragraphs regularly, one after another, as I shall arrange and number them; and must confine themselves, as to space, so as not to exceed, in any instance, *double* the length of that which they profess to answer. Those who may choose to enter this field of controversy, will, of course, keep copies of what they send to me; and, if I find any thing not connected with the subject, I will state it, whereupon they may make the necessary curtailments. I take these precautions, because I would not involve this interesting subject in confusion, which, to truth, is not much less an enemy than is falsehood itself.

We should enter upon this discussion with minds unheated by any thing that has recently transpired; and, above all things, we should subdue in us any thing like a *spirit of revenge*. I am ready, and I have conversed with no man who is not ready, to say—"What is done cannot be undone: let there be no thought of vengeance for the past: let all that has been done be forgotten for ever, and let no one meet with any punishment or reproach on account of it, provided we now have that which shall *effectually* prevent the recurrence of such things for the future." And, indeed, if you consult history, you will find, that,

amongst nations as well as amongst individuals, it is not the original and naked offence so much as a pertinacity in defending, or persevering in, it, that inspires the offended with that thirst for vengeance, which, though it may bring calamity upon the offended as well as the offender, does very seldom fail to prove destructive to the former.

Nor, if our deliberations should conclude with an unanimous decision in favour of Reform, should we, in my opinion, be too *hasty* in our expectations. All changes of great national importance require time. That which is done in great haste, is seldom well done. Improvement in all things generally proceeds by degrees; and, though we have here the book of the constitution for our guide, complete restoration, any more than creation, cannot be expected to be the work of a single effort. When we confront the practice with the theory of our government, which we have, at all times, a right to do, we must, of course, make a lumping appeal from the one to the other; but, when we set about the work of restoration, we must, if we mean to succeed, first remove that which we find to be most injurious and most hostile to the principles of the constitution; and thus pursue our course, till all the *essential* evils be removed.

A remark or two seem necessary here, in answer to the insinuation, and, indeed, the open accusation, against all those, who stand prominently forward in the cause of Reform: it is this, that they wish for confusion; for the annihilation of property; and for uproar and bloodshed.

This, gentlemen, has always been the charge against all those, who have had the courage to take the lead in endeavouring to root out corruption. From the nature of things, it is a charge that must be preferred against such men; because the corrupt will naturally seek to disarm those who attack them, and, it being impossible (or, at least, it has always appeared so till *now*) to say that *corruption is right*, there is no mode of attacking its assailants, other than that of representing them as wishing for confusion and uproar, by which representations, the uninformed are misled and the timid are frightened. By this mode, this nation has long been deceived, and alarmed. Posterity will, I hope, hardly believe; I hope, that our children will hardly credit the true history of the delusions and alarms of the last fifteen years, during several of which the Act of Habeas Corpus, or Personal Safety Act, stood repealed, and any man was liable to be sent to prison, and there to be kept for years, without a trial and without a hearing; nay, many men were so imprisoned. And what was all this for? Why was this suspension of that great law, without which, in fact, the English government is no better than the old government of France? Why, because the nation was *alarmed*; because it was persuaded that certain Clubs and Societies would destroy all property, when what those Clubs demanded, though they might do it indiscreetly, was, in truth, no more than what Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond had themselves demanded, and had represented as *necessary to the safety of the nation*, many years before. The disgraceful days of alarm are, indeed, now passed; and, I think, it will be very difficult for the friends of corruption to cause their return; but, still they harp upon the *dangers* of change, though they cannot deny, that the change would be for the better; and still, though we ask only for the restoration of a *part* of the well-known and long-tried constitution of England, as relating to the House of Commons; still they accuse us

of a wish to introduce confusion, uproar, and bloodshed. But, who are these accusers? Those who accused Mr. Wardle; those who denounced him to the nation as the tool of a Jacobin Conspiracy; those who have been detected in the misapplication of the public money, and in the worst sorts of corruption; these are the persons, who attribute to us a wish to destroy all property, and to introduce uproar and bloodshed. In short, if we would form a correct opinion of these efforts to excite new alarm; if we would form a correct opinion of the views of those, who raise these impudent calumnies against our cause, we have only to bear in mind, that JOHN BOWLES was the first who accused Englishmen of *Jacobinism*; that the REV. DR. O'MEARA, from under the wing of Mrs. Clarke, preached before the King against *Democracy*; and that the REV. MR. BEAZLEY, who tendered a bribe to the Duke of Portland to make him Dean of Salisbury, wrote a pamphlet upon the approaching *dangers of Popery*.

Such are the *alarmists*; and, if you bear this fact in mind, you will have very little difficulty in deciding as to what are now the *real* grounds of alarm.

Besides, who and what are the persons, who stand most prominently exposed to this accusation? SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, MR. MADOCKS, MR. WARDLE, and LORD COCHRANE. These are the only members of the House of Commons, who, as yet, have taken a *decided* and active part in the cause. And, are you to be made to believe, that these four gentlemen, or either of them, can wish ill to their country? That they, who have, all of them, such large portions of property, wish to see all property destroyed? Or, are you to be made to believe, that they, who have so much talent; so much knowledge, and so much of mind in every other respect, are, upon this subject, fools? The thing is not to be believed by any man in his senses.

With respect to *myself*, I should certainly not trouble you, were it not my opinion that it may be useful, in this Introductory Address, to give you an instance of the behaviour of my opponent writers.

Some of you will have heard, perhaps, that while I was in America, I wrote several pamphlets, some under a feigned name, and some under no name at all.

From one of these pamphlets, the London ministerial newspapers have extracted these words—"For my part, I am *no friend of the English*; I wish their island *was sunk to the bottom of the sea*." Having taken this sentence, they tell their readers, that it is quite natural "*such a person*" should wish for a Reform that would lead to revolution.

Gentlemen, I do not recollect any thing so bad as this, ever done, or attempted to be done, by any writer in the world.

The pamphlet, from which the extract is made, was written for the purpose, and the sole purpose, of serving my King and country, and that, too, at a time and in a place, when and where no man but myself had the zeal to write a line for such a purpose. In order to give effect to what I was writing, it was necessary for me to say something to disguise the fact, that it proceeded from an *Englishman's* pen; and, that this was the case, there needs no proof but this, that the *government* at home *caused this pamphlet to be republished in England*. Further, for having written this and other pamphlets in America, the government here made me offers of their support, which I never accepted of. Upon my return from America, those offers were renewed, but again rejected.

I received marks of approbation, *for these writings*, from all the men then in power. I dined at Mr. Windham's with Pitt, which I then thought a very great honour; and, really, when Mr. Canning looks back to the time, when I dined at his house at Putney, and when he paid me so many just compliments for my exertions in my country's cause, I can hardly think, that he must not view with some degree of shame these attempts on the part of persons, who are publicly said to write under his particular patronage. As to Mr. Windham, he has declared, in open parliament, that, for my *writings in America*, I deserved a statue of gold.

Judge you, then, of the candour, the truth, the honesty, of the *writers*, who oppose Parliamentary Reform; and, *as yet*, I have seen it opposed by no writer, who is not of this description. Judge you of the motives of such men; judge you of the nature of that cause, in support of which such means are resorted to; judge you how strong my adversaries must think me in fact, in argument, and in character, when they are driven to the employment of means like these.

I have not troubled you with this statement by the way of *complaint*; for, indeed, such things cannot fail to have a good effect, with all sensible men, and to such only do I address myself. The man, who takes upon him to write on politics, necessarily exposes himself to misrepresentations and calumnies of all sorts; especially if his object be to spoil the trade of the corrupt and the venal. It is his inevitable lot; but, he has always this consoling and encouraging reflection; that his adversaries, with a strict regard to the rules of proportion, are sure to adapt the measure of their anger to the magnitude of his success, and of their consequent dread of his future exertions. The greatest compliment that can possibly be paid to any writer, is, to answer his argument by an attack upon his person; and, the next is, that of appealing to his opinions, formerly expressed, especially under a total change of circumstances, whether as to the things themselves, or the information relating to them. This last species of attack has been made most liberal use of against me. Just as if opinions formed and expressed, when I was not much more than half as old as I now am, and when I had, in fact, had no *experience* at all, were to invalidate, or have any weight, against the arguments that I now have to offer. Because I praised Mr. Pitt, when I was in America, or upon my return, does it follow that I was to continue to praise him, after being some years a near witness of his conduct, and after having seen it proved, that he lent, without interest, 40,000*l.* of the public money, to *two members of the House of Commons*, without any authority for so doing, and even without communicating the fact to his colleagues? When I saw this come to light, and when I saw him take a *bill of indemnity* (that is, a law to *screen him from punishment*) for this, as well as for other acts of his administration: when I saw this, was I *still to praise him*? Or, if I did not, was I to be accused of *inconsistency*?

This was the drift of MR. POULTER'S personalities at Winchester, and of the handbills, which on that morning had been posted up in the inns and other places of the city, and all which *you* treated with that contempt which they so well merited.

Such attempts, when made upon men of sense, always fail of their intended effect, and are sure to recoil, with tenfold force, upon those who make use of them. Any attack upon me, if it come in a creditable shape, I am at all times ready to answer, and am *certain* that I shall beat my adversary; but, having thus exposed to your view the means by which

the enemies of Parliamentary Reform have hitherto endeavoured to excite a prejudice against one of its principal literary advocates, I shall not, hereafter, suffer the discussion to be encumbered with any thing not immediately belonging to the subject; I shall not suffer myself to be lured from the important points at issue, by any thing whatever relating personally to me.

There is one more topic, upon which I think it may be necessary to say a few words in this introductory address, and even before I come to lay down the heads and the order of the discussion. I allude to the *cry*, with which every attempt to obtain a Reform of the Parliament is, upon all occasions, met by those who have so manifest an interest in preventing such Reform. The cry is this: "What, you want a REVOLUTION, do you?" and, then they fall to a description of the horrors of the FRENCH REVOLUTION.

Gentlemen, I do not think that you, or that any part, or any one, of my readers can be so weak as to be swayed by a fallacy so palpable as this; but, it may not, upon this occasion, be amiss to give it an exposure in detail, in order to see whether those, who make use of it, have in them any remains of shame.

There was a *revolution* in France, which produced great calamities and horrors, and, therefore, we are desired to believe, that *all* revolutions must produce calamities and horrors; and this doctrine, too, is preached to us from the very same lips whence proceed endless *praises* of the revolution in England, which placed the House of Brunswick upon the throne.

Supposing, however, all political revolutions to be very mischievous; supposing all changes in the succession to thrones, in the forms of governments, in the distribution of the powers in a nation; supposing all these to be, at all times, mischievous, the supposition, though a very wild one, would not bear against the cause of Reform in Parliament, because we, who wish for that Reform, neither propose, nor wish for, *any thing new*. We want nothing but the sincere profession and the faithful observance of what is *already* the constitution of England, as laid down, and clearly laid down *in the books of our laws*. To set up against us, therefore, the cry of *revolution*, can, I am confident, have, with men of sense, no other effect than that of adding one more to the numerous proofs, which we already possess, of the insincerity of the enemies of Reform.

But, let us *patiently*, if possible, inquire a little into the grounds of the monstrous supposition, that, because confusion and bloodshed took place in France some years ago, in consequence of the changes there made, the same must take place here if a reform in the House of Commons be adopted.

What *similarity*, let me first ask, is there in the two cases? In France the government was despotic; any man could, at any time, be sent to prison, and there kept for life, without trial and without hearing; the laws were in fact made by the King's sole will, there were no juries to try causes of any sort; the feudal system was still in such vigour as to make it a crime, in many places, for people to grind their own corn or bake their own bread, being compelled to carry the materials to the mill and to the oven of the Lord of the Manor, paying him a heavy tax for the grinding or the baking. Endless would be the points of contrast; but, for our present purpose, it is quite sufficient to state merely this,

that the French had *no legislative assembly*; no body of persons, who, as to the making of laws, had any share of authority. In France, what was proposed to be effected, was a total change in the very nature of the government; the thing set about was the making of a *government of a new sort*, and, of course, taking the old one to pieces, from top to bottom. It was not therefore very wonderful, that, from the resistance of the feudal Lords as from the crown, great anger should be engendered, and deadly strife arise; and, especially when the numerous noblesse, instead of yielding their oppressive privileges, and endeavouring to assist the people with their advice, flew with eagerness to join an army of foreigners, called by them for the purpose of compelling the people to submit to their authority, and to prevent the redress of what all the world acknowledged to be grievances that no human beings ought to support, and the refusal, the obstinate refusal, to consent to any measure, which should prevent the return of which, was the cause, and the sole cause, of that sway which bloody and impious men afterwards obtained, and by the means of which sway so many foolish and wicked and cruel acts were committed. But what has all this, or any part of it, to do with our question of *Reform in Parliament*? Does that measure contemplate any one of those objects that were in the contemplation of the French? Have we any feudal Lords to whose mills and ovens we are compelled to carry our corn and our flour? Have we not juries already? Have we not laws (while we keep them *unsuspended*) which prevent arbitrary imprisonment? And, have we not Houses of Legislators, without whose consent no laws can be passed? Do we, like the French, stand in need of a change in the nature of the government; of the abolition of the old powers and the erection of new ones; and, in short, of a new sort of government, from top to bottom? You know, Gentlemen; all the world must know, that we stand in need of no such thing; and that there is not, in the whole nation, one single man, capable of obtaining half a score of adherents, who entertains so mad a notion. We, as I said before, want *nothing new*. We have no schemes or projects; all that we want is that share in the government, which the constitution gives us, and of which we think ourselves not at present in possession, owing to the abuses, which have, by degrees, crept into the Representation in Parliament. This is all we want; and, because we want this, we are accused of wishing for *Revolution*, and our adversaries, the friends of corruption, having neither fact nor argument wherewith to oppose to us, hold out to those whom they think themselves able to deceive and terrify, the "dreadful consequences of the Revolution in France," than which a more gross attempt at imposition, surely, never was made.

That this attempt will not succeed I am perfectly satisfied. I am convinced, that, sooner or later, and the sooner from the absence of every thing like *violence* or *haste*, the measure of Reform will and must be adopted. Nay, the Bill of Mr. Curwen, now before the House of Commons (and which Bill will, to all appearance, pass in that House), completely *recognises* the main principle, upon which we proceed; namely, that Seats in that House ought not to be obtained by corrupt practices, and that votes in it ought not to be paid for, either in money or in money's worth. In the introduction and entertaining of this Bill, the House itself acknowledges, *that we have good grounds of complaint on the score of representation*; the House itself acknowledges, that, to a certain extent at least, *Parliamentary Reform is necessary*; and, there-

fore, it would be full as just to accuse the House of *Revolutionary* intentions, as to prefer that accusation against us, who, out of the House, wish for that Reform.

Having endeavoured to place in a clear light the fallacy, not to give it any worse name, of the general objections, or, rather, the outcries, which have been raised against a Reform in the Representation of the People, in the House of Commons, I propose, in my succeeding letters, to discuss the following questions: I. Whether the present state of the Representation be consonant with that constitution, which has so long been the boast of Englishmen. II. What sort of Reform ought to be made. III. Whether the nation would be benefited, and, if so, in what way, by such Reform. IV. Whether the present be a proper time for making such Reform.

These, gentlemen, it appears to me, are the only questions that we have to discuss and to decide upon; and, if we discuss and decide upon them without passion, I have no hesitation to say, that your decision will be the decision of the nation, and that, at no distant day, if your acts correspond with your opinions, if you steadily and ardently, but, above all things, *steadily*, persevere, in your constitutional efforts to obtain your object, that object will be obtained.

I am,

Your friend,

Botley, 16th May, 1809.

WM. COBBETT.

TO THE

INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

(*Political Register, May, 1809.*)

LETTER III.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

Whether the present state of the Representation be consonant with the principles of that Constitution, which has so long been the boast of Englishmen?

GENTLEMEN:

I. BEFORE I proceed to the discussion of this question, suffer me, for one moment, to advert to an assertion, which has been made by more than one member of the House of Commons; namely, that the *country* does not wish for a Reform of Parliament. Precisely what these gentlemen may mean, when they say "the *country*," neither you nor I can positively tell; but, I think, it would be extremely difficult for any man to devise a method, by which to draw from a country, containing so many people as this, any thing better entitled to the appellation of the general wish, than that expression of a wish for Reform, which has now been uttered in this kingdom. It is notorious, that there is scarcely any por-

tion of the people, who may be deemed at liberty to express their opinions, who have not decidedly declared for Reform. Even in *Cornwall*, where, if any where, the cause of Reform might reasonably be expected to meet with few friends, a County Meeting, held at Bodmin on the 15th instant, resolved, "That the corruptions which have been suffered to accumulate " to so grievous an extent in this country, are to be traced to the defective state of the representation; that it is, therefore, the firm conviction of this Meeting, that a Reform in the representation of the " people in the Commons' House of Parliament, is the only effectual " corrective of existing abuses; and that the only security against future " corruptions, will be the restoring to the people that share of the " elective franchise which the public good requires, and to which they " are entitled by the principles of the British Constitution."

It is but just to the County of Cornwall, as well as to the cause of Reform, to state, which I do upon certain information, that Lord Eliot, Lord de Dunstanville, Mr. F. Gregor, Mr. F. G. Glanville, Mr. William Rashleigh, Mr. Charles Rashleigh, and several other of those, who are well known to have a deep interest in the numerous boroughs in that County, were present at the Meeting, and that, notwithstanding their opposition, the Resolutions were carried by a majority of fifty to one. It is also worthy of notice, that the Resolutions were brought forward by Mr. Colman Rashleigh, a near relation of two of the above-named gentlemen, who are well known to have the largest share in the management of the Cornish boroughs. It is further proper to state, that Lord de Dunstanville and Mr. Gregor, who took an active part in the debate, said, that they had *no objection to a vote of thanks to Mr. Wardle*; though it will be recollected, that the King's ministers, in the House of Commons, declared their resolution to oppose a vote of thanks to that gentleman, if it were brought forward. A similar declaration was, you will recollect, made by all our opponents at Winchester, which it is very material to bear in mind, because it shows, that even the supporters of the ministers have not, when they come to meet the people face to face, the courage to maintain the declarations of those ministers.

The result of this Meeting in Cornwall is a good specimen, but it is no more than a specimen, of what has passed, and is passing, in every part of the kingdom, where the people have the liberty to assemble for the purposes of political discussion; and yet, there are men, who scruple not to assert, and that, too, without the smallest reservation, that "the country" does *not* wish for a Parliamentary Reform!

II. Now, Gentlemen, in coming to the question before us, when we talk of the *Constitution*, we surely mean, that there is *something*; something *really in existence*, to which that favourite word applies? We surely have not talked and written and preached and even prayed so long about a thing, which has no existence in the world, and which is merely a creature of the imagination? Well, then, what is this *Constitution*? Fully to define it, in a short compass, would be impossible; because the definition is to be drawn from numerous usages and laws. But, a definition, quite sufficient for our present purpose, is this: that the Constitution provides, that no man shall suffer punishment, in any way, unless he be guilty of an offence known to the laws; that no man shall be held in confinement, unless upon sufficient cause being legally shown; that the dwelling, or possessions, of no man shall be entered into against his consent, unless for sufficient cause legally shown; that the property of

no man shall be taken from him, unless for just cause legally shown; that the property of no man shall be taken from him, in the way of taxes, without his consent; and that, in order that these rights and liberties may be preserved, the people shall be represented in a Commons' House of Parliament, the members of which shall be elected by the people themselves.

Such is the substance of the Constitution of England; that constitution, for which we are called upon to fight and to make pecuniary sacrifices enormous, and for which we are ready to fight and make any sacrifices that can be named.—It is easy to perceive, however, that, as far as regards the safety either of the persons or the property of the people, all must finally depend upon the state of the representation in parliament; upon the point, whether they be, or be not, in reality, represented in the Commons' House; or, in other words, whether the members of that House be, or be not, *chosen by the people*.

From *Magna Charta* down to the *Act of Settlement*, there runs through the whole of our laws, this leading principle; namely, that nothing shall be taken from the people, in taxes, *without their own consent*; and, indeed, *Magna Charta* itself was nothing more than a declaration and confirmation of what was the law of the land before. That every individual is to give his consent to a tax, when the tax is demanded of him, neither is nor ever was the notion; but, that no tax is to be levied upon any man, without the consent of the people, *given by their representatives*, in a general assembly, always was the notion, and the settled doctrine of the kingdom of England. Indeed, it is this, and this alone, which distinguishes the government of England from that of any state subject to the will of a despot; for, take away this, and we are subject immediately to lose any part of our property that those who have the sword of authority in their hands choose to take from us. Without this, the people have no check upon the Crown, or upon the Aristocracy; and, it will be easily seen, that, without this check, the sparing of even our persons must, with any ministry, be merely a question of policy.

With respect to the mode of appointing persons to represent the people, divers regulations have been made, in order to ensure the operation of probity and of good sense in this important business. With regard to the qualifications of the representatives, the description, at a more remote period, was less definite; latterly a landed qualification has been settled; but, always, it was a principle, that members of parliament should be men of substantial property, which was, of itself, a sufficient check against any thing of too democratical a cast. On the part of the people, *property* was, as, in reason, it must be, the basis of the right, or duty, to choose members of parliament; and, there could be, in remote times, no distinction as to the different sorts of property, because those who were *not freeholders* had, in fact, *no property at all*, and were merely the vassals of the barons and other great men. But, while time has completely worn away this character of vassal, and while copyholders and other owners of real property, have, as to all other purposes, become of full as much consequence as the owners of freehold land, the right, or duty, of voting, has, with regard to the counties, been perseveringly confined to the freeholders: the name of freeholder has been kept up to the utter destruction of the constitutional principle of suffrage. And, as to the boroughs, which were called upon to send representatives, they were so called upon, because they were, at the time, places of the *greatest*

trade in the kingdom, when it is notorious, that, at this time, many of them have dwindled into mere villages or hamlets, some of them containing scarcely a single house. In those times *Old Sarum* was a considerable place, and *Manchester* a place of no consideration at all; and, in order to have a striking view of the unreasonableness of still leaving to the former the choice of two members, while the latter chooses no member at all, we have only to suppose the case of calling upon *Old Sarum* to pay more in taxes than *Manchester*, because it *formerly* paid more in taxes. If such a demand were made, who would not exclaim against its injustice? Should we not hear it said, that the scythe of time had disabled *Old Sarum* from paying its ancient proportion of taxes? Well, then, shall the effect of the attacks of time furnish no argument in favour of a change in the representation, when it is found to be unanswerable in favour of a change in behalf of the places represented? To leave the choosing of members of parliament to old and decayed boroughs is as contrary to reason as it would be to expect from age and decrepitude the functions of youth. Whenever any invasion of the rights of the people has taken place, and has called forth an appeal to our ancient laws, we have been answered by the remark, that one of the great excellences of the constitution is, that it is *constantly capable of amendment*; and is it not very strange, then, that those who have thus answered us, should, as to this point, wherein the hand of time has been so manifestly destructive, refuse, and represent as an attempt at *innovation*, any proposition to alter or amend? The truth is, that to leave the choosing of members to rotten boroughs and to forty-shilling freeholders is *the innovation*; this is the innovation, and time is the innovator. The constitution makes real *property* the basis of representation in the counties, and *trade* in the towns and cities; therefore, where time has removed this basis, there is an innovation introduced; and to apprehend the destruction of the ancient fabric of the constitution from giving *Manchester* representatives instead of *Gatton* or *Old Sarum*, is just as wise as it would be to apprehend the fall of a building from the removing of a rotten pillar and putting a sound one in its stead.

III. Let us now see what has been written upon this subject by that author, to whom our adversaries, in all other cases, think proper to appeal. I mean the famous Commentator on the Law of England, Mr. BLACKSTONE, who, in 1768, when his work was first published, was a *Professor of Law* in the University of Oxford, and who, in consequence of his writing that work, was afterwards made a *Judge*. Let us who are accused of *clamour* and *factiousness*, and of *wild* notions and *chimerical* projects; let us, to get rid at once of all this, appeal to the book of Blackstone: and then let those, who defend the corruptions of parliament, and who abuse all those, who dislike those corruptions, direct their abuse towards this great legal authority.

"The *Commons*," says Blackstone, "consist of all such men of any property, in the kingdom, as have not seats in the House of Lords; every one of whom has a voice in parliament, either personally or by his representatives. In a free state, every man, who is supposed a free agent, ought to be, in some measure, his own governor; and therefore a branch, at least, of the legislative power should reside in the whole body of the people. And this power, when the territories of the state are small and its citizens easily known, should be exercised by the people in their aggregate or collective capacity, as was wisely ordained in the petty republics of Greece, and the first rudiments of the Roman state." . . . "In so large a state as ours it is very wisely con-

"trived, that the people should do that by their representatives, which it is impracticable to perform in person: representatives, chosen by a number of minute and separate districts, wherein all the voters are, or easily may be, distinguished. The counties are therefore represented by knights, elected by the proprietors of lands; the cities and boroughs are represented by citizens and burgesses, chosen by the mercantile part or supposed trading interest of the nation.".....After a description of the great powers of parliament; the unlimited and unchecked powers of that body, he proceeds thus:—"So that it is a matter most essential to the liberties of this kingdom, that such members be delegated to this important trust, as are most eminent for their probity, their fortitude, and their knowledge; for it was a known apophthegm of the great lord treasurer Burleigh, 'that England could never be ruined but by a parliament': and, as Sir Matthew Hale observes, this being the highest and greatest court, over which none other can have jurisdiction in the kingdom, if by any means a misgovernment should any way fall upon it, the subjects of this kingdom are left without all manner of remedy. To the same purpose the PRESIDENT MONTESQUIEU, though I trust too hastily, presages; that as Rome, Sparta, and Carthage have lost their liberty and perished, so the constitution of England will in time lose its liberty, will perish: it will perish, whenever the legislative power shall become more corrupt than the executive.".....

"With regard to taxes: it is the ancient, indisputable privilege and right of the House of Commons, that all grants of subsidies or parliamentary aids do begin in their House, and are first bestowed by them; although their grants are not effectual to all intents and purposes, until they have the assent of the other two branches of the legislature. The general reason, given for this exclusive privilege of the House of Commons, is, that the supplies are raised upon the body of the people, and, therefore, it is proper that they alone should have a right of taxing themselves. This reason would be unanswerable, if the Commons taxed none but themselves: but it is notorious, that a very large share of property is in the possession of the House of Lords; that this property is equally taxable, and taxed, as the property of the Commons; and, therefore, the Commons not being the sole persons taxed, this cannot be the reason of their having the sole right of raising and modelling the supply. The true reason, arising from the spirit of our constitution, seems to be this: The lords being a permanent and hereditary body, created at pleasure by the King, are supposed more liable to be influenced by the Crown, and when once influenced to continue so, than the Commons, who are a temporary elective body, freely nominated by the people. It would therefore be extremely dangerous, to give them any power of framing new taxes for the subject."

That is to say, it would be *extremely dangerous* to give a power of taxing the people to any persons liable to be under the influence of the Crown.

He next comes to the qualifications demanded of the electors; and, from his account of this part of the constitution, it will be easily seen, what is now wanted in order to restore the spirit of that constitution.

"The true reason of requiring any qualification, with regard to property, in voters, is to exclude such persons as are in so mean a situation that they are esteemed to have no will of their own. If these persons had votes, they would be tempted to dispose of them under some undue influence or other. This would give a great, an artful, or a wealthy man, a larger share in elections than is consistent with general liberty. If it were probable that every man would give his vote freely, and without influence of any kind, then, upon the true theory and genuine principles of liberty, every member of the community, however poor, should have a vote in electing those delegates, to whose charge is committed the disposal of his property, his liberty, and his life. But since that can hardly be expected in persons of indigent fortunes, or such as are under the immediate dominion of others, all popular states have been obliged to establish certain qualifications; whereby some, who are suspected to have no will of their own, are excluded from voting, in order to set other individuals, whose wills may be supposed independent, more thoroughly upon a level with each other.".....

"The knights of the shires are to be chosen of people dwelling in the same counties; whereof every man shall have a freehold to the value of forty shillings by the year within the county; which, by subsequent statutes, is to be clear of all charges and deductions, except parliamentary and parochial taxes. The knights of shires, are the representatives of the *landholders* or *landed interest*, of the kingdom, their electors must therefore have estates in lands or tenements, within the county represented: these estates must be freehold, that is, for a term of life at least; because beneficial leases for long terms of years were not in use at the making of these statutes, and copyholders were *then little better than villains*, absolutely dependent upon their lord: this freehold must be of forty shillings annual value; because that sum would, *then*, with proper industry, furnish all the necessaries of life, and render the freeholder, if he pleased, an *independent man*.....
 As for the electors of citizens and burgesses, these are supposed to be the mercantile part or trading interest of this kingdom. But as trade is of a fluctuating nature, and seldom long fixed in a place, it was formerly left to the crown to summon *pro re nata* the most flourishing towns to send representatives to parliament. So that, as towns increased in trade, and grew populous, they were admitted to a share in the legislature. But the misfortune is, that the deserted boroughs continued to be summoned, as well as those to whom their trade and inhabitants were transferred."

He next comes to the qualifications and disqualifications of representatives.—"That in strictness, all members ought to be inhabitants of the places for which they are chosen: but this is entirely disregarded. That no persons concerned in the management of any duties or taxes created since 1692, except the commissioners of the treasury, nor any of the officers following (namely, commissioners of prizes, transports, sick and wounded, wine licenses, navy and victualling; secretaries or receivers of prizes; comptrollers of the army accounts; agents for regiments; governors of plantations and their deputies; officers of Minorca or Gibraltar; officers of the excise and customs; clerks or deputies in the several offices of the treasury, exchequer, naval, victualling, admiralty, pay of the army or navy, secretaries of state, salt, stamps, appeals, wine licenses, hackney-coaches, hawkers, and pedlars), nor any persons that hold any new office under the crown created since 1705, are capable of being elected members. That no person having a pension under the crown during pleasure, or for any term of years, is capable of being elected. That if any member accepts an office under the crown, except an officer in the army or navy accepting a new commission, his seat is void; but such member is capable of being re-elected;" which latter, it must be observed, is in consequence of an act, made to repeal a part of the act, which placed the King's family upon the throne of England.

I conclude with what he says about the value of really free elections: "It is essential to the *very being of parliament*, that elections should be *absolutely free*; therefore, all undue influences upon the electors are illegal, and strongly prohibited. For Mr. Locke ranks it among those *breaches of trust* in the executive magistrate, which according to his notions, amount to a *dissolution of the government*, 'if he employs the force, treasure and officers of the society to corrupt the representatives, or openly to pre-engage the electors, and prescribe what manner of persons shall be chosen. For thus to regulate candidates and electors, and new model the ways of election, what is it,' says he, 'but to cut up the government by the roots, and poison the very fountain of public security?'"

Such, gentlemen, is BLACKSTONE'S description of the Constitution of England, as far as relates to the composition of the House of Commons, and to the share which the people ought to have in the composing of that House. Let us, then, see how the *fact* squares with this description; let us ask ourselves, whether that which Blackstone says *ought* to be the state of things, in this respect, really *is* the state of things at this present time; or, in other words, whether we *now have* that constitution, which the friends of corruption accuse us of a desire to destroy.

Have all men of property (except the peers) a voice in parliament, either personally or by their representatives?

Is there a branch of the legislative power, which resides wholly in the people?

Are the county members elected by the proprietors of the land?

Are the borough members elected by the mercantile or trading interests of the nation?

Are the members of the House of Commons persons most eminent for their probity, their fortitude, or their knowledge?

Has there *never*, by any means, a misgovernment fallen upon that House?

Do the people really, by their representatives, tax themselves?

Is the qualification for voters such as to exclude persons in so mean a situation, that they are esteemed to have no will of their own, and are liable to be tempted to dispose of their votes under some undue influence or other?

Is the income of forty shillings a year now sufficient to render the freeholder an independent man?

Are placemen and pensioners excluded from seats in the House of Commons; or, do the people really acquire the right of choosing them anew after they have accepted of places?

Are elections absolutely free, which Blackstone avers to be essential to the very being of parliament?

And finally, *is* the force or treasure, or *are* the offices, of the society, *never* employed to corrupt the representatives, or openly to pre-engage the electors, and prescribe what manner of persons shall be chosen?

IV. Leaving it to you, Gentlemen, to answer these questions, I shall now proceed to state certain undeniable facts, appertaining to this subject; and then I shall leave you to draw your own conclusions, and to decide the question, whether a reform of the House of Commons be, or be not, necessary.

The FIRST of these facts is, That, in the year 1793, a petition was presented to the House of Commons, by CHARLES GREY, Esq. (now Earl Grey), in which petition it was, amongst other things, stated, that *one hundred and fifty-four individuals* did, by their patronage (or unlawful influence), send *three hundred and seven* members to the House of Commons, forming, of course, a decided majority of the 558 members of which the House then consisted; and that the petitioners were ready to prove this at the bar of the House.

SECOND: That, in the said petition, the petitioners declared, that they had the most reasonable grounds to suspect, that no less than *one hundred and fifty* of the members of the Commons' House, owed their elections entirely to the *interference of Peers*.

THIRD: That the statute law declares, that Peers *shall not interfere* in the election of any member of the Commons' House.

FOURTH : That, for many years past, seats in the House of Commons have been publicly advertised for sale.

FIFTH : That, on the 10th of December, 1779, the House of Commons passed a resolution in these words : " That it is *highly criminal* for any Minister or Ministers, or any other servant of the Crown in Great Britain, *directly or indirectly*, to make use of the power of his office, *in order to influence the election of Members of Parliament*, and that an attempt to exercise that influence was an attack upon the *dignity, the honour, and the independence* of Parliament, an infringement of the *rights and the liberties* of the people, and an *attempt to sap the basis of our free and happy Constitution.*"

SIXTH : That on the 25th of April last, the following resolutions were, by LORD ARCHIBALD HAMILTON, moved in the House of Commons : " 1. That it appears to the House, from the evidence on the table, that Lord Visc. Castlereagh, in the year 1805, shortly after he had quitted the situation of President of the Board of Control, and being a Privy Councillor and Secretary of State, did place at the disposal of Lord Clancarty, a member of the same Board, the nomination to a writer-ship, in order to *facilitate his procuring a seat in Parliament.*—2. That it was owing to a disagreement among the subordinate parties, that this transaction did not take effect ; and—3. That by this conduct Lord Castlereagh had been guilty of a gross violation of his duty as a servant of the Crown ; an abuse of his patronage as President of the Board of Control ; and an attack upon the purity of that House ;" which resolutions were *rejected* by the House.

SEVENTH : That, upon the same day, and upon the same occasion, the House passed a resolution in substance as follows : " That while it was *the bounden duty of that House to maintain at all times a jealous guard upon its purity*, and not to suffer any attempt upon its privileges to pass unnoticed, the attempt in the present instance (that of Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Reding), *not having been carried into effect*, that House did not think it then necessary to proceed to any criminatory resolutions respecting the same."

EIGHTH : That, on the 11th of the present month of May, MR. MADDOCKS made, in the House of Commons, a charge in substance as follows : " I affirm, then, that MR. DICK *purchased a seat in the House of Commons* for the borough of Cashel, through the agency of the Honourable HENRY WELLESLEY, *who acted for, and on behalf of, the Treasury* : that, upon a recent question of the last importance, when Mr. DICK had determined to vote according to his conscience, the noble Lord, CASTLEREAGH, did intimate to that gentleman the necessity of either his *voting with the government, or resigning his seat in that House* ; and that Mr. Dick, sooner than vote against principle, did make choice of the latter alternative, and vacate his seat accordingly. To this transaction I charge the Right Honourable Gentleman, MR. PERCEVAL, *as being privy and having connived at it*. This I will *engage to prove* by witnesses at your bar, if the House will give me leave to call them."

NINTH : That, at the end of a long debate upon this subject, the question was taken upon a motion FOR AN INQUIRY into the matter ; that there appears from the report of the proceedings, published in the papers, to have been 395 members present ; that, out of the 395, only 85 voted

for the motion, which, of course, was lost, there being 310, out of the 395, who VOTED AGAINST THE MOTION FOR INQUIRY.

TENTH : That, in the year 1802, this same Mr. PERCEVAL, being then Attorney-General, prosecuted PHILIP HAMLIN, a tinman of Plymouth, for having committed the crime of offering Mr. Addington 2,000*l.*, to give him a place in the custom-house ; that, upon this occasion, Mr. Perceval demanded judgment upon the said Hamlin, for the sake of *public justice* ; and that the Judge, after expatiating upon the " incalculable mischief," to which such crimes must naturally lead, sentenced the said Hamlin to pay a fine of a hundred pounds to the King, and to be imprisoned for three calendar months.

ELEVENTH : That in the year 1805, evidence was taken before a Committee of the House of Commons, and was laid before that House, proving that the late minister, PITT, had lent, without the consent or knowledge of Parliament, and without the consent or knowledge of any council of the King, 40,000*l.* of the public money (without any interest paid to the public) to two members of the then House of Commons ; and that, when this matter was brought before the House, in 1805, no censure whatever was passed on the said minister, but he was, by a bill of indemnity, secured from any punishment for having in such way employed the money of the public.

TWELFTH : That, it appears from a report, laid before the House of Commons, in the month of June last, in consequence of a motion made by Lord Cochrane, that there then were, in that House, seventy-eight placemen and pensioners, who, though part of what they receive is not stated, are, in the said report, stated to receive 178,994*l.* a year out of the public money.

Now, Gentlemen, to these facts, and to many, many others (others too numerous to state, even in the most brief manner), which might be added to them, I shall not subjoin a single word by way of comment. I wish to avoid every thing like high colouring ; every thing like declamation ; every thing calculated to rouse any angry passion in your breasts ; I wish to avoid even persuasion ; I wish to lay the state of the case fairly and clearly before you, and to leave the decision to the intelligence and the rectitude of your own minds. Those of you, who, notwithstanding what has been here stated, may be of opinion, that the present state of the representation in parliament is consonant with the principles of the Constitution of England, will of course see no justifiable cause for any reform in that representation ; but, those of you, who may think with me, that the present state of the representation is *not* consonant with those admirable principles, will, I trust, be disposed to follow me in my next letter, into an inquiry respecting *what sort of reform* it would be just and prudent to adopt. I am, your friend,

Botley, May 24th, 1809.

WM. COBBETT.

" ELEMENTS OF REFORM."

THERE has been published, in London, a pamphlet under this title, and under the name of " Mr. WILLIAM COBBETT," as the author. It consists of passages from my writings, *against reform* and *against reformers* ; and, the object of it is, to counteract, by the publication

of these passages, the effect of what I am now writing in *favour* of reform.

That the compilers of such a work should include those passages from the different parts of my works, wherein I have candidly confessed the *error*, under which I wrote what they have selected for publication; that such persons should do this is not to be expected; nor is it to be expected from them to make even fair extracts as far as they go. They have, as might be reasonably expected, garbled every thing that they have touched.

But, while I am very certain, that their publication will wholly fail of its object; while I am certain, that no one will think me bound to praise John Bowles *now*, because I praised him in 1800, when I must almost necessarily be, and when I really was, totally ignorant of what I have since learnt respecting the subject of his writings, as well as respecting his too evident motives; while I am certain, that no one, who has a grain of sense, will think me bound *now* to censure Sir Francis Burdett, because I did severely censure him at a time when I acted under a total misrepresentation of his principles and his character; while I am certain, that no man of common sense, or common honesty, will think me bound to deprecate a reform of Parliament *now*, because I did deprecate it at a time when I had never known that seats were advertised for sale, and when I had never seen, or dreamt of the possibility of, any thing like what has now come to light and has been proved respecting the House of Commons; while I am certain that the nation, who, with far better opportunities of knowing the truth, were full as much deceived as I was, and whose change of opinion has kept pace with mine, will not think me *now* bound to applaud a system of politics, war, and finance, of which it was terrified into an approbation ten years ago, and all the mischiefs of which we have since seen exposed; while I am certain, that none but very weak persons indeed will think any man bound to praise any thing after he has discovered it to be unworthy of the praise that he once bestowed on it; while I am certain of all this, I cannot refrain from observing *how favourable a symptom this publication is to the cause of Reform*; how strong an indication it is of the fear, which the friends of corruption entertain, of the effects of that discussion, upon which they perceive me to have seriously entered. In America, my opponents, who were very numerous, and who had far greater talents than the persons with whom I have now to contend, were driven to a somewhat similar expedient. The public, after having been surfeited with their pamphlets against me, would read no more; when, what did these opponents do? Why, what has now been done here: they published pamphlets *under my name*, and then, for a time at least, they found them *sell*. There were several booksellers at a time living upon my name; actually buying bread and cheese with it. I used to urge the injustice of their not giving me a share; and, really, I think, that the gentlemen here are liable to the same charge; for, not one of them has offered me the smallest acknowledgment. If the public will not read books unless they have my name to them, I think it is but just, that I should have some small part in the gains. I shall be content with less than a Dutch-Commissioner's profit; but something I certainly ought to have.

That those, with whom this pamphlet *originates*, wish, by the publication, to injure the cause of Reform there can be little doubt; and, I think, that there can be as little, that they are, in this effort, counter-

acting their own wish. For, in the first place, their flying to my former opinions as affording a contrast to those which I now entertain, upon this subject, is a pretty good proof that they have neither fact nor argument, whereon to meet me upon the merits of the case. In the next place, the errors, which they expose, and which have, long ago, been distinctly confessed by me, only serve to show, in the strongest possible light, how completely I was deceived, and, thereby, to form an apology for the change of opinion in others. All we want is, as Major Cartwright has said, *discussion*; discussion is what these gentlemen are assisting with all their might; and, if they have but a moderate share of discernment, I should think that the *great sale*, which their pamphlet is said to have, must leave upon their minds the mortifying conviction of the popularity of the "*Elements of Reform, by Mr. Wm. Cobbett*;" for, from this title, it is not a work *against*, but in *favour* of Reform, that the public think they are buying. They think it is a *new* work; a work containing what I have written at *the present time*; and by adopting such a title and taking my name, the publishers themselves confess, that that matter and that name stand high in the public estimation. The publishers are very cautious, in their advertisements, to let fall nothing *hostile* to me; because they know, that by so doing they would injure their sale; and, it is truly curious to see the *COURIER* and even the *MORNING POST* trumpeting forth the praises of a *Work on Reform, "by Mr. Wm. Cobbett,"* the effect of which must be this: that all those, who do not read the pamphlet, will look upon those papers as having become converts to my doctrine; while on the other hand, the pamphlet will have no effect at all upon those who do read it, because they have already read my confession of the errors, which it contains.

The doctrine of *consistency*, as now in vogue, is the most absurd that ever was broached. It teaches, that, if you once think well of any person or thing, you must always think well of that person or thing, whatever changes may take place either in them, or in the state of your information respecting them. For instance, if you praise a man to-day, and, to-morrow, receive proof of his having long been a thief, you must still continue to praise him. Where is the man, who has not changed his opinions of men as well as of things? Those who write every day, or every week, must express what they think at the time; but, if new sources of information open to them, they must express what they *then* think, and not with any regard to what they have given as their opinion before.

But, how would this doctrine suit my opponents, if I were to attempt to hold them to? If I am to say, to some of the friends of corruption, "You used to praise me, and why do you not praise me now?" they would, doubtless, answer: "Oh! but, you *then* wrote to please us; and *now* you do not. Owing to your ignorance of us and our views, we *then* were objects of your applause, and *now* we are objects of your *censure.*" To be sure, nothing could be more reasonable than this. There is nothing at all *inconsistent* in it; but, then, the argument is just as good for me as it is for them.

The truth is, that, as to opinions, no man is to be blamed for a change, except there be strong reason to conclude that the change has proceeded from a *bad motive*; or, rather, that it is not a real, but a pretended change, for the purpose of something selfish or wicked. This is the case, when we see men change their opinions upon exchanging no

offices, for offices under the crown ; when they have one set of principles for *out of place*, and another set of principles for *in place*. Now, nothing of this sort can possibly be imputed to me ; and, in short, it is quite impossible to make any man of sense believe, that the change in my opinions has proceeded from any other cause than that of a sincere conviction, that, in my former opinions, I was wrong.

I am not very anxious to make an apology for the errors of my former opinions ; but, surely, without attributing to myself any very extraordinary want of discernment, those errors, when my then peculiar situation is considered, stand in need of nothing by way of excuse. When John Bowles said, " My attachment to the British Monarchy, and to the " reigning family, is rooted in my heart's core ; my anxiety for the " British throne, pending the dangers to which, in common with every " other throne, it has lately been exposed, has embittered my choicest " comforts ; and I most solemnly vow, before Almighty God, to devote " myself, to the end of my days, to the maintenance of that throne : " when John Bowles said this, I praised John Bowles ; but, must I praise him *now* ?

I have been told, that the King, when he visited Cuffnells in 1804 (and which, in my opinion, he ought not to have been advised to visit), said, the moment he entered the house, "*Where is MY FRIEND Cobbett's paper ?*" This was told to me, not long ago, by one, who, I thought, appeared to think it necessary to remind me of my duty to the King. But, in what instance have I ever shown a want of a due sense of that duty ? When have I ever hinted, that the royal office and authority were not essential to the happiness and even to the *liberty* of the people ? When have I expressed a wish hostile to the King's person, authority, prerogatives, or family ? When have I, as these pamphlet compilers would insinuate, expressed any opinion which could justify the inference, that I wished for the predominance of a mob, or the degradation of royalty or aristocracy ? The truth is, that I have been constantly labouring to prevent the degradation of both ; and if either has been degraded, it is because my labours have, with respect to them, been unavailing. If I ever did merit the honour of being, by the King himself, called *his friend*, I now merit that honour more than at any former period ; because I have now told him *truths*, which nobody else would tell him, and to know which truths is of far more importance to him than the support of all the tribe, who have the insolence to give themselves the exclusive appellation of *King's Friends* ; and who, in an hour of danger to his person or his throne, would, as all the sycophants of the Continent have done, desert him, while, I trust, I should be found ready to hazard my life in his defence. There is no man, in this country, who shall read what I am now writing, that will not acknowledge, that he has a thousand times heard it observed, that " there is *no knowing what may happen*," upon an event which we all hope may be distant, but, which we are all sure must, in the course of nature, take place. I put it to the reader, *whether this be not a subject of general anxiety ?* Whether he be acquainted with *one considerate man*, who does not partake in this anxiety ? Is it not, therefore, for those, who really wish for the stability of the kingly government, and for the unimpaired authority of the King and his successors, to use their best endeavours to see things settled upon a solid foundation, *before the event alluded to takes place ?* It surely is ; and, as I am one of those, who think that the only means of obtaining that solidity is to give the people

confidence in their Representatives, and thereby reconcile them to their sacrifices, I wish for a Reform of the Commons' House of Parliament.

Nothing, to me, at least, can be more evident than this: that, to ensure the stability of the throne, a Reform in the House of Commons is absolutely necessary. The people, if fairly and fully represented, would grudge nothing to the King or to his family; and, indeed, that which has recently given so much anxiety and pain to the royal family, may be clearly traced to the same source, whence all the other heart-burnings may be traced. Those, who have dealt in parliamentary seats, always make common cause with the King; always drag him into the party with them, by accusing their opponents of being *his* enemies; when the fact manifestly is, that the King's legitimate authority, his dignity and his just prerogatives, suffer by such dealings as much as the rights and liberties of the people suffer by them.

There is something in the heart of every man, which impels him to desire, that the person, whom he acknowledges as his *sovereign*, should be clothed with dignity; and, does it not naturally follow, that it must be mortifying to a sensible and honourable people, to see the authority of the King cramped and thwarted by the owners of Boroughs? If, agreeably to the principles of the constitution, the people were represented; if they had nothing to complain of upon this score; never would they wish to interfere with the prerogatives of the King. They love kingly government; and they grudge the King and his family nothing in the way of splendour. It is notorious, that *royal economy* is no favourite virtue with them. But they love their own rights and liberties, without which nothing will make them heartily contented.

Look at the *Pension* and *Sinecure* Lists, those lists which create so much well-grounded complaint. Look at the persons, upon whom the public money is heaped. This, observe, is all done in the name of *the King*. Is this doing justice to the King? Is it doing justice to his present Majesty to hold him forth to his people as having, for instance, bestowed *one thousand five hundred pounds a year* of their money upon *Mrs. Fox*? Will any man deny, that it would be an act the most friendly to the King to set him free from that, the existence of which, and of which alone, could have induced him to put his royal signature to such a grant? Is there a man in the whole kingdom, who can believe, that the King *cheerfully* put his signature to that grant? Yet, he is held forth to his people as having been the author of it; as having made such a grant, in the virtue of a power given him by the constitution for the purpose of supporting the *honour* and *dignity* of his throne!

It is worthy of remark that each party, when out of power, complain of "the *influence of the CROWN*;" of the vast sums of money, and the great number of offices, which "the *CROWN*" has in its gift. This is a very convenient notion to be inculcated by those, who can dispose of seats, and who can force ministers upon the King. To them it is very convenient to represent all that the people dislike as proceeding from the royal will, and, of course, to cause it to be believed, that, in order to get rid of such grants as that to *Mrs. Fox*, and such concerns as those of the *Dutch Commissioners*, we must first get rid of the King, which they know the people would think of with horror. The *borough* influence they never wish us to look at; but, can any man believe that, if it had not been for that *influence*, the present King would not have

driven from his presence the man, who had such a disregard for the feelings of both King and people as to propose the grant to Mrs. Fox?

Now, by way of illustration, suppose the King had spurned at this proposition. The consequence would have been the going out of the ministry, who, upon such a point, would, in all probability, have retained their majority in the House. But, upon the supposition that the free voice of his people had been appealed to, would not they, by their choice of members, have expressed their gratitude to him for his care of their interest and their honour?

That man, therefore, is the real friend of the King, of his family, his office and dignity, who would free them, for ever, from all influence of this sort; who would leave the King unencumbered with any influence, other than that of the advice of his constitutional counsellors, to make such appointments and grant such favours as he himself should choose; and, I am persuaded, that if what I am now writing should ever reach the ear of his Majesty, he will, upon a due consideration of the matter, still call me, as he is said to have done at Cuffnells, his "*friend Cobbett*."

TO THE

INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

(*Political Register*, June, 1809.)

LETTER IV.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

What Sort of Reform ought to be made?

GENTLEMEN:

I. In stating the question, which we now have to discuss, it is impossible to overlook the circumstance, that there is *one sort of reform* now on foot; that it is now actually before the House of Commons; and, which is, in a most distinguished degree, worthy of your attention, this measure has been entertained, has been kindly received, nursed and dandled, rocked, swathed, and pap-fed by. . . . *whom?* Why, by those very persons, who voted against censure upon Castlereagh, on the motion relating to his offer to swap a writership for a seat; yes, by those persons, who, when Mr. Madocks distinctly charged Castlereagh, Henry Wellesley, and Perceval (the Tinman's prosecutor), with trafficking in a seat; those persons, who, upon this occasion, voted 310 to 85, that there should be *no inquiry*; and many of whom openly avowed, that the thing was not only common, not only in general use by all ministers, but a thing perfectly proper. Well, now mark, that these persons, on both sides of the House, *approve* of Mr. CURWEN'S bill;* and, when you con-

* See Parliamentary Debates, May 26, 1809.—ED.

sider what their conduct was upon Mr. Madocks's motion,* you will easily guess *what they expect from this bill.*

II. This consideration alone furnishes a pretty good presumptive proof, that Mr. Curwen's bill is not at all calculated to answer any useful purpose; to contribute, even in the smallest degree, towards the checking of those manifold corruptions, and that waste of the public money, under which the nation is now suffering so much disgrace and misery. But, we will not let off this bill so lightly; it requires to be fully exposed; for, under the garb of "a reform," it tends, in my opinion, to the prolonging, if not perpetuating, the traffic in parliamentary seats, and of course, all those infamous bargains, by which the blood as well as the treasure of the nation become the object of barter. Before, however, we proceed to an examination into the proposed provisions of this bill; before we proceed to inquire, whether *this* be the *sort* of reform that is wanted, it is quite necessary for us to trace the progress of this reforming bill; for, in that progress we shall clearly discover, what the 310, who voted against Mr. Madocks's motion, expect from this bill.

III. This bill was introduced *before* Mr. MADOCKS made his motion; but, when leave was given to bring in the bill, Mr. MADOCKS had *given notice of his motion.*

Now, mark: the bill has leave to be brought in; and, when Mr. Madocks makes his motion, he is told to wait, and *see what effect Mr. Curwen's bill will produce.* But, Mr. Madocks's motion having been got over; "a stand" having been made, the two factions seemed determined to throw out the bill altogether; or, at most, to let it go no further than just to get into a committee. This was pretty plainly expressed in the debate of the 26th of May, upon the motion for going into a committee. But, during that debate, corruption received an assault, which appeared to have shaken its nerves. In that debate Sir Francis Burdett expressly denied, that *that House was the Commons' House of Parliament*; he distinctly said, "This House is *not* now the *Commons of England in Parliament assembled*;" and that he would never again call it so. This speech, which, from beginning to end, was well calculated for the purpose, appears to have excited much sensibility in the SPEAKER, who, after all the other intimations usual upon such occasions, actually called Sir Francis *to order.* Lord Archibald Hamilton having observed, that, "by the openly avowed and defended corruptions, the House itself *appeared to have disclaimed its title,*" the SPEAKER replied: "It is my duty to call any member to order, who affirms, *that this is not the House of Commons*; and I will do it as long as the House *will support me in it.*" Sir Francis resumed with a statement of his reasons for not calling that assembly the House of Commons, which statement was, in a very pointed manner, addressed to the Speaker.

There can be no doubt, that it was *this speech*, which produced, in the mind of the Speaker, a resolution to break through general custom, and to deliver his sentiments, not upon Mr. Curwen's bill, but upon the avowals and doctrines to which he had lately been obliged to listen, and which he appears to have been convinced must, if suffered to stand as the avowals and doctrines of the House, produce, in a short time, an universal persuasion of the worse-than-uselessness of that House.

* See Parliamentary Debates, May 11, 1809.—ED.

Therefore, when the House went into a Committee, on the 1st of June, and, of course, gave the SPEAKER an opportunity of delivering his sentiments, he made that Speech,* which, in the newspaper reports, has been read with great interest by all ranks of people.

A new turn has thus been given to the fortunes of Mr. Curwen's bill. The seat-merchants and stand-makers appear to have become less audacious; and, according to present appearances, the bill, with various modifications, will finally pass.

But, what is well worthy of notice here, is, how completely the Speaker justifies all that we have said against the practice of selling seats; against the wretches concerned in such traffic; and as to the mischievous consequences that must arise from it. When, on the ever-memorable 12th of May (it was *morning* when the division took place), the House by a majority of 310 against 85, declared, that there should be *no inquiry*, though Mr. Madocks *distinctly charged* three members of the House with having been concerned in the *sale of a seat*; upon that occasion, there was heard, from all quarters and corners of the House, the exclamation, "A stand! a stand!" "It is," exclaimed many voices at once, "*high time to make a stand against popular encroachment*;" just, of course, as if the *people* were guilty of *insolence* in coming, by one of their representatives, to complain, that seats were bought and sold. But what says the Speaker? The Speaker has seen much and read more about proceedings in parliament; but, he had never either seen or heard of any thing like *what he saw and heard*, during the night of the eleventh and the morning of the 12th of May last, and which I wish, with all my soul, the whole of the people of England could have *seen and heard*; for, if they could, there would be no *writing* necessary about Parliamentary Reform. Conviction would have been, at once, imbibed from a sight of *actions*, such as will never be forgotten, by those who were witnesses of them. What says the Speaker? Does he talk of a *stand* against popular encroachment? Does he avow the practice of seat-selling, and say that it makes a part of the Constitution? Does he say, with Mr. WINDHAM and Mr. GEORGE JOHNSTONE, that the selling of seats was a thing carried on amongst our ancestors to a greater extent than amongst us? No: he says, "That it is a proposition, at the sound of which our ancestors would have *startled with indignation*." We have heard the avowal with indignation; and, because we have, in our several meetings, expressed that indignation, we have, by this same House of Commons, been called *factionous rabble*. The Speaker, as to this point, has now spoken to the House the sentiments of the people. He has gone full as far as any of us, upon this subject of complaint; and, it is no wonder, that his hearers were, as it is said they were, thunderstruck at his speech, which speech, as to its allegations, was quite equal to any speech of Mr. Madocks.

IV. Now, as to the probable *effect* of this bill of Mr. Curwen's, for the passing of which bill the Speaker appears to have been so anxious, my opinion has already been stated, that it will be *no reform* at all; that it will only serve the corrupt crew as a pretence for *having made* a "*moderate reform*;" and that, unless care be taken to watch, detect, and expose the measure in its progress, it will become a source of much deception and mischief.

* See Parliamentary Debates, June 1, 1809.—Ed.

The Speaker, after expressing his indignation at the doctrine, that it was right for seats in parliament to be bought and sold like stalls in Smithfield; after dwelling upon the profligacy of the open avowal of the long existence of that, for having asserted the existence of which so many men have suffered fine, imprisonment, and pillory; after having reprobated the acknowledged existence of that, for endeavouring to accomplish what would have remedied which, Palmer, Muir, and Gerald were sent to Botany Bay, and Tooke and Hardy were tried for high treason; after having expressed his horror of the conduct of those, who had openly and unblushingly acknowledged, that it had been common for the ministers (to whichever party belonging) to buy and sell seats in parliament, and to bargain for the votes of those members, to whom the said seats were sold; after telling the House, what a scandal this was to the parliament and the country, how directly in violation of every principle of the constitution, the Speaker said distinctly, that, to buy or sell a seat in parliament was, and always had been, *an offence at common law*. Well, then, does not Castlereagh, Henry Wellesley, and Perceval (the Tinman's prosecutor), stand charged, by Mr. Madocks, of this offence? And have not the House refused to inquire into the matter? Are not these things notorious? And, is not this a pretty good beginning in the way of reform? Have we not great reason to repose confidence in those, who voted against that inquiry? Must not Mr. Curwen's bill, which *they* approve of, be a fine thing for *us*? They, several of them, repeatedly declared, that, supposing what Mr. Madocks charged against Castlereagh and Perceval to be true, to the full extent, *they should not think the worse of them for it*. Must not Mr. Curwen's bill be, then, a very pretty *sort of reform*, seeing that these same persons like it very well?

But, let us now come to its provisions. What is its professed *immediate* object? It is this: *to prevent, in future, the sale of seats in the House of Commons*. And what is its ultimate object? *to prevent the members from voting away the people's money, in order that they themselves may pocket a share of it*.

This, turn the question about and about as long as you please, is the main object, which every man of sense has in view, when he talks of a reform in parliament. The House of Commons, according to the constitution, are the people's stewards; the guardians of the national purse; and, what is complained of in the House, as it now stands, is, that many of the members, many of the guardians of the people's purse, do receive into their own pockets, money voted by them out of that purse.

While this is the case, we, who wish for a reform in parliament, think it downright nonsense to talk of a *representation of the people*; and Mr. Curwen, apparently in the hope of checking the evil, proposes a bill, which, as he seems to think, will prevent the actual *sale of seats*, or the *exchange of them for offices under the government*. This he proposes to do by *oaths* and *penalties*. Members are to swear, that they have given no money for their seats, and seat-sellers are to swear that they have made no bargain for any office or title, for any seat placed at the disposition of the minister.

Now, for my part, I am convinced that the Oath, if taken, would have no other effect than that of excluding some few men of fortune and of good intentions, who might otherwise get in by means of their money; for, can any man believe, that the miscreant who should enter the

House of Commons with the sole view of turning his vote to a good account, with the sole view of selling the sound of his voice, or of saving his forfeit carcass from the hands of a swindled and justly enraged creditor; can any man, who has not taken leave of his senses, believe, for one moment, that such a miscreant, if such an one should be found, would hesitate to take Mr. Curwen's, or any other, *oath* that could be tendered to him?

But, does not the Reader see how many ways would and must offer for the evading of any such oath? It would be impossible so to frame a law as to stop up all the crevices that an ingenious rogue would discover. We have already about one hundred and twenty statutes, made for the express purpose of preventing what it is now proposed to prevent; and, they have all been found to be ineffectual. Nay, the Speaker himself tells us, that the thing now to be put a stop to is already an offence at Common Law; and, if *prosecutions* do not *now* take place against those, who are charged with having committed offences of this sort, what reason have we to suppose, that any law, now to be passed, will, by this same House of Commons, be caused to have effect? If there is to be no punishment for the *past*, why should there be any for the *future*? Many members of the House expressly declared, that they did not think the worse of the ministers for their having been concerned in selling a seat in parliament, supposing the charge to be true; and, what are we to expect, then, from an *oath* intended to prevent the traffic in seats?

After all, however, the Oath, supposing it to be adopted, and supposing it never to be taken falsely, would not answer, it appears to me, any useful purpose.

What we want is, a House composed of members having interests and feelings in common with *the whole mass of the people of property*; and, how are we to have this as long as an individual returns, of his own will, several members to the House of Commons; and as long as nine tenths of the people of property have no share whatever in returning members to that House?

Mr. Grey's Petition stated, that *one hundred and fifty-four individuals* returned *three hundred and seven* members to the House of Commons. This is a notorious fact; and, Mr. Curwen's Oath, supposing it to have all the effect that can *possibly be wished* for from it, does not pretend to go one inch towards the removal of this evil. All that it professes to do; nay, all that the Speaker himself seemed to hope for from this bill was, that it would cause seats to be *given* in cases where they are now *sold*. He talks of the shame of carrying the seats to a market amongst *strangers*; but appears to have no objection at all to their being given to *relations* or *friends*.

We will first see how far Mr. Curwen's Oath would be likely to answer the Speaker's purpose, and then we will see how his purpose would square with the interests of the nation.

V. Now, for instance, I, in 1802, saw a *Doctor of Divinity*, who had two seats in the House of Commons to dispose of, at that general election. The Doctor, who had come to London for the purpose, said, in my presence, that his intention was to exchange his seats with the minister for some dignity, or something good, in the church. Whether the swap actually took place, or not, I cannot say; but, such was the reverend trader's intention.

Now, supposing such an intention to have been carried into execution,

supposing the Doctor to have been made a Dean, or a Bishop, and supposing the ministers to have *given* the seats to two of their own tribe, would not these two have taken the oath very safely? Neither the lay minister nor the divine Doctor would have been sworn. They would have had no oath tendered them relative to the transaction; and yet, is it possible to form an idea of any transaction more corrupt, more disgraceful to the parliament, or more injurious to the people?

Suppose the owner of any borough wishes to sell his seats. He offers them to the treasury, and he gets so much money for them, it being, in such a case, by no means difficult to see *whom* the money comes from. Very well: the borough-monger gets his money from the minister, and the minister sends down to the borough a couple of fellows to be elected. When they take their seats, supposing them to have consciences, they swear, and they safely swear, that they have given no money for their seats, and that they know of none that has been given.

Thus, supposing a seat to be actually purchased by the minister with the people's money, and then filled by the minister so as to secure him a devoted voice in the House; supposing this, even then, even in such a flagrant case, Mr. Curwen's Oath might be safely taken by the member returned, and to him alone the Oath would, or could, in such case be tendered.

VI. What, then, is the main tendency of this Bill? Why, to give the Treasury a *monopoly* of the saleable Seats. The member cannot, supposing him to have any regard for an Oath, or to be at all afraid of any of the penalties of the Bill, purchase the seat himself, either directly or indirectly; for, I shall suppose the law so well contrived as to leave no room for evasion. But, the borough-monger would still *sell*; he must have a market; and, as the Treasury would then be the only market, thither he must carry his article. He would not obtain so high a price; but sell he must, and sell he would, to the minister of the day.

This would be a *reform* with a vengeance. We should see 300 Seats, out of the 658, sold to the Treasury; the Treasury would nominate the members; and those members, bound by Mr. Curwen's bill, and *regarding* an oath and *fearing* to incur penalties, would readily and safely take the oath prescribed, or take the seats without the oath. That the ministers would take care to put in such persons as they could *trust*, there can be no doubt at all; so that when once a parliament was thus packed, it would be quite impossible to obtain the smallest chance of removing any minister; and, as to *grievances*, the people in India might as well talk of grievances, and with just as much hope of redress.

VII. That this is the sort of "*moderate reform*," which the bill of Mr. Curwen would produce, is, I think, so evident, that it was useless to dwell upon the point so long as I have done. But, even supposing, that the bill should (as the Speaker seems to wish, and to content himself with) prevent the *sale* of seats, and cause them to be *given* by the patrons to their *friends* and *relations*. Suppose the bill should effect this amiable object, what would it do for the people? How would it contribute towards the independence of parliament?

My Lord Shabbaroon, for instance, has got a borough, and he wants money for the couple of seats. But, Mr. Curwen will not let him *sell* them, either to the minister or any body else. He cannot get money for them. Well, then, he must have money's worth; and he seeks a good *sinecure* either for himself, or some of the sons or younger brothers of

the family of Shabbaroon. He, therefore, puts in his sons or brothers or his attorney and steward, or some other persons totally dependent upon him; and, by the votes of these, he obtains his object. Would it not, now, be much better to leave the thing as it is; to leave my Lord Shabbaroon to sell his seats to persons, who have the money to spare; *who may be independent if they will*; and who may do, with that independence, a great deal of good; while, if a law cut off the possibility of their getting into the House, their independence must be useless to the country?

VIII. The SPEAKER seems to have conceived the idea, that those borough-mongers, who now notoriously sell their seats to the highest bidder, would, after the passing of Mr. Curwen's bill, not only not attempt to sell seats again, but would be completely divested even of the *desire* to sell them, or even to turn them, in any way whatever, to pecuniary account! This were, indeed, miraculous. What! take from the borough-monger; the trafficker in seats; the vender of votes; take from such a man the *desire* of still deriving profit from his commodity! Well; if you can do this, Mr. Curwen, your bill is certainly a wonderful invention; but, still, I shall deny, that it is, in any sense of the word, *a reform* of the House of Commons; and I also shall deny, that it will operate to the benefit of the nation. For what do you effect? You put a stop, if this *miracle* takes place, to the selling of seats and to the obtaining of offices from the minister, through the means of disposing of seats to relations and friends and underlings; but, you are still as far as ever from having *representatives of the people*. The members will still, in fact, be the representatives of particular families and individuals; and, at the very best, you will create a new sort of unprincipled opposition to every ministry that the King may choose. Indeed, there would, in this case, arise a much more complete oligarchy than there is at present. The seats, now sold for money, would be kept in hand; and, the decision, upon every question, would depend upon much *fewer free voices*, than are now heard in the House of Commons.

IX. Such is the "*moderate Reform*," which Mr. Curwen has in contemplation; and, by which Reform, if he could *get the people to believe in its efficacy*, he would, I am fully persuaded, do this country more mischief than has been done to it by any man for the last hundred years, Pitt not excepted; and, it is not the less mortifying to reflect, that there is every reason to suppose, that he is sincerely inclined to do good instead of harm.

There is one passage in the speech of the SPEAKER, which I do not clearly comprehend. It is that, where, in speaking of the effect of the scandalous facts, relative to the traffic in seats, lately come to light, and of the new doctrine, upon which the sale of seats has been justified in the House, he says: "It furnishes the most formidable weapons to those, who are professing, and, I am willing to believe, sincerely professing, to *reform*, but, as I fear, are, in truth and in fact, by the tendency of their endeavours, labouring to *subvert*, the entire system of our Parliamentary Representation."

I will not affect to misunderstand, that the Speaker here alludes to those, who, at the public meetings, recently held, in different parts of the kingdom, have declared for a Reform in the Commons' House of Parliament; but, I really do not see the consistency of suspecting such persons of endeavouring, though unintentionally, to *subvert* our system

of Parliamentary Representation, when the avowed object of those persons is, to do away, in the most effectual manner, the evil of which the Speaker complains. To be sure, they mean to go much further; they, and for the reasons which I have stated, see nothing at all in a plan like Mr. Curwen's, but the very likely means of deceiving weak people; of spreading delusion in the country; of drawing a crust over the wound, and thereby rendering the cure more difficult, and leaving small chance of life, except from amputation. In short, what they want is, a *representation of the people*; they want the House of Commons to be *in fact*, what it is *in name*. "Would that men should be what they seem; or that they should seem none!" This is the maxim they act upon. They think it would be a great deal better to have no House of Commons at all, than to have a House of Commons, the seats in which should be bought and sold; but, they are, at the same time, fully convinced, that, unless the people really have the *choosing* of the members, it can be of no consequence at all to them, whether the seats be saleable, or not. If, through the operation of a measure, like that of Mr. Curwen, the monopoly of seats were fixed in the Treasury, and the chance of seeing an independent man lay out his money for a borough were completely done away, we should think our situation a little worse than it now is; but, as to whether seats are sold or not; as to whether some hunks, who has a desire to gild the remnant of his life with a title, takes money or takes empty sound for his seats; this is a matter of very little consequence to the people. Their sufferings and disgrace; the profligate waste of their money, and the disregard of their feelings, arise from such hunks having seats at his disposal at all. It is his *possessing* of the seats, which is the curse to them; and this is a curse, which Mr. Curwen's bill does not attempt to remove. That bill is, in short, little more than a measure for *regulating* the traffic in parliamentary seats, while it professes to *put an end* to that traffic. And, is it, then, possible, that the Speaker can suppose, that those, who really wish for Reform, will be satisfied with a measure like this?

X. Whatever the Speaker may suppose, gentlemen, certainly we, who see and who most sorely feel the evils of a system, which, in fact, deprives the people of all voice in the Legislature, shall not be satisfied with any such measure; which, were there no other objection to it, would and must be looked upon with a very suspicious eye, when we see it applauded, when we see it cherished with the kindest attentions, by all those who were the very loudest in opposition to Mr. Wardle. We shall find, in our county, that all the well-known peculators and plunderers, all the slaves, who dance attendance upon the great distributor of government favours, will approve of this bill; of this measure, so well calculated to enable them to spread deception through the county, and to enable them to impose upon the unreflecting, by representing a *reform* as having been *begun* by the House of Commons itself. It is surprising how harmoniously all those, who hate the idea of *real* reform, chime in, in praise of this bill of Mr. Curwen. Even the hired newspapers; the papers, which, in a late debate, Mr. Whitbread openly declared to be in the employ of the government; even these downright hired vehicles, part of whose business it is to stifle inquiry into abuses, and to traduce and vilify every man who is an enemy to corruption; even these publications highly approve of Mr. Curwen's bill, which they call a "*temperate reform*."

XI. This is not the Reform that we want. We want a Reform, not that shall consist of new regulations about the manner of disposing of seats; not of prohibitions or permissions, relative to the bargain and sale for offices and seats; we want a Reform, not to consist of a statute to prescribe whether our rights shall be *sold, swapped, or given away*, but that shall restore those rights to us, their owners. If I find a man has taken away, or, by any means, got possession, of my *field*, I do not, in my proceedings against him, complain of the *manner in which he uses my field*; whether he ploughs it or plants it or lays it down in grass, or whether he lets it to another or keeps it in his own hands. I do not trouble myself with these matters, with which, indeed, I have nothing to do. I see him in possession of what belongs to me, and I demand it from him; and, really, Mr. Curwen's bill does appear to me as being something like an action in such a case for misuse of the field, instead of an endeavour to recover the field itself. The people demand the right of choosing persons to fill the seats. They, in other words, demand possession of the seats, which they assert to be their own. The justice of the claim is not denied; but, says Mr. Curwen's bill, "Let us be *temperate*. You must not have your seats. That is too much to demand. But, we will take care, that, in future, those who have your seats shall not *sell* them (except, perhaps, to the minister), but shall *give* them away." Pretty consolation, truly! Almost as good as if a man, when complaining of another for having stolen his horse, were told that the horse was never to be sold again, and only let out to hire once in a time. There may be persons; I do not positively aver, that there not persons, who may expect some good from this bill; but, to me, I must confess that it appears to be capable of nothing which will not be injurious to the country.

XII. There is one thing, however, which, supposing the bill to pass, may lead to good; and, that is, a *speedy dissolution of parliament*; for, if it be true, that the present House of Commons have been returned in a manner that requires this bill; if the Speaker's description of the state of things be correct; if the provisions of the bill be necessary to ensure proper members of parliament; if this be so, the King ought to be addressed to dissolve the House as soon as possible; because, in this very measure, the people have wherewith to appeal to, in order to show, that they were not fairly dealt by in the returning of *this* House of Commons. At any rate, the members of the House ought now to take the purgatory oath proposed by the bill. "No, no," Mr. Perceval will say, perhaps, "it is not a good way to punish *past offences*." Very true, though you did not think so in the case of Hamlin; but, observe, we do not want to *punish* at all; we only want this House, which has still the power of making laws to bind us, and will have that power for *four or five years yet to come*, to take this oath, whence we are to derive such amazing security; for, it is a shocking thing, Mr. Curwen, to leave us four or five years to wait for the *beginning* of the operation of your measure. This is, indeed, the most *temperate and moderate* Reform I ever heard of in my life. It is a sort of *reversionary* Reform. In short, it is a Reform that will never take place. The bill may pass into a law; but, long before the time for acting upon it shall come, either it will have been set aside by a real Reform of the House of Commons, or it will be too late to talk of Reform, or of any thing else whereby to preserve the liberties of the people and the independence of the country.

Having, in this Letter, endeavoured to show what sort of Reform we do not want, I shall, in my next, give you my opinion as to the sort of Reform that we do want.

I am,

Your friend,

Botley, 8th June, 1809.

WM. COBBETT.

TO THE
INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

(*Political Register, June, 1809.*)

"Let High Birth triumph. What can be more great?
"Nothing but Merit in a low estate."

YOUNG.

LETTER V.

The Court-Martial.

GENTLEMEN,

In a former Letter, I spoke to you upon the subject of the *personal attacks*, which the associates in corruption were making upon me; of which attacks I shall now speak to you more fully; because, an exposition of the falsehood and malice of our enemies will strongly tend to show, not only that their cause is bad, but that they know it to be bad, and that they have neither fact nor argument to advance in its defence. The truth is this: they see plainly, that, unless they can, by some means or other, destroy the effect of my publications, those publications will, in time, destroy corruption and public robbery; that is to say, destroy the meat which they feed upon; and, therefore, it is no wonder, that they are making such efforts to destroy the effect of those publications; and, yet, being quite destitute of the means of meeting me in the field of discussion; being quite unable to make head, to stand one moment, against me there, they have recourse to personal attack, just as if any thing that I did twenty years ago could have any connection with what I am now writing upon the subject of Parliamentary Reform; just as if my having acted thus or thus, while I was in the army, could have any connection with what I have now said about the Vote of the 310 upon Mr. Madocks's motion,* or about the decision with respect to Castlereagh, Wellesley, and Perceval, compared with the prosecution and sentence of Philip Hamlin. I am accusing the associates in corruption of various crimes against the people; I am exposing their robberies to the people; and I am proposing the means of preventing such robberies in future. Why do not the corrupt defend themselves, if they can? Is it common for the thief to attack the lawyer who is pleading against him? And, if

* See page 241 of this volume.—Ed.

he were to do it, would that gain him any credit with the jury, or at all tend to save his neck? Of this, one would think, the public robbers must be aware; but, they are so stung; they smart so severely; they are so full of resentment, against all who are not public robbers, that they cannot subdue their passions to the command of reason. Against me, in particular, they entertain such mortal antipathy, that I am sure there is nothing but their cowardice that withholds them from attempting assassination. In *this county* especially they are desperate. They have (to whichever set, or gang, they belong) here seen all the respectable part of the people turn their backs upon them with disdain, after having, for so many years, been the dupes of one gang or the other; and this (to them) alarming change they ascribe principally to me. No wonder, therefore, that they are not very nice in their attempts to obtain vengeance.

Some of these attempts I noticed in a former letter, where I spoke of some of the falsehoods and misrepresentations they had made use of. I have now to speak of their last attempt; and, having so done; having once more shown the falsehood, the malice, the incomparable baseness of the associates in corruption, I will *never again* take up any part of my paper, or the time of my readers, with answering any thing that shall be published against me *personally*. The vile wretches have now published, at an enormous expense; an expense of not less, perhaps, than *ten thousand pounds*, a thing which they pretend is a true account of a COURT-MARTIAL, in which I was concerned, at the time of my leaving the army, in 1792. Why, gentlemen, they might, when they were at it, as well have gone the full length of the enemies of England in America, and published an account of my being *tried for my life and left for execution*. They might as well have accused me of highway-robbery, house-breaking, or any other offence. There would have been full as much truth in such a charge, as in what they have now published, which is a falsehood, from one end to the other, as to what it means to cause to be believed respecting me. It contains, like most other deliberate falsehoods, something which is true in words; but, then, the meaning is totally perverted by the suppression of all the material parts of the transaction. Suppose you were to say, "If selling seats in parliament be not punished, it is a shame to hang a poor fellow for house-breaking." Suppose you were to say this; and I, pretending to give an account of what you had said, were to drop the former part of the sentence, and accuse you of saying, "It is a shame to hang a poor fellow for house-breaking." This, though true *in words*, would be shamefully false in *meaning*; and yet, even this would not be more base and detestable, than the publication, of which I have spoken above, and which the public robbers are circulating, at such an immense expense, all over the kingdom, and particularly in this county. They have sent hundreds and thousands of copies into Hampshire. All the gentlemen, who signed the last requisition, have received them for nothing. The post-office at Winchester has charged only a penny for their transmission to Twyford, for instance. The robbers, as they have come down from London in their carriages, have brought with them whole bales, which they have tossed out to all whom they met or overtook upon the road. A few days ago, a landau full of *he* and *she* speculators passed through Alton, tossing out these pamphlets as they went. The thing has been put into all the inns, and other public places, particularly in Winchester, where it would cer-

tainly be put into the churches, if they were places of much resort; for, the Winchester clergy appear to be perfectly convinced, that the way to prove that their brother, DR. O'MEARA, did nothing that was wrong, is to abuse me; that the way to whitewash the church, is to cover me over with dirt.

Now, then, *what is this publication*, upon which the fool-knaves rely for the demolition of my character? It consists of certain documents, relating to the afore-mentioned Court-Martial, and, as I shall show you by-and-by, these documents, as they stand in this publication, present to the reader a tissue of the vilest falsehoods. But, first I must give something of a history of the Court-Martial itself.

Late in the year 1791, I returned to England with my regiment, which landed at Portsmouth in the month of November. Very soon after that, I, being then the Sergeant Major of the regiment, asked for my discharge, which, after many efforts, on the part of the commanding officer, Major Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and of General Frederick, the colonel of the regiment, to prevail on me to remain (upon a promise of being specially recommended to the King, as worthy of being immediately promoted to the rank of ensign), I obtained in the following words:

“By the Right Hon. Major Lord Edward Fitzgerald, commanding his Majesty's 54th Regiment of Foot, whereof Lieut.-Gen. Frederick is colonel.

“These are to certify, that the bearer hereof, WILLIAM COBBETT, Sergeant Major in the aforesaid regiment, has served honestly and faithfully for the space of eight years, nearly seven of which he has been a non-commissioned officer, and of that time he has been five years Sergeant Major to the regiment; but having very earnestly applied for his discharge, he, in consideration of his good behaviour, and the services he has rendered the regiment, is hereby discharged.—Given under my hand and the seal of the regiment, at Portsmouth, this 19th day of December, 1791. “EDWARD FITZGERALD.”

“Portsmouth, Dec. 19th, 1791.—Sergeant Major Cobbett having most pressingly applied for his discharge, at Major Lord Edward Fitzgerald's request, General Frederick has granted it. General Frederick has ordered Major Lord Edward Fitzgerald to return the Sergeant Major thanks for his behaviour and conduct during the time of his being in the regiment, and Major Lord Edward adds his most hearty thanks to those of the General.”

The object of my thus quitting the army, to which I was, perhaps, more attached than any man that ever lived in the world, was, to bring certain officers to justice for having, in various ways, *wronged both the public and the soldier*. With this object in view, I went straight to London, the moment I had obtained my liberty and secured my *personal safety*, which, as you will readily conceive, would not have been the case if I had not first got my discharge.

I must here go back a little, and give an account of the measures, which, while in the regiment, I had taken, preparatory to this prosecution; and, in order to give the reader a full view of all the circumstances; in order that he may be able to form a just opinion of what I was in the army, I will give him a short account of my progress.

I enlisted at Chatham in 1784; I joined the regiment, in Nova Scotia, in 1785; I was almost immediately made a corporal; in a few months afterwards I was made a sergeant; and at the end of about a year and a half, I was made the sergeant major.

While I was a corporal I was made *clerk* to the regiment. In a very short time, the whole of the business, in that way, fell into my hands; and, at the end of about a year, neither adjutant, pay-master, or quar-

ter-master, could move an inch without my assistance. The *military* part of the regiment's affairs fell under my care in like manner. About this time, the new *discipline*, as it was called; that is to say, the mode of handling the musket, and of marching, &c., called "*Dundas's System*," was sent out to us, in little books, which were to be studied by the officers of each regiment, and the rules of which were to be immediately conformed to.

Though any old woman might have written such a book; though it was excessively foolish, from beginning to end; still, it was to be complied with; it ordered and commanded a *total change*, and this change was to be completed before the next annual review took place.

To make this change was left to me, who was not then twenty years of age, while not a single officer in the regiment paid the least attention to the matter; so, that when the time came for the annual review, I, then a *corporal*, had to give lectures of instruction to the officers themselves, the colonel not excepted; and, for several of them, if not for all of them, I had to make out, upon large cards, which they bought for the purpose, little plans of the position of the regiment, together with lists of the words of command, which they had to give in the field.

Is it any wonder that we experience *defeats*? There was I, at the review, upon the flank of the grenadier company, with my worsted shoulder-knot, and my great, high, coarse, hairy cap; confounded in the ranks amongst other men, while those who were commanding me to move my hands or my feet, thus or thus, were, in fact, uttering words which I had taught them; and were in every thing, excepting mere authority, my inferiors; and ought to have been commanded by me.—It was impossible for reflections of this sort not to intrude themselves; and, as I advanced in experience, I felt less and less respect for those whom I was compelled to obey. One suffers injustice from men, of great endowments of mind, with much less of heart-burning than from men, whom one cannot help despising; and, if my officers had been men of manifest superiority of mind, I should, perhaps, not have so soon conceived the project of bringing them, or some of them, at least, to shame and punishment for the divers flagrant breaches of the law committed by them, and for their manifold, their endless, wrongs against the soldiers and against the public.

This project was conceived so early as the year 1787, when an affair happened, that first gave me a full insight into regimental justice. It was shortly this: that the quarter-master, who had the issuing of the men's provisions to them, *kept about a fourth part of it to himself*. This, the old sergeants told me, had been the case *for many years*; and, they were quite astonished and terrified at the idea of my complaining of it. This I did, however; but, the reception I met with convinced me, that I must never make another complaint, till I got safe to England, and safe out of the reach of that most curious of courts, a *Court-Martial*.

From this time forward, I began to collect materials for an exposure, upon my return to England. I had ample opportunities for this, being the keeper of all the books, of every sort, in the regiment, and knowing the whole of its affairs better than any other man. But, the winter previous to our return to England, I thought it necessary to make extracts from books, lest the books themselves should be destroyed. And, here begins the history of the famous *Court-Martial*. In order to be able to *prove* that these extracts were correct, it was necessary that I should

have a *witness* as to their being *true copies*. This was a very ticklish point. One foolish step here, would have sent me down to the ranks with a pair of bloody shoulders. Yet, it was necessary to have the witness. I hesitated many months. At one time, I had given the thing up. I dreamt twenty times, I dare say, of my papers being discovered, and of my being tried and flogged half to death. At last, however, some fresh act of injustice towards us made me set all danger at defiance. I opened my project to a corporal, whose name was *William Bestland*, who wrote in the office under me, who was a very honest fellow, who was very much bound to me, for my goodness to him, and who was, with the sole exception of myself, the only sober man in the *whole regiment*.

To work we went, and during a long winter, while the rest were boozing and snoring, we gutted no small part of the regimental books, rolls, and other documents. Our way was this: to take a copy, sign it with our names, and clap the regimental seal to it, so that we might be able to swear to it, when produced in court.

All these papers were put into a little box, which I myself had made for the purpose. When we came to Portsmouth, there was a talk of searching all the boxes, &c. which gave us great alarm; and induced us to take out all the papers, put them in a bag, and trust them to a custom-house officer, who conveyed them on shore, to his own house, whence I removed them in a few days after.

Thus prepared, I went to London, and, on the 14th of January, 1792, I wrote to the then Secretary at War, SIR GEORGE YONGE, stating my situation, my business with him, and my intentions; inclosing him a letter of petition, from myself to the King, stating the substance of all the complaints I had to make; and which letter I requested Sir George Yonge to lay before the King.

I waited from the 14th to the 24th of January, without receiving any answer at all, and then all I heard was, that he wished to see me at the war-office. At the war-office I was shown into an ante-chamber amongst numerous anxious-looking men, who, every time the door, which led to the great man, was opened, turned their eyes that way with a motion as regular and as uniform as if they had been drilled to it. These people eyed me from head to foot, and I never shall forget their look, when they saw, that I was admitted into paradise without being detained a single minute in purgatory.

Sir George Yonge *heard my story*; and that was apparently all he wanted of me. I was to hear from him again in *a day or two*; and, after waiting for *fifteen days*, without hearing from him, or any one else, upon the subject, I wrote to him again, reminding him, that I had, from the first, told him, that I had no *other business in London*; that my stock of *money was necessarily scanty*; and, that to *detain me in London was to ruin me*. Indeed, I had, in the whole world, but about 200 guineas, which was a great deal for a person in my situation to have saved. Every week in London, especially as, by way of episode, I had now *married*, took, at least, a couple of guineas from my stock. I, therefore, began to be very impatient, and, indeed, to be very suspicious, that military justice in England was pretty nearly a-kin to military justice in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

The letter I now wrote was dated on the 10th of February, to which I got an answer on the 15th, though the answer might have been written in a moment.

I was, in this answer, informed, that it was the intention to try the accused upon *only part of the charges* which I had preferred; and, from a new-modelled list of charges, sent me by the Judge-Advocate, on the 23rd of February, it appeared, that, even of those charges that were suffered to remain, *the parts the most material were omitted*. But this was not all. I had all along insisted, that, unless the Court-martial were held in *London*, I could not think of appearing at it; because, if held in a garrisoned place like Portsmouth, the thing must be a mere mockery. In spite of this, however, the Judge-Advocate's letter of the 23rd of February informed me, that the court was to be held at Portsmouth or Hilsæa. I remonstrated against this, and demanded that my remonstrance should be laid before the King, which on the 29th the Judge-Advocate promised should be done by himself; but, on the 5th of March, the Judge-Advocate informed me, that he had laid my remonstrance before *whom*, think you? Not *the King*, but the *accused parties*; who, of course, thought the court ought to assemble at Portsmouth or Hilsæa, and, doubtless for the very very reasons that led me to object to its being held there.

Plainly seeing what was going forward, I, on the 7th of March, made, in a letter to *Mr. Pitt*, a representation of the whole case, giving him a history of the obstacles I had met with, which letter concluded thus:—
 "I have now, Sir, done all a man can do in such a case. I have pro-
 ceeded regularly, and, I may add, respectfully, from first to last: if I am
 allowed to serve my country by prosecuting men who have injured it,
 I shall do it: if I am thwarted and pressed down by those, whose
 office it is to assist and support me, I cannot do it: in either case, I
 shall be satisfied with having done my duty, and shall leave the world
 to make a comparison between me and the men whom I have accused."

This letter (which, by-the-bye, the public robbers have not published) had the effect of changing the place of the Court-martial, which was now to be held in London; but, as to my other great ground of complaint, the leaving of the *regimental books unsecured*, it had no effect at all; and, it will be recollected, that without those books, there could be, as to most of the weighty charges, no proof produced, without bringing forward *CORPORAL BESTLAND*, and the danger of doing that will be presently seen.

But, now, mark well as to these books; as to this great source of that sort of evidence, which was not to be brow-beaten, or stifled by the dangers of the lash. Mark well these facts, and from them judge of what I had to expect in the way of justice.

On the 22nd of January, I wrote to Sir George Yonge for the express purpose of having the books secured; that is to say, taken out of the hands, and put out of the reach, of the parties accused. On the 24th of January, he told me, that HE HAD *taken care to give directions to have these documents secured*. On the 18th of February, in answer to a letter, in which I (upon information received from the regiment) complained of the documents not having been secured, he wrote to me, and I have now the letter before me, signed with his own hand, that he would write to the Colonel of the regiment about the books, &c. "Although," says he, "I cannot doubt but that the regimental books have been properly secured." This was on the 18th of February, mind; and, now it appears, from the documents, which the public robbers have put forth, that the first time any order for securing the books was given,

was on the 15th of March, though the Secretary told me he had done it on the 24th of January, and repeated his assertion in writing, on the 18th of February. There is quite enough in this fact alone to show the public what sort of a chance I stood of obtaining justice.

Without these written documents nothing of importance could be proved, unless the non-commissioned officers and men of the regiment should happen to get the better of their dread of the lash; and, even then, they could only speak from memory. All, therefore, depended upon those written documents, as to the principal charges. Therefore, as the Court-martial was to assemble on the 24th of March, I went down to Portsmouth on the 20th, in order to know for certain what was become of the books; and, I found, as indeed I suspected was the case, that they had never been secured at all; that they had been left in the hands of the accused from the 14th of January to the very hour of trial; and that, in short, my request, as to this point, the positive condition as to this most important matter, had been totally disregarded.

There remained, then, nothing to rest upon with safety but our extracts, confirmed by the evidence of Bestland, the corporal, who had signed them along with me; and this I had solemnly engaged with him not to have recourse to, unless he was first out of the army; that is to say, out of the reach of the vindictive and bloody lash. He was a very little fellow; not more than about five feet high; and had been set down to be discharged when he went to England; but, there was a suspicion of his connection with me, and, therefore, they resolved to keep him. It would have been cruel, and even perfidious, to have brought him forward under such circumstances; and, as there was no chance of doing any thing without him, I resolved not to appear at the Court-martial, unless the discharge of Bestland was first granted. Accordingly, on the 20th of March, I wrote, from Fratton, a village near Portsmouth, to the Judge-Advocate, stating over again all the obstacles that had been thrown in my way, complaining particularly that the books and documents had been left in possession of the accused, contrary to my urgent request and to the positive assurances of the Secretary-at-War, and concluding by demanding the discharge of a man, whom I should name, as the only condition upon which I would attend the Court-martial. I requested him to send me an answer by the next day, at night, at my former lodging; and told him, that, unless such answer was received, he and those to whom my repeated applications had been made, might do what they pleased with their Court-martial; for, that I confidently trusted, that a few days would place me beyond the scope of their power.

No answer came, and, as I had learned, in the meanwhile, that there was a design to prosecute me for *sedition*, that was an additional motive to be quick in my movements. As I was going down to Portsmouth, I met several of the sergeants coming up, together with the music-master; and, as they had none of them been in America, I wondered what they could be going to London for; but, upon my return, I was told by a Capt. Lane, who had been in the regiment, that they had been brought up to swear, that, at an entertainment given to them by me before my departure from the regiment, I had drunk "*the destruction of the House of Brunswick.*" This was false; but, I knew that that was no reason why it should not be sworn by such persons and in such a case. I had talked pretty freely, upon the occasion alluded to; but I had neither

said, nor thought any thing against the King, and, as to the *House of Brunswick*, I hardly knew what it meant. My head was filled with the corruptions and the baseness in the army. I knew nothing at all about politics. Nor would any threat of this sort have induced me to get out of the way for a moment; though it certainly would, if I had known my danger; for glorious "Jacobinical" times were just then beginning. Of this, however, I knew nothing at all. I did not know what the *Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act* meant. When you have a mind to do a thing, every trifle is an additional motive. Lane, who had enlisted me, and who had always shown great kindness towards me, told me they would send me to Botany Bay; and, I now verily believe, that, if I had remained, I should have furnished a pretty good example to those, who wished to correct military abuses. I did not, however, leave England from this motive. I could not obtain a chance of success, without exposing the back of my poor faithful friend Bestland, which, had I not pledged myself not to do, I would not have done. It was useless to appear, unless I could have tolerable fair play; and, besides, it seemed better to leave the whole set to do as they pleased, than to be made a mortified witness of what it was quite evident they had resolved to do.

Such is the *true* history of this affair, which, had the public robbers given it as it stood, unmutilated, not a word should I ever have published by way of defence, or explanation. At the time when I was writing against PITT and MELVILLE, the Robbers then talked of *exposing* me with the account of this transaction, which I never wished, nor had any reason to wish, to keep a secret, and which I then called upon them to make known to the world. "There is," said I, "nothing that I should like better, than your publishing the *whole* of the documents relating to that affair. You have not only my free leave to do it; but my request "to do it."

They knew better. They knew, that, with whomsoever should read *all* those documents, I could not fail to rise in esteem; because they proved me to have been, in all times of my life, an enemy to public robbers, whether on a great or a small scale.

Mark what these robbers have now done. The intelligent reader will easily find out, who the robbers are; and I beg him to mark how they have acted in this instance.

Of TWENTY-SEVEN Letters, written by me, these miscreants have published FIVE, and those of the least importance. My petition, in the form of a letter, to the King; my letter to Mr. Pitt, as long as one-half of all the rest; my *last letter to the Judge-Advocate*; all my letters to the *Secretary-at-War*; all the *Charges*, occupying the space of several pages: all these are *suppressed*, and with them, all the grounds and motives of my coming forward; all the remonstrances that I made against the discouragement I met with; all the *conditions*, upon which I pledged myself to prove guilt; and, finally, all the reasons which I gave for not appearing, when those conditions had been violated.

This is the way, is it, that these public robbers make use of documents, which are committed to their hands? This is their "honourable" conduct, is it? And these are the publications, are they, that the Clergy at Winchester circulate gratis?

When I first saw the *Affair of the Court-martial* advertised, I was at the house of a friend, and upon his showing me the advertisement, I said, "Now, if the rascals do but publish *all* my letters, what honour

they will do me!" They took care not to do that. They dared not do that: the facts and the sentiments therein contained would be found to cut too close: and, besides, those letters, if all published complete, would do me so much honour: the reader of them would, at every sentence, exclaim, "Here were the same mind and the same principles, that we find in him at the present day."

There are not, I am fully persuaded, in any country, such *mean* and *dirty* wretches as our public robbers. Buonaparte has nothing in his dominions that is not manly and dignified, compared to our gang. He may have people, who would lend a man a sly blow in the dark, if they found him too hard for them with his pen; but, I do not think, that there is, in all Europe, not even amongst the Sicilians or Portuguese, a set of creatures so mean and despicable in their spite as our public robbers; a set of "tame cheaters;" the poison of asps is under their lips, but they want the courage even of a worm.

One would wonder where they would find the assurance to *face* me, or to *face* the public, after having suppressed these *twenty-two* letters. Why, the truth is, they dare not *face* me, or any body else. They dare look no part of the public in the face. They skulk from the light. Not a man of them dares put his *name* to the publication, upon which I have been remarking. They are conscious of their villanous deeds: they feel, even now, the dread of that punishment, which their manifold robberies so richly merit: they feel that they are not safe while my pen is in action. This inspires them with deadly hatred; and that hatred urges them on to that mixture of malignity and folly visible in this their last production.

The object of the Pamphlet, which the public robbers have so industriously circulated, is to cause it to be believed, that I brought a *false* accusation against the parties; that I knew it to be false, and that, when the hour of trial came, I *skulked* away. But, what sense would there have been in such a proceeding? What motive could I have had for doing a thing so very silly? Can it be believed, that I would have put

* In the *Westminster Review*, for October, 1835, the reader will find one of the rarest specimens of sham impartiality that ever was presented by the pen of a critic. The writer professes to give, in the space of about twenty pages, not a mere hasty glance at Mr COBBETT's political history, but a review of his political works, which consist of one hundred volumes. It is clear, that if this writer really read what he was writing about, he has been guilty of a wilful suppression of truth, for the purpose of foully misrepresenting the character of Mr. Cobbett; for, while he studiously brings in the affair of the Court-Martial as an important incident in Mr. COBBETT's life, he leaves it to the reader as a matter for which Mr. COBBETT had never undertaken to account. "*His reasons for withdrawing himself*," says this liberal critic, "*after every opportunity had been yielded, have never been satisfactorily explained.*" Perhaps this "liberal," in his extreme candour, would not have ceased to doubt about Mr. COBBETT's motives, even if he had read this letter to the People of Hampshire. But, whatever might have been his own conclusions in that case, his commentary upon the transaction stands falsified by the letter itself. We can hardly believe that the critic was wicked enough to make the above assertion, *knowing the fact* that Mr. COBBETT had thus explained. But that is all we can say for the critic, who, if he were himself ignorant of Mr. COBBETT's works, was not a proper person to describe them to the rest of the world. The Editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, partaking of that same liberality which prompted the reviewer upon this occasion, spoke of this review as an "*admirable portrait* of one of the most extraordinary men of the age"—(*Morning Chronicle*, Oct. 8, 1835). The truth is, that here was an endeavour made, whether from malice or

myself to the expense of a two or three months' living in London, when my circumstances so loudly called me away, and that I would have taken the pains to write twenty-seven letters, and to dance attendance as many times at the Horse Guards? Can it be believed, that I, who was capable of writing these letters, and who was so well acquainted with the law as well as the facts of the case? Can it be believed, that I should have put myself to all this trouble and expense, merely for the purpose of bringing a parcel of officers and soldiers to London and making fools of them?

Besides, if this had been the case, how comes it, that I have remained in England now, for *nine years*, and have never been called upon by any of the accused parties to unsay, what I said of them in 1792? True, it is now so long as *seventeen years* since the charges were preferred; but, it was only *eight years*, when I returned to England. If, therefore, either the *parties* or the *government* had had any reason to complain of me, why did they not do it immediately upon my return? They knew very well where I was. They could not help knowing it. Nay, they knew where I was and all about me *while I was in America*, where I published an account of my having been the Sergeant-Major of the 54th regiment, and of my having left it in such a year. The pamphlet, in which this was stated, was published in England, in 1796, only *four years* after the Court-Martial was held; it was published, too, at the express desire of Mr. Canning, who was then an under Secretary-of-State in Pitt's ministry. This being the case, would not the parties, if they had really felt themselves *wronged* by me; if they had really wished to be confronted with me; would not they, even while I was in America, have found the means of charging me with having made a false accusation against them? Would they, under such circumstances, have suffered me to rest in quiet? And, the *government* too, who, in the Case drawn up for the opinion of the Attorney and Solicitor General, said I had *deceived the crown*; the government, who appeared to be so angry at me for having made a "*mockery of justice*;" how came the government not to call upon me, when, *nine years* ago, I returned to England? They all talked very big when they found me safe gone, but, none of them thought proper to challenge me to the proof when I came back. The history of the transaction, drawn up to be laid before the then Attorney and Solicitor General, was *false*. It kept out of sight the circumstance of *three-fourths of my Charges having been suppressed*, and the still more important circumstance of *the regimental books and papers not having been secured*, according to my desire, so often and so earnestly expressed. If these facts had been related to Sir John Scott and Sir John Mitford; if they had had all my twenty seven letters before them, their opinion would have been very different from what it was.

from sincerity founded on mistake, to *blacken* Mr Cobbett's character. The reviewer does not scruple to repeat the stale insinuations of Mr. Cobbett's having once been in the *pay* of the English government, and of his afterwards being *neglected*, and therefore angry with men in power. "It may serve" (the Court-Martial affair), says the reviewer, "to account for the apparent *neglect* of Cobbett in high quarters some years subsequently." Yes, *serve*, indeed! and what will not serve, to any purpose, however low, when *used* as the Westminster Reviewer has used this Court-Martial affair? See our foregoing notes on the subject of "pay," "high quarters," "neglect," &c., p. 12 of our Preface, and pp. 212, 302, in Vol. I. of these Selections.—ED.

They would, indeed, have seen, that it was those, who had thrown obstacles in my way, who had been guilty of "deceiving the crown and making a mockery of justice." But, at any rate, if the parties had really thought they had grounds of actions against me, how came they not to *bring those actions*, when I returned to England, nine years ago; especially as it would have afforded them so charming an opportunity of vindicating their own character, and fixing an everlasting stigma upon that of their accuser, whom they must necessarily hate, and of course, wish to expose and to punish? How came they not to bring those actions? How came both they and the government to remain so quiet?

The fact is, they *all* knew my charges to be true; they were all glad that the matter was got over so quietly; they had not the smallest desire to stir the coals again; and, it is that state of desperation, in which the public robbers now are, that has induced them to resort to this old transaction, in the hope of framing a charge against me, which, owing to the long lapse of time, I should find it difficult completely to refute.

These robbers, particularly those of them who curse the county of Hants with their presence or interference, endeavour to represent me as a *low* person; a person of no consequence; a person by whom the county ought to be ashamed to be *led*.

In the first place, I have not the presumption to wish to *lead* the county, though I have a very strong desire to assist in asserting its honour and independence; to assist in rescuing its property from the fangs of public robbers, and its people from the intolerable disgrace of being the tools of a set of tax-gatherers and political priests.

In the next place, as to being a *low* person, I never, in point of *birth*, pretend to be a *high* one; I never put on any airs; I never attempt to dictate at any public meeting; I never shun any man on account of his poverty, or low rank in life; I am not a seeker after the nobility and those who call themselves great men. Therefore, any reproach of this sort does not apply to me.

But, as to being *low* in point of *character*, or in point of *weight as a public man*, I am persuaded, that there are very few persons, who will not laugh at the idea, especially when endeavoured to be inculcated by those very robbers, whom, it is notorious, I make tremble for their cheese, and who are more afraid of me than ever rat was afraid of a terrier.

I am, and always have been, for paying respect to rank and title, even to mere *birth*, unaccompanied with any other consideration; because, such distinction in society appears to me to be productive of many good effects, which I need not now dwell upon. But, I think, there can be no question, that great endowments of the mind, without any of the circumstances of title or family, must, if properly used, be considered as giving the possessor an elevated place in society. Why are Clergymen, Medical men, and Lawyers, considered as *gentlemen*? Not because they are persons of high birth; for many of them, and especially the Clergy, are bred at charity schools; but, because their profession argues them to possess considerable mental endowments. In short, as it is *mind* alone which raises man above the brutes and gives him the command of them; so it is superiority of mind that raises one man above another, and gives him, in one way or another, more or less of command over him.

Therefore, when the Poulterers and the parson Woodcocks and the Mr.

Portals cry out, "What a shame it is for the County to be led by Cobbett!" the county has only to ask, whether I appear to have more or less *mind* than the Poulters and the parson Woodcocks and the Mr. Portals. That is the only question: not whether I have more or less of *lund*, but whether I have more or less of *mind*; and then, whether I have more or less of *truth* on my side, than they have on theirs. These are the questions for the county to ask; and, if it were disposed to put one more question, it might be this: Which has most merit; which has shown the greatest capacity; which is, on account of his acquirements, whether of mind or of property, entitled to the greatest respect, Mr. Poulter, who owes all he possesses to the luck of having a Bishop for a brother-in-law; or, Mr. Cobbett, who owes all he possesses to his own talents and industry?

But, Gentlemen, this attempt to represent me as a *low* and *insignificant* person, besides the folly of it, is an instance of *hypocrisy* well worthy of notice. There is scarcely a man amongst those who now appear to be united together for the purpose of *decrying* me, who has not, upon some occasion or other, paid his court to me, sought my acquaintance, asked of me something or other, either for himself or for some relation or friend. I was told, a few weeks ago, that DENT, a member of parliament, should say, that he wondered the *gentlemen* in Hampshire did not *put me down*. Why, this DENT is one of the scores of such men, whom I have shut my door against. He wanted to introduce himself to me, while I lived in Duke Street, Westminster, which I absolutely would not permit him to do. He called several times, and sent me up very respectful messages, till, at last, the servant had orders to tell him, that I would not see him. I did not like DENT, and I would not be acquainted with him. I have mentioned him in particular here, because I recollect that Mr. Windham was in my study one of the times when he sent up his card; and yet this man has now the assurance to talk of me as a *low* person who ought to have nothing to say in a county!

I do not like to say so much of myself; but, to do it this once appears due to the *cause*, if not to myself. And, I think, I may venture to say, that the lives of very few men have been marked with stronger proofs of merit of every sort. In my regiment I was every thing; the whole corps was under my control: I rendered services, not only in the regiment, but in the provinces where we were stationed, such as no one but myself would have thought of. I remember a set of *Commissioners* being sent out from England a part of whose business it was to make a statement and report of the population, &c. &c. of the province. They lived about our quarters for some time; they had some jovial carousings with our officers; but, *it was I* who made out their statement, and *drew up their report* to be sent home to the King; for which, by-the-bye, they never gave me even their thanks. This statement, which, as was the case with every thing that I meddled with, was done in so clear, correct, and, in point of penmanship, so beautiful a manner, that I have been told, the Duke of Kent, when he afterwards became Commander-in-Chief in those provinces, had it copied; and took away the original as a curiosity. This was the way in which I did every thing. I was, of course, very much envied and hated by the weak and the wicked, and, as was natural to expect, I did not, amongst people, whom, though my superiors in rank, I could not help despising, bear myself with much moderation. From nineteen to

twenty-seven is not much of an age for moderation, especially with those, who must necessarily despise all around them. But the fame of my services and talents ran through the whole country. Every good man respected me. I was invited to visit people in all parts of the provinces. While we lay at Fredericton in New Brunswick, I had the settling, or rather the preventing, of eight or nine lawsuits. I had the affairs of a whole regiment to attend to; all its accounts, its parades, its guards, its every thing. I found, however, time for studying English and French grammar; I learnt geometry and fortification; I built a barrack for four hundred men, without the aid of either draughtsman, carpenter, or bricklayer, the soldiers under me cut down the timber and dug the stones, and I was the architect; I went through a tract of woods, of above a hundred miles, where no man had ever ventured before to go alone; and this I did for the purpose of putting a stop to desertion, by showing the regiment that I *myself* was able to follow the fugitives, and accordingly, after that we had no more desertion to the United States. With all these occupations (of which I mention only a few particulars that occur to me at the moment) I found time for skating, fishing, shooting, and all the other sports of the country, of which, when I left it, I had seen, and knew, more than any other man. There is some little difference, I think, between such a man as I and such a man as Mr. Poulter! I might, surely, say to him as VOLTAIRE said to the monk: "Yes, yes, no doubt, you are a man, as well as I; but, my friend, there are *two sorts* of men."

Why, I *always* had weight and power. Wherever I was, I was a *leader*, and would it not be a base abandonment of the claims which nature and habit have given me, to pretend that I am nothing more than such a man, for instance, as parson Woodcock, whose mental endowments are discovered in his turning off those of his tradesmen, who signed the Requisition for a county meeting to thank Mr. Wardle!

I cannot help again reverting to this newly-thought-of scheme of representing me as a *low* and *insignificant* person.

As a proof of the estimation, in which I was held, while in the army, I will mention, that, about four years ago, General Carleton, brother of the late Lord Dorchester, and now Lord Dorchester himself I believe, *came to my house to see me*, and to remind me, that he had the pleasure of knowing me in New Brunswick. He was Governor of the province of New Brunswick, while my regiment was stationed there. He was our reviewing General, and he knew me, my character and services, well. He had, however, never known me in any other capacity than that of Sergeant-Major; and *Generals* are not much in the habit of going to see Sergeants-Major, unless there be something very particular about them. This gentleman had been governor, upon the very spot where I was with my regiment for four years; and, his visit to me in England, was, it will be observed, after my return from America the *last time*, after the affair of the Court-Martial of course; and of that affair he must have been well acquainted with all the circumstances, seeing that his own name, as a reviewing general, who had been imposed upon by a false return, was mentioned in one of the charges. His visit to me was a pretty good proof, that he had perceived nothing dishonourable in my conduct.

But, this is altogether the foolishlest charge that even the robbers ever invented.

Why, on my return from America, having stopped at Halifax in Nova

Scotia, the Duke of Kent, who requested to see me, talked to me about my regiment and about all its affairs. He must have known all about the Court-Martial. Mr. Windham and Mr. Yorke have been, since my return, and the former was before, *Secretaries at War*; they had the whole history in their office; and yet nobody in the country has ever *spoken*, and, I believe, *thought*, better of me, than Mr. Windham and Mr. Yorke have. I remember, that in dining with MR. PITT, at Mr. Windham's in August 1800, the former asked me about *Lord Edward Fitzgerald*. We talked about him a good deal. I gave the company present (of which Mr. Canning was one) an account of his conduct, while at the regiment; I spoke in very high terms of his zeal for the service, and I told Mr. Pitt, that Lord Edward was the only sober and the only *honest* officer, I had ever known in the army. I did this for the express purpose of leading him on to talk about the Court-Martial; but, it was avoided. In fact, they all well knew that what I had complained of was true, and that I had been baffled in my attempts to obtain justice, only because I had neither money nor friends. The same is known to those, who now are publishing and circulating this false account of that transaction; but, what they have in view, is not truth; it is, in short, to preserve their plunder, which they think is in imminent danger, unless they can destroy my credit with the public.

They naturally hate me. They have abundant reason so to do; but of late, their hatred must have received fresh supplies. Many of the gentlemen connected with the press have dealt the robbers some deadly blows; but, from the nature of my publication; from my being able to devote the *wholc* of my pages to the thing, I have certainly hit them harder than any body else, and the measure of their hatred is accordingly. It is true, that one would imagine, that nobody could be so foolish as not to see, that, when detected in such shameful garbling as to suppress 22 out of 27 documents, and especially to suppress *every* document, upon which the real merits of the case turned; one would imagine, that even the Poulterers would have been able to tell the compilers, that a publication like this must defeat its own purpose, and that, in the end, ⁱⁿ place of injuring me, it must do me a great deal of good. But, the truth is, that in such circumstances, men's minds are shut against all reasoning. Detected in their robberies, they jump from the roof. They break their necks on the pavement, in order to save them from the halter.

The purpose, at present, of all the public robbers, of every description, is to prevent the success of our endeavours to bring about a *Reform in the House of Commons*; for, unless they can effect that; unless they can prevent such a Reform from taking place, they must experience such a change as will compel them to *earn their livings honestly*, or *live upon their own means*; and, this is what they appear resolved not to do, if they can avoid it. Mr. Wardle has pledged himself to prove, that a Reform in the House of Commons *would render the Income Tax unnecessary*; and I, who have considered every part of the subject with great attention, and who am acquainted with every branch of revenue as well as of expenditure, am not only convinced, that this saving could and would be made; but, that a *much greater* saving would be made, and without any injury whatever to any part of the public service, while it must be manifest, that such saving would prevent, in a considerable degree, the further depreciation in the

value of funded property. All this the whole gang of public robbers deny; flatly deny. Here, then, is a great question to be decided; and, as I have taken a leading part in the discussion, the robbers, as to a desperate remedy, have been driven to personal attacks upon me. For the sake of the *cause*, therefore, it became necessary for me to show how baes, how detestable, are the conduct and the evident motives of our enemies. Those who publish these things against me, know well how false they are; but, it is when they affect to consider me as a *low* and *insignificant* person; it is then that they are the greatest hypocrites. I could mention, if I were to take a day or two to consider, a thousand instances, in which persons, who are *enemies to Parliamentary Reform*, and who are considered as *great men*, have availed themselves, or endeavoured to avail themselves of my support. But, there is one instance, which now occurs to me, and which, under the present circumstances, I cannot refrain from stating.

Each of you, Gentlemen, will probably recollect, that much about this time of the year, six years ago; that is to say, in the summer of 1803, at a time when there was a general fear of *invasion*, a publication was issued *by the government*, was sent to all the parishes, was distributed in the churches, and was read from the several pulpits. This paper was entitled, "IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE PEOPLE OF THIS KINGDOM:" It was, in the newspapers, attributed to LORD HAWKESBURY; afterwards to DR. HORSLEY, DR. RENNELL, and other learned and eloquent men; but, the real author of it was *myself*. I wrote it; offered it to Mr. Addington, through Mr. Yorke; he accepted of it, in which he showed his sense of duty to be above party pique: and, it was published and distributed at the expense of several thousands of pounds. Now, though the Reverend Messrs. Poulter and Woodcock may be ready to bite their tongues upon reflecting, that they once read, even from the pulpit, a production of mine, that will not do away the fact.

They would fain represent me as a *low* and *insignificant* person; but, let them efface, if they can, the fact, that a production of mine, when its author was unknown, was, by the periodical publications of the day; aye, by that *Morning Post* and that *Courier*, which now abuse me, ascribed to *Dr. Horsley* first, and then to *Dr. Rennell*; and that this publication was sent to every parish throughout the kingdom *under government authority* and at the *public expense*. When Mr. Poulter or Mr. Woodcock or Mr. Portal, or any of those, who attempt to lower me in the estimation of the people of this county; when any of them shall have produced any thing to be so honoured as this production of mine, and shall have refused, as I did, to take any compensation for it; when they shall have given such irrefragable proofs of ability, public spirit, and disinterestedness, then let them pretend to place themselves upon an equal footing with me; but not before; till then, let them keep their due, that is to say, an inferior place. In every way in which we can be compared, except as to mere money, I am *their superior*; and that, you be may assured, Gentlemen, I will not, if they persevere in their opposition to our laudable undertaking, and if I have my life and health, fail to make them *feel*.

I have, in spite of all provocation, abstained from stating this anecdote to the public, for *six years*; nor should I have mentioned it now on my own account; but, seeing that the *cause* is to be attacked through *me*,

it is necessary for me take care to guard the channel. The cause of Reform has been, and studiously is, identified with my reputation; therefore, it is necessary for me to show that those are the vilest of hypocrites and calumniators, who attack that reputation. The *King*, I was well informed, expressed the highest approbation of the work I have been speaking of. He was not, I dare say, told who was the author, nor was it necessary that he should be; for I wanted nothing of him by way of reward, no not even a "*thank you*." But, I must confess, that, *now* I do think, the *King* owes me something; and thus, I humbly conceive, he ought to pay me: He ought, I think, to order his ministers to cause this Letter to be circulated, in the same way that the little Pamphlet was; or, which I should prefer, to order them to circulate, in that manner, my next Letter upon the subject of *Parliamentary Reform*. The little pamphlet did, I verily believe, produce more effect, in this country, than had been produced by all other publications put together for years before. There are about eleven thousand Clergymen in England and Wales, and my real belief is, that all of them together, in the whole of the preceding eleven years, had not, whether by writing or preaching, moved the people so much as I moved them in one single week. I trust, therefore, that his Majesty will be pleased to give his sanction to the circulating of one of my Letters. I should, I think, prefer the next Letter upon Parliamentary Reform. I will certainly make the application, in a proper way; and, if the *King* follows his own opinion, he will, I am certain, grant my request.

I have now, Gentlemen, to apologize for the length of this Letter. I could not curtail it, without leaving out something material; and yet, I am aware, that it may be thought more, than any man, under any circumstances, ought to say of himself. Had it not been for the *public* cause, not a word should any of these vile attacks have drawn from me. What I have done seemed to be due to my *friends*, private as well as political; because those who would be silent to my face, would not scruple to taunt them. I must, however, express my earnest hope, that no friend of mine will, *in future*, expect of me, that I waste any part of my time or paper in the answering of personal attacks. At any rate, I am resolved not to do it; unless by barely stating, in a short sentence, that such or such thing is *true* or *false*. There will be thousands of lies against me; but that is what I have to expect; and really, the good opinion is worth but little of that man, who can lend an ear to the assertions of wretches, who, in pretending to give a true history of a transaction, could suppress twenty-two documents out of twenty-seven, and insert only such as tended to throw no light at all upon the merits of the case. After this instance of falsehood, baseness, meanness, and dirtiness, on the part of my assailants, no one can think it necessary for me to answer any of their future attacks except by a mere affirmation or negation; such, therefore, is all the answer they shall in future receive.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your friend,

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, 14th June, 1809.

TO THE

INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

(Political Register, July, 1809.)

“What mighty contests rise from trivial things!”

POPE.

LETTER VI.

The Pauper's Action.

GENTLEMEN,

In the poem, from which my motto is taken, you will, I dare say, recollect, that the poet records the important consequences that resulted from a gentleman's cutting off a *lock of a lady's hair*. Disproportioned as those consequences were to their cause, they are, I think, surpassed, in that respect, by the consequences, which have resulted from *the running away of a CARTER-BOY from my service*, which act has produced, probably, a greater noise and bustle, and excited more curiosity and more interest in this county, than any act or event that has taken place within the long reign of the present king; that is to say, almost half a century. Notwithstanding this, however, I should not, in this elaborate manner, have addressed you upon the subject, had the noise and bustle been confined within the county. My intention was merely to have contradicted, in the *county papers*, the falsehoods, which had been spread abroad. But, perceiving that the TRIAL, which took place at Winchester, last week, relative to this affair, has been made, in the *London ministerial prints*, a subject of vast importance, the groundwork of new calumnies, and the intended means of injuring that great public cause, in the sup-
 porting of which our enemies know me to be instrumental to the utmost of my power: perceiving this, I think it necessary to enter fully into the subject in my own work, in order that the refutation may circulate as widely as the charge; that it may even go beyond it, and that, in countries where an English ministerial paper is never seen, the character of such publications may be made known.

Those amongst you, gentlemen, who were at Winchester during the last week, and who, of course, heard the universal buz, saw the knots of people, in all parts, laying their heads together, and who, at last, saw the court crammed even to suffocation; and all this on account of a thing the most trifling, that the law can, when administered by a judge, possibly take notice of, and that, in spite of all that could be done by all the machinations of *all* the parties, high and low, concerned in the scheme, obtained from me damages to the amount of only *three pounds, six shillings, and eightpence*; you, who were eye-witnesses of the scene, and who had the means of hearing, from my neighbours, the real state of the facts, and the real motives of the action; you must have ceased to feel any surprise whatever on the subject; but, to those, who were not

at Winchester; to those whom the story has reached only through the newspapers, it must seem utterly astonishing, that all this outcry should have been made, that all this interest should have been excited, by an act, the commission of which should call for damages to the amount of only *one-third part of ten pounds*. A London paper, called the *MORNING POST*, has filled almost the whole of its columns, of Saturday last, with an account of this trial, to the exclusion of even the *French Bulletins*, which record the battle of Wolkersdorf; that battle, which, perhaps, will decide the fate of the European quarter of the world. The fall of Austria appears, with these gentlemen, to be a mere trifle, when compared with a hope of bringing me down; the struggle between the Emperors Napoleon and Francis seems to be but a thing of secondary importance, while there is a struggle between me and my carter-boy. This paper, upon the face of it, seems to say: "There has, to be sure, been a battle in Austria, and the last hope of our only remaining ally seems now to be completely annihilated; but, never mind that, loyal reader, for, look here! here we have *Cobbett* in damages to the amount of *3l. 6s. 8d.*"

According to this print, the damages against the three parties, were laid at a *thousand pounds*. Pretty modest for a pauper's being held in duress during about *seven hours*; but, was it not, then, very much like a defeat to get but *ten pounds* out of the *thousand*? I am sued for *332l. 6s. 8d.*, and the jury say, that, at the most, I ought to pay the odd *3l. 6s. 8d.*, just about the amount of the wine that almost every man drinks in a fortnight, and I drink none. The damages laid, appear to have been very well proportioned to the story. They seem to have swelled up together; and, when they came into the court, and had to face an honest and intelligent jury, who were not to be imposed upon by either *rant* or *cant*, they both together shrunk into just a *hundredth* part of the magnitude they had assumed; and, if the jury could have been informed of the *whole* of the facts, they would have shrunk into nothing, for not one farthing of damages would have been awarded; but, as we shall see, by-and-by, the action was *so contrived* as to put it out of our power to produce any of the most material facts to the jury, who were, therefore, obliged to give their verdict upon evidence brought all on one side.

That this action was not brought *for the sake of the pauper* the jury appeared to be very well convinced. Indeed, the real object of it was clear enough to every person of common discernment, the moment it was discovered whence came the *advice* to bring the action, namely, from a bench of magistrates at *DROXFORD*, composed as we shall by-and-by see. This object is clearly enough explained in the speech of *MR. BOROUGH*, one of the counsel for the pauper, the substance of which speech has been published in the *Portsmouth* newspaper, in these words:—

"The Plaintiff was a labouring man, residing in the parish of Droxford, Hants, in the service of Richard Goodlad, Esq. a magistrate for the county. The Plaintiff was of quiet and honest habits. The Defendant, *Cobbett*, was the *well-known* Author of the Political Register; who, for the last five or six years, had been resident at Botley, in that county. He was long the *pretended friend* and *advocate for the liberty of the subject*, and the privileges of Englishmen. At the *public Meetings in that county*, he had taken a conspicuous part in declaiming against the *abuse of power*, and was then addressing *weekly letters to the people of Hampshire*, urging the necessity of a Reform in the state, in order to preserve the ends of freedom, and the true spirit of the English Con-

"stitution; but the character which he assumed was badly supported by his conduct in domestic life. He was oppressive and severe around the whole circle which his power and influence extended to, the sequel of which would ill accord with his professions. The other Defendants were Blacksmiths."

These are the words, attributed to the counsel for the pauper plaintiff; these are the words published as part of the speech of a man who was assigned to plead the cause of this pauper. Who, then, can be fool enough to believe, that this action was advised and carried on for the sake of the pauper? And who can refrain from admiring the good sense and firmness of the jury, who, by their verdict, defeated the real object of the scheme? The *Morning Post* has inserted a part of Mr. BOROUGH'S speech not much less interesting, which part the Portsmouth paper has omitted. It is that where he expresses his hope, that the jury will make a distinction between the parties; that they will take the burden of damages off the other two, and lay it all upon Mr. Cobbett.

After this, it is hardly necessary to say to any man of common discernment, that the pauper was a mere cat's-paw in this action; that his pretended sufferings made no part or particle of the real motive of the action; and, in short, that the whole thing, from the beginning to the end, was a mere invention, for the purpose of misrepresenting my character, and of causing it to be believed, that, while I am preaching against public oppressors. I am, as to all those who are under my power, myself an oppressor. This was the point; this was the jet of the plan; this was the purpose for which a little village attorney was set to work to bring forward the pauper and his family, and to ferret out evidence even amongst the servants that were still living in my own house. But, though this conclusion must be drawn by every man of common sense, still I think it may be useful to relate minutely all the circumstances of this transaction, from which, better than from any general description, you, gentlemen, and the public in general, will be able to form a just opinion of the conduct of the several parties concerned.

A lad, about 16 or 17 years of age, named JESSE BURGESS, was my servant in husbandry, in the month of March last, and had been so for about two months, or a little better. Some time in the latter end of February, I found fault with him for coming in to breakfast before he had cleaned out his stable; and, on the 1st of March, I found fault with him, and that, too, in very sharp language, for lying in bed after I myself was up, that is to say, after five o'clock. These were the only times that I ever even found fault with him, as far as I can recollect.

On the 2nd of March, that is to say, the next morning, the boy got up very early and set off from his service.

His sister, Mary Burgess, who was also a servant in my house, was then sent by me to tell her parents, and the boy too, if she found him at home, that, if he came back again that day, I would forgive him; but, that, if he did not, nothing upon earth should induce me to forgive him. He did not come back. I, according to my word, got a warrant for him from Mr. SMITH of Southampton, and delivered it to Mr. Astlett, the constable of Botley, in order that he might take up the boy, which he did on the 3rd of March, and having brought him to Botley, the boy escaped, which escape produced the pretended false imprisonment of the plaintiff, Wm. BURGESS, the brother of Jesse, and which also gave a handle for the bringing of the action.

But, before we go to that, let us finish the story of Jesse, who, in the first instance, was to have all the wages he *asked*, and was told, that, if he behaved well, he should have *more*. He lived as well as I myself did; he went to bed when he pleased; he had a good fire to sit by; he had every thing that heart could wish; but, I insisted upon his getting up *early in the morning*, having full as much detestation for a slug-gard as I have for a thief. Of this he had fair warning when he was hired. He was told, over and over again, that he must rise early; that, as to other things, I might look over a good deal, but that I never would overlook his lying late in bed. Boys are, however, apt to be sleepy, and, if he had come back, when his sister went for him, I should merely have told him to get himself another master, his services being, in fact, not worth to me the half, no, nor the fifth part, of his food, living in the manner that he lived. But, there was, in the case of a servant running away and setting me at defiance, a duty which I owed to the community, and especially to my neighbours, occupying lands, who must have experienced great injury from such an example, if this boy had been suffered to get off with impunity. There are many persons, who, in such a case, would not take the trouble, and especially if, as was really the fact here, the running away is rather a lucky thing for the master; but, that is not my way: I always endeavour to discharge my duty towards the community: I, in such cases, look upon the crime not as committed against *me*, but against the public, and I act accordingly. Upon this principle it was, that, when the boy had escaped, I spared no pains or expense to recover him. He has cost me more, probably, in advertisements, than he would have earned during the year; but, what of that? I have caught him at last; he has been sent to prison; and the example will be of general utility. What a villainous thing must it be in any one to do that which shall induce people in this rank of life to set contracts at nought; to think nothing of their engagements; to make agreements with a fraudulent intention; to teach them all the tricks and quirks of pettifoggers; to make them clever in nothing but roguery; to give that turn to their minds, which, in the end, must lead them to the gallows! What a villainous thing it must be for any one to do this!

Before the boy was taken up and sent to prison, there might be some ground for supposing that he had been *ill-used*; but, *after* that, there could be none, especially when the circumstances, under which he was committed, are known. I shall by-and-by speak of these circumstances, which form a sort of underplot in the grand drama. Suffice it, at present, to say, that the boy was taken at Winchester, in the very room where the Attorney had his witness, and was, after a full examination, and a remarkably patient hearing of all he had to say, *committed to prison*. This, of itself, is a pretty good proof, that he was *used well* while at my house, and that he had no real ground of complaint, and, consequently, no reasonable cause for quitting my service. The editors of the Portsmouth paper, amongst the many falsehoods, which they have knowingly stated, have this, "that the boy was *not* a servant in *husbandry*." If so, what pretty *magistrates* must those be, who committed him *to prison* for quitting my service! I mention this as one instance of the length, to which these retailers of falsehood will go. In fact, they stick at nothing. There is no falsehood too bold for them. They know very well, that they shall be exposed, and that all good men will despise

them ; but, they value not the opinions of good men ; they make sure of the *wages* of their falsehoods and calumnies, and having those, they are perfectly dead to all feelings of shame or of conscience. It is the conduct of their employers and prompters that would surprise one, were it not the uniform practice of such people to give way to their envy and hatred, and to turn a deaf ear to the voice of reason.

Thus, it is, I think, made manifest enough, that as far as related to my *servant*, Jesse, I acted as became a master and a public-spirited man. The *mother* of the boy came, a few days before his running away, and got his *wages* up to the 1st of March or thereabouts. It was, therefore, clear, that the intention was to get the boy away for the *spring and summer*, after having placed him in good keep during that part of the year when there was little to do. This is a very common trick through the country ; my neighbours, the farmers, are plagued half out of their lives with these desertions, which always take place just as the sun begins to shine on both sides of the hedge ; that is to say, when those who have been warmed and fed all the winter, are called upon to make some remuneration by their labour. Nothing is so common as the sending of people to prison for this offence : Sir Wm. Heathcote, I was told, sent a boy to prison for the same offence, only a day or two before I was at Winchester ; but, Sir Wm. Heathcote was not a person capable of attracting attention ; he was not a person, whom speculators and hireling writers found it their interest to misrepresent ; he was not a person to excite the envy and the hatred of so many wretches, versed in the arts of cowardly calumny ; in short, he had not for his enemy every public robber, every low, dirty, hungry, pettifogging fellow in the whole county.

We must now return to the time when the boy, Jesse, was first taken up, and when the *escape*, which led to the *action*, took place.

Mr. ASTLETT, the constable of Botley, took him, at his father's house, about six miles from Botley, in the night of the 3rd of March, and brought him to Botley, to a public-house called the Dolphin, whither, by the indulgence of the constable, he was accompanied by his *mother* and his elder brother, WM. BURGESS, the pauper plaintiff.

In the morning Mr. Astlett, who is a blacksmith, had occasion to go to his own house, and, while away, he left his prisoner in the hands of the tithing man, whose name is DUBBER. While the boy was in the custody of Dubber, this latter says, that the mother came with a pretended message from me, *desiring that the boy might be permitted to come to my house* ; that thereupon he let the boy go, and that the mother and the two sons went off together.

Be this as it may, whether Dubber was thus *deceived*, or whether he, in conjunction with people at the public-house, *connived* at the boy's escape (the latter being by far the most probable), the boy did escape ; he ran away somewhere, and the mother and her elder son, the pauper plaintiff, made the best of their way towards their home.

Mr. Astlett, the constable, finding what had taken place, set out, ordering Dubber to go with him, in pursuit of them. The boy was not to be found ; but, they took up the brother and the old woman, for having aided in the escape, and these they brought to Botley.

Now, mind, all this had taken place *before I had heard even of the escape of the boy*. When this had been *done*, Mr. Astlett came to ask me what he should do with these people ; and, my answer was this :

" I have nothing to do with the matter, Astlett, nor do I know whether you have done right or wrong ; but, as you *have* taken them into custody, I think your best way is to take them before Mr. Smith (at Southampton) who issued the warrant for taking the boy up." After this, at the request of Mr. Astlett, I determined on going to Southampton myself ; and, having some other business to do with the Justice's Clerk, I told Mr. Astlett that I would meet him at the office, and *get him the best advice I could*, all along telling him to recollect, that the affair was none of mine ; that it was his affair ; that it was to him that I had to look for my servant ; and that, if the servant was not brought back, I was resolved to punish those who had let him escape.

Thus far, then, as to the *taking* of the plaintiff, I had no hand, nor had I any *knowledge*.

When I was setting off to Southampton, Mr. Astlett and Dubber were preparing to put the old woman and the plaintiff into a cart to take them thither ; and I stopped opposite the place where they were, to remind Mr. Astlett again, that the affair was no affair of mine ; that he might take them to Southampton or not, just as he pleased ; but, that, if he did take them there, I would get him the best advice I could.

I then proceeded on to the office of the magistrate's clerk, whither I was soon followed by Mr. Astlett and his prisoners. Having waited some time for the clerk's return home, I went myself to the magistrate, and gave him a full account of what had passed. He said, that, under all the circumstances, the best way, he thought, would be for the constable to let the people go, getting them to promise to bring the boy as soon as possible. Accordingly, when I went back to the clerk's office, I told Mr. Astlett this, and, as it was Saturday, we got them to promise to bring the boy on the next Monday. They were then suffered to depart, at about five o'clock in the evening, having, at the utmost, been in duress for not more than *nine hours*, having suffered *no assault*, and having sustained no other injury than the loss of a day's work, which they would have lost, whether they had been forcibly detained, or not ; seeing that they had come from home, of their own accord, and were, by their own free will, at Botley at eight or nine o'clock of the same day. Their intention was, too, to go to Southampton along with the boy ; so that, if all had gone on according to their own *voluntary intentions*, they would have had to *walk* the six miles and a half that Mr. Astlett carried them in his taxed cart, and would of course have suffered more than they actually did suffer.

Here, then, is, the mighty "*injury* !" Here is that "*act of oppression*," which has been blazoned through the country ! And here is that, which, had we not had a jury of sensible and honest men, would have extorted a good round sum of money.

From this statement, it must be evident to you, gentlemen, and to every one who shall read this letter, that I had no hand either in the imprisonment, or the detention, of the pauper plaintiff or his mother. Not that I think, that the constable did wrong ; for, though it might not be exactly *legal*, it was quite *reasonable*, that he should take before the magistrate those who, whether by stratagem or force, had rescued his prisoner. But, though I still think that the constable did right, *I had nothing at all to do with the matter*, any more than Mr. Borough or old George Rose himself

But now, as to the *real source* of this action. In about a fortnight

after the escape of the boy and the taking up of his brother and mother, Mr. Astlett and Dubber went again in search of the boy, whom they found at his father's house. What took place in the house it is not necessary to state here. Things took this turn, that Mr. Astlett came to Botley for assistance, while Dubber was left in the garden to see that the boy did not escape.

Now, observe, the new characters that come upon the scene.

One **STONE**, who was *bailiff* to Mr. **GOODLAD** (whose house stands at a little distance), and which **STONE** was also *tithing-man* of the place, came to Dubber, and told him, as Dubber says, *to go away*, for that he had no business there.

Mr. Goodlad, who lives in the parish of Droxford, and who is a *justice of the peace*, was the *master* of Wm. Burgess, the pauper plaintiff, and the occasional employer of others of the family. I knew him pretty well, and he had always seemed to me to be a very harmless man. He was, as I am told, a *salt-dealer* in *India*, and, at his return, like most other persons who have made fortunes in that country, he built a big white house upon a hill; and the spot being in the tithing of *Hill*, he called his residence *Hill-plate*.

Poor Paul told me, that, in *India*, he went by the name of "*honest DICK GOODLAD*;" and, I am ready to confess that his general conduct in our neighbourhood, has well corresponded with this appellation. He has laboured with great judgment and effect in bettering the lot of the poor in his parish, and, at the same time, greatly reducing the poor-rates; but, he knows very well, that, even in this way, *I have done a great deal more than he has*; he knows very well, that no labourer of *mine* could have *sworn himself a PAUPER*. However, he has done a great deal, and, I believe from very good motives. So well satisfied have I been of this, that I, about a year ago, joined with the farmers of the parish in a subscription for the purpose of purchasing him a piece of plate, by way of acknowledgment for the pains he had taken in arranging and conducting the affairs of the parish, particularly relating to the poor.

Such being the man, and such my opinion of him, I was very much surprised when the constable told me, that the Burgesses boasted of having *the support of Mr. Goodlad*. I accordingly wrote to him by the constable, stating to him the whole of the circumstances, cautioning him against being deceived by the stories of the Burgesses, and expressing a hope, that he, as a magistrate, who must naturally desire to see the law duly executed, would give the constable countenance and support. To my utter astonishment, the answer I received was, as nearly as I can recollect, this: *That the whole of the fault of resistance lay with the constable of Botley, whose IGNORANCE of his duty had induced him to execute a warrant OUT OF HIS OWN HUNDRED*; and, not a single word about giving the constable countenance and support! The answer further informed me, however, that the old woman and her son William, the pauper plaintiff, had been at the *Bench* at Droxford, where they had been told, that, if their story was true, *they might bring an action for false imprisonment*.

It was from this letter that arose the cross-questions, put to the old woman in court, where it appeared that the magistrates at this *Bench*, sitting in their capacity as magistrates, not only told the old woman and her pauper son, that they had ground of action, but *advised them to go to the Attorney* (Gunner) for the purpose of commencing the action.

They did not send to me, their neighbour; they did not send to Mr. Astlett, one of their peace-officers, and whose "ignorance" entitled him, in a peculiar manner, to their advice; they did not do any thing of this sort, in order to come at the real facts of the case; but, without a moment's delay, counselled an action for false imprisonment, and sent off the people to an Attorney; and, the old woman, upon being asked, whether this bench of magistrates *gave her advice to take her runaway son back to his master's service*, answered, *that they did not*.

The persons generally composing this bench are, the Rev. Mr. Poulter, the Rev. Mr. Baynes, a brother of *General Clavering*, and Mr. Goodlad. From the old woman's evidence, it appeared, that, upon the occasion now spoken of, there were actually present, besides Mr. Goodlad, only Mr. Baynes and a Mr. Henry Minchin, the former of whom has the merit of having, from very low life (his father having kept an alehouse at Bishop's Waltham), got up to the possession of a pretty good living, after having, I believe, had the honour of being teacher to a son of the bishop of the diocese, who, it will be remembered, is a brother-in-law of Poulter. Of Mr. Henry Minchin, the public shall hear some curious particulars another time. At any rate, we are all about upon a footing in respect to birth. The pedigree of none of us need occasion much trouble at the Herald's Office; so that, there was nothing, in point of *etiquette*, to prevent these magistrates from writing to me, or even to the constable, and inquiring into the truth of the matter; for, as to *family* (of which so much has been said of late), I rather think, that, if the matter were strictly inquired into, of the whole of the parties concerned, the constable would be found at the top of the tree.

Here, then, we have the *origin* of the action. Let us now see a little of its progress.

The *Attorney* was soon in motion. Botley, Droxford, Hill-Pound, Southampton, and the borders of the Forest, heard the sound of his horse's feet, and were struck with the eager countenance of the rider. He went to Mr. Astlett to learn whether *I had not a hand in the matter*, and Mr. Astlett uniformly assured him, *that I had nothing at all to do with either the imprisonment or the detention*. Since the Trial, Mr. Astlett has made, before a magistrate at Southampton, an Affidavit, of which the following is a copy:—

COUNTY OF } William Astlett of the parish of Botley, in the said county,
SOUTHAMPTON } constable of the said parish of Botley, personally appeared before me, Richard Vernon Sadlier, Esq., one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the said county of Southampton, and made Oath,—That, of the arrest of William Burgess, plaintiff in an action tried at Winchester, on the 20th instant, Wm. Cobbett, Esq., was, as far as this deponent firmly believes, totally ignorant, until *after the said arrest had taken place*;—that this deponent never *spoke to*, or *saw*, Mr. Cobbett [after the escape of the boy Jesse Burgess], until about *three hours after the arrest had taken place*;—that neither at that, or any future, time, did Mr. Cobbett aid, by advice or otherwise, *in the imprisonment or detention of the said William Burgess or his mother*;—that Mr. Cobbett, from first to last, said he did not understand the law in this respect, that he would have nothing to do with the matter, and that he (this deponent) *might keep the people, or let them go, just as he pleased*;—And that, *before the action was brought*, he (this deponent) *declared all this to Mr. Gunner, the plaintiff's Attorney*.

(Signed)

WILLIAM ASTLETT.

Sworn at the Town and County of Southampton, }
this 25th day of July, 1809. Before me, } R. V. SADLIER.

Here, then, Gentlemen, you plainly see the reason for making the constable and the tithing man *parties* along with me. By so doing the schemers deprived me of the *possibility of producing evidence* to prove that I had nothing to do with the matter.

As to the conduct of the *Attorney*, that did not at all surprise me, and would surprise nobody. The man was labouring in his vocation. He was earning his living. It was his calling, that he was at work in; and there are different sorts of work for attorneys as well as for men of other callings. But, what shall we say to Mr. Borough, who talked of the necessity of *making an example of me*; who declared me to be the *instigator to the arrest*; who mixed up *politics* with his law; and who, with all the *affectation of sincerity*, called upon me, "*challenged*" me, to *produce a witness* to contradict what his witnesses would swear! And all this, when he *well knew*, that the *only* persons who could *possibly* disprove what the family of Burgess would swear, were made *parties along with me*, and, by that means, were cut off from being witnesses; when he well knew, when he must have known, that this was the scheme from the beginning!

He said, that I was the great aggressor, and that all, or most part, of the damages, *ought to fall upon me*. Well, then, *why* was the action brought against Mr. Astlett and Dubber? Why not have attacked *me alone*? Why harass and put to expense two men, whom I, as was alleged, had persuaded, if not forced, to act illegally? Why not leave them out, and *have their evidence*, which would have been so much more satisfactory against me, than that of the old woman and her daughter? If the object was to produce *truth* and general conviction as to my *oppressive disposition*, why stick me into a record along with a constable and a tithing man? Why not, again I say, leave these two men to give evidence against me, *the truth of which evidence nobody could have doubted*?

It is useless to pursue these questions. Mr. Astlett's Affidavit is an answer to them all; and, I need not say another word, to enable any man of common understanding to affix to the whole of this transaction, and to the several parties concerned in it, the character they deserve, and which character, I trust, they will bear.

I will just add, that Mr. Astlett, who is a blacksmith, is a man of considerable property; that he is not at all under my influence, but, on the contrary, has been supposed to be rather at variance with me, I having, better than a year ago, ceased to employ him, which, before that time, I used to do.

My enemies, which, Gentlemen, are *your enemies*, and the worst enemies of our country: I do not mean any poor, paltry things in the country; but our enemies, *who have power over the press in London*; these enemies, like all men who are more under the influence of vindictive passions than of reason, have, in this, as in many other instances, contributed towards my elevation in their endeavours to pull me down.

In the first place, by the very noise, that they have made about this action, without any thing else, they confess their fear of me, and proclaim their high opinion of my consequence in the country. There is no man, who reads what they have caused to be published, who must not, from the bare magnitude of the publication, when compared with the result, conceive a high notion of the person attacked. He must

without any reasoning at all, imbibe a high opinion of my consequence in the country.

Mr. Borough called me plain "*Cobbett*," and the Judge, in summing up, observed upon what Mr. Jekyll had said about my being a "*public character*," that he did not see any reason for giving that appellation to "*a man who wrote in a newspaper*." With all my heart. I do not want to be, or to be thought, a "*public character*;" but, the vexation of it is, my enemies, and the enemies of my country, will make me one; they will insist upon my being a public character; I must be so, in spite of all my efforts to bury myself in woods and in fields. "*A man who writes in a newspaper*" is an appellation that will do very well for me; but, they will not let me be quiet with it; they will suffer no act of mine, no office of life performed by me, to pass with that degree of notice which is bestowed upon the acts and offices of common men. If, for instance, Mr. Poulter or Mr. Sturges (who is another very near neighbour of the Burgesses) had happened to have been defendant, the other day, in my place, there would not have been twenty people present to hear the trial; and, if any notice at all of it had been taken in the newspapers, that notice would have been squeezed into three lines. They wish to sink me into oblivion; and, they have so ably managed the matter as to make even the sound of my name sufficient to call together a multitude of people, in any part of the kingdom. When the run-away boy was retaken at Winchester, and I went before the magistrate to give an information against him, the room was instantly filled with black coats and white heads. It was quite charming to see, that the poor had so many friends amongst the fat fellows assembled. I think there were four, who *gratuitously* pleaded for the boy; while "*poor boy*" issued from the mouths of fifty people at once, who live in laziness upon the labour of the poor.

If it were not useless to be angry, one might, and I do think, without any sin at all, wish for the power of exterminating this race of hypocrites, who, so far from believing me to be an oppressor of the poor, count, amongst their reasons for hating me, that, as far as my personal influence extends, I have made the labouring people comparatively independent. It is a shame for me, at such a time as this, when the most interesting political subjects present themselves for discussion: it is a shame for me, at such a time, to fill my pages with my own domestic concerns; but, as in the case of the Court-martial, it is really rendered necessary for the sake of the public cause. I am informed, that, so early as Friday last, the very day after the trial, the walls in London were covered over with large bills about the "*OPPRESSIONS OF COBBETT*;" and "*COBBETT, THE OPPRESSOR OF THE POOR*," &c. &c. These posting bills cost, perhaps, *fifty pounds a day*! And, by the time that this thing is done with, it will, I dare say, cause an expenditure of, at the very least, *ten thousand pounds*. This is doing pretty well for the purpose of circulating the knowledge of an action, in which I am brought in for damages to the amount of *3l. 6s. 8d.*; nor is it amiss to bear in mind, that these publications, these wonderful exertions of philanthropy, are making by those very persons, who, from first to last, defended the conduct, all and every part of the conduct, of the *Jailor Aris*!

For these reasons, for the sake of the *public cause*, which is thus sought to be injured through me, I think I shall be excused for stating some facts, which will, much better than any general description, enable

those who do not know me to judge of my character as a *master* or *employer*.

In the first place, I have made it a rule, that I will have the labour of no man, who receives *parish relief*. I give him, out of *my own pocket*, let his family be what it may, enough to keep them well, without any regard to what wages other people give; for I will employ *no pauper*. I pay poor-rates, part of which go to the maintenance of other people's labourers; but, any thing in the shape of *parish relief*; any thing to obtain which a man is to humble himself into a pauper, I never suffer a labourer of mine to receive.

In the next place, I give my men *constant pay*, all seasons and all weathers. My labourers have none of those anxieties about the weather that labourers in general have; and, though I have no rule about *sickness*, I have never yet had, amongst my constant labourers, a sick man, whom I did not pay all the same as if he were well.

I have now four men whom I employ constantly, one has been with me ever since I first came to reside at Botley; one about two years and a half; and the other two about a year and a half; and to only two of these men, and that upon only one occasion, did I ever give an angry word. These men have always been *by the week*, so that, once in every seven days, they have had an opportunity of quitting me, if they chose.

I wish the hungry-looking philanthropists, who exclaimed, "*poor boy!*" over my run-away carter, could see my labourers. I wish still more that we had an opportunity of comparing them with their half-starved wretches, who, from sheer poverty of blood, are eaten up with disease. I wish all England could see my labourers and compare them with those who have hatched against me this charge of oppression. Has Mr. *Borough* labourers? If he has, I here offer to bet him the amount of the damages *he laid* against the amount of the damages *he got*, that any *three* of my labourers receive as much from me as any *five* of his labourers receive from him. Come, Mr. Goodlad, I'll offer you a bet; and that is, that I pay *one fourth more, all the year round*, to a labourer who has only *one arm*, than you pay to your labourer, William Burgess, the pauper plaintiff. No labourer of mine has, indeed, the advantage of being able to *swear himself a pauper*; no man who labours for me, no man whose sweat drops upon my land, however large his family, stands in need of any thing but what I give him in the shape, not of alms, but of *pay*; but William Burgess, a labourer of this Mr. Goodlad, one of those who advised the action, could, with only *one child*, and he an able young man, *swear himself a pauper!*

I do not pretend, that it is from a regard for my labourers that I give such great wages; for, I am convinced, that it is my interest to do it. One of my labourers is worth two or three half-famished creatures. But my great motive is, the lessening of the number of paupers; the setting an example in this way, that may tend to raise part, at least, of the labouring people from that state of *slavery*, commonly called *pauperism*. No man that is in health, that has the use of his limbs, and is, in all respects, able to labour, ought to be reduced to the necessity of *begging*; and what is it but begging, to go weekly for parish relief? This is the most shocking thing that ever existed in any country upon the face of the earth. That one half, or more, of the *labourers* of a country should be paupers, is really something too disgraceful to think of. I have always thought this, and now that I have it in my power to put my principles in prac-

tice, I do it as far as I possibly can. A constant state of pauperism would debase the best nature that man ever possessed. A labourer in this state is always studying deceit; he is afraid of nothing so much as of appearing prosperous, healthy, or happy; he contracts a plaintive language and manner; the worst side he always puts outwards; his children are studiously clad in rags and covered with filth; his wife is always "poorly;" and, in short, a few years rob him of every particle of spirit and sincerity. He, like slaves every where else (for to *have nothing* is to be a slave), has no regard for country, or for any thing attached to country; and all his hopes and all his wishes centre in the quantity of food to be extracted from the overseer. Is it not shocking to reflect upon the natural, the inevitable, consequences of rearing families in this way? I never should have a moment's peace, if a labourer of mine was thus rearing up a brood of hypocrites. A family, thus reared, not only is likely to be, but is sure to be, a nest of thieves and impostors. Nor is the "*comforting system*" much better; the cow system, the child-bed-linen system, the church-going system, and the industry system, all which, like the schools of Mrs. Hannah More, do more harm than good. In fact, all the largesses that well-meaning people bestow, in any of these ways, are so many *premiums for hypocrisy*, which, amongst the poor in particular, is the worst of all vices. A good labourer may be in distress. Give him something, then, at once, and *say no more about it*. Let him do with it what he pleases. Make no bargains with him about his morality; for, if you do, you make him a hypocrite. It is quite delightful to see this village of Botley, when compared to most others that I know. They seem here to be quite a different race of people. They are what some people call saucy, but they are not hypocrites. They are, in short, what Englishmen ought to be; they show their humours when they like; they give *their* labour for *your* money, and think there is *no obligation* on either side. Beautiful as is this part of the country, and this village in particular, there is nothing in either that pleases me like the spirit of the people, who are a race of men quite different from those, who, in the school of pauperism, have learnt all the arts of cringing and dissimulation.

The way in which we have proceeded here, is really worth being made public, and may, with a little individual exertion, be turned to great and general utility. As an instance: we had two families, one of which contained *nine* children and the other *seven*, the whole of whom, drawn up in rank-intire, and set off to the best advantage, that is to say, half hung over with rags, the rest of the body being naked, were arrayed against us before a bench of magistrates. We were satisfied, that, owing to particular circumstances, they had quite a sufficient income; but, as we could not *prove* it upon oath, the magistrates were about to order them relief, when I offered to *pay* them weekly all that they *said* they earned, and, besides that, as much as they *received from the parish*, rather than suffer them to continue paupers. They declined my offer, got no relief, and have not only done without relief since, but have gradually assumed a more decent and prosperous appearance; and, for this very obvious reason, that they have no longer an *interest in being thought miserable*. Here were, at once, sixteen children raised from a state of pauperism; that is to say, from all sorts of vice, but particularly of that worst of all vices, hypocrisy.

I have mentioned this in the hope that some few persons, at least,

who have the power, will try the experiment; will endeavour to lessen this terrible evil of pauperism. The fact is, that, as matters now stand, the paupers are *partners* in no inconsiderable part of the property of every farmer; and, gentlemen, I beg you to observe, that this part of your property is not left to *yourselves* to distribute, but is taken out of your hands at the will of the next bench of magistrates, a great part of whose sway consists in the disposing of that part of your property called Poor-rates; and thus, this disgraceful evil of pauperism, does, in some degree, produce *your* subjection also, of which it is impossible to get rid by any other means than these, of which I have been speaking. The power to dispose of this money is frequently, and, indeed, almost always, in this county, in the hands of those who *pay little or no part of it*. This is, of itself, a very galling consideration; but, as I said before, there is, at present, no way of getting rid of, or lessening, the evil, without reducing, by some means or other, the number of paupers.

To return again, for a few minutes, to the subject of my treatment of labouring people, I do not know any thing more decisive that I can say than this: I do not like to throw out a *general* challenge, but I will select a few remarkable gentlemen in the county; and first there are the two county members, Messrs. *Chute* and *Heathcote*; then there is the *High Sheriff*; then there is Mr. *Borough*, the chairman of the Quarter Sessions; and, lastly, there is *Old George Rose*. Now, if my labourers do not, upon an average, receive from me constantly above one fourth part more pay than the labourers of these gentlemen, or any of them, receive from them, I will then be content to pass for a grinder of the poor.

Of all the charges that could have been invented, that of being a hard master, or employer, is the one that suits me least. All those who know me, know that I never higgie as to prices in any case whatever; that I never attempt to beat any body down; never attempt to cheapen any thing; never waste any of the precious moments of life in this sort of lying and cheating. If the public would know what I am in this respect, let them look at those who have been long employed under me. Let them look at Mr. BAGSHAW and Mr. BUDD, both of whom have been constantly employed by me, in one way or another, ever since my return to England. A young man, who was my shopman in America, and whom I took from being a journeyman book-binder, now has the business which I had at New York. This prosperity is not too much; it is not more than they have all merited; but, it has been invariably the case with those employed by me, that, if *sober* and *industrious*, they have rapidly risen in life, I myself, being to them an example of sobriety and industry. Accordingly, I have been, and I am, better served than any body else. Those who have been long employed by me, not only like my employment, but they like me personally better than they like any other man in the world, and this, not from any wheedling or coaxing they get from me; not from any cant about humanity; not on account of any *palaverings*; but on account of that frankness and sincerity which they always experience from me, that freedom in conversation, that unrestrained familiarity, and that absence of every thing like superciliousness or austerity, which have always marked my character, and, in all which, to the surprise of most observers, I indulge, with my children as well as with all others under me, without at all lessening the weight of my authority. That reserve, that distant behaviour, and all those arts, which are so often resorted to for the

purpose of keeping up a consequence in the eyes of inferiors, I despise. I would sooner earn my bread with a mattock or a spade, than make use of such arts. In short, I do not believe, that, in the whole world, there is one man more completely happy in family and in those under his authority than I am; and, I do not believe, that there are many who deserve it more. In my house we know of no such thing as blue-devils (which by-the-bye, are much worse than black-devils); we know of no lowness of spirits; we are always sober, always industrious, always up early in the morning; and, like the Quakers, we are *never gay*, and, therefore, we are *always cheerful*. Our taste is to lay out, what we are able to lay out, upon *useful labour*; upon that the effects of which will, in one way or another, be seen and felt when we shall be no more. This is our taste, and not to exhaust our substance, and entail a life of dependence upon our children, by vain and empty attempts at show. We have too just notions of what constitutes happiness, as well as of what is our duty towards our children, to waste, in vain parade, that which may make those children as independent in conduct as we are. Our maxim is, that we have *no right* to live in a style higher than that in which we have a fair chance of enabling *each* of our children to live; that it would be *criminal* in us to bring our family up in a way, which would induce them to expect a life higher than the one that *we can secure* to them, and which might lead them to become dependents upon the government, that is to say, a *higher sort of paupers*, and tempt them to do all manner of base and infamous acts. We see too many of those miserable creatures, who, with all the outward show of ease and gaiety, lead a life of continual care and woe; we see too much of this splendid beggary; we see too many of these higher sorts of paupers, to think of imitating them; and, indeed, it is because we are happy and independent, because we care for none of them, because we despise them, because we are a living satire upon their baseness, that they hate us, and would gladly see us exterminated. They put me in mind of Milton's Devil, in the garden of Eden, looking round the bush and gnashing his fangs, at Adam and Eve.

Now, Gentlemen, it is really a shame, at a time like this, to fill a public paper (which ought to be devoted exclusively to political topics) with matter like this; but what am I to do? I have carefully examined the newspapers, commonly called ministerial, and, I find, that, for more than two months past, more space has been occupied with ME, than with the Emperor Napoleon, the Archduke Charles, and Sir Arthur Wellesley, all put together; and I could almost venture to assert, that, during that time, there have been, in various ways, not less than from *twenty to thirty thousand pounds* expended upon publications against me. The Trial relating to this pauper, was, as I before observed, inserted in those papers to the exclusion of the account of that battle, which in all probability, has decided the fate of continental Europe. In short, when compared to the defeating of me, the defeating of Buonaparte appears to be considered as a mere trifle. His fearful, his terrific success, really seems to have been overlooked during the tide of joy excited by the damages of *3l. 6s. 8d.* obtained against me at Winchester; and all that appears to have been wanting, was, the firing of the Park and Tower guns, when the news of this famous achievement was received. This being the case, I am compelled, in spite of my natural inclination, to

consider myself as a person of great consequence not only in this county but through the kingdom; I am compelled to consider whatever relates to my conduct or my character as being of great public importance, and as being deeply interesting to all descriptions of persons. "Greatness is thrust upon me;" and, as if it were impossible to do the thing sufficiently in London, recourse has been had to the assistance of my neighbours in the country. I, therefore, have no need of any apology for this long address upon matters relating almost wholly to myself; for, the fact, notoriously is, that notwithstanding the great events that are passing upon the continent of Europe, there is, in England, no subject whatever, which excites so much public interest as the character and conduct of William Cobbett.

One word, Gentlemen, by way of conclusion, relative to the conduct of the *Judge* and the *Jury*. Some persons thought, that the Judge's summing up was *hostile towards me*. I must confess, that I did not think so. It was next to impossible that he should have any notion of the case as it must *now* appear to you and to the public. There was a buzz of calumny and falsehood against me, running through the city of Winchester. Little or much of this would naturally reach the ears of the Judge, and those ears he could not shut. But, independent of this, the *evidence* was such, that unless the Judge had known the parties, and the whole history of the thing, I do not see how he was to draw any other conclusion than what he did. In short, I saw in the judge's conduct nothing that appeared to me at all unfair; and, I hope, that, in a similar case, I should have acted just as he did.

The *jury*, not one of whom did I know, and not one of whom lives I think, within ten or twelve miles of Botley, would, however, naturally be better acquainted with the real nature of the case than the judge. They were, for the most part, farmers; and, as a great talk had been excited by the falsehoods which my enemies were circulating, these farmers would naturally make inquiries amongst the farmers from my neighbourhood, and would, thereby, get at something nearer the truth. They would perceive, too, that which the Judge could not be expected to perceive, relative to the *conduct of the bench at Droxford*. The moment we got the Old Woman to confess, that a bench of *magistrates*, before whom she went, did *not* recommend her to induce her run-away son to return to his master's service, but *advised her to bring an action against that master and the two peace-officers, who alone could be witnesses for him*; the moment we got the Old Woman to confess this, the jury must have been to the bottom of the matter. Still, however, there was the *evidence*, which, owing to the circumstances before mentioned, we could not overset; and therefore, it was impossible not to give the verdict against us; but the jury took care, at the same time, to act *justly*, and they thereby most cruelly disappointed those expectations, which many had evidently formed. Had the judge and jury seen the case in its true light, had the forms of law permitted me to produce the evidence that I could have produced, the damages would not have been sufficient to purchase the Attorney a glass of grog. or a quid of tobacco; and yet the *bets* ran at between 300*l.* and 500*l.*; and the jury were, by some gay-dressed rabble that stood near a friend of mine, execrated almost to their teeth. The dis-appointment of Mr. BROUGH, who appeared to be the favourite of the day, was the most striking. While the Jury were consulting, he, with folded brief in one hand and pen in the other, was prepared to *note down*

the verdict. His body was not on tip-toe, for he sat down, but his mind manifestly was. The jury paused a little. He dipped his pen afresh, and again brought it to the attitude of making the to-be-celebrated record. His eagerness was observed. He affected to chat. A jury-man made a half turn: back came the pen, replenished with a new dip. Thus he sat, his arms upon the table, his eye fixed upon the jury-box, all his muscles strained, apparently to their utmost stretch—when, at the sound of the words *ten pounds*, down, with a sort of fling, went the brief out of one hand and the pen out of t'other. That these workings of anxiety and disappointment were not confined to the breasts of the pauper's counsel was very evident from that longitude of face, which, at the moment when Mr. Borough dropt his pen and brief, became dolefully visible in some of the gayest and most smirking of the boxes.

Thus, Gentlemen, burst that bubble, which the envy and hatred of some, and the folly of others, had blown up till it assumed a magnitude superior to that of all the other causes brought before the court; and thus, it is possible, though by no means certain, that my and your enemies received a lesson from an honest Jury, that may be useful to them in future. Nothing so completely as this affair, and the publications that have arisen out of it, could prove to the whole nation, to what low and despicable means of calumny my enemies are capable of resorting. Gentlemen, all that my friends, that is to say, the friends of the Constitution of England, have to do, is, to put to my enemies this question: "Would YOU have advised, or pushed on, or had even the *smallest share* in, that action against Mr. Cobbett?" Put this question to them *individually*; put this question to each man *in the face of all companies*. Ask them, then, whether *they* never *swear* at those with whom they are angry? And, if the blush of shame does not come upon their cheek, if they are such double-distilled hypocrites as still to affect horror at such expressions, set them down for the disciples of some *gambling, drunken, impious, political priest*.

With every sentiment of regard,

I am,

Your friend,

WILLIAM COBBETT.*

Botley, 26th July, 1809.

* Many years after the occurrence of this action, the affair of *Jesse Burgess* was again raked up as an instrument to injure Mr. COBBETT with the public. Just after his return from America, in 1820, he became a candidate to represent the city of Coventry in Parliament. No pains were spared in spreading false reports in order to make the electors dislike him; and the story of *Jesse Burgess* was brought forth amongst other things. But it so happened, that *JESSE BURGESS* was alive, and living not far from Botley, though Mr. COBBETT had never seen any thing of him since the date of the trial. He was now sent for, in order that he might go to Coventry, there to tell his own story, if he chose, to the electors; and thither *JESSE* went accordingly, and was seen by the people. As neither he, nor the rest of his family, had, in fact, had any thing to do in getting up the action, they did, as was very natural, express their regret at that circumstance on being reminded of it. The man's own account only confirmed the above statement of Mr. Cobbett; and the object of this calumny as revived at Coventry, was defeated.—ED.

JACOBIN GUINEAS.

(*Political Register*, September, 1809.)

NOTE BY THE EDITORS.—These Articles on “Jacobin Guineas,” show the truth of what Mr. COBBETT had, for some years before, been asserting as to the depreciation of the Bank Paper; but particularly the affair of Dr YONGE came to his aid as a practical illustration of the truth of all his arguments. The depreciation was becoming so evident to the nation, that Mr. VANSITTART (now Lord BEXLEY) moved, and carried by a large majority, in the House of Commons, the following Resolution:—“That the promissory notes of the Bank of England have hitherto been, and are at this time, held in public estimation to be equivalent to the legal coin of the realm, and generally accepted as such in all pecuniary transactions, to which such coin is lawfully applicable.”—See *Journals*.

THERE is a curious dispute going on between two philosophers, one of whom writes in the *Morning Chronicle*, and the other in some ministerial paper, about the *discount upon guineas*, which, it seems, is now openly confessed to exist to what one of these writers calls “an *alarming degree*,” though, for my part, I see nothing alarming in it. The philosopher, who writes in the *Chronicle*, has suggested a *remedy*; and what does the reader think it is? Why, nothing short of compelling the Bank of England to confine its issues to a certain reduced amount; that is to say, to the putting down of its paper altogether; for, the moment it begins to draw in, the whole thing vanishes into its native nothingness. Like the other parts of the system, the paper must go on increasing, or it falls.

This philosopher would fain have the Bank make such regulations as would *enhance the value of money*; that is to say, as would make us pay more to the fund-holders than we now pay, when every reflecting man wishes that we had to pay them less instead of more.

Besides, does this writer imagine, that the *country* bankers would not make money to supply the place of any reduction at the Bank of England? He seems to imagine, that no paper money is good for any thing except that of *the Bank*, as it is called. But, have we not thousands of banks? Aye, and that make as good money as the Bank in Threadneedle-street. Indeed, the Threadneedle-street money will not pass only at this distance from London half so well as the money made by our neighbours, and that this writer would have plainly seen if he had been with me, last Tuesday, at Giles’s Hill Fair, where he would not have got a hundred weight of cheese for a thousand pounds in the Threadneedle-street money. The truth is, that the paper-money makers in the country *are known* to those who use their manufactory; and, what is more, the *estates* of most of them are known. If a contrary wind were to blow away the credit of all paper-money, those who hold notes of their neighbours fall upon *their land*, in default of specie; but, where are those to go, who hold the notes of the manufacturers in Threadneedle-street? The country manufactory is not a *legal tender*. Its makers are under no

"RESTRICTION," not to pay in gold! Oh, the pretty phrase "*Bank Restriction!*" How will our sons laugh at this? Nay, what fun shall we yet have with it ourselves! The Bank of England gets a law passed to prevent their creditors from demanding gold for its promissory notes; and then the law lays "*a restriction*" on them not to pay gold for their promissory notes! And, because guineas will not associate with such paper; because a guinea, which has an intrinsic value, will not degrade itself by circulating in company with such paper, calling itself money, is it to be accused of *Jacobinism*? The persons who take, as well as those who give, three or four or five and twenty shillings for a guinea (it fetched, I believe, only twenty-two shillings at Giles's Hill Fair, owing, perhaps, to the purchase being made in *country-made paper-money*), are accused of Jacobinism; but, it is the guinea's fault. It will not go for less. You cannot get it to stir without a discount. It feels its superior worth, and asserts it. But, there is nothing Jacobinical in all this; if there be, at any rate, the Jacobinism is in the guinea.

The guinea is now become an object of purchase and sale, and no longer a piece of current coin. No man ever sees a guinea *paid away*, except by mere accident; but, to the comfort of our two philosophers, be it known, that when the *trade* in guineas shall have become well established, which time is, in all probability, at no great distance, guineas will *flock back again into the kingdom*. They go abroad at present only because they *will not circulate with paper-money*, and because they are not as yet a well-known *article of commerce*. When they become the latter, back they will hasten, from all parts of the world; and, indeed, they will do well; for they will *very soon be wanted*. Then, indeed, will be a day for a *Jubilee*; then the people of England may again dance and sing; but, at present, I see no reason for a Jubilee, which, to make the thing complete, is called for by those, who have been most instrumental in driving the King's image and superscription from the land. When his Majesty's picture returns to our dwellings, then will we join in a Jubilee; but until then, let Jubilees, like Turtle Meetings, be confined to those who make contracts and loans, and who bask in the sunshine of "*Bank-restrictions.*"

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, Thursday, 14th Sept., 1809.

JACOBIN GUINEAS—Continued.

(*Political Register, September, 1809.*)

THE phrase "*discount upon guineas,*" in my article upon this subject, was used in a hurry, instead of "*discount upon bank-notes in exchange for guineas.*"

I am pleased to see, that the philosopher, in the *Morning Chronicle*, and his opponent, in some publication not named by the *Chronicle*, seem disposed to keep up their controversy; because I am quite sure, from what they have already done, that they will do a great deal of good.

Twenty thousand of these JACOBS were, the newspapers tell us, apprehended, the other day, by the police-officers, in a vessel upon the Thames, whence they were just about to set sail to the continent, and, in all likelihood, to Holland or France. But, alas! it is in vain to endeavour to stop them by coercive measures. They will go any whither, rather than remain here to circulate in company with the Threadneedle-street money. Besides, *what should they be kept here for?* They have in them a *real value*; and, what should they remain here for, while we have so many shops for the making of money, which has in itself *no real value at all?*

It is folly supreme to suppose, that, in the present state of things, the guineas will remain in England. Suppose I had ten thousand of them, I should let them go with persons who wanted to carry money abroad, because these persons would give me, perhaps, eleven thousand pounds, in paper-money, for them. Is there any *law* against the emigration of guineas? Oh, no! It is nonsense to talk of it, while, if any one will go to Portsmouth, or Plymouth, when a fleet of men of war is going out, he will see a couple of hundred of subaltern blood-suckers, who wear long beards, that they may pass for Jews, selling guineas to the sailors at a price much higher than they have ever yet fetched in Smithfield-market, and, by the means of which traffic, the poor fellows *lose a very considerable portion of their pay*. This is a very serious evil, and one, amongst thousands of others, that we owe to the terrible system of paper-money.

One of the wise men, who are writing upon the subject, in the newspapers afore-mentioned, says, that it is not the paper which has *depreciated*, but the guinea which has *risen*, in value. What a wise man! What a philosopher! So, because we can still get a loaf, at some rate or other, for the Threadneedle-street money, that money has *not depreciated*; because it is not completely blown away, it is as good as it ever was! But, wise man, you should bear in mind, that the value is *relative* and not *positive*, and that, if the paper-money be not worth so much, in relation to the guinea, as it used to be, the paper-money *has depreciated*. The guinea is the standard; it is the *touch-stone*; and, if the paper-money will not bear its touch, it is become debased.

To a certain point the guinea will sink with the paper, but it will go no farther. Whether it has already reached that point, I am not certain. I do not think it has *generally* and *decidedly*; because, if it had, we should *see more guineas*; and we should hear bargains openly made, making a distinction between prices in gold and prices in paper. The guineas disappear now, only because things are not *generally* come to this pass; because they have not their just value given them in our bargains; because they are insulted by the continual attempts which ignorance is making to keep them upon an equality with old rags mashed and printed into money. When they once come to be treated with proper respect and deference, they will, as the gold did in America and France, re-appear in abundance. At present they are gone, and appear to be fast going, upon their travels; but, it is surprising how quickly they will flock back again, when once they find us generally disposed to treat them with becoming distinction.

One of the philosophers, above referred to, has a remark, that paper is as good as gold, *as long as people have confidence in it*; aye, sure; and, *with the same proviso*, hairs out of a Hanoverian's whiskers are as good as paper. But, the fact is, that there are *events*, nay, mere ru-

mours of events, arising from within or coming from without, any one of which would *destroy that confidence in the twinkling of an eye*; and would, of course, annihilate the paper-money; but no event, of any sort, however dreadful or calamitous, could either destroy, or lessen the value of, gold and silver; but, on the contrary, would, and must enhance their value; because it must be clear to every one, that, if the paper-money were annihilated, the guinea, which will now purchase only about five pecks of wheat, would purchase, perhaps, three bushels, as it did previous to Pitt's administration.

There is a passage in the Morning Chronicle of Wednesday, in a letter signed R., which passage I shall here insert, as well worthy of notice, particularly by my readers.

"The severity of the law against the exportation of gold coin, prevents any one from openly selling bank-notes at a discount; not from any delicacy, as your correspondent supposes me to say, against doing an *immoral* or an unlawful act, but from the fear, that, as it is known that no one can purchase guineas, but with a view to exportation, he would become an object of suspicion, — he would be watched, and unable to effect his purpose. Repeal the law, and what can prevent an ounce of standard gold in guineas from selling at as good a price as an ounce of Portugal coin, when it is known to be rather superior to it in purity? And if an ounce of standard gold, in guineas, would sell in the market (as Portugal coin has lately done) at 4l. 13s. per oz., how long would a shopkeeper sell his goods at the same price either for gold or bank-notes indifferently? The penalties of the law, therefore, have degraded the few guineas in circulation to the value of the bank-notes, but send them abroad, and they will purchase exactly what an equal quantity of Portugal coin will."

This latter part of the paragraph says what I said about four years ago, and for saying which Mr. Sheridan attacked me by name in the House of Commons, while, "out of doors," I was assaulted, by the whole gang of hirelings, as a wretch that aimed a blow at the vitals of my country. Now, MR. PERRY, pray show me, what right you have to publish such truths, any more than I had.

To be sure, if the guinea be, "*degraded*" no matter from what cause, it will not stay. It will go abroad, because it cannot get its value at home.

I am rather pleased at seeing the passage, because it has actually reached me since I wrote down to the very sentence, with which I have introduced it. I am pleased at it, because it is a proof, that there is a right way of thinking arising amongst us, as to this important matter, and because it affords room to hope, that the grand delusion is fast drawing to a close.

This writer, however, has his *remedy*, for which I am sorry, because he aids the delusion. He has a notion, that, by *diminishing the quantity of bank-notes*, you would raise their value, and so *bring back the gold*. But, admitting that such would be the effect would the cause produce no other effect?

Let us hear his own words:

"This is the temptation to their exportation, and operates the same as a demand from abroad. Our currency is already superfluous, and it is worse than useless to retain the guineas here. But diminish the currency, by calling in the excess of bank-notes: make a *partial void*, as your correspondent justly observes was done in France and other countries, from the *annihilation of their paper-credit*, and what can prevent the effectual demand which would thereby be immediately

“ created, from producing *an importation of gold*, and consequently a “ favourable exchange ? ”

The *other effect* which this diminution would produce would be this : that, the country would have to pay much more than it now pays to the *fundholders*. Diminish the quantity of circulating medium, and you add to the value of what remains ; so that the fund-holder, who now receives, in the name of a *pound* in money, about 15 quartern-loaves from the tax-payers in general, would in that same pound, receive 20 or 30 quartern-loaves. Oh, no ! There can be no *diminution* of the quantity of paper, which, on the contrary, must increase with the quantity of the taxes, and which, of course, must go on depreciating in value and *driving the guineas out of its society*, until the day comes, when that “ *partial void* ” in the currency, of which this writer speaks, shall take place. I do not, I must, however, confess, very clearly comprehend what is meant by the word “ *partial*,” as here applied. He speaks of “ making a *partial void*, as was done in France and other countries, from the ANNIHILATION of their paper-credit.”

Zooks ! a *void* indeed this would make ; but, very far from being *partial* I think. I will not, however, quarrel with the *name* : give me but the *thing*, and I care not how you name it.

But, is it not odd, that this writer should think of effecting, by the means of a *diminution* in the amount of the bank-notes, that which, in France, it required an *annihilation* of paper-money to effect ? As an argument of analogy this is certainly very deficient, and that, too, in the most essential point.

It is impossible to look at the state of the paper-money, and to consider its connection with what is called *the funds*, or *the stocks*, without feeling an anxious desire to warn people against the danger, nay, the ruin, to which, from a misunderstanding of the matter many of them, with the best intentions, are daily exposing themselves, and many more of them are daily exposing their children.

When Pitt first became minister, a person who received 5 pounds a year interest upon a certain quantity of stock, could buy about *two hundred quartern-loaves* with it ; but, that same person, with the same interest upon the same stock, can now buy only about *seventy-five quartern-loaves*. Thus that person's income has sunk in *reality*, in the proportion of from 200 to 75, though it is *nominally* the same. And, indeed, we daily witness the melancholy effects of this depreciating power of paper-money, not payable in gold or silver. That the thing will go on thus, there can be no doubt. Ought not fathers and mothers, therefore, to reflect well before they provide for their children's future support by vesting property in what is called *the funds*, or, by some, *the stocks* ? There are numerous persons whose income arises from this source, where the kindness of parents has placed it by way of *security* ; but, surely, living parents ought to take warning from the fate of those children whose fortunes were vested in the funds only a few years ago, and many of whom, able then to keep their carriages upon their incomes, are now scarcely able to keep a single servant of any sort or size. But, this is not all. It is not a *regular annual diminution of fortune* only that such parents ought to dread, in behalf of their children (which, however, no parent has a *right* to bequeath to his child) ; there is the further danger of a total *annihilation* of the *fortune* ; for, the fact is, that *the funds are the bank-notes*, and *the bank-notes are the funds*. From every person, who is

possessed of a stock certificate, the government has, directly or indirectly, borrowed so much money, Well, what does it give as a security for the payment of the interest? Why, this same certificate. Well, and of what use is the certificate? Why, it enables the holder of it to go and draw the interest. Well, and whither does he go to get the interest? Why, to the bank in Threadneedle-street. Well, and what sort of money is he paid the interest in? Why, *the paper-money printed at that place.*

Well, then, is not here the whole thing complete? And, if any event were to destroy the paper-money, would not the certificate of such stock-holder be worth less than the bit of paper upon which I am now writing?

Fathers and mothers; all those who have fortunes to leave; all those who have provision to make for children, relations, or friends, should duly consider these things.

For the same reason, people should avoid *annuities* as much as possible, the *nominal* amount being always the same, in such cases, whatever may be the depreciation in the real value. If, for instance, an annuity were now granted of a hundred a year, in twenty years time (things proceeding as they have done) it would not be worth above forty pounds a year. The life insurance offices must gain immensely from this cause. In this case, indeed, and in the case of a grant or settlement upon *private* property, the chances may be said to be reciprocal; because, though the paper-money be annihilated, and money, of course, *augmented* in value, the annuity must still be paid in its nominal amount. I must confess, however, that I do not think, that this *could* be, and, if it could, it ought not; for certainly the party granting or settling never could count upon any such change, if he had, it is clear he would have provided against it. In the case, therefore, of an annihilation of the paper-money, the law must come and fix upon a mode of doing justice between the annuitant and the party who had to pay the annuity. This, too, must be the case with respect to *rents*, and other payments, arising from contracts of a similar nature. Nor, can I help thinking, that very great injustice was done to landlords, mortgagees, and others, having permanent nominal demands upon real property; I cannot help thinking, that great injustice was done to them, when the act was passed, to protect the Bank in Threadneedle-street, against those who demanded, or might demand, gold in exchange for its promissory notes. This act produced a depreciation of money, which has ever since been going regularly on. Of course, the landlord, who had then let a farm for a *hundred pounds* a year, now gets less for it than he then did. The fact is, that, though *nominally* the same, the *real* amount is not now above two-thirds of what it was then. So that, this act of protection for the Threadneedle-street Bank, did in reality, produce a violation of the contract between the landlord and the tenant, to the very great injury of the former, and, if he let a 21 years' lease, to something very little short of his ruin. This act ought to have provided for the due fulfilment of all *contracts* then existing, by enabling the claimant parties to demand payment in gold which they cannot now do, or, at least, they cannot legally *enforce* their demand, in the same way as they could have done before that act was passed.

Here again it may be said, that the chances are *reciprocal*; but, no; for, depend upon it, that if the value of money was to take so sudden a rise (as it inevitably would upon an annihilation of the paper-money) as to sink wheat from 30*l.* to 10*l.* a load, a law would be passed, and a

law, indeed, must be passed, to restore leases to the spirit of their covenants. For these reasons, all those who have lands to let, and who think it beneficial to let leases for any number of years, should follow the example of LORD MALMSBURY, who (I am told so, at least), lets all his lands upon a *corn-rent*; that is to say, he covenants to receive in each year, *the market price, of that year, of so many quarters of wheat*, for each farm. Nothing can be more fair or satisfactory than this mode to both parties. Neither, as far as this transaction between them goes, need care what is the price of wheat, or what the state of the currency. The one is sure to receive the *real* amount of his rent, and the other to pay no more than the real amount of it, from the one end of the lease to the other. And, there is this peculiar excellence in it, that the amount which the tenant has to pay must always keep an exact proportion to his means of paying; and, on the side of the landlord, in dear years he receives more, in cheap years less; so that even his income too is proportioned to his necessary expenditure.

So much for *Jacobin Guineas*. They have led us into a long string of desultory remarks, which, however, must, one of these days, become interesting to every soul in the kingdom.

As to the "*remedies*" for depreciation, for the buying up and exporting of guineas, they are all imaginary. There is no remedy. The thing must go on, and will go on, as irresistibly as the bills of mortality; and, I should think, that to convince any one that no diminution in the quantity of the bank-notes can take place, it is only necessary to point out, that one effect of such diminution would be *to augment the real amount of the taxes, now paid to the fund-holders*, unless, indeed, such person supposes, that the nation has not yet got taxes enough to pay.

THE WHIGS are all alive, apparently, upon the prospect of some change in the ministry. I can say nothing new upon the subject, and shall only repeat my wish, that *no change whatever may take place*.

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, Thursday, Sept. 21, 1809.

JACOBIN GUINEAS.—Continued.

(*Political Register, October, 1809.*)

THAT his Majesty's own portrait, stamped on gold too, and in a year of *jubilee*, should be concerned in a conspiracy against him and his government, would be a thing not to be believed, if it was not so positively asserted by so many credible witnesses.

The hired newspapers do, indeed, throw the blame, not upon the guineas, but upon those who buy them up, whether to *hoard* or to *export*. This will not do. It is the guineas themselves that are to blame, if any one is, for their retreat from circulation. They will not stay to circulate amongst so much dirty, ill-looking, worthless paper. None of your imputations against us Jacobins of flesh and blood, therefore. If there be jacobinism at the bottom of the evil, it is in the guineas them-

selves and not in us. To be sure, I must, for myself, confess, that I wish success to the guineas; that I wish them to beat the nasty mashed rags; that I wish to see some of the thousands upon thousands of those who are gulling the public, and, in fact, cheating them, reduced to follow some honest occupation; but I never will allow, that we Jacobins have had any hand in this any more than in the war-matters. The "great-man-now-no-more;" that object of the joint praises of Lord Grenville and Lord Grey; he, whose debts we were taxed to pay; he, whom to bury and to raise a monument to whose memory we were taxed; aye, that was the man, the *grand financier*, who managed all the banking affairs, who caused the bank-notes to be made virtually a legal tender; aye, that was he; it was that "great man," who, at once, put down jacobins and made "a war of finance" upon the French. Do not blame us, then, for these jacobin tricks of the guineas. It was he, to whose memory the worthies of the short parliament compelled us to pay for the building of a monument; it was he who inundated the country with paper.

Aye, it was that idol of the Jews, jobbers, and loan-mongers; it was he, who, a hundred times, declared in the House of Commons, that the war with the French was a *mere war of finance!* Aye, it was he (oh, that he was still on earth!) who, year after year, promised this deluded nation, that the French were just upon the point of being ruined; nay, who told us, that they were ruined, beggared, and starving.

Good heavens! Look back, reader, to the date of those empty, those shallow-pated predictions, and look at what now is. The anti-jacobin Pitt and his anti-jacobin followers had their will; they persecuted, they put down, they silenced their opponents at home; they have, even until now, done what they pleased with all the resources of the nation: and, lo! that France, that very France, which, in the year 1795, they said was ruined, is now the mistress of Europe; that France, which, even at a later period, they had prepared plans for parcelling out, now has assumed such an attitude, has, during their unceasing hostility, arrived at such a pitch of greatness and of physical strength, as to make it matter of *boast* with these her former menacers that she has not yet subdued England!

It was a war of finance that Pitt waged, and a war of starvation. Europe cannot have forgotten his measures for preventing provisions from going to France, in a time of dreadful scarcity; nor can they have forgotten the *forging of assignats* in London, under the authority of the government, and sending them to France, in order to ruin the finances of that country. Well, what is the result of this "great man's" war against the purse and the belly of the French? What is the result? Why, we are now endeavouring to obtain corn from France; and, while our current coin flees the society of our countless millions of paper-money, France abounds in gold and silver, and knows none of the evils of a paper-currency; and, which is a very curious fact, I am credibly informed, that a great quantity of Louis d'ors, or Napoleon d'ors, were purchased by us in the islands of Guernsey and Jersey, in order to be sent out on the Walcheren Expedition!

Such, thus far, has been the result of the Pitt "war of finance." And, yet, do we find people so foolish, or so impudent as to assert, that this was a great statesman. They will, in all human probability, suffer for his having had authority; and I say, let them suffer; for it is next to

impossible, that people so wilfully blind, or so basely bent, should suffer more than they deserve.

The subject of astonishment is, how any man can be found with impudence sufficient to pretend to believe, that that was "a great man," who so managed the affairs of this nation; who so used its resources, of all sorts, as to render it, at least, a mere petty state in comparison with its ancient rival. But, again, I say, suffer for it they will; and, again, I say, let them suffer.

To return more immediately to the subject of *Jacobin Guineas*, I have no scruple in saying, that I think it a subject of *more* importance than any other; and, for this reason, that, as long as the present system of paper-money-making lasts, so long will last the abuses and corruptions which are eating out the vitals of the country. Viewing the subject in this light, I cannot help endeavouring to correct the errors of others, who write upon the subject; or, at any rate, what I deem errors. With this object in view, I here insert a letter, published, the other day, in the *Morning Chronicle* newspaper, signed L., which letter, as far as it goes to prove the *depreciation of bank-notes*, is not only unexceptionable, but is excellent; but, when it comes to speak of a *remedy*; of the Bank's keeping its issues of notes *within due bounds*, he does not, I am sure, foresee the consequences of what he recommends.

The letter is rather long, but every word of it is well worthy of the attention of every father, mother, guardian, and of every one, who thinks of acquiring funded property:

"A writer in your paper, under the signature of A. Z. acknowledges, that to purchase a pound weight of gold you must pay in bank-notes 55*l.* 16*s.*, while the Mint or standard price of the same commodity is no more than 46*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*, and yet he says that bank-notes are not at a discount. I am of a contrary opinion, and the fact as stated above, and which is admitted by A. Z. is of itself sufficient to prove it.

"A pound of gold is equal in weight with 44 guineas and a half, and when taken to the Mint, will coin into that number, this pound of gold will cost in bank-notes 55*l.* 16*s.*, and when coined into guineas it passes for only 46*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*; does not this furnish a proof that our currency is depreciated? It certainly does; and, at the same time, it presents to our view the quantum of its depreciation, which, upon 55*l.* 16*s.*, is 9*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

"The truth of this position may be proved by any one who will purchase a pound of gold bullion, for which he must pay in bank-notes 55*l.* 16*s.*; let him take that pound of bullion to the Mint to be coined into guineas, he will have returned to him 44 guineas and a half; they will weigh exactly a pound. Now let us see what these 44 guineas and a half are worth as currency in the purchase of goods; they will pass for no more than 46*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*, though the gold from which they were coined cost in bank-notes 55*l.* 16*s.*; is not this a proof that bank-notes are depreciated? That they are at a discount? Again, let the same 44 guineas and a half be melted, and turned once more into bullion, they will instantly recover their former value with respect to currency, and will sell or exchange for 55*l.* 16*s.* in that depreciated medium. The same experiment may be tried upon a smaller scale; buy one ounce of gold bullion, for which you must pay in bank-notes 4*l.* 13*s.*; take the said ounce to the Mint and it will coin into 3*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.*; by this operation you will sustain a loss of 15*s.* 1¼*d.*, which sum is the depreciation of currency, both in coin and bank-notes, or, to use other terms, it is the discount on 4*l.* 13*s.* in currency, compared with bullion.

"Gold in bullion is the currency of the whole mercantile world, therefore it is not in the power of any particular Government to fix the limits of its price, which, for that reason, will always preserve its true and just value—whereas gold in coin is the creature and child of every particular Government, over which it has absolute power and control, and the current value of which, by

" various expedients, it can raise or sink at pleasure, as is proved by the financial history of every country in Europe; therefore, gold in coin, viz. in guineas, is no standard at all whereby to measure the true value of bank-notes, and it was a want of attention to this very important point, which betrayed your correspondent A. Z. into an error, when he concluded, that, because guineas and bank-notes are of equal value in currency, therefore bank-notes are not at a discount.

" It is true that a pound-note and a shilling will buy as much of any commodity as a guinea, hence many have inferred with A. Z. that bank-notes are not at a discount, this inference is at first sight plausible, therefore calculated to delude the unthinking; but if it be tried by the touchstone of truth, it vanishes in a moment, and we discover the plain and naked fact to be this—that the bank-note is positively depreciated; that this depreciation has communicated itself to the guinea, consequently they are both in a state of depreciation. The great quantity of bank-notes in circulation has degraded them in value, and they, in their turn, have brought down to their own level the small quantity of coin: the market is glutted with bank-notes, whereby they are depreciated, and, in their fall, they *have carried down the guineas along with them*; but this lamentable effect could not have been produced without the co-operation of two powerful causes.

" First, the law has made it felony, to melt the coin of the realm; therefore, though it may be done to a very great profit, and, for that reason, a tradesman may sell his goods cheaper for guineas, than for bank-notes, and reimburse himself by melting the guineas, and selling them as bullion, yet he is deterred by the severity of the law, *he dares not make two distinct prices, because it would demonstrate, that he intended to melt the guineas, and thereby commit felony, in which he would instantly lose his character, and would probably be ruined.*

" Secondly, the law, though not in express terms, yet virtually, has made bank-notes a legal tender. If a man owe you 20 guineas, he may tender you 21*l.* in bank-notes, and should you refuse to accept them in discharge of the debt, you are not allowed to arrest him. Thus bank-notes are become a legal tender, which is equivalent to enacting a law that no difference shall be made in current value between guineas and bank-notes. The intention of that law was to prevent the depreciation of bank-notes, by keeping up their value to a level with that of guineas. and so long as the quantity of bank-notes in circulation was kept *within proper bounds*, there was no depreciation; but as soon as bank-notes were sent into circulation, in greater quantities than the trade of the country required, the market became overstocked with them, and they sunk in value, and in this state of things it was impossible to prevent their depreciation: but the power of the law had put them upon a level with guineas, and ordered that they should remain so: it therefore followed of course, that the depreciation of the one was the depreciation of the other, for the law having bound them together, bank-notes sinking in value, *carried down the guineas with them*; by these means the whole currency of the kingdom, consisting of a *great* quantity of bank-notes and a *small* quantity of guineas, became equally depreciated.

" To prove the truth of this statement, let these two laws be repealed, and leave guineas, like other things, to find their value unconnected and unfettered with bank-notes, and what would be the consequence? They would instantly separate from coin, and have a distinct value. Guineas would then be estimated as bullion, two prices would be made in every commodity; one for bullion, the other for bank-notes; and should the difference be from 16 to 17 per cent., which is about the present proportion, it would follow, that bank-notes would pass in the market at 16 to 17 per cent. discount, and that in purchasing goods, a bank-note of a pound would pass for no more than about 16*s.* 8*d.* sterling. This is in reality about the price for which they now pass, though the fact is concealed and hidden from the unscrutinizing eye, because by the violence of law, *guineas have been degraded along with bank-notes*, and the degradation being common to both, it is not to be discovered by comparison. The only way to prove the fact, is, by referring to the true standard, gold in bullion.

" The general depreciation of currency, is to be distinctly seen in the rapid increase of prices, that within a short time has taken place in all these commodities which are purchased with our circulating medium. The same crisis

" which seems to be now coming on in this country, took place in France ;
 " when assignats, being issued in too great abundance, depreciated, so as almost
 " to lose their value, and the horrible result must be fresh in the recollection of
 " every one. Should the depreciation or discount on bank-notes continue to
 " increase, there is no knowing to what height the prices of all the necessaries
 " and conveniences of life may attain, and with what weight the pressure may
 " fall upon the public; they may rise so high as to become almost unattainable,
 " except by the rich, and the consequences may be dreadful.

" If then we are threatened with such horrible calamities, why is not a remedy
 " instantly applied? Why do not the Bank Directors keep the issue of their
 " notes within due bounds? And, if they are not so disposed, why do not Govern-
 " ment compel them? Or, why does not our Government order them, as for-
 " merly, to pay their notes in cash? For then they could not keep in circula-
 " tion more than the commerce of the country required, their notes would al-
 " ways be at par with bullion, and the high prices of commodities would return
 " to their former level; but the Bank Directors may have motives which induce
 " them to overstock the market with their paper; the more notes they can keep
 " out, the greater their profits; the greater their profits, the more they can
 " divide in the shape of interest and bonus; and the more they divide, the
 " higher will be the price of their stock. This accounts for the late enormous
 " rise in the price of Bank stock, while the Government funds have continued
 " nearly stationary. By persisting in such a system, the Directors of the Bank
 " may, in a short time, raise the price of their stock to 300 per cent., or up-
 " wards, and when the temptation to enrich themselves, by raising the price of
 " their own stock, is so very great, and is at the same time completely in their
 " power, may not human frailty, stimulated by avarice, yield to the temptation."

Upon this letter I have first to remark, that the *proof of depreciation* is very good; that the point is clearly and undeniably established. Yet, I must observe, at the same time, that this point was as clearly made out before, in the Political Register, Volumes IV. and V., and VI., and in a very excellent pamphlet, published by Lord King about the same time. Indeed, if the Reader will just turn to these Volumes, under the heads of *Finance, Restriction on the Bank,* Funds*, and some others, he will find, that the writer of this letter has, without perceiving it, repeated the arguments and many of the illustrations there used in support of the asserted depreciation of bank paper, and especially those in refutation of the plausible argument, *that a pound in paper will buy as much goods as a pound in specie.*

This point of an actually existing depreciation, is, then, a point settled. No one but a fool, or a knave, will any longer deny the fact. And this being the case, I am rather surprised, that so clear-headed a person, as he who writes this letter, should think it amiss, that the bank-stock holders divide more per cent. than formerly. He should recollect, that what they divide is, like the rest, *depreciated*. I do not know any thing of the names of their trash, which they call property; but, I will suppose, that a man was fool enough to lay out a hundred good pounds in gold upon a thing (call it *Stock*, or what you will) for which the Bank, in the year 1792, used to pay him five pounds a year. I shall suppose him to have been fool enough to leave his principal money in the same hands, after Pitt openly declared, that he was making a war of finance; and, for argument's sake, I will beg my countrymen's leave to suppose, that some one amongst them was such a double-sculled wretch as to leave his money still there, after the law was passed to exempt the Bank from paying their promissory notes; and, supposing all this, it is certain, that, unless the

* See these "SELECTIONS," Vol. I. p. 314.—Ed.

nominal amount of this man's dividends were raised, he would in *reality* not receive much more than *half* as much as he received when he first put his money in the Bank. To call it the *same sum*, therefore, is stupid; it argues a want of capacity to combine ideas. Yes, sure, five pounds is still five pounds in *name*, but it is not the *same thing*, it has not the same powers of purchase. For ten years previous to the year 1792, the average price of the quartern loaf was under *seven* pence; for the ten years ending with this year, the average price of that loaf will have been nearly about *thirteen* pence. "Oh!" exclaims some ricketty, bandy-legged Jew, or Jew-like Christian, "but that is owing to the *dearness* of bread." Why, yes, Moses, it is so; but, the dearness of bread, Moses, is, in fact, owing to the *cheapness* of money, and that cheapness has been produced by the eternal workings of your mill in Threadneedle Street.

At any rate, reader, you will take hold of this plain fact, that, before 1792, a pound in money would purchase nearly twice as much bread as a pound in money now will, and, of course, our bank-stock holder, if his dividend were not nearly doubled, would, in fact, lose nearly one half of his income.

But, now we come to the point that is of great interest to the people at large; and that is this; that, while the *bank-stock* holder, who is, in fact a partner in the banking house in Threadneedle-street, has his dividends augmented in *nominal* amount, in order to keep pace with the depreciation of money, the man who has his money in what is, drolly enough, called "*The Funds*," obtains *no augmentation* of the nominal amount of his dividends. If, for instance, your father, by will, left you, in the year 1792, a thousand pounds, in "*The Funds*," compelling you to keep it there, you then received as much interest annually as would purchase nearly *twice as much bread* as you can purchase with that same interest now, because the nominal amount of your dividends cannot be augmented, as in the case of bank-stock, where the partners in the concern have the money-mill in their own hands. The fathers or mothers, therefore, who would thus *provide* for their children now, must be either very ignorant, or most obstinate brutes. Seeing, however, that it is entirely owing to the base credulity of those who adore banks and funds; seeing that all the disgraces and miseries of the nation are, at bottom, owing to this description of baseness, the more these people suffer the better, and there is a consolation in reflecting, that they will be great sufferers.

The author of the letter before us, in speaking of the *destruction of the paper-money in France*, which arose from its excessive quantity, reminds us of that "*horrible result*." What does he mean by "*horrible*?" I see nothing horrible in the annihilation of a nasty, dirty, debased, currency, printed, like shop-bills, at every corner of every town. I see nothing horrible in this, and in the return of gold and silver coin. But, on the contrary, I see something very horrible indeed in the system, which imperceptibly steals away the loaf, bit by bit, from the mouth of the widow and the orphan, and gives it to those, whom Lord Chatham denominated *muck-worms* and *blood-suckers*. I see something very horrible in that system, and especially when I reflect, that scarcely an assize passes over without sending to the gallows tree some one or more of our fellow creatures, the forfeiture of whose lives is necessary to the support of that system. This system may, indeed, be called "*horrible*;" it was the fatal present that the Whigs and their King gave to England.

Perhaps the writer means to say, that the *bloodshed* in France proceeded from the annihilation of the paper-money. Of this I do not believe one word. There is no reason why it should have produced bloodshed. Robespierre, indeed, and some others, *in order to SUPPORT the paper-money*, put people to death; but, by the *annihilation* of the paper, neither bloodshed nor confusion was produced; and, my real opinion is, that, if our paper-money was completely annihilated in the space of six days, it would not create either mischief or trouble; but, on the contrary, would be like the removal of a long-endured, painful, alarming, and disgraceful disease. The destruction of the paper-money in America produced no bloodshed, and yet, *all* the currency was paper; and so much was it depreciated, that the *dollar notes*, sixty-four of which were printed upon a sheet of paper, were paid away in the *quire*, uncut; and, at last, they *would not fetch their worth in blank paper*. Well, then, it all vanished, and no confusion at all ensued. The desirable thing is, that the depreciation should be *gradual*; because, then, the most perverse, the most greedy, and the most base, suffer most.

As to the "*remedy*" proposed by this writer, I have before shown, that the application of it is *impracticable*, and, if practicable, it would be, in the very highest degree, unjust and wicked. This gentleman, with all the evils of a paper currency before him; full in his sight, would fain find out the means of *renovating* and *perpetuating* that evil. I, now, for my part, like to see the paper-money increase in quantity. I like to see new shops set up, new mills erected, and I thought that I should have split my sides with laughter, when, the other day, I saw, in one of the newspapers, a very pompous description of a *new-invented machine*, by the means of which the Bank in Threadneedle-street would be enabled to strike off its notes *with much greater rapidity than heretofore*. Bravo! said I. Tell me his name, and I'll toast the inventor. What a comforting thing this machine must be to those who have their whole income chained in the Funds! What a comforting subject of reflection with thousands of widows and orphans!

Here are the exhibitions for a *Jubilee*. Let the Jews and the jobbers and the contractors call forth all these miserable creatures, and march them in procession, together with our million and a quarter of paupers, and let them all be brought and made to kneel down before *Pitt's statue* and this *newly-invented machine*.

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, Oct. 12th, 1809.

JACOBIN GUINEAS.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, January, 1810.*)

THE depreciation of the paper-money, made in Threadneedle-street, and in various other parts of the country, is a thing still denied by some persons, though it is notorious, that almost the whole of the metallic money has fled from the degrading society of that paper, and though it is not less notorious, that any piece of metallic money will sell for more in paper-money, than its nominal amount.

The fact of an existing traffic in guineas and other pieces of gold coin could not be doubted ; but, in the following paragraph, taken from the Statesman of the 2nd instant, we have something like judicial proof of it. This proof is not, however, what interests me upon this occasion. I am interested in the fate of the man, who is here said to have been "*fully committed* to take his trial," as a *felon*, for having sold some guineas at more than twenty-one shillings each.

"On Saturday, at the Mansion House, a Jew, of the name of Dr YONGE, was charged by the *Solicitor of the Mint*, under an act of *Queen Elizabeth*, with the offence of selling the current coin of the realm, called guineas, at a higher price than the current value. By the statute in question, it is declared, that any person who shall extort, demand, or receive, for any of the current coin of the realm, more than the legal current value thereof, shall be esteemed guilty of *felony*. It appeared that the prisoner had sold 56 guineas, for a sum amounting to about 22s. 6d. each, or 1s. 6d. for each guinea more than the legal price and current value. Evidence being adduced to prove this case, the prisoner was *fully committed* to take his trial for the offence."

I am persuaded, that there must be some error in this statement ; but, it is not likely that it is *wholly* unfounded ; and, if it be true only to the extent of a man's having been *committed to jail* for having sold guineas at a price above twenty-one shillings each ; if it be true only to this extent, it is of very serious importance ; and, if we are in danger of being sent to jail for making as much as we can of a guinea, it really is high time for us to look about us pretty sharply, or, which would be the safer way, perhaps, to draw ourselves into our shells, there wait the coming of the storm, and let it rage on. What ! send a man to jail, under a charge of *felony*, for having made an exchange of guineas against bank-notes, and taken the profit ? It never can be. I certainly do not believe this. Robespierre put people in prison, and some he put to death, because they made a difference in their prices, taking less, for the same weight of sugar for instance, in metallic money than they took in paper-money ; and this, in effect, is just the same thing as selling guineas for more than their nominal value. Robespierre made it a capital offence to show this preference for metallic money ; but Robespierre did not, by that means, prevent the paper from depreciating, though he was quite successful in driving the very semblance of metallic money out of the country ; and, if I could possibly believe the above statement to be correct, I should not have the least hesitation in predicting, that the Old Lady in Threadneedle-street and her numerous family all over the kingdom, must very soon give us paper-money down to half-crowns, if not to half-pence. The Old Lady has always found abundant business for JACK KETCH ; but, if the paragraph above-cited be correct, Mr. KETCH might set up his carriage and have his villa as well as the best of them.

But, it is hardly possible that the paragraph can be correct ; for, there is no such act of parliament as the one described in the paragraph. There is an act of Edward VI. and one of William III. against *exchanging gold and silver money for more than their value* ; but, for these offences the penalty is trifling ; a small pecuniary punishment merely. There is an act of Queen Elizabeth, to be sure, touching money ; but, unless by a straining of the meaning, unequalled in the annals of law, it is quite out of the question to make this act apply to the case before us.

It is the act, Chapter I. of the 18th year of that Queen's reign. In the 5th year of her reign, an act had been passed, making *treason* (not *felony*) "the offences of *clipping*, *rounding*, *washing*, and *fling*, for wicked lucre or gain's sake," any of the monies or coins of the realm, or of the monies or coins of other countries, suffered to be current in the kingdom; in short, of any of the monies or coins legally current. In the 18th year of her reign, it being found, that some other method, or methods, not coming strictly under either of the descriptions in the former act; namely, of *clipping*, *rounding*, *washing*, or *fling*, had been discovered for diminishing the value of the current coins, another act was passed, leaving out the words *clipping*, *rounding*, *washing*, and *fling*, and inserting in their stead the following general description: "any act, ways, or means, whatsoever;" and then the prohibition ran thus: "Be it enacted, &c.—That, if any person, &c. &c.—shall, for wicked lucre or gain's sake, by any act, ways, or means whatsoever, *impair*, *diminish*, falsify, scale, or lighten, the *monies*, or coins, of this realm, &c. &c. &c. he shall suffer *death*, &c. &c."—Now, except one other act, passed in the 14th year of Queen Elizabeth, against counterfeiting foreign coin, the two acts above-mentioned, are the only acts, at all relating to money, that were passed in the reign of that Queen; so that, if it be true, that the Jew in question has really been committed under an act of Elizabeth, the ground of commitment must have been different from that stated in the paragraph.

This act of the 18th of Queen Elizabeth makes it high treason to *impair* or *diminish*, by any act, ways, or means, the *monies*, or coins, of the kingdom. Well, then; let us see how this could possibly be twisted to apply to the act alleged against the Jew. Are bank-notes *monies*? Because, if they are, to sell a guinea for twenty-two shillings and sixpence of the said monies is certainly *one way* of *impairing* or *diminishing*, the said *monies*, or the value of them, at least.

But, then, what will become of the *country bankers*, who now exceed in numbers (counting all the partners, both pikes and gudgeons) the trampers employed in collecting the rags of which their money is made. You would send them all on board of ship, perhaps, or give them an opportunity of displaying their loyalty by enlisting into the West India regiment. Aye, but, if the above paragraph be correct; if a man has actually been committed, as a felon, for having done an act tending to *impair* the *bank-notes*, the country-bankers cannot hope to get off so lightly, seeing that they are notoriously guilty of an act of this sort as often as they set their money-mills a-going. However men may differ as to other points respecting the banking system, they all agree, that the greater the quantity of paper-money, the less must be the *real* value, in proportion to the *nominal* value, of that money: in other words, that the paper monies which were in circulation yesterday, must have their value *diminished* by any grist of fresh-ground monies put into circulation today. This is a proposition universally admitted. Indeed, it is almost self-evident. Hence it is, that the Old Lady in Threadneedle-street, is continually complaining of her progeny, the country money-mills and shops, while every man, who views the matter in its true light, and who has the good of his country at heart, must sincerely rejoice at the rapid increase of those mills and shops; and, for my own part, I am convinced, that the time is not far distant, when we shall see the paper-money shops exceed in number the shops of the tailors and barbers united. "Ici l'on

a des assignats, dès cent francs jusqu' à un sous :” that is to say : “ Paper-money to dispose of here, from a hundred francs to a single half-penny.” I remember seeing these words over a shop-door at Calais, in 1792 ; and, indeed, notifications, of this sort, were, in all the sea-port towns, or towns near the coast, as common as the notifications relative to “ good wine ” or “ good brandy ;” and the makers and venders of paper-money seemed sometimes to have been so hard-pushed as to have coined up the very shirts off their backs. Well ! where was the harm of this ? Their shirts, poor devils, made very good money. At last, indeed, you were obliged to give a hundred pounds for a quartern loaf, or for a couple of rabbits ; but, then, the shoemaker took care to sell his shoes at five or six hundred pounds a pair ; so that, in the end, those who had sense enough to *keep possession of things of real value*, and merely to let the paper-money pass *through* their hands, sustained no loss, at the bursting of the bubble.

To return from this digression : can any one imagine, that, upon the above-quoted statute of Elizabeth, our country money-makers are all liable to be *tried for their lives* ? Yet, I scruple not to assert, that if, *upon the statute of Elizabeth*, a man be liable to be tried for his life for having sold guineas at a rate which tends to diminish the value of the paper-money, every paper-money maker in the country is liable to be tried for his life.

Let me, however, distinctly state, that it appears to me, that there *must* be an error in the paragraph quoted from the Statesman ; because, all other reasons aside, the paragraph talks of *felony*, whereas the *statute* talks of *treason* ! Mercy on us, if this were law, and if the law were put in force against all the money-makers in the country, why, the very air would be poisoned with the stink of their carcases !

I regard these money-grinders as a very useful description of persons ; they are, in reality, doing more good than any other description of persons that I know of ; they make little noise in their work, but their operations are sure ; every inch they gain is held ; there is no back-sliding in the progress of their efforts ; and, which is not the least amiable circumstance, they not only appear to be, but, in general, really are, wholly unconscious of the great good they are doing.

What, then ! would the STATESMAN, who is, generally, so just in his sentiments, condemn all this most populous and most useful class of active citizens to a trial for their lives ? Forbid it justice ! forbid it gratitude ! He is labouring very hard, and very earnestly, in the cause of a reform of abuses and the extirpation of corruption ; but, he is not labouring with half so much *effect* as they are. He is attacking the monster in front, while they, more wise than he, are labouring, and with a certainty of success, to take from that monster the very meat he feeds on.

I should like to see, in the Statesman, an explanation of the above-quoted paragraph. It must be, in its description of the law, at least, erroneous ; and I am quite at a loss to discover upon what law a commitment *for selling of guineas* could possibly take place, unless, indeed, the guineas were sold, or exchanged, for other *coin* ; and then, as was before observed, the crime is not *felony*, but simply an offence, punishable by a pecuniary forfeiture.

If there be, however, contrary to my opinion and my conviction, any statute, upon which a man may be punished, in any way whatever, for

taking a premium upon guineas, or gold or silver coin, when exchanged against paper-money; if there be any such statute, and if such statute be put in force, it requires but a very small portion of understanding to perceive, that coin of every sort must very shortly totally vanish out of circulation: for, the very fact, that such exchanges do take place, is a clear proof that the coin is worth more than its nominal value in paper-money; and, as *every thing will have its real worth*, the coin will either go into a hoard, or out of the country, if it be prohibited from obtaining its real worth in circulation. A guinea may be in the hands of a man, who may be unable to hoard, or to export, it; but, when out of that man's hands, it will not travel far. Probably the second or third person, into whose possession it may fall, may, from similar causes, be unable to hoard or export; but, the guinea is the last thing that the holder will part with; its progress from hand to hand thus becomes very slow; and the moment it comes into the hands of one who is able to hoard or export, away it goes from circulation entirely, because, if to sell it for its worth be a crime, it will *answer the holder's purposes* to hoard it, even if exportation were rendered impossible, seeing that at the rate of 1s. 6d. upon the guinea, the hoarder has nearly a year and a half's interest, at five per cent; and during that year and a half, what are not the chances, that the guinea will become worth twice as much as it is worth now?

Oh, no! There is no way now left of keeping the gold coin, still remaining in the country, from totally disappearing; no way but that of leaving every holder of such coin to sell it at any price that he can get for it.

The country paper-money makers have, within the last two years only, *doubled* their number. The next year will in all probability, double the present number. It will, at least, greatly augment it. There can be no doubt of that. Consequently, their money will continue to depreciate in an increased proportion. The depreciation must go on with an accelerated velocity. Oh! these paper-money makers are the men! What an abundance of money we shall have! Every man, of any substance, will make his own money. What a *rich* nation we shall be! There was a man, belonging to the Mother Shop, who, some years ago, wrote a pamphlet, entitled, "GUINEAS AN ENCUMBRANCE." Ought we not, then, to rejoice at our present situation, and our present more brilliant prospects? Of this encumbrance, at any rate, we are nearly rid; and, who knows but it may be followed by that of the "*National Debt*," as it is called?

When I see a new paper-money mill set a-going, I hail the event as an additional sign of approaching good times; and, amongst all the absurd and ridiculous things that I have ever heard of, the *preference*, which some people appear to entertain for the manufactures of certain mills, appears to me to be the most absurd and ridiculous. What signifies it what mill the money comes from? What signifies it what it is made of, or whose name is upon it, so that it will pass out of your hand as soon as it comes into it? No man is, I suppose, foolish enough ever to suffer it to remain with him twenty-four hours; and, that being the case, what *risk* does he run? Success, then, say I, to the money-making trade! I do not mean figuratively, but literally. The trade of making money; the mechanical operation of making money, and the vending of that money; a trade, which is regularly working on towards all those effects, which every real friend of his country wishes to see produced, and which may yet make England what she formerly was in the scale of nations.

JACOBIN GUINEAS.—Continued.

(Political Register, August, 1810.)

“ Our Paper is of value in commerce, because in *law* it is of none. It is powerful on 'Change, because in *Westminster Hall* it is impotent.”—BURKE. Reflections, 1790.

THERE seems to be a sort of fatality belonging to what I write. At the moment when I am writing about a thing, no matter what, some occurrence is taking place with regard to it. In my last Number, towards the bottom of page 132, I spoke of *the Jew*, who had been, some months before, *prosecuted for selling guineas* for a price higher than their nominal worth in bank-notes. I observed, that, though a bill of indictment had been found against him, I had not heard that he had been brought to trial; but, that the prosecution itself, though left in that state, would be quite sufficient to prevent an *open* traffic in guineas, and that, such being the case, the possessors of guineas would inevitably *hoard* or *smuggle*.

While I was writing this, the trial of the Jew, whose name is DE YONGE, was, it now appears, actually going on, at Guildhall, before the Lord Chief Justice, where the man was, by a Special Jury, found *guilty*.

This trial, considering the nature and bearings of the questions connected with it, I hesitate not to pronounce the most important that has taken place for many years; for, as to the trials in which MR. WARDLE, and I, have been concerned, they were things which all the world *understood*; and, with regard to no part of which was any man in the nation, however blind and stupid, at all *deceived*. But, this trial of DE YONGE has circumstances belonging to it, which are not generally known; and, besides, there will, in all human probability, consequences arise from it, that will be most sensibly felt. This being my opinion, I cannot refrain from beseeching the reader to bestow on the subject his serious attention.

Before I submit, upon it, any observations of my own, I shall, agreeably to my usual custom, insert the fullest report that I have been able to find of the trial itself; begging the reader to observe, however, that I do not give this report as a thing for the correctness of which I am answerable. It is a *publication*, which I find in the newspapers; as such I give it, and as such I shall comment upon it. For aught I know, it may be partly incorrect; or, it may be false altogether. I take it as I find it published in print, and in the newspapers of the day; and, as such I shall make it, perhaps, a subject of criticism.

“ SALE OF GUINEAS.—The *King* against JAMES DE YONGE.—The Defendant “ was indicted for unlawfully exposing to sale a certain quantity of the current “ coin of the realm, called guineas, and disposing of them at *11. 2s. 6d.*; the “ standard, by his Majesty’s proclamation, having been settled at *11. 1s.*

“ MR. ATTORNEY-GENERAL stated, that this indictment was founded on the “ Act of the 5th and 6th of the reign of Edward the Sixth: which enacted, that “ if any person gave more, or disposed of any current coin of the realm for a

“ profit, or gave or received more in exchange than was authorized by the standard which was fixed by royal proclamation, he or they should be guilty of a misdemeanor, and be liable to the confiscation of such coin so exchanged, and be subject to a fine and imprisonment for such offence. *The chief object of the Act was to prevent persons collecting and disposing of the coin of the realm to persons leaving the kingdom; he was sorry to say, that latterly it had become a prevalent trade.* It was unnecessary for him to state how injurious it was to the nation at large, and particularly to the commercial part of the community. He would prove that the defendant had carried on this illicit trade to a great extent. The Commissioners of the Mint had got information of it, and wisely provided for his detection. It was unnecessary for him to state the circumstances, as they would be detailed in evidence. He was afraid that this traffic had been too long carried on without being detected; it accounted for the circulation of British gold on the Continent, and its disappearance at home. He had not a doubt, that when the Jury were in possession of the circumstances of the case, they would find the Defendant guilty.

“ *Mr. Leonard* from the Council Office, produced the Gazette containing the Proclamation of George the First, dated from Saturday the 21st of December, to Tuesday the 24th, in the year 1717, settling the standard of a guinea at 1*l.* 1*s.*

“ The Proclamation was read by Mr. Lowten.

“ *Mr. MARRYATT*, Counsel for the Defendant, objected to it as proof, as the indictment set out that it was proclaimed under the Great Seal, and there was no proof that the Proclamation in The Gazette had the Great Seal affixed to it.

“ *Mr. ATTORNEY-GENERAL* was happy this objection had been taken, for it was impossible that the Sovereign could issue a Proclamation without its passing under the Great Seal.

“ *Lord ELLENBOROUGH*—I am convinced that the Proclamation published in a Gazette, authorized by His Majesty, is sufficient proof, and we are not at this day to doubt that Proclamations do not go under proper scrutiny. It is the only mode the Sovereign has of communicating his wishes to his people. I am convinced that the Gazette is good evidence of the existence of the Proclamation.

“ *Mr. ATTORNEY-GENERAL*—My Lord, I have got the original Proclamation, with the Seal affixed to it, in Court; but I wished it to be laid down by your Lordship, that The Gazette was good evidence, that it might act as a precedent in other places where they have not the advantage of your lordship's presiding.

“ *Mr. Edward C. Powell* deposed, that he was Assistant-Solicitor to the Mint; that from some information which came to the Office, he gave instructions to two men, of the names of Caul and Nash, to proceed to the Defendant's house, on the 26th of December last, and purchase some guineas. In order the better to disguise themselves, they both spoke the Dutch language. Caul was to perform the part of a Dutch Supercargo, who could not speak English; and Nash to act as his interpreter. He gave Nash 5*9l.* in Bank of England notes, which he took an account of, and made Nash examine them with him; he also gave him two Bank of England dollars, which he marked. They went to the Defendant's house; he attended in a coach at no great distance off, accompanied by a person of the name of Browne, an officer of Shadwell Police-office. Upon a preconcerted signal being given, he went to the Defendant's house, and found that Leadbeater, a City Marshal, who accompanied Caul and Nash, had the Defendant in custody. Leadbeater produced 50 guineas, which he said he took from the person of Caul. The witness asked Nash who Caul had received them from? he answered, from the Defendant, and that Caul had paid him 56*l.* 5*s.* for them in notes, and a Bank dollar. He asked the Defendant if it was true? he said it was; but added, that the difference between 52*l.* 10*s.* and 56*l.* 5*s.* was given him by Caul, as a present for the exchange; that he had not charged more than 1*l.* 1*s.* for each guinea. Leadbeater then produced a parcel of Bank of England notes, which, he said, he took from a drawer in a bureau in the room. They were the notes the witness had given to Nash; there were three short. He asked the Prisoner if he had any silver? He put his hand in his pocket, and brought it out full of dollars and other silver. The witness took from amongst them the dollar he had marked. He asked the

"Defendant if he had much more gold? He showed him a bag containing 90 guineas; a second, containing a great quantity of half-guineas; and a third with seven-shilling pieces. There were several empty money-bags in the room. The three other Bank of England notes were produced by Leadbeater; he took them from Caul, with the other Bank dollar.

"J. Caul fully corroborated the evidence of the last witness, as to his and Nash's instructions. When they went first to the house of the Defendant, they saw his wife. Nash said the witness was an acquaintance of his, just come from Holland. She inquired from the witness what he wanted; he replied, in Dutch, a little gold; she asked who recommended him, in the same language; he answered, Capt. Kaysoll, who was gone to Gottenburgh: she showed them into the parlour, and sent a boy for the Defendant, who shortly made his appearance, and asked nearly the same questions his wife had done. He said, he knew Captain Kaysoll. The witness told him he hoped he would let him have the gold on the same terms as Captain Kaysoll. The Defendant answered, he could not; he let him have 900 guineas, at an advance of 1s. 3d.; but the price had rose, and he could not take less than 1s. 6d. advance. The witness told him he must even agree to that; for paper would be of no use to him in Holland; and he only wanted 50 guineas. The Defendant gave him the guineas, and he paid him 56l. in notes and 5s. by a Bank dollar. The Defendant told him he must take care how he took them out of the country, for by the law of the land he was not entitled to take more than five. He told him he need not be afraid, for he would wind them round his waist. Nash said he knew a better way than that, for he could sew them in a garter and fasten his stockings with them. The Defendant's wife said she knew a better way than either, and asked the witness if he did not wear a cushion in his neck-handkerchief; he answered in the affirmative. She brought a piece of flannel, and rolled some shillings in it, and said, 'Thus you may put your guineas, and when folded in your handkerchief, it will be beyond suspicion.' The witness proposed they should have something to drink, which was sent for. They took a glass of rum a-piece. The Defendant requested that the witness would recommend some of his countrymen to him, and, by mentioning his name, it would be a passport. Nash and the witness were going out of the street-door, attended by the Defendant and his wife, when they were all shoved back by Leadbeater and Browne; the Defendant seemed much frightened, and whispered the witness in Dutch to say, that he did not give more than 1l. 1s. for each guinea. On his cross-examination he said he gave bank-notes for guineas, and not coin for coin.

"Leadbeater and Nash corroborated the evidence of the other two witnesses.

"Mr. MARRYATT said, the exchange was admitted; but he had humbly to submit to his Lordship, that the indictment could not be maintained. It was founded on an Act of Parliament which was nearly obsolete; the Act stated that it was unlawful to *exchange gold coin for silver, or silver coin for gold*, for profit; but not a word was mentioned of bank-notes; they could not be contemplated, for they were unknown for many years after; and by the statute, the penalty was as great on the purchasee as on the purchaser.

"Lord ELLENBOROUGH—If you wish, Mr. Marryatt, you can save this point: not that I hold a doubt of its invalidity, but because we have a vast deal to do, and there will be more time to argue it in Term; I have not a doubt but the statute was intended for the exchange of the truck of the then present day; but I think it *wide enough to admit bank-notes, or even gross goods*, if it is agreed to take a certain value over the standard currency.

"Mr. MARRYATT—The only reason, my lord, that I should wish to argue the question now is, that the Defendant is liable to a specific punishment, if found guilty, and the Crown may arrest him.

"Mr. ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I will, my lord, do away with Mr. Marryatt's uneasiness, for I will give my promise the Defendant shall not be disturbed until after his Counsel has an opportunity of moving for a new trial. He is already under bail.

"Lord ELLENBOROUGH—Gentlemen of the Jury, I am of opinion that the Defendant did receive more than he was allowed by the Proclamation; and I would recommend that you should find your verdict *as such*; at the same time I will save the point for the Defendant; *but don't let it be understood that I*

"*am of opinion that it is not a breach of the statute.** I would not wish it to go abroad that there was any doubt upon the subject, for it is a most injurious traffic.

"The Jury returned a verdict of—GUILTY."

Here are two distinct questions presenting themselves for discussion; a question of *law*, and a question of *political economy*, the former of which, as being of the least importance (though by no means unimportant), we will first dispose of.

DE YONGE was, it would appear from this report, indicted on an Act of Parliament of the 5th and 6th of Edward VI. And, in this report, the reporter makes "Mr. Attorney-General" say, that "the chief object of the act was to prevent persons *collecting* and disposing of the coin of the realm *to persons leaving the kingdom.*"

As I said before, I do not give this as a correct report; but, be it what it may, I do not understand the meaning of words, or, the Act, under which this Jew is said to have been indicted, has no such meaning as this. But, that the reader may be able to judge for himself, the best way is to lay the Act before him.

"Whereas in the Parliament holden at Westminster the 25th year of the reign of King Edward the Third, it was accorded, That it should be lawful for every man to exchange *Gold for Silver*, or *Silver for Gold*, or for *Gold and Silver*, so that no man did hold the same as exchanged,† nor take no profit for making such exchange, upon pain of forfeiting the money so exchanged, except the King's exchangers, which take profit of such exchange, according to an ordinance before that time made: which statute notwithstanding, divers covetous persons of their own authorities have, of late, taken upon them to make exchanges, as well of *coined gold* as of *coined silver*, receiving and paying therefore more in value than hath been declared by the King's Proclamation to be current for within this his realm and other his dominions, to the great hindrance of the Commonwealth of this realm.

"Be it, THEREFORE, enacted, that, if any person, or persons, after the first day of April next coming, exchange any *coined Gold*, *coined Silver*, or money, *giving, receiving, or paying*, any more in value, benefit, profit, or advantage, for it, than the same is, or shall be, declared by the King's Proclamation to be current for within this his Highness's realm, and other his dominions, that then all the said *coined Gold*, *Silver*, and *money*, so exchanged, and every part and parcel thereof, shall be forfeit, and the *parties*, so offending, shall suffer imprisonment by the space of one whole year, and shall make fine at the King's pleasure."

Such is the Act, on which, it seems, DE YONGE has been indicted and found guilty, the fact of his having exchanged, or sold, guineas for a price higher than the one fixed in the King's proclamation not being denied.

But, the question is, and that is a question yet to be argued, it appears; the question is, whether this Act of Edward VI. can be construed in such a way as to extend to an exchange of *gold* or *silver coin* against *paper currency*. Not only is there, in this Act, no mention of *paper-money*, or of any thing but *coined gold and silver*; but, it is a truth perfectly notorious, that no such thing as *paper-money* existed at

* See 14. EAST'S Reports, p. 402, the question being argued before the Judges, they decided that DE YONGE's was *not* an offence against the Statute.—ED.

† That is; hold a common exchange.

the time when the Act was passed, and, what is more, such a thing never had existed at that time, either in England, or, as far as we can gather from history, in any other country upon earth.

The Attorney-General is, as was before observed, represented, by the reporter, as having said, that "the *chief* object of the Act was to prevent persons *collecting* and disposing of the coin of the realm to *persons leaving the kingdom*." Whence is this conclusion drawn? On what premises is it founded? There is not, in the Act, a word respecting the *exportation* of coin: not a word about coin being *taken out of the kingdom*: such a consequence of the prohibited exchange is not even glanced at in any part of the Act. Nay, I cannot see how the Act *could possibly* have such an object in view. Instead of such being the *chief* object of the Act, it does not appear to me *possible*, that it was any object at all of the Act. For, *why* should such work be carried on for the purpose of getting *coin* out of the kingdom? If a man had wanted to carry or send *coin* out of the kingdom, *why*, in the name of common sense, should he go to *exchange* it into *other coin*? Had there been, indeed, a *paper-money* in the kingdom, and a *paper-money* not exchangeable into coin at the will of the holder; had this been the case in the reign of Edward VI., there would, then, as now, have been some sense in exchanging one sort of money for the other when a man wanted to send money out of the kingdom, because one sort would pass in foreign countries and the other would not; but, when *all was coin*, what sense could there be in making an exchange for such a purpose? This, however, has nothing to do with the *law* of the matter, DE YONGE being indicted for unlawfully *exchanging* coin; and not for *exporting*, or attempting to export, coin, which is a quite distinct offence, and made so by other acts of parliament.

If further illustration of the meaning of this Act of Edward VI. be wanted, we have, I think, only to look back to the Act of Edward III., out of which it grew, and *solely* to add to the *penalties* of which it was clearly intended. This is it, Statute V., Chapter 12.

"That it shall be lawful for every man to exchange *Gold for Silver*, or *Silver for Gold*, or for *Gold and Silver*, so that no man hold a *common Exchange*, nor take *no profit* for making such Exchange, upon pain of forfeiture of the money so exchanged; except the *King's Exchangers*, which take profit of such exchange, according to the ordinance afore-made."

Now, is it not evident, that this applies to a state of things, wholly different from the present state of things? There were, when this and the other Act were passed, *Exchangers* appointed by the King. Are there any now? And, the objects of the acts were, to prevent people from being cheated in the exchange of money, but, more particularly to prevent individuals from *sharing in the profit of exchanges*, which profit was a branch of the King's *revenue*. Is there any such thing now? And could the makers of these Acts have a state of things like the present in their contemplation? The offence contemplated by this Act, is, the doing of that by an *unauthorized individual*, which the King's officers only were *authorized to do*. But, are there now any King's officers regularly appointed to do that which De Yonge has done? Are there any officers now appointed to *exchange bank-notes for gold*? Yet, would not this be necessary, in order to make these Acts bear upon the case?

So much for the question of LAW, which I may now, I think, safely

leave to the decision of any man, who has plain common sense for his guide. The question of *political economy* is of a nature to require greater powers of mind, or, at least, greater attention, in the discussion of it.

The report, which I have inserted above, represents the ATTORNEY-GENERAL as saying, that "it was quite *unnecessary* for him to state how "injurious the practice (of selling guineas) was to the nation at large, "and particularly to the commercial part of the community."

Yes, this was indeed, quite *unnecessary*, seeing that the man was not tried for *injuring the merchants*, but for *violating a written law*, and whether his conduct had, or had not, a tendency to injure the merchants, that had nothing at all to do with the question of *guilt*, which was the only thing, upon which the jury had to decide. "Mr. ATTORNEY," as he is called, said well, therefore, when he said, that it was *unnecessary* for him to state the injurious effects of DE YONGE'S traffic. Nor would he have done ill, if he had wholly held his tongue upon the subject of those effects; for, though I have been uncommonly diligent in my endeavours to discover *how* such a practice as that of De Yonge could possibly be injurious to the nation at large, and especially how it could injure commercial people *more* than others, I have not been able to make any such discovery. The judge is also represented as having said, that the traffic is "a most *injurious* traffic;" but, as in the case of Mr. ATTORNEY, no *reason* is given in the report, to *show how* such a traffic operates injuriously.

Mr. ATTORNEY is represented as having said, that "he was afraid that "this traffic had been too long carried on without being detected; it "accounted for the circulation of *British gold upon the continent*, and "its disappearance at home." Indeed! So! the selling of guineas to people who take them on board of ship and sail down the Thames with them accounts for the said guineas going out of the country! Bless us, what a discovery! Well, but, let us hope now, that since the "*learned gentleman*" has pronounced this to be an injury to the nation; yes, let us hope, that we shall hear no more about *guineas* being an *encumbrance*. We were wont to hear such bragging assertions about the super-excellence of bank paper, and to be so abused for pretending that it was depreciating, that, at last, some people seemed to wish never more to hear of coin; but now, behold! we are told by the Attorney-General, that the sending away of guineas, the getting rid of the "*encumbrance*," is a great national injury, and is particularly injurious to the *commercial* part of the community! Let us hope, then, that the author of "*GUINEAS AN ENCUMBRANCE*," will, in future, be more cautious as to what he writes; for, I think, he may be fairly looked upon as an abettor or instigator of De Yonge.

That no *law* can prevent the exportation of the coin, while the paper-money continues to circulate in such quantities, no man can, I think, seriously doubt. It is notorious, that the Jews go on board of the ships at Spithead, when the latter are about to sail for foreign parts, and openly sell the gold and silver at an enormous premium. This fact, I remember, was stated to me very much in detail, so long as about *six years ago*. Indeed, how should it be otherwise? If a ship or a regiment be paid off in paper-money, of what use is that money to the sailors and soldiers, when they arrive in Nova Scotia, in Canada, in Sicily, at the Cape of Good Hope, or, any where else abroad? What are they to do

then? Why, change their paper into coin, to be sure. And, who will do that for them without a premium? It is nonsense to suppose that any body will; and, of course, they must keep the useless paper, or must give such premium.

But, is it not, after all that I have written upon this subject, and after all that we have witnessed; is it not, after all this, a waste of time to insist upon the great and immutable principle, upon which these operations of sale and exportation of coin take place? In 1804 a "learned friend" and a member of the Honourable House, famous for the making of poetical puns, took it into his noddle to cry out against the "disloyal people," who were then *hoarding* the coin, in which cry he was joined by Mr. ADDINGTON, who, however, had too much sense not to discountenance the idea, hinted at by Mr. JEKYLL, of passing a law to put a stop to the practice. A law to prevent hoarding! Why not a law to prevent a man from doing what he pleases with his *house* or his *land* or his any thing else? Next after this would have come the code of Robespierre. "Disloyal!" Why, the hoarders were, and still are, chiefly the old women, whose *loyalty* is proverbial.

No, Mr. Jekyll, it is not *disloyalty* that makes people hoard: it is human nature: it is the first law of that nature; *self-preservation*. The next law, the *desire of gain*, makes people in more active life sell and export the coin. And, unless you can change human nature, Mr. Jekyll; until you can, by punning poetry or plain prose, efface these laws from the human breast, it will be full as well for you to hold your tongue with respect to the "disloyalty" of putting one's guineas into a chest and locking them up when one pleases.

That the paper-money has depreciated is *proved* by the common practice of selling the coin for more than its nominal value in the paper-money. The *cause* of this depreciation, and also the *cause* of the migration of the coin, were, I trust, so fully and clearly stated in my Register of the 28th of July, that there is no longer any good ground for dispute upon those points. If those causes were, then, rightly stated, can it be believed, that the depreciation of the paper or the migration of the coin, can be stopped or even checked, by any powers of the law? The words taken for my motto express, very forcibly, the opinion of Burke as to the effect of the law, when used for the purpose of giving validity to a paper-currency. Burke, you know, was no *Jacobin*. He was the mortal enemy of Jacobins. Hear *him*, then, if you will not hear me.

The moment the assignats in France began to depreciate, that moment the coin began to quit the country. It went off in every direction, and in all manner of ways. To England it came in *barrels*, many hundreds of which were received full. All the coin, down to the very lowest size and sort, disappeared at last. We see, too, that ours is going in the same way. De Yonge, it appears, had even *seven-shilling pieces* for sale. This is the natural, and inevitable progress. It must be so, while men are prone to pursue their own private interests; and, we have now the proof, the *legal* proof, of the truth of what I have all along been asserting. The trial of De Yonge has brought us acquainted with the detail of the operation of selling coin. We here behold the parties at

* The articles alluded to will follow the Letters to the King, in the next number.—ED.

work. We see the Jacobin Guineas come forth from their retreat in the Jew's bag; and under the auspices of Mrs. De Yonge make preparations for their voyage. Mrs. De Yonge, appears to be a great practical political economist. A lesson or two from her would be of great benefit to the "learned friends" of the Edinburgh Review, who are mighty talkers about *capital*, and with whom the paper-money system is a great favourite. Mrs. De Yonge would soon put them right as to these matters, if they were not too conceited to listen to her. She would teach them how the *capital* of the nation was increased by putting guineas into the stuffer of a neckcloth. Oh! the incomprehensible nonsense that these pretenders to profundity have talked about the powers and the blessings of *capital*!

To what an extent even the coins of smaller value have been hoarded or exported, must have long been evident to the public in general from the almost impossibility of getting *change* upon any terms whatever; but, I think, that it is not generally known, because it was not, until within these few days, known to me, that, in England, the pieces of paper-money had already been carried so low as *seven shillings*. That such is the case, in one part as the country, at any rate, will appear from the following, which is a copy of a note now lying before me.

N^o. 332 TUNBRIDGE-WELLS ACCOMMODATION. N^o. 332

I Promise to pay the Bearer on demand Seven Shillings, for Value received. Tunbridge-Wells, 21st day of July, 1810.

Seven

SHILLINGS

For Jas^r Sprange, Sam^l Guy, & Edw^d Palmer.

Jas^r Sprange.

Ent^d J. Clifford.

Now, I ask the reader, whether he can believe it to be *possible*, that gold and silver coin will circulate *in company* and *upon par*, with paper like this? Well, then, if it will not circulate with such paper, what is to become of it? Must it not go to the hoard, or to foreign parts?

Here, then, I think, we have the whole of this subject of JACOBIN GUINEAS completely before us; *practice* as well as *theory*. The latter we were long ago masters of, and Mr. and Mrs. De Yonge have now put us in complete possession of the former.

There remains but very little more to be said about *paper-money*, the nature of which seems now to be pretty generally understood, and the final consequences of which seem to be pretty generally anticipated.

There appears to me to remain for discussion nothing but the question, *whether it be wise to adopt any measure tending to extinguish the country banks*. I mean, wise in those who wish to see the *paper system upheld*. This question has been started in the MORNING POST newspaper, and, in a way, that would almost lead one to suppose, that it was intended to feel the public pulse upon the subject. That print began, as was noticed by me, by calling the *country bank notes* "*destructive assignats*," and to recommend their "*abolition*," as the only means of "*reinstating commercial confidence*." This was in the Morning Post of the 19th of July. This object has been laboured at in several articles since that date. These articles, in which the *country bank-notes*

are called "*vile dirty rags*," I shall notice, and shall endeavour to make the question between the *country money* and the *Threadneedle-street money* as clear as all the other part of the subject now appears to be to almost every reader.

WM. COBBETT.

TO THE KING.

(*Political Register*, July, 1809.)

LETTER I.

On the Maritime War against France.

SIR :

WHEN every eye in the nation, at the end of sixteen years of a war which has given rise to the Income Tax ; which has caused a part of every man's estate to be alienated under the name of Redemption of Land-Tax ; which has banished guineas from the land and made bank-notes a legal tender ; which has seen the Habeas Corpus or Personal Safety Act for many years suspended ; which has drained the kingdom of its youth and its vigour, leaving the next generation to be the offspring of decrepitude, deformity and imbecility ; which has thus entailed upon the nation, ugliness and weakness and disease, and which, while it has robbed the land of thousands upon thousands of the best of its labourers in order to convert them into defenders of Sicily and other foreign countries, has introduced thousands upon thousands of foreigners to defend this same land : at such a time, when every eye in the nation is anxiously fixed upon the great, and, in all probability, the last, attempt, about to be made against the enemy, it appears to me, that it may be useful publicly to state certain facts, relating to the mode of carrying on a war of such wearisome length and such desolating consequence ; and that this statement may, from its manner, lose none of its intrinsic importance, I, for the second time in my life, presume to address myself directly to your Majesty, taking care, that in this instance, no keeper of official papers shall, as in a recent one, have it in his power to garble, or to suppress, any part of that which I write.

That your Majesty is not well informed as to the great and interesting matters, upon which I am addressing you, I, without the smallest hesitation, conclude ; first, because the measures of your servants, through whom your information must come, are, in nowise, calculated for the real state of things ; and, secondly, because, supposing those servants to possess both talents and zeal sufficient for all the purposes of their respective stations, their time has, from the moment they entered those offices, been almost wholly engrossed by endeavours to defend themselves, and to annoy and degrade their own political enemies and your Majesty's late servants. As men may be blinded by too much light, so a people may be kept in error, may be deceived and ruined, by the means of *the press*, which, unperverted, is so well calculated to ensure the constant

triumph of truth ; and, I have, for my part, no doubt, that, with all our parade of publicity, with all our ostentation of unreserve, there is, in the whole world, no people, who, in proportion to their magnitude, understand so little of their public affairs as is understood by the people of this kingdom. Were not this the case, Sir, it would be impossible that the enemy should be in his present flourishing state, with respect to his internal and other resources, while England possesses such means of cutting off those resources.

The general opinion in this country, is, that France is in a miserable state ; that the people are starving ; and, that, as to *commerce*, there is no more of it going on in the dominions of Napoleon, than upon any of the islets in the Thames about Windsor or Hampton-Court. This, too, I conclude to be the opinion of your Majesty ; because, as I before observed, your information, as to such matters, must be derived from your servants, and those servants prove, by their express declarations as well as by their conduct, that such is their view of the situation of the empire of France. As to whether the subjects of Napoleon like, or dislike, his government ; or, whether they be better or worse off now than they were under their former sovereigns ; these are questions, which we can discuss to no profit, because we possess no facts whereon to reason ; but, with regard to the *commerce* of France, and that sort of commerce which is the *only valuable one*, I possess, from the best possible source, quite a sufficiency of facts to show, that, upon that subject, at least, this has been the most deceived of nations, and your Majesty the most deceived of sovereigns.

The sort of commerce, to which I allude, is what we, in England, call the *coasting trade* ; but, in the dominions of Napoleon, or countries under his sway, it is to be considered as something much more important than it is with us. There is no doubt, that the trade between *London* and the *coal-mines* is of a million times more value to England than all her foreign commerce put together. But, if we cast our eye over the map of Europe, we shall see, that the coasting trade of Napoleon embraces *climates* ; and that a maritime communication between his several countries must be, not only of vast benefit to him, but in some cases, necessary to the existence of the people. Some of these countries must supply the others with *corn*. Without the oil and the wine and the silks and the cotton these countries *might* exist ; but the Southern countries could not, in many cases, possibly exist without the necessaries of life from the North ; and of carrying on this commerce there are no means other than those of a maritime nature.

The extent of this commerce, in the dominions of Napoleon, is scarcely to be credited by those, who are not acquainted with the facts. Along the coasts of Naples, Tuscany, Genoa and Piedmont ; from the Southern Provinces of France and Marseilles, through Cette, and the grand canal of Louis XIV., to Bourdeaux, and thence along the Atlantic coasts of France, the whole of the coasts of Holland, and into the Elbe ; in short, from the Baltic to the southern point of Italy, all the countries are connected by a chain of commercial intercourse as complete, perhaps, at ever existed in the world, and as advantageous as it is extensive. This commerce is, by your Majesty's servants, spoken of under the degrading appellation of " a mere *coasting trade* ;" but, this is precisely that trades which is *really* advantageous to a nation. If England were cut off from all communication with foreign nations, she would, in point of strength

and of happiness, suffer nothing at all. But, cut off the communication between London and the coal-mines, and the inhabitants of London must perish or disperse. There are several branches of our coasting trade, of a degree of importance, not, indeed, approaching nearly to this; but, still of greater importance to us, than all our foreign commerce put together. If, for instance, only one year's interruption were to take place in the exchange of *coals* for *timber* between Cumberland on the one part, and Hampshire and Sussex on the other part, the woods of these latter counties must be burnt to keep the people from perishing, whereas by the exchange now going on, these woods are preserved, the people have fuel in plenty, and that fuel, after having given comfort in that capacity, becomes a valuable manure for the land. One year's interruption of this exchange would do England more harm than would be done by the sinking of all foreign countries to the bottom of the sea. This is, however, only one instance out of hundreds which might be enumerated; and, without any thing more being said, it must, I think, be as clear as the sun at noon day, that, if the enemy were able to put a stop to our coasting trade, it might be at once asserted, that he had it in his power to reduce us to his own terms, be they what they might. Is it not, then, worth the while of your Majesty's servants; is it not worth the while of those, who are entrusted with the conducting of the war, to inquire what is the extent of the coasting trade of the French empire, and to inform themselves as to the means of destroying, or, at least, interrupting that trade? To attack, or to oppose, Napoleon in Spain, Naples, Sicily, Sweden, Denmark, Hanover, or in the East or West Indies, is what it would be for an enemy to attack us in Nova Scotia, Canada, or in any of our colonies, where, though a defeat might produce mortification, it would not seriously affect us, either in our comforts or in the sources of our national strength. We should regret the loss of Canada, perhaps, or of a West India island; but, the loss, like that of a child out of a numerous family, would not be felt in our affairs. We should still be as rich and as strong as before; but, cut off the means of sending corn and timber and iron and tin and coal along our coasts, from one part of the kingdom to the other, and the distress is instantly felt. In fact, the different parts of this kingdom can no more dispense with the coasting trade, than the farmer can dispense with the aid of the blacksmith and the wheel-wright.

This, it will, perhaps, be said, is not the case with the countries under the dominion of Napoleon. But, will it, then, be asserted, that those countries, though extending almost across the whole of the European continent, and including such a variety of climates, are, nevertheless, so circumstanced as to be able to exist, and contentedly too, without any commerce with each other; that is to say, without any exchange of natural productions, or of manufactures? The truth is, however, that the commerce between the several parts of this vast empire is so great, that convoys of *eighty*, a *hundred*, and even of *two hundred sail*, are frequently seen, and by your Majesty's fleets too, carrying on this trade in perfect security. These consist chiefly of Luggers, or Zebecks, of a light draught of water, from eighty to a hundred and twenty tons burden, and are navigated by a proportionate number of seamen. There are employed in this commerce, from the river of Bourdeaux alone, *thirty three thousand seamen* and upwards. The coasts of the Mediterranean teem with this commerce. Its ports and bays swarm with vessels; and,

at no time was the commerce so great between France and Italy on the one side, and between France and Holland and the North, on the other side, as it is at this moment, while your Majesty's servants are boasting, that they have a navy which scours the ocean, and that "England engrosses the commerce of the world." While they amuse themselves and the nation with this empty vaunting, the commerce of France, and her vassal states, carried on almost within the reach of the naked eye of our admirals, far exceeds, in the means of contributing towards national strength, the commerce of England and of all her allies. The general persuasion here, is, that all the people, under the sway of France, are suffering from causes almost similar to those which affect the inhabitants of a besieged town; that the people of the North can get no wine or oil, and that those of the South can get no corn; that there are no materials to make goods of any sort, that all is decay and misery, and that, *surely*, the poor, beggared, pinched people must, *surely*, they must soon be pushed to desperation; must revolt, and must tear Napoleon and his government to morsels. This has been the expectation for years, in like manner as, for years before, Mr. Pitt and the foreign pensioner Sir Francis D'Ivernois kept alive the constant expectation, that France would become a *bankrupt*, and would then be compelled to submit to her enemies. As the nation was deceived then, so it is deceived now; and so, I greatly fear, it will continue to be deceived, until a knowledge and a belief of the truth will come too late. One thing, indeed, has staggered many of even the credulous part of the nation; and that is the fact of France being able still to renew her squadrons and her maritime expeditions. For, this astonishing power of creating a maritime force is altogether incompatible with the assertions of your Majesty's servants respecting the ruined state of the commerce of France. The commerce of France being "*annihilated*," we cannot help wondering that the ports of Brest and Rochefort should be continually sending forth their squadrons: we cannot help being surprised and somewhat vexed at seeing a squadron of ten or twelve sail of the line come out of the ports of France, in the space of a few months after we have been congratulated upon the destruction of the *last* of the enemy's ships. The fleet in Basque Roads is said, by the prints of your Majesty's servants, to have been worth *several millions of pounds sterling*, and that the Calcutta alone was worth six hundred thousand pounds, being full of military and naval stores. To have effected the destruction of the whole of this fleet would have been a subject of great joy; to have effected the destruction of part of it was a subject of joy; but, in our haste to express such joy, we forgot to ask, how all these stores came to be found in the port of Rochefort, so many years after we had "so completely *annihilated* the commerce of France," agreeably to the ten-thousand-times-repeated assurances of your Majesty's servants. The fact is, that, not only from the Elbe and the Scheldt are the ports of France supplied, by the means of the coasting trade, with an abundance of naval stores, but also from that part of Spain lying near the Atlantic coast, whence they receive iron, pitch, tar, resin and ship-timber, of various sorts, and in vast quantities, and at a rate much cheaper than some of these articles can possibly be brought to the arsenals at Portsmouth or Plymouth. If this be the case, and I scruple not to assert that it is the case, what are we doing? What is the *use* which your Majesty's servants are making of the immense means, which the industry and patience of your people put into their

hands? If there be a commerce, such as I have described, carried on between the different parts of the dominions of Napoleon, of *what use*, as the means of keeping him in check, are the thousand ships of war, now employed? Of *what use* is it, if this commerce is to go on uninterrupted; of *what use* is it, that the sea is covered with your Majesty's ships, and that history will record the valour of your seamen? Of *what avail* is it, that we destroy French ships of war, while we leave, in full vigour, all the means of creating others to supply their place? If this be the way of making war, it must be clear to every one, that we can never have peace, without being exposed to imminent danger; for, it will require but a short space of time, for France to raise a navy equal, in numbers at least, to any that we can possess.

The security of this extensive and most valuable commerce of the French dominions arises, in great part, from the use of land signals, or telegraphs, so constructed, placed, and managed as to keep the vessels upon the coast at all times correctly informed of what is passing upon the whole line of coast. From Flushing to Bayonne a report is exchanged *four times a-day*; at day-light, ten o'clock in the forenoon, two o'clock, and just before sun-set. So that, at Flushing, they know, four times during the day, what is passing at sea, within sight of the highest hill in the neighbourhood of Bayonne, and, of course, they are informed of what is passing near all the intermediate parts of the coast. The same system is established along the coast of the Mediterranean, from the Gulf of Spezzia to Rosas. The coasting vessels, thus instructed how to move; thus kept constantly in a state of perfect knowledge as to the situation of our fleets or cruisers, and able to sail in safety, carry on their trade in as much security as if those ships were not in existence; and this only, as I shall hereafter prove to your Majesty, from causes which prevent the necessary exertions from being made, and which causes may instantly and easily be removed.

The advantages to the *nations* (for they are many), which carry on this commerce, are not greater than they are to Napoleon himself, in his views of conquest and dominion. From this commerce, notwithstanding our opinions to the contrary, he derives no small part of his revenue, through the means of a stamp-tax, imposed upon every article exported or imported; and hence he is able to dispense with *direct taxes*, which are always odious, and which are, indeed, those which have uniformly ended in exciting the feelings and producing the acts, under which so many governments have perished. This is a great point. By the means of this commerce, he disguises from his people the burdens which they bear. It is, indeed, a gross imposition to tell a people, that *commerce* pays taxes, the fact being, that those taxes still fall upon the people themselves; but, as your Majesty must have observed, it is an imposition, it is a fraud, it is an act of duplicity and knavery, the success of which in *other countries* warrants the belief that it must be greatly useful to your Majesty's implacable and powerful enemy. Very much, then, are your Majesty's servants deceived, when they suppose, that the Emperor Napoleon has no Custom-house, whereto to collect duties. His *scale*, indeed, may not be so noble as to afford him Counts and Dukes for receivers; he may not have Maquises for collectors, Barons for wharfingers, and Knights of the Eagle for wine-tasters; but, I am of opinion, that his Custom-house yields him a much greater *clear* revenue than is derived from any similar establishment in the world, and that it affords

him the means of drawing upon other sources of taxation with so sparing a hand, that his people, especially within the ancient boundaries of France, have reason to congratulate themselves upon the comparative lightness of their burdons. A great many of your Majesty's subjects, including some in high stations, have, at different times, expressed their astonishment, and, indeed, their vexation, that the people of France should be so slow in *rebelliing* against their Emperor, with whom your Majesty made a treaty of peace and "*amity*" only about seven or eight years ago; but, if they had been informed of the facts here stated, relative to the commerce of France, and especially relative to the revenue yielded by that commerce, together with the relief thereby given to all the other sources of taxation, itself not appearing as a tax; if they had been duly informed of these facts, and had been possessed of but a very moderate portion of that sort of knowledge, which enables men to trace popular discontents to their real causes, they never would have entertained a hope of seeing a rebellion in France.

But, great as are the financial advantages of this commerce, Napoleon derives from it the still greater advantage attending such a *nursery of seamen*. It has been most clearly proved, over and over again, that, for our navy, the nursery is our *coasting* trade. There requires, therefore, nothing more to satisfy us, that, from a coasting trade such as I have described, the advantage to Napoleon is so great as to excite well-grounded alarm in the mind of every reflecting Englishman. It is from this copious source, that the Emperor of France has drawn those hundreds of thousands of seamen, with whom he has manned his fleets and squadrons for many years past, and which fleets and squadrons, though always hitherto defeated, and, in many instances, captured and destroyed, by the superior skill and valour of your Majesty's fleets, answer the terrible purpose of causing us to keep up a force by land as well as sea so immense, so disproportionate to our population and our pecuniary means, that the country is stripped of its youth and its vigour, the fields are left to be tilled by the decrepid, and the taxes are so general and so heavy, and the anticipations upon them so large, that *hope*, which alleviates all other burdons, here refuses her sustaining hand. Year after year, we not only see the taxes and the tax-gatherers increase; we not only feel their immediate pressure, but, we see mortgaged, deeper and deeper, the very seeds of property; we see taken from us, for the purposes of current expense, that which was held out to us as the sure pledge of permanent relief. Could we once be sure, that it was out of the power of Napoleon to *send a fleet to sea*, how different would be our situation! But, this assurance we can never have, so long as he has the command of the seamen, necessarily employed in such a commerce. How often, within the last fifteen years, have we "*annihilated*" the navy of France; how often have we "*swept the ocean*:" but, still France, in the midst of all this annihilation, finds the means of sending out fresh squadrons and fleets; and proves, beyond a doubt, that she possesses, in spite of all we have hitherto done, the means of forming a navy in a very short space of time.

The parliament has recently been told, in your Majesty's name, that the aid you are giving to the enemies of France, upon the continent of Europe, is *given with a view of keeping Napoleon from our own shores*. The expressions are somewhat different, but, this is the substance, this is the real meaning of the words. Does it not, then, become me, if I have

it in my power, to prove to you, that this is *not* the way to keep the conqueror from the shores of England? That this is a waste of our means? That it has no other effect than that of augmenting at once our debts and our taxes, and of hastening the day, when the cries of the widow and the orphan shall proclaim, whether or not "a national debt be a national blessing."

In *what way*, I should like to ask of your Majesty's servants, their subsidies to the enemies of France upon the continent are to keep Napoleon from our shores? Is it by giving him *employment* upon the continent? That, of course, must keep him from our shores for *a while*; but, the *possibility*, at least, is, that, by all the means we can contrive, by all the wars we can excite, and by all the treasure we can squander, he cannot, for any *long time*, be thus employed; and, consequently, when he can no longer be so employed, we, upon the very principle on which this aid is given to his enemies, must be in imminent danger. Therefore, by our present line of politics, by our present system of defence, by our present explicit avowal, if Napoleon succeed in subduing all his enemies upon the continent, *we have very little hope of being able to resist him.*

This, Sir, though neither very consoling nor very honourable to the country, is the conclusion to be drawn from the declaration as well as the acts of your Majesty's servants, who appear to have given up all hope of England being able, if left to herself, to provide even for her safety, leaving her honour totally out of the question. And this opinion, is, indeed, very reasonable, upon the supposition, *that the present is the only system of naval warfare that can be adopted.* Upon the supposition, that we have it not in our power to prevent Napoleon from carrying on an uninterrupted exchange of products, the most valuable of all commerce, between all the countries from Naples to Marseilles, and from Bayonne to Hamburgh; that we are unable to prevent him from connecting all these countries, and consolidating them under his sway, by ties of convenience and of interest as well as by the power of his arms and of his civil and political establishments; that we are unable, with all our endless list of ships, to counteract the operations of signal posts, defended each by a couple of invalids; that, in spite of all we are able to do, France will teem with seamen, naval stores, and all the means of speedily creating a navy: upon *this supposition*, it is, indeed, perfectly reasonable to conclude, that, when Napoleon has put down all his enemies upon the continent, when he has removed the possibility of their meeting with further hostility excited by our gold, *we ourselves shall be unable to resist his power for any great length of time.* Upon such a supposition, this conclusion is natural; but, as I think I shall be able to show, in my next letter, such a supposition is not founded in truth, and that *we have the ability* to do with respect to the commerce of France, with respect to that fruitful source of power to her and of danger to us; that we have the ability to do all those things, which are necessary to our safety, permanent as well as present, and with a comparatively small portion of expense.

When one looks at the navy of England; at the quarter of a million of people whom in various ways it employs; at the fifteen or seventeen millions of money (*a fifth part*, I believe, of the *rental of the whole kingdom*) that it annually costs; when one looks at this wonderful power, this mass of means, this focus of the fertility of our soil, and of the industry, ingenuity, valour, and patriotism of the nation; when one contemplates all this, and reads the history of the war, for several years

past, one cannot help being struck with the disparity between the means and the effect. For *what purpose* are all this preparation and all the sacrifices which it occasions? What does this immense navy *accomplish*? If, for many years past, all its prizes and all the mischief it has done to the enemy were estimated, they would not amount to enough to pay the expenses of finding the navy in *water*. The navy is *our defence*, it may be said; but, that cannot be said, without acknowledging, that we are deficient either in the strength or the courage or the will to defend our country by land. As the means of *mere defence*, either the army or the navy must be considered as superfluous, or else we acknowledge ourselves to be inferior to our enemy in point of valour, or of disposition to defend our country. To consider the navy as the means of mere defence, is, in fact, to acknowledge, at once, that Napoleon has it always in his power to put us to an expense of seventeen millions a year, without any other expense on his part than that of the paper and ink, composing a paragraph in one of his *Moniteurs*. The navy should be made the means of *attack*, the means of annoyance, the means of distress through the empire of our enemy. The taking or destroying of ships at sea, the capturing of colonies, will avail us nothing, *while the ever-fertile source of naval power exists unhurt in the dominions of France*.

In war, as well as in every thing else, those difficulties and dangers, of which we can foresee *no end*, are most powerful in subduing the mind; in producing weariness, disgust, relaxation of efforts, and finally a disposition to give up the contest. And, I beseech your Majesty to consider, what prospect there is, or can be, of an end to our difficulties and dangers, while Napoleon possesses, undisturbed, the means of building and manning fleets of ships of war, though England, at the same time, maintains a navy at the expense of seventeen millions a year; what prospect there can be of peace and safety to England, while France, insensible of the calamities, and almost of the existence, of war, is able to impose upon your Majesty's subjects burdens such as were never before heard of, and which, with the duration of war, must necessarily increase. To me, therefore, it appears evident, that unless our mode of warfare be changed; unless our immense means be made use of to annoy and distress the enemy, and particularly to cut off his naval resources, we shall fail in this contest, which is not only for honour but for independence.

The *facts* which I have stated, relative to the commerce carried on in the dominions of Napoleon, are stated upon *such authority*, that I have no scruple in vouching for their truth. So minute, indeed, is my information, that I could have named *times* and *places* and other particulars, in confirmation of every fact relative to this commerce, that I have stated in general terms. That such a commerce, so extensive, so beneficial to the parties concerned in it, forming so complete a chain of connection between the several countries whose means Napoleon must wish to unite and bring under his control, so fertile in all the means of restoring or creating a vast naval power; that such a commerce existed I know that the people of England could not have supposed possible, and I verily believe, that your Majesty's servants were, in this respect, little better informed than the nation at large; for to believe otherwise would be to suppose them guilty of a heinous offence against their master as well as against his people. To believe, that they knew of the existence of a commerce, carried on in the dominions of Napoleon, and employing, perhaps, two hundred thousand mariners; to believe that they knew of

the existence of such a commerce while they were congratulating us upon the annihilation of the maritime power of France, would be to accuse them of hypocrisy unparalleled in the history of human depravity. Of this knowledge, therefore, I acquit them, and shall be well satisfied, if they now, though late, adopt measures calculated to remove from us that danger, which, if their present system be adhered to, can, as far as I can perceive, never terminate but in the subjugation of our country, and, of course, in the subversion of your Majesty's throne.

In my next, I shall endeavour to show, that the commerce of France *may be destroyed*, and, of course, that her vast means of creating a naval force *may be cut off*. The real *causes* of the inefficiency of our navy, in this respect, will be found to lie much deeper than is generally imagined, and where, I am sure, your Majesty does not suspect, because, supported as your Majesty would be by the unanimous voice of your people, you possess the power of removing for ever the most mischievous of those causes. The war upon the continent *may* prove very embarrassing to Napoleon; it *may* produce his overthrow: but it *may* produce exactly contrary effects; it may not only relieve him from all those embarrassments which he has hitherto experienced, but may end in the complete overthrow of every thing that calls itself our friend. This accomplished, as far as relates to the East, how quickly will the wings of revenge, united with those of ambition, bear him to the South! And, if he once obtain secure possession of the whole of the coasts of Portugal and Spain, what, if we persevere in our present mode of warfare, is to prevent him from sitting himself quietly down, and seeing us exhaust ourselves, wear ourselves out, torment ourselves with continual alarm, while his dominions have only to support a flotilla at Boulogne and an army of England, at an expense, perhaps, not greater than that which we are put to for the maintenance of the local militia? Where, then, should we look for an *end* of our danger? There never more, while that state of things lasted, could be *peace*, united with *safety*, for England.

If this paper should (which I greatly doubt) reach the ear of your Majesty, I hope, that, by this concluding paragraph, I shall prevail upon you to distrust those, who flatter you with the prospect of seeing the people of France revolt against their Emperor, to do which there has not appeared, in any shape, the smallest inclination. I beseech your Majesty to consider, that all those persons, in France and her new dominions, who are now from twenty to forty years of age; that is to say, all that part of the population, which, in times of disturbance, decide the fate of governments, have been reared up in principles, which must make them hazard their lives a thousand times over, rather than see their country return to the ancient order of things; and that, supposing principle and prejudice to have no weight, still *self-interest*, that all-powerful stimulus, will never suffer a nation consisting, in great part, of those who are styled usurpers of the soil, to permit any thing which shall expose them to the chance, however small, of being ousted from their usurpations. I trust, therefore, that your Majesty will be induced to place no reliance upon any such events; and, of course, that you will be the more disposed to adopt such measures as shall tend to bring into fair operation the naval power of the country, and thereby to keep alive the hopes of your people. Hitherto there has always been some ground for hope, or the people have, at least, imagined such ground. But, if Austria should fall; and if, which would be the almost certain consequence, the southern penin-

sula should follow, where then, *if the means of suddenly forming a navy be still suffered to exist in France*, will be our ground of hope? The gloom of despair will pervade, and must pervade, the political horizon; to *submission* alone we can look for any alleviation of our burdens, and, though the thought will, at first, be accompanied with horror, to that submission we shall, in time, fashion our minds.

Such, Sir, is my view of this subject. For the truth of my *facts*, I vouch with as much confidence as if they had come under my own eyes; and my reasoning upon them is, as I believe, correct. I have sometimes been wrong in my opinions, but I have much oftener been right; and, in this instance, the greatest favour I would presume to ask from your Majesty would be that your *war-ministers*, by sea and land, should be called upon to prove the erroneousness either of my premises or my conclusions. The sending out of 40,000 men, the *selecting of proper persons to command them*, the planning of operations for such an army; all this is of great consequence in itself, but it is nothing at all when compared to the object which I have submitted to the consideration of your Majesty; to the evil which I have pointed out, and to the remedy which I shall hereafter have the honour to submit. I am, &c. &c. &c.

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, July 13th, 1809.

TO THE KING.

(*Political Register, August, 1809.*)

LETTER II.

On the Maritime War against France.

SIR :

THAT event, that great source of future danger, which event was anticipated in the former Letter that I took the liberty to address to your Majesty, has now taken place. Austria has been defeated in her own territories. Her sovereign, *in the midst of nearly twenty millions of subjects*, by whom a venal press assured us he was *ardently beloved*, has been pursued to his capital, driven from his capital, beaten out of an entrenched camp in the heart of his dominions, and, after having fled before the enemy, till, in flight, he could, in all likelihood, no longer see a chance of even personal safety, he has besought, and, at last, obtained, under the name of Armistice, a respite, which no reasonable man can possibly consider as of long duration. How serious are the reflections to which this event must give rise in the mind of every Englishman, anxious for the welfare of his country, and especially in the mind of your Majesty! The delusive hopes, excited in the minds of the uninformed, by the reiterated misrepresentations and falsehoods of a venal press, with whom the Emperor Napoleon and his army were become subjects of mockery; these hopes are now vanished, and the people are in a state of mind

much more depressed, than if they had never been deceived into bright expectations. They now see the reverse of the picture: they see the immense sums of money, which this war, so fatal to your Majesty's ally, will have cost them; and it is not in nature that they should feel as much zeal in the cause of the war in general, as they felt before this event. They must hate those, by whom they have been so grossly deceived. It is impossible that they should not hate them; and, as to any belief in them in future, no one, in his senses, can entertain a hope of it. In short, public opinion, public confidence, seems now to have received a greater shock than it ever before received since I have had any knowledge of public affairs; which of itself is no small evil. But, for this the *people* are not to be blamed; for, I do not believe, that, in the whole world, there were ever such arts made use of to deceive a people, to pervert the reasoning powers of man, and, at the same time, to debase and corrupt the mind. To those, therefore, who conduct, or direct the conducting, of the venal press (including, perhaps, *nine-tenths* of the publications in the kingdom) belongs the whole of the blame of having produced this enormous mischief; this total want of faith, which, in an hour of real danger, will weigh, perhaps, more against the country than an enemy's army of a hundred thousand men. This is, with me, so important a point, that I cannot refrain from pressing it upon your Majesty's attention. Napoleon owes no small part of his success, and of that power, which has now become so gigantic, to his having never suffered any description of persons to delude his people with false hopes; to raise their expectations beyond what the real state of things warranted; to cajole and cheat them, to abuse their credulity, to wear out their patience with promises a thousand times made, and never once fulfilled. There is, too, something, not only disgusting in itself, but greatly injurious to the cause, in the *abuse*, the *vilifying language*, the *foul names*, which the venal press is continually bestowing upon the Emperor Napoleon, when all the world must recollect, that, during the short time that we were at peace with him, a writer was prosecuted, at the suit of your Majesty's Attorney-General, who is now your prime-minister, and was convicted of a *libel* for having *written abusively of this same Emperor Napoleon*, for whom almost every writer seems now to vie with all the rest in devising foul and abusive appellations; and, what is more, these same writers put forward claims to *loyalty*, to the utter exclusion of all those who do not join in this abuse, and who think that foul words are not the most effectual weapons wherewith to attack, or repel, an enemy so formidable as Buonaparte. The great objection, however, to this mode of *warfare* is, that it draws off our attention from the true state of the case, the true nature of the contest in which we are engaged. As is invariably the case with those who vent their anger in words, our actions do not correspond with our threats; we so exhaust ourselves in violent expressions, that we appear to be satisfied with that, or, at least, our hostility seems to carry us but very little further. Words cost but little, and, therefore, there are enough to contribute in this way; there are enough, who, like the pensioned poet, Fitzgerald, are willing to make "*sacrifices*," in this way, for the support of the war, and the "*deliverance of Europe*."

In spite, however, of all these sacrifices; in spite of the volumes of abuse, which have since the prosecution of Mr. Peltier, been, in various shapes and under various titles, published against the Emperor Napoleon;

in spite of all the toasts at the Mansion-House, Guild-Hall, the London-Tavern, and elsewhere; in spite of all this, our enemy has not only gone on increasing in power, but has, at last, arrived at a point, whence your Majesty must naturally fear, that he has not far to go ere he arrive at the complete subjugation of the continent; but, (and this is the great danger, from the cause I am now speaking of) along with this abuse of Napoleon, is industriously spread abroad notions, whence a great part of the people must be led to conclude, *that he is not an object of dread*. Those who abuse him, having their own selfish purposes to answer; having the passions of others to flatter and indulge, will allow to neither him nor his generals nor his army any sort of virtue, military or political. The same obstinate and perverse spirit, which ascribed the victory of *Marengo* to *DESSAIX*, and the *turning out of the directory* to *LUCIEN BUONAPARTE*, and which maintained, that, in both cases, Napoleon exhibited all the marks of *folly* and of *cowardice*; that same spirit still prevails; it is still mighty; it still gives us accounts like that of the Austrian "*victory*" of *Aspern*; it tells us, that, at the battle of *WAGRAM*, as it told us at the battle of *AUSTERLITZ*, the Archduke "led Buonaparte into a *trap*." When this spirit will be put down; when the people of this country will be able to get at the truth, is more than I can say; but, my opinion is, that, of all the allies that Buonaparte has, few are more faithful or more serviceable to him, than this base and foolish disposition to disparage, upon all occasions, his talents and his courage, and especially now, when it is become manifest, that, for no great length of time, can the deception possibly prevail, even amongst the most ignorant classes of society. Leaving the morality of the thing out of the question; or, rather, supposing, that the case warrants a departure from all its rules; still, Sir, the deception is to be reprobated; because, by tending to hush the fears of the people, it must tend to retard the hour, when they shall come to that state of mind, which will be necessary to secure the independence of the country.

That the time is now fast approaching, when this kingdom will have single-handed to contend for its INDEPENDENCE, and that too, against ALL THE REST of Europe, under the sway of the Emperor Napoleon; this is, I think, a proposition, which no one, except one of those whose interest it may be to deceive the public, will attempt to deny, unless there be grounds for an opinion, that the mild, and christian-like, and un-ambitious nature of that conqueror should induce him to make no attempts against us, merely because we have discovered more enmity towards him than any other people have shown, and because the conquering of us would be more glorious than the conquering of any other people. Those, who think thus, may see nothing new, nothing alarming, in the present state of the war; but, those who think directly the reverse; who think, that from principles of *self-preservation*, as well as from the passions of envy and revenge, and from a love of glory, Napoleon will seek the subjugation of this kingdom; these persons must perceive, that the battles on the Danube, the subsequent armistice, and the treaty by which it will necessarily be followed, have given to the contest that decided character, which warrants the assertion, that England is now *contending for her existence*.

This being the case; or, at least, it being so in my opinion, the next thing for me to inquire into is, *How we are to maintain this contest?*

There are two modes of warfare, which we may suppose Napoleon to

pursue; that of *wasting* and that of *assault*. Suppose him to pursue the former, and us to pursue the same mode of warfare that we now pursue, what, I would like to ask your Majesty's ministers, must be the consequence of his sitting down quietly, giving rest, and, in fact, *peace*, to all his dominions, while he caused us to expend *seventy millions a year*? How many years would this last? How many years would it be possible for us to carry on a war of this sort, which, as far as I can see, need not cost the subjects of Napoleon a sum, which, when distributed, would amount to a farthing a head? I have before explained to your Majesty, that all the most useful commercial communications are even now carried on between the several countries, under Napoleon's sway; and, that, in fact, as far as relates to the prosperity of those countries, our power as now used, has no effect. What, then, I should be glad to know from your Majesty's ministers, should we do, were he to resolve upon a mere menacing, a mere paragraph warfare; if he were to *do nothing at all*, but merely to say: "you shall not have peace?" In this case, the question comes to this: "*How long we can continue to expend seventy-millions a year?*"

But, it is not to be believed, that the ever-active spirit of Napoleon will suffer him to pursue this mode of warfare. On the contrary, if he should, in the course of a year, have finished his work upon the continent of Europe, will he not, as surely as he has life, set himself seriously about his last labour, the fulfilment of his pledge to Lord Whitworth? Upon this supposition, which is, indeed, the only rational one, we have next to take a view of his means of attack.

He will have in his hands, or completely at his command, all the roads and harbours and arsenals that he could wish for; and many more than he could possibly want. His means of building and fitting out and manning ships, would be inexhaustible. Even during the present war, he has, I believe, *built two new ships to our one!* Having once settled the continent to his liking, how long would he be in creating a navy far superior to your Majesty's navy *in numbers*? Not equal in skill, and I hope not in bravery; but far superior in numbers; and, unless we suppose the French totally incapable of attaining naval skill, we must allow, that experience would soon make them formidable. Painful as it may be to contemplate such truths, it would be folly in the extreme for us to shut our eyes against them. If we look, then, at the naval efforts that Napoleon has been able to make, even during his great military wars, we cannot refrain from being alarmed at those which he will be able to make, when he shall have completely gotten rid of those wars, and shall, at the same time, have added to the ports already in his possession, those of Spain and Portugal. For my part, I can see no reason (if we pursue our present system of warfare) why Napoleon should not in a year after he has settled the affairs of the continent, have afloat *a hundred ships of the line*, completely manned and fit for sea. Leaving the Baltic out of the question, there are quite ports and arsenals enough for this purpose; and, as to the other means, hemp, pitch, iron, copper, and timber of all sorts, he will have the greater part of them for a fourth of what they will cost us. Why, then, I would put it to your Majesty's ministers, should he not have such a fleet in the course of *one year*? But, suppose he chooses to stop *three years*? Suppose him capable of restraining, for that length of time, his eagerness to conquer this country; and, that he has 300 ships of the line fit for sea. Suppose this to be the

case, in what a situation should we then be? And, if our present mode of warfare be continued, I do not, for my part, see any reason, nor can I discover any reason, why he should not have such a force, and even in a *much shorter time* than that which I have pointed out. Three years is not a long period. The present war has already endured more than six. It, therefore, becomes us to consider, whether we shall have the means of resisting such a force. But, without supposing the existence of any such force as this, no one, I should think, will deny, that, in the course of two years, at the farthest, Buonaparte, upon the supposition of his having settled the continent, will be able to send out *several stout squadrons at once*, or at nearly one and the same time. Supposing him to do this, and to have from ten to fifteen thousand men on board of each, and to make for Ireland. The chances are that *some* of them would reach their destination. To *watch* six or seven stout squadrons would require twice as great a force as we have. In fact, it would, against such a maritime force, as we are now supposing, be utterly impossible to guard all the approaches to Ireland, supposing that to be the only object to attend to. But, if Napoleon should have a stout squadron in *every considerable port*, from the *Texel* to *Cadiz* inclusive, there will be nothing, that I can see, to prevent him from engaging the attention of the whole of our force, such as it is now, upon the Eastern coasts of England, while he sails for Ireland from Ferrol, Lisbon, or any of the Southern ports. To blockade the *whole* of his ports, and especially if each contain a stout and well supplied squadron, will be impossible, even if the weather should always be fair; and to blockade a part will be of no use; and, therefore, unless we adopt a new mode of warfare, it appears to me quite evident, that the time is at no great distance, when the safety of Ireland will depend upon the disposition of the Irish to defend their country against an invasion on the part of the French.

I trust, that no one will dare to tell your Majesty, that there is no danger *now*, because *hitherto* the threats of Napoleon have proved harmless; that no one will dare to tell you, that for several years, during the present war, England fought France *single-handed*, and was very far from losing in the contest. The *battle* was, indeed, single-handed, sometimes; though during this war, France has actually had to fight Austria, Russia, Prussia, Naples, Spain and Portugal, and, by way of interlude, she has disposed of about half a dozen principalities and a popedom. But, whether she had *actually* to fight them, or not, she knew of their being *in existence*. There were, at any rate, *three great powers*, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, who, though not at war with her, *might* be at war with her at any moment, if a misfortune happened to befall her; so that, in fact, we had then all these powers on our *side*, for whatever appearances might be, they all hated France at the bottom of their hearts.

Now how different is the state of things! With the sole exception of Russia, there is no power, worthy of being so called, left upon the continent, besides France; and, it is but too evident, that, before Napoleon again returns to Paris, he will make himself as sure of the obedience of Russia as he is of that of Holland or Italy. He will, in that case, be freed from all apprehension. There will scarcely remain the possibility of interrupting him, in his plans with regard to England; and the whole of the mental as well as other means of his vast empire will, without doubt, be directed against this kingdom. I beg your Majesty to reflect on this important change in the circumstances of the war. Pared as the

nails of Austria were in her last war, she was still a *great power*. If she had remained quiet for the present, she might still have been an object of fear with Buonaparte ; but, she listened to the voice of those who hit upon the bright thought of making in Austria a *diversion* in favour of Spain, and she has paid the price of her credulity. She is no longer a *power*. It is not to be doubted, that Napoleon will use the rights of a conqueror, and bestow the territories of the Emperor Francis, or great part of them, upon those in whom he can confide. As to the *people*, it is evident that their wishes will never be consulted ; nor, indeed, does it appear to be at all necessary. They seem to have been very calm and indifferent spectators of the passing events ; and so they *must* have been, seeing that 200,000 Frenchmen were permitted to take possession of their capital, and to overrun their country ; a lesson, one would think, well calculated to be useful to other governments, if governments were capable of receiving lessons ; if any one ever *began to amend* until amendment was too late ; if any one ever relied upon any thing but its *power*, till that power was swept away, and till all other means of preservation became useless ; if any one ever appealed to any thing but the *sword*, till it was compelled to listen to the sentence : " he who *lives* by the sword shall *die* by the sword." This lesson is, indeed, of a nature, one would think, to strike sensibility even into a stone. *Eighteen millions* of people suffer *two hundred thousand* to take possession of their country, and that two hundred thousand being seven or eight hundred miles from home ! What a *lesson* ! But, what are we to think, when we are told that these eighteen millions of people were full of "*loyalty*," full of "*enthusiasm*" in the cause of their country ? I beseech your Majesty to remark this well ; and to bear it in mind, when you hear or read the language of courtiers, or of venal writers, or when, from lungs of contractors and jobbers, you hear those songs, healths, and sentiments, which the unprincipled retailers of news and politics have the impudence to circulate as the effusions of *loyalty*. How often, alas ! were we told of the *loyal* songs and tunes at the theatres at *Berlin* and *Vienna* ! How often were we told of these proofs of enthusiastic loyalty, and of hostility towards the French ! How many thousands of paragraphs have, for our information, been translated from the German papers, in which the writers of that country appear almost to melt away in reading the marks of the people's attachment to their "*beloved* sovereigns." We have now seen, and the sovereigns of Germany have felt, what reliance is to be placed upon such professions and protestations ; upon this miserable cant of loyalty ; while the sovereign of Spain has seen even those of his nobles nearest to his person, lead the way over to his enemy, and lend their hand to the imprisonment of him, whom they had formerly addressed on their knees.

But, if there is no hope in the dispositions of the *people* of Austria, or of any other country, and if Buonaparte should become completely master of the whole of the continent, the ports and naval arsenals included, still it may be said : " the *sea* is ours : let us take that and keep it, if he take and keep the land." True, and so obviously true, that it requires not a moment's reflection. It is evident, that, unless we can command the sea as completely as he commands the land, we must fall. And, then the question is, *can* we do it ? If we can, *how* ? Some persons may think, perhaps, that the discussion of these questions is unnecessary, seeing that *we command the sea now* ; but, from the facts, stated in my former Letter, it appears, that we do *not* command the

sea now ; for, would it not be absurd to call that a command of the sea, which permits convoys of two or three hundred vessels of the enemy to pass unmolested, and to carry on, uninterrupted, between the countries of the enemy, all that sort of commerce which is essential to their mutual comfort and prosperity, and which furnishes that enemy with all the means of forming, in a short time, a vast naval force ? Yes ; it would be absurdity itself to give to this the name of *an absolute command of the sea*. We have an absolute command upon the sea where we cannot injure the enemy, unless he choose to come out to us ; but, as to that sort of command, which is capable of really annoying him, and preventing the growth of his naval power, if we have it, it is manifest that we turn it to no account.

The *expedition*, now, perhaps, in the act of attacking the enemy, *may*, indeed, do some service ; that is a sort of command of the sea, which, *if the effect be proportioned to the means*, must tend to the great object, at which I aim, namely, the destruction of the enemy's valuable commercial intercourse ; and, of course, of his means of rapidly raising and sending forth a navy, equal, or superior, in numbers, to that of England. But, Sir, if this mighty armament ; this really great force ; this, probably, more than half of the force which England can command, is intended to do nothing, or should be able to do nothing, but merely capture an island, to keep which will require very great strength and expense, and which, after all, is of no great consequence ; if this, even adding to it the destruction of a few ships of war and a naval arsenal ; if these are to be the achievements of, perhaps, 80,000 men, by land and sea, and of an expense of millions ; if, not to reckon the loss of lives, *such effects* are to be purchased with *such means*, what must be our situation before this day five years ? At this rate of proceeding ; according to this mode of carrying on the war, the destruction of every French ship will cost us half a million of money. Besides, shall we, when Napoleon has settled the affairs of the continent, *dare* attempt such a mode of warfare ? If, instead of his now having a war to carry on in Spain and another in Austria, he had no war but his war with us to attend to ; should we, in that case, have attempted this expedition ? It is clear that we should not have dared to attempt it ; because, while our force was bent towards the Scheldt, he would have had, from several ports to the Southward, squadrons sallying out for Ireland, or other parts of these islands. If, at a time when Napoleon has wars in Spain and Austria, and while he himself is, perhaps, seven hundred miles distant from our point of attack ; if, at such a time, under such circumstances, it requires such an armament to destroy a few French ships, what can we expect to be able to do, when these circumstances shall be totally changed, and when not one circumstance favourable to us will remain ?

That the commercial intercourse between the several countries under the sway of Napoleon is capable of being interrupted, and even destroyed, there can be no doubt in the mind of any man, who is acquainted with what has been done in this way by some few officers of your Majesty's navy, and by ONE in particular, whom it is not necessary for me to name. It is not less matter of certainty, that, as long as our present general mode of warfare continues ; that is to say, while our fleets and even our cruisers, lie like so many batteries, or fortresses, upon the water, the commerce of the enemy and his naval resources never can be

injured. The vessels of the enemy now know, especially with the aid of the signal-posts upon the shore, the situation of each of our ships as well as they know the situation of any rock or shoal. To *station* ships along the coast of the enemy is, therefore, as useless as it would be to fix so many *buoys* along those coasts. They may, and do, cast anchor and amuse themselves in *fishing* and *shooting*, while they see the immense convoys of the enemy, moving along the shore, completely out of their reach. The expense to us is immense, while the injury, and even the inconvenience, to the enemy, is scarcely worth notice. Our commerce with the East Indies costs us more to protect it, in one year, than the protection of this commerce of France would cost in a man's life-time ; and, a most striking circumstance is, that the "*annihilated navy of France*" forces us into all this expense for the defence of our commerce with the East, a commerce which Napoleon is too wise to envy us, and of which, or of the dominion out of which it grows, he would not deprive us if he could, convinced, as he must be, that that commerce and that dominion are amongst the most powerful of those causes, which are working in his favour. Yet, upon this worse than worthless commerce we expend so much, while he expends scarcely any thing upon the protection of that invaluable commercial intercourse, which I have so often described. To assail this intercourse, we want no *additional* force ; we want no more ships ; we want nothing, that would be expensive, which we have not, in abundance, already : and, indeed, for this great purpose, the force we already have is three or four times as great as it need to be ; for, what is the use of a ship lying with her sails flapping, in the same, or nearly the same place, for months at a time, while, with the naked eye, her commander sees the crowded convoys of the enemy pass by unmolested ? That one ship, employed in the *destruction* of this commerce, would be more useful to the country than a thousand ships, employed in *looking* at it, need not be insisted upon : but, to effect this destruction, there must be, besides that *skill* and *courage*, in which I shall suppose none of your Majesty's naval officers to be wanting, a *motive* sufficient to bring that skill and courage into action, and to create that perseverance in watchfulness and toil without which the sort of warfare, here contemplated, is not to be carried on with even a chance of success. The officer, who is to assist in destroying the commerce of France and her means of creating a navy, must make up his mind to live amidst rocks and shoals, and, of course, to the running of continual risks. So that, to say nothing of his incessant labour, his life and his reputation must be hourly at stake. But, if these difficulties be fairly encountered, the success is by no means doubtful ; and, therefore, all that is wanted, supposing our naval force to be judiciously distributed and employed, is, a *sufficient motive* for the encountering of these difficulties ; and to show to your Majesty, that such motive does not, at present, exist, is the chief purpose for which I have undertaken to address you.

The service, of which I am speaking, is not one which admits of being performed in consequence of mere *orders*. It does not, like the conducting of a convoy, or the fighting of ships, or the attacking of a battery, admit of particular instructions. General instructions may be given ; a latitude to cruize in may be prescribed ; but, in almost every case, each single commander must be left to his own discretion, as to

the place, time, and manner of the service to be performed. Now, Sir, though it might, perhaps, be no very difficult matter to find out one or two or three commanders, in the British navy, who, from a *pure love of glory*, or upon principles of *pure patriotism*, would, in spite of all the difficulties and dangers before-mentioned, undertake and go through the service of attacking repeatedly the coasting vessels of the enemy; yet, I am persuaded, that no rational man would expect to find *twenty persons*, so actuated, even amongst that very excellent class of men, the British naval officers. Indeed, such characters may be drawn by poets for the purposes of inspiring emulation; but, they are rarely to be met with in real life. It is notorious, that, in our country, men seldom become soldiers and sailors *for any other reason* than because they are *poor*, every man being poor, whose income is deemed by others as well as himself, insufficient. It is therefore perfectly preposterous; men may talk as they please about it, but it is perfectly preposterous to suppose, that, in order to insure the performance of services, which necessarily imply great danger of various sorts, besides unavoidable bodily exertion and fatigue, we stand in need of no motive other than that of the *glory* or the *patriotism* of the act. Our practice, indeed, our invariable practice, despises this theory; for, while we talk of the glory of having done this or that piece of service, we are pretty sure not to forget something of a more substantial nature. In short, every thing has its worth in money; every service has its price; and, when we talk of *reward*, we always mean money, or money's worth. After viewing the list of noble-men and gentlemen, whose names are to be found amongst the pensioners and sinecure-place men, it would be miserable affectation to expect from officers of the navy in general the performance of services, such as I have been speaking of, without some motive *other than that of glory or of patriotism*, and, indeed, without the motive of gain, in one shape or another. It would be something below affectation; it would be to suppose those officers senseless brutes; creatures completely divested, indeed, of what nature teaches to all other animals, namely, a feeling of self-preservation, a love of life, of ease, and of happiness.

There are, Sir, various reasons, why this motive should be but little efficient as to the service I am speaking of, the important service of distressing the subjects of our enemy, and of cutting off the source of his naval stores; but, the principal one, and the only one, with which I shall trouble your Majesty, at this time, is the little hope, the very faint hope indeed, which, even in case of distinguished success, the practice of the *Prize Courts* leave the successful commander of deriving any advantage whatever from such success; for, I trust, and, indeed, I am sure, your Majesty will agree with me, that, to receive half a dozen pounds out of a prize worth four or five hundred pounds, ought not to be called an advantage, and that a sum so pitiful ought to be beneath the notice of any man bearing your commission. What I am now going to lay before your Majesty, will, I am certain, astonish you as it has me. I have been accustomed to look upon prizes taken by our ships, as the sole property of the officers and men of those ships, as their reward, their hard-earned reward; what was my astonishment, then, at learning, that, in many cases, much the greater part of the amount was shared amongst *lawyers*; and that, in almost all cases, a very considerable proportion of the amount found its way into this channel. I shall now proceed, without further comment, to give some instances of the distribution of Prize-

Money, and, it is, I hope, unnecessary for me to say, that I give them from authentic documents; and, from these documents it will be seen how erroneous are the opinions, which have heretofore been generally entertained as to the distribution of Prize-Money.

The first instance is that of a French prize :

Amount of the Sales	£291 11 1
The Charges, including <i>duties</i> and <i>Proctor's</i> bill	229 1 4
	<hr/>
Remains for the Captors!	62 9 9
	<hr/>

The capturing ship was a 38 gun frigate; and the shares were, according to the present regulation, as follows :

The Captain	£10 8 0
A Seamen	0 1 6
A Landman	0 1 0

What does your Majesty think of this? Was I not right in boldly asserting, that your Majesty could know nothing of this? This was a *French* ship, about which there could be no dispute, or, at least, no litigation; and yet, out of 291 pounds, the sailor gets but *eighteen pence*, and the Captain not *ten guineas*, while the Proctor's bill alone amounts to upwards of *twenty seven* pounds.

I need not appeal to your Majesty, whether here be a motive sufficiently powerful to induce any one to enter, with zeal and alacrity, upon any service full of difficulty and danger, and having nothing of glory belonging to it.

Another instance is that of a Prize, the sales of which amounted to 1102*l.*, out of which the captors had to pay 358*l.* 14*s.* 2*d.* for the *Proctor's bill alone*, consequently one third part of the amount of this prize went to be divided amongst *Judges, Advocates, Registrars, Marshals, Proctors, Surrogates*, and the like; so that, by the time that the duties and other expenses were cleared, there remained, in all probability, not about twenty pounds for the Captain and about half a crown for the sailor.

I am sure, that it is not, because it *cannot be*, your Majesty's wish that your Navy should be thus rewarded.

The next case presents us with the Gross Sales of a ship and stores to the amount of 745*l.* out of which (it being a *salvage* case) the Captors got 43*l.* 11*s.* 9*d.* as salvage, while the Proctor's Bill amounted to 233*l.* 18*s.* 0*d.*; thus the people in the courts received more than five times as much as the Captain and his Ship's Company.

The next is a *neutral* case, where there appears to have been some litigation.

Gross sales	£1,415 13 2
Duties	£414 2 0
Paid to neutral master	391 0 0
Other charges	44 0 8
	<hr/>
	849 2 8
	<hr/>
	566 10 6
Proctor's bill	410 6 10
	<hr/>
To be distributed between the Captain and Crew	£156 3 8
	<hr/>

Thus, while the Captain and his crew received *one hundred and fifty-six pounds*, the Officers of the Court received *four hundred and ten pounds*; nor must it be forgotten here, that, if the prize had *not been condemned*, the Captain, whose share was, perhaps, about thirty pounds, would have had to pay, out of his own pocket, not only the 410*l.* 6*s.* 10*d.* being the amount of the Proctor's bill, but also the amount of *the damages sustained by the neutral*. Who will, who dares, run such risks?

The next is a case, wherein the Captain, *in obeying the Orders in Council*, brought in a neutral ship, part of the cargo of which was good prize; and, your Majesty will now see what was the fruit of his obedience to those orders.

Gross sales of the part of the cargo condemned.....	£13 16 6
Divers charges.....	£40 13 8
Proctor's bill.....	127 18 7
	<hr/>
	168 12 3
Gross sales, as above	13 16 6
	<hr/>
Loss suffered by the Captain who made the Prize.....	151 15 9

Now, as your Majesty will not fail to observe, there was no avoiding this loss, without a breach of duty towards your Majesty and the country. Not to have taken this neutral, it being manifestly in his power, would have subjected the captain to a trial for his life. Is it not then, extremely hard, that he should suffer such a loss, he whose pay is barely sufficient to afford, what, to him, are necessaries of life; is it not hard, that he should sustain such a loss, and that the amount of it should go into the pockets of those, who have risked neither life nor fortune? In such a case, surely, the law should be more merciful. In short, Sir, there needs nothing but the statement of this case to do away all our *wonder* that the sea is still covered with the ships of our enemies, secret as well as open, and that Napoleon is able to replenish his arsenals, and to build ships of war faster than we can.

I shall cite one more case, and that I shall give in detail, as far, at least, as I possess the materials. It is that of a ship condemned in July, 1808, the Gross Sales of which amounted to 272*l.* 3*s.*, out of which only 59*l.* 16*s.* remained to be distributed between the Captain and his crew, leaving, in the proportion of a 38 gun frigate,

For the Captain.....	£9 19 8
For a Seamen.....	0 1 4
For a Landman.....	0 0 11

while the Proctor's Bill alone amounted to 58*l.* 19*s.* 2*d.*, and while, as your Majesty will see from the Items, that the Advocate's *clerk*, whose business was to open his master's door twice to the Proctor, received, out of this prize, more than three of the seamen concerned in the capture.—Now to the detail:

Gross Sales of ship, stores, and cargo	£272 3 0
	<hr/>
DEDUCT.	
Pilotage	4 2 0
Warehouse rent	3 3 0
	<hr/>
Carried over	7 5 0

	Brought over	£7 5 0
Labourers		14 12 4
Prizemaster		0 14 0
Advertisements for sales, &c.		17 5 0
Ship-keepers		13 14 0
Brokerage		2 14 9
Agency		7 7 2
Incidents		10 9 6
<i>Paid to private Persons for necessary Services</i>		<u>74 1 9</u>
Duties		18 8 6
Fees to the Custom-House		15 16 6
Fees for release from Quarantine.....		8 17 6
<i>Paid in taxes, and to tax-officers appointed by Government</i>		<u>43 2 6</u>
<i>Paid to the Chest at Chatham and Greenwich Hospital</i>		<u>3 2 11</u>
Actuary's bill		26 5 0
Judges' Certificate		2 6 8
Registering the Letter of Attorney and Amount of Sales at Doctor's Commons		4 9 0
Proctor's bill		58 19 2
<i>Paid to law and other officers, appointed by the Government</i>		<u>91 19 10</u>
Remains for the Captain and his crew to share amongst them		<u>59 16 0</u>

That is to say, then, the Captain and the whole of his crew have, amongst them all, only *sixteen shillings and ten-pence* more than the Proctor's bill alone amounts to.

This is what neither your Majesty nor your people could have thought *possible*. For my part, though I was aware of the exorbitant charges of the Admiralty courts, and though I saw, in almost all of them, the offices filled by a deputy, who made a fortune, while the principal, or sinecure-place-man, made a fortune also; though I was aware of all this, even I could not have believed in the existence of what I am now laying before your Majesty.

To state more particulars may appear to be useless; but, a *Proctor's bill* must be a curiosity to a King, and, therefore, I here insert the bill, relating to the afore-mentioned prize.

Proctor's Fee retained	0 6 8
Attending the Translator and ordering an Abstract of the Ship Papers	0 6 8
Paid for same	1 1 0
Perusing the Abstract and drawing Case for the Opinion of his Ma- jesty's Advocate whether the Captors could proceed with any prospect of success	0 13 4
Fair Copy	0 6 8
Attending his Majesty's Advocate therewith, and seeing him	0 6 8
Paid his Fee	2 2 0
His Clerk	0 2 6
Perusing the Opinion, Copy for the Captor's Agent, and writing him therewith	0 6 8
Paid Carriage of Ship Papers and Examinations	0 10 0
Attending and retaining his Majesty's Advocate	0 6 8
Paid his Fee	1 1 0

Attending before a Surrogate and bringing in Ship Papers and Examinations, and paying Monition, and Surrogate's Fee	0	6	0
Registrar's Attendance	0	6	8
Act of Court	0	2	8
Filing Attestation	0	2	8
Paid for Monition under Seal, Stamps and Extracting	1	17	8
Copy for Service	0	6	8
Paid the Marshal for Service	0	6	8
Certificate of Service	0	3	4
Praying Publication and Act	0	7	8
Attending in the Registry inspecting the Depositions and bespeaking Copy	0	6	8
Paid for Office Copy thereof, Stamps and Collating	5	4	0
Extracting	0	6	8
Perusing and Abstracting	0	16	8
Copy for his Majesty's Advocate	3	9	0
Paid for the use of the standing Commission	0	8	6
Revising the Abstract and comparing the same with the Examinations to enable me to draw a Case for the Opinion and directions of his Majesty's Advocate and drawing such Case accordingly ..	0	13	4
Fair Copy	0	6	8
Attending his Majesty's Advocate therewith and seeing him	0	6	8
Paid his Fee	2	2	0
His Clerk	0	2	6
Perusing the Opinion Copy for the Captor's Agent and writing him therewith	0	6	8
Attending in the Registry inspecting the Ship Papers and selecting such as were necessary to be translated on behalf of the Captors and bespeaking Copy	0	6	8
Paid for Translations and Office Copy thereof, Stamps and Collating ..	9	13	10
Extracting	0	6	8
Perusing and Abstracting	0	13	4
Copy for his Majesty's Advocate	1	5	0
Paid for Office Copy Attestation as to Ship Papers, Stamps, Collating and Extracting	0	16	8
Perusing the same, and Copy for his Majesty's Advocate	0	6	8
Drawing Allegation for Condemnation of the Ship and Cargo, and engrossing the same and Stamp	0	11	8
Fee giving in the Allegation when the same was admitted and Act ..	0	7	8
Paid filing same	0	4	0
Attending and returning the Monition and Act	0	7	8
Drawing Case for the Hearing on behalf of the Captors	1	6	8
Copy for his Majesty's Advocate	0	13	4
Attending him with the Case and Papers, and seeing him	0	6	8
Paid his Fee	3	3	0
Attending when the Cause was assigned for Sentence on the first Assignment and Act	0	7	8
The like on the second Assignment and Act	0	7	8
Trinity Term Fee	0	6	8
Attending Informations	0	6	8
Fee when the Judge at my Petition on motion of his Majesty's Advocate by Interlocutory Decree condemned the Ship and Cargo and Act	0	7	8
Interlocutory Fees to Judge, Registrar, and Marshal	2	18	8
Paid the Registrar for drawing the Interlocutory	0	6	8
Attending him therewith	0	6	8
Deputy Registrar, Marshal, and Cryer's Special Attendance, being an Extra Court day	0	19	4
Attending in the Registry and bespeaking Copy of the Interlocutory ..	0	6	8
Paid for Office Copy thereof, Stamps and Collating	1	0	8
Paid the Registrar for Acts, Sportulage and Attendances	1	10	0
The like for Copying and Dispatch	1	3	0
His Clerks	0	7	6
Officers of the Court	0	7	6
Extra-judicial Attendances and Consultations	0	13	4

Proctor's Clerk	0	7	6
Letters, Messengers, and Sportulage	0	6	8
			£58 19 2

Thus, Sir, you see, that your Majesty's *Advocate* received (within £1 11s. 8d.), out of the proceeds of this Prize, a sum equal to that received by the Captain who took her, and who, in taking her, did, perhaps, run great risk in losing his life, and did certainly run a risk of losing his money, if, by accident, he had any to lose.

I beseech your Majesty to look at the charges, which close this bill. After having charged separately for every attendance; after having made a distinct item of charge for every scrap of paper of every description; after having, as it would seem, rung the changes upon all the terms of separate charge, there come in, at the end, a set of general charges for *attendance* and for *clerks*!

Applying these statements to the great point, upon which I have been addressing your Majesty, can it be, to any one, matter of wonder, that, while this mode of distributing the amount of Prizes exists, the commerce and naval resources of Napoleon remain uninterrupted by our navy? The nature of the service is such as scarcely to admit of any *brilliant exploit*; such as scarcely to afford a chance of any of those achievements, which give officers a claim to *honours* or *promotion*. The service is a service of mere drudgery; of watching and fatigue and care; and, if it hold not out a pretty fair prospect of gain, in compensation for all its toils and its dangers, who will undertake such a service; and, especially what man of great skill (for great skill it requires) will so spend his time, when, without a positive breach of orders, he can avoid it?

It is a circumstance not a little galling, that, when any officer of your Majesty's navy has made a prize, the prosecution of his claim to her must be committed to persons, not of his own choosing; not to *Proctors* (who are merely *Attorneys*) and *Advocates* (who are merely *Counsellors*) chosen by himself, but to a Proctor and an Advocate, appointed by the ministers of your Majesty; to persons, in short, whom he *may* like, but whom also he may *dislike*, and in whom, however unexceptionable their character, *he* may have no confidence, whether as to talent or integrity. If, indeed, nothing was at stake but the prize, there might be some show of reason in saying, that what is taken by the public force shall be committed to the management of none but public officers; but, this is not the case; for, the *private property* of the capturing commander is at stake; that property he may lose, and may, indeed, be reduced to beggary and lodged in a jail by the decision upon a prize; and, shall he not, then, be at liberty to *choose his own Attorney and Counsellor*? Shall his property, and, eventually, his personal liberty, be committed to, be wholly left, or, rather, *taken*, into the hands of attorneys and counsellors, of whom, perhaps, *he* has a bad opinion, however good may be the opinion which others entertain of them? It frequently happens, that a *partner* of the *King's Proctor*, as he is called, has the management of the cause for the *claimant*; so that, the capturing commander, in such case, is compelled to commit his cause, and to impart all his documents and other information, to the same persons, who have the management of the cause *on the part of his adversary*; which, were it not a fact as notorious as it is, never could be believed. This was, some time ago, complained of in the House of Commons; but, as with re-

spect to most other grievances, no redress was obtained, nor even proposed to be granted.

Under such discouragements, under such a system of deciding upon Prizes, it is not to be expected, that arduous services will be undertaken and prosecuted to success. It is against nature for a man to expose his life, or to harass himself half to death, for the sake of swelling the bags of Proctors and Advocates. And why should not this evil, this great bar to the exertion, to the utility, of our naval power: why should it not be removed; why should not some mode of deciding upon Prizes be adopted, that would leave to the captors something like a fair chance of compensation for their toil and their danger? Why this *should* not be done, there can be no reason; but, why it is not done, there are reasons more than sufficient. The rich offices of *judge advocate, proctor, surrogate, marshal, registrar, actuary*, together with the endless list of subalterns, form one of the most important heads of *ministerial patronage*; or, in other words (and here we touch the *real source* of the evil) these offices are necessary to satisfy the demands of those, who possess that sort of influence, which it is not necessary to name, either to your Majesty or to the country; and which influence, as it has sunk this nation from what she was, will, unless speedily put an end to, complete her degradation and her ruin. How many are the ways, in which this poisonous influence is working for our destruction! But, in no way, perhaps, more visibly than in the one here pointed out, where we see it directly opposed to those exertions, which are necessary to our national safety. Its workings are to be traced to hundreds of other mischievous effects; but, here we see it, at one view, in open hostility, not only to great national interests, but to the very independence of the nation; and, yet, such is the state in which we are, such is the power of this influence, that I should feel much more indignation than surprise at hearing it asserted, that the patronage arising from the profits of the Prize-Courts was of more consequence than the destruction of the commerce and the naval resources of France. It is matter of perfect notoriety, that the far greater part of the fees imposed upon Prizes, go into the pockets of *sinecure* officers, like Lord ARDEN, for instance. Of the courts of Vice-Admiralty abroad, where the charges are, as far as I have been able to ascertain, still more exorbitant than at home; of these courts, it is notorious that the officers *reside in England*, and have their business performed by deputy. It is equally notorious, that what these *sinecure* officers receive *must be so much taken from the captors of prizes*; so that, in fact, the Navy is, in part, at least, employed to gain opulence for them. Is there, Sir, any reason in this? Would it not be far better to pay these *Sinecure*-place-men out of the taxes, and leave the navy to enjoy the full fruit of its earnings? If there must exist an influence to be counteracted only by grants of places or pensions, surely it were better to take the means, at once, out of the purses of the nation at large, than thus to check those exertions, upon which our existence as a nation may soon be found to depend. I am aware, that there are those, who would rather see the navy perish than see this source of patronage abridged; but, if such men are not few in number, I trust they will have no influence in the councils of your Majesty. I am, &c. &c. &c.]

Botley, 3rd August, 1809.

WM. COBBETT.

THE JUBILEE.

(Political Register, October, 1809.)

To RICHARD GOODLAD, Esq.

OF THE

Parish of Droxford, in the County of Hants.

SIR:

When I had, on the 17th instant, the pleasure of seeing you at the Justice-meeting at Droxford, you mentioned to me something about a subscription in behalf of the poor inhabitants of that parish, which has so long experienced the good effects of your activity and benevolence. You informed me, at the same time, that Mr. CHIDELL, the overseer of the poor, in our tything, would call upon me with a paper, containing a list of the subscriptions already taken. This paper, with *my name* on it, has just been presented to me; and, against my name, I have written these words: "*Mr. Cobbett thinks it improper to give any thing at all;*" my reasons for which opinion I shall now state to you, and (under an address to you) to the public at large; because I am satisfied, that, in more than one point of view, the statement may, sooner or later, be conducive to the public good; and, as to the mode of address, it will, I think, require no apology, when it is considered, that the afore-mentioned subscription-paper came accompanied with a circular-letter under your hand.

Of this letter, Sir, which I kept in my possession until I had read it twice through, the following is the substance:—*That, on the 25th inst., being the day when the King will enter upon the 50th year of his reign, there will be a GENERAL rejoicing through the kingdom;—that it would be a PITY, that, amidst this general joy, the parish of Droxford should APPEAR LESS LOYAL than its neighbours;—that MR. GARNIER the Rector, and MR. NOTT the Curate, together with other gentlemen of the parish, assembled after divine service, on Sunday last, proposed the opening of a subscription for the purpose of raising a sum of money, wherewith to purchase bread, meat, and beer, to be delivered, on the 25th inst., to the poor parishioners of Droxford, it being the opinion of the parties so proposing, that the King would be peculiarly delighted with our loyalty's showing itself in the form of largesses to his poorer subjects.*

These, Sir, are the principal propositions contained in your letter; and, before I come to consider them in their relation to what is called the Jubilee; before I come to consider them as relating solely to the present occasion, give me leave to trouble you with some observations upon all subscriptions, having such an object in view, and being set on foot in such a manner.

First, then, I decidedly disapprove of this manner of *feeding* and *treating* the poor, which, so far from being conformable to the principles of *hospitality*, it does, in fact, argue, in the donors, a contempt for the persons fed and treated, who are thus as clearly marked out for a degraded

caste, as if they had badges put upon their clothes, or, as some of the American negroes have, a burnt mark on their cheek. When, therefore, I treat a poor man, I treat him under my own roof, or, in case of sickness, send what I have to give him, to his own house, and never expose him to the humiliation of this kind of public and pauper-like relief. Besides, Sir, I hold it to be very injurious to the country, that any attempt like this should be made to keep pauperism in countenance; for such will be the tendency, though certainly not the *intention*, of the proposed largess. It must, in my opinion, as far as it operates, have the effect of reconciling the minds of the labouring people to a state of dependence and beggary, and to efface the small remains of that spirit, which formerly withheld their names from the list of paupers. I hold, Sir, that it is a terrible evil, that a labourer not afflicted with *illness* of any sort, either in himself or his family, should be under the necessity of applying for parish relief, should be under the necessity of begging any part of his bread, or of receiving any assistance in the character of either beggar or pauper; and, of course, I must disapprove of any project the object of which is to feed and treat any portion of our neighbours in that character. But, adverting here, for a moment, to the particular case before us, there is this additional objection to the proposed largess, that I cannot help considering it as a sort of premium for hypocrisy, fitted to this especial occasion, though certainly not so considered by you or the rector or curate. For, either it must be meant, that the people thus fed and treated, do entertain *some sentiments* respecting the 50th anniversary of his Majesty's accession, or that they care nothing at all about it: if the latter be the case, then are they induced, by the proposed treating, to express joy which they do not feel; and in the former case, their sentiments must perfectly correspond with yours, or they are guilty of a still more detestable species of hypocrisy. The poor should, like the rich, be left to rejoice where they see *occasion* for joy. Men may meet together for such a purpose; but, then, to avoid the charge of hypocrisy, they must meet and feast at their own expense. Who, for instance, does not despise the plaudits of a drenched rabble at an election, except the wretch who is mean enough, for his own selfish purposes, to purchase muddy beer, wherewith to drench the said rabble? Do the purchased shouts of a drunken crowd, do honour to the candidate in whose behalf they are uttered? Your answer must be in the negative; and, yet, Sir, I think you will find it difficult to make out a clear distinction between the character of those shouts, and the shouts, which the beer you propose to give, will purchase in behalf of our sovereign. After all, however, the great objection that I have to this species of treating in general, is, that it *encourages pauperism*; it keeps pauperism in countenance: it nourishes that which I wish to see checked, and which, as far as I am able, I keep down. The *labourer* is worthy of his hire; and if he and his family be in health, shame on the employer if the labourer can call himself a pauper, or can think it becoming his character to be fed and treated through the means of a parochial subscription, and, whatever may be his feelings, put on the face of joy for the sake of a meal of bread, meat, and beer. Good God, Sir! am I told by you, that a meal of good victuals and drink, is a *rarity* amongst the labourers in the parish of Droxford? No: in so many words I am not thus told; but, what am I to think of their situation, when I am called upon, as a *proof of my loyalty*, to contribute towards the purchasing of one meal in

fifty years for the labourers of that parish. *My* labourers, Sir, stand in no need of any such largess; they have, *from me*, the means of purchasing bread, meat, and beer, every day of their lives; no parish officer ever sees their face; they are not slaves, but as free as I am myself; if they see cause for *rejoicing* on the 25th inst., they will do it, if not they will let it alone, and the probability is, that they will, on that day, earn bread, meat, and beer for the next. If all labourers were in this situation, we should have no occasion for subscriptions for the purpose of feeding the poor; and, indeed, that degrading appellation, under which all the labourers are now-a-days included, would soon bear a different meaning.

Now, Sir, as to *the manner of setting on foot this subscription*, unconnected with the particular occasion, I have a very great objection. The name, I perceive, of every person whom you expect to subscribe, in each tithing of the parish, is put down upon the subscription paper, and in this state the paper is handed to him. So that, if he does not think proper to give his money away upon your recommendation, his name is to stand upon the list, with a blank against it, which blank does, in that case, amount to a positive refusal, to assist in feeding and making glad the heart of the poor. A very good judge of human nature and of the moral duties of man has observed, that, "the recommendations of superiors savour strongly of commands;" and, Sir, when I consider the weight, which your fortune, and especially your office of acting Justice of the Peace (the only one in the parish) necessarily give you, I must beg you to excuse me if I apply this observation to your present recommendation, which, I think, I am completely justified in doing, seeing that you have sent round our names, ready written upon the subscription list; an act so offensively presumptuous (though, I am sure, it was not so intended) that, had I been ever so much disposed to subscribe, I should not have done it, without protesting against the exercise of such manifest dictation. The truth is, that habit, powerful in every walk of life, is peculiarly so with persons intrusted with public authority of any sort or degree; and, upon this occasion, you really do appear to me to have forgotten, that when writing your circular letter, you were not upon the bench, where your office frequently makes it your duty to dictate, but which office gives you no right whatever to issue dictatorial recommendations to any persons whatever, for subscriptions of money, and especially to order the collection to be made by the overseers of the poor, or other parish-officers, or persons usually employed by the parish to collect its rates. Under such circumstances, Sir, it is in vain, it is quite idle, to call the subscription *voluntary*. With yourself, and with the other gentlemen, with whom the thing originated, the contribution is, of course, a voluntary act, and you have all, doubtless, your reasons for what you have done; but, with the *farmers* of the parish, with those who cannot be insensible to the weight of your recommendation, and whom you must be pretty sure would not send back your paper with a blank against their names; with these persons, is there any candid man will say, that the act of subscribing could possibly be voluntary?

These objections are *general*: they apply to all subscriptions called for with a view of feeding, or treating, the poor; and also, to all subscriptions, for whatever purpose, set on foot in such a manner. But, Sir, upon the supposition, that subscriptions for feeding and treating the poor, may, in certain cases, be proper; and upon the further supposition, that there are cases to justify the manner, in which this subscription has

been set on foot, I have, in this case, an objection to the thing *on account of the occasion* ; I object to the *principle* of your proposition ; and, because I think it may be useful to the public, because I think it may tend to produce, or increase, a right way of thinking upon this and other political subjects, I shall here state the reasons, upon which my objection is principally founded.

The 25th of this month is, it seems, considered, by some persons, at least, as a day for the expressing of national joy ; that it is, in short, to be a day of *Jubilee*, that is to say, of *rejoicing* and all sorts of *merriment* and signs of *gladness* ; and it is to be so, for what ? Why, it seems, because, upon that day, *the King enters upon the fiftieth year of his reign*. Now, Sir, if I had no other objection to your proposition than that which is founded upon the *nature of the occasion*, if its general principle, and *if its manner*, were such as I *approved of* ; and if the jubilee were *expressly* stated to be merely a mark of *personal respect towards his Majesty*, under whose reign I was born, I should very willingly have joined your subscription ; but, Sir, so far from this being the case, so far from its being expressly declared, that the jubilee is to be regarded as a mark of personal respect towards the King, it is perfectly notorious, that, with those individuals who have taken the lead in the thing, and who, indeed, first set it on foot, the object is any thing but that which I have described, and that one of the main purposes is, in this indirect manner to obtain what will be construed into a *general approbation of all the ministerial measures of this long and unfortunate reign* ; rather than aid in effecting which purpose, I shall certainly run the risk of exposing myself to your implied charge of *disloyalty*, of the justice and decency of which charge I will speak more particularly by-and-by.

But, let us inquire a little closer into this subject of rejoicing. You call upon me to rejoice on the 50th anniversary of the King's accession to the throne. Now, even viewing the matter in the best possible light ; even supposing, that you wish the Jubilee to be held with reference to the King solely, to the King personally ; *why* would you have me rejoice at *this time* in particular ? You certainly would not call upon us, your neighbours, to express our joy *that 49 years of the King's reign are already past* ; to clap our hands and to shout because he has passed nine years beyond the age of man ; to sing and dance and drink for joy, because the King is very old ; to be full of joy, to overflow with gladness, in short, because the King has attained to an age, which, according to the course of nature, *must render the remainder of his reign of but short duration*. No : it certainly is not at *this* that you call upon us to rejoice. But, at what, then, would you have us rejoice ? If not at the *old age* of the King, which is just the same thing as the mere *length of reign* ; if not at this, you must then wish us to rejoice at and to celebrate the *changes and events of his reign*, and, in this way, to express our gratitude for the good which the nation has derived from those changes and events. Let us, therefore, see whether those changes and events are such as call upon us for expressions of joy and gratitude.

When the King mounted the throne, the *DEBT*, of which the nation pays the interest in taxes, amounted to about 90 millions ; it now amounts to nearly 700 millions ; and, one year's taxes now is nearly equal to what the whole debt then was. The poor rates of England and Wales then amounted to about *a million and a quarter* annually ; they now amount to *more than six millions* annually. The number of parish paupers

was then about *two hundred thousand*; that number is now above *twelve hundred thousand*. These are pretty good proofs, Sir, that we have no cause to rejoice at the changes of this reign. But, Sir, there is one, which will be very pat to your purpose, when you have the poor labourers of Droxford parish assembled on the jubilee-day; and that is, that, when this reign began, it cost the labouring man *five day's* work to earn a bushel of flour, and that now it costs him *ten day's* work to earn a bushel of flour; and that, if he happens to have three children, it is, upon the common run of wages, utterly impossible for him to earn bread enough for his family to eat, to say nothing of meat, drink, clothing, fire and house-rent. Pray, Sir, state this fact to the young ones; the old ones will not need be told of it. State this fact to them, and if they do not rejoice it is very strange indeed.

Then, Sir, if you should have some politicians in the higher seats of the festival, you may entertain them with the history of the last fifty year's glories, in diplomacy and in war. You may relate to them how we lost the continent of America for *the sake of a tax*; and how, for the *sake of other taxes* and of *corruption*, we got possession of vast countries in the East, through the means of which countries enterprising young men, with scarcely a second shirt to their backs, and with a not much greater stock of ideas, contrive so to draw upon the taxes raised in England as to oust from their estates those, by whom the said taxes have been paid.

From these topics you may diverge into matters of a warlike nature; you may remind the "loyal" audience of the capture of a whole British army at *Saratoga*, and of another at *York-town*. *Dunkirk* and the *Helder* will, of course, become the theme of your praise, after which, in due place, will follow *Ferrol*, *Buenos Ayres*, *Cairo*, *Cintra*, *Corunna*, *Talavera*, and *Walcheren*. You will, then, doubtless, attempt an enumeration of those who have been slain during the *thirty years of war*, with which this nation has been blessed out of the happy *fifty*; nor would it be amiss if you were to lay before the convivial guests a detailed account of those who have lately died at *Walcheren*, and of the thousands of sick and wounded left behind, by our general in Spain, to the mercy of the French; aye, to the mercy of those very French, whom the "loyal" writers in England denominate "*blood-thirsty villains*." Returning again to the blessings of our present state, and the cause we have for joy, you may remind your hearers, that the King's servants, in their extreme care of us, have introduced a very considerable body of foreign troops into the country; a whole legion of Germans, horse, foot, and artillery. You may remind them of the present state of Ireland, and bid them not to forget the number of years, during the present reign, that saw the *personal security act suspended*, and during which years many of their countrymen were kept, for years, in jail; without being brought to trial from first to last.

If this be not enough; if you find them still backward in rejoicing, remind them of the taxes they have to pay, and of the purposes to which they are applied; and, pray do, Sir, show them that there are many individual sinecure placemen, and many pensioners, any one of whom swallows up more of the taxes, in *one month*, than goes to the keeping of all the poor in Droxford for a *whole year*.

Should they still be insensible to your eloquence, remind them of the history of the *Darling*, not forgetting your old neighbour; late a tenant of *Newgate*. Your reverend coadjutors may expound to them the cases

of the holy Doctors O'Meara and Locke, and of the reverend Mr. Beazely, and bid any one produce, if he can, any thing the like thereof in any other reign. Any loyal lady, who chances to be present, may enter upon the rise, progress, and suspension of the "*Delicate investigation*;" and, if they still remained unmoved, why tell them, tell them yourself, Sir, the history of the *Garniers* and their sinecure.

I should not have revived this topic, Sir, had not your letter, circulated through the whole of the parish, and, of course, amongst many of my neighbours, left it to be clearly inferred, that all those who did not *give money*, to be expended in a way that you and Mr. Garnier and Mr. Nott chose to point out, were *disloyal* men. I have every reason to suppose, that you knew, that my sentiments were opposed to any celebration of the day in question; to any act or deed which might give countenance to the thing to be called a Jubilee. But, whether you knew this, or not, a circular letter from you, making the act of subscribing a *test of loyalty*, and accompanied with a subscription paper having my name ready written upon it, contingently inferred the accusation of disloyalty. You send me one paper with a list of names as subscribers to the jubilee, and amongst those names you place mine; and you, at the same time, send me another paper which tells me, in words the meaning of which is not to be misunderstood, that, unless I give my money, I shall be considered as *disloyal*. I do not choose to give my money, and your imputation of disloyalty follows of course. This imputation is a thing for me to laugh at; but, as my intention is to cause this letter to be read by all those who have read your letter, I shall here add a sentence or two for the purpose of showing them what is the real meaning of the word *loyalty*, according to its modern acceptation, and by way of illustration, to give them a striking example of loyalty in the head of the family of that Garnier, who, as your letter states, thought it was "*a pity that the parish of Droxford should appear less loyal than its neighbours.*"

Be it known, then, to those of our neighbours, amongst whom you have circulated your letter, that *loyalty*, now-a-days, means the getting of a good round sum annually out of the taxes, or at least, it means *living upon the public*. For this we have a fine practical instance in Mr. Garnier of Wickham, who though he has never, during his whole lifetime, done for the public one single hour's service; though it has been given in evidence before the House of Commons, that he never has meddled at all with any business for the public; though these facts are indisputable, this Mr. Garnier does get of the public money upwards of *twelve thousand pounds a year*, arising from an office, which he has enjoyed *ever since he was a boy at school*, and which, though not formerly so profitable, or nearly so profitable, as at present, was always a place of great profit. The total sum that he must have, during the whole time, cleared by this place, cannot be less than *three or four hundred thousand pounds*. If that is not a proof of *loyalty*, I do not know what is a proof of loyalty. But, Mr. Garnier has given a still stronger proof of his loyalty; for, not content with pocketing, out of the public money, *twelve thousand pounds a year*, under the denomination of profits of his office of Apothecary-General; not thinking this a sufficient proof of his attachment to the King and his government, what does he do, but gets a post *in the army* at the pay of *ten shillings a day*! Not content with twelve thousand pounds a year out of the public money, out of the taxes that we pay; not content with this immense sum *for doing nothing*; for, observe, it is

proved, upon oath, that he has never meddled with any part of the business; not content with twelve thousand a year for doing nothing, he asks for, and gets, from the government, from that government whose conduct we are to have a jubilee to applaud; he gets from that government an allowance of *ten shillings a day as a medical officer in the army*; and, while he lives constantly at Wickham, he is now actually in the receipt of this ten shillings a day (unless it be very lately taken off) out of the taxes that we pay. Aye, well, indeed, may men like this hold a jubilee in praise of this long reign of war and taxation; this reign, the wars of which have, perhaps, put into the pockets of the Garniers not less than *two hundred thousand pounds*.

By this time, Sir, I hope, that you begin to be convinced, that there are some of us, at least, who understand too well the worth of modern loyalty to fear the effects of any such imputations as that, which, contingently at least, is conveyed in your letter; and that, by means of that sort, we shall not have the money extracted from our pockets. If Mr. Garnier, indeed, has a mind to give back to the people any portion, however small, or if another of your neighbours, Mr. Sturges Bourne, has a mind to give back a part of what he is annually receiving out of the taxes, let them do it; but, let them not accuse me or Mr. Chidell or Mr. Edney or Mr. Cowdry or Mr. Parrott, or any of the rest of us, of disloyalty, that is to say of a very serious crime; let them not so accuse us because we do not choose to give our money to make people rejoice at events which have produced great mischief to the nation in general, and good to none but those, who live upon the public, who get rich in proportion as the nation gets poor, whose riches do, in fact, spring from the same sources as the people's poverty. To all such accusations; all attempts made at getting popularity amongst the parishioners at our expense; all attempts at forcing us to give away our money, or to submit to be represented as hard-hearted towards the poor; all these attempts we shall repel merely by stating, that Mr. Garnier of Wickham receives out of the public money more, *every month*, than is expended in keeping the poor of Droxford parish for a whole year; that, if only one *tenth* part of his income were distributed amongst the poor of Droxford, there would not need any parish rates at all, for there would be no poor; and that, of course, if he would give up the whole of what he receives from the public *for doing nothing*, it would, for ever, take away all poor, leave not one poor person, in *ten parishes* like that of Droxford. By statements like this we shall always answer any attempts to make us, who *earn* what we spend, appear hard-hearted to the poor. We shall not, upon such occasions, forget, that farmers Parrott and Edney and Chidell, and the like; that every man who possesses any property; aye, and that even the day-labourer, whose very quid of tobacco is taxed, assists in maintaining the splendid equipage of Mr. Sturges Bourne, and the rattling coach-and-four of Mr. Garnier. Yes, Sir, I trust that the day is not far distant, when not a man, either in Droxford parish or in any other, will want assistance to make him clearly understand these things; and, as for the present essay, if it should prove, in any degree, conducive to this great purpose, our neighbours will have to thank you much more than,

Your most humble and most obedient servant,

Botley, Oct. 19, 1809.

WM. COBBETT.

TO WILLIAM BOSVILLE, ESQ.

(Political Register, November, 1809.)

“ For, all that passess *infer nos*
 “ Might be proclaimed at Charing Cross.”

POPE.

DEAR SIR :

Few things have giving me greater pleasure than to hear, that you resisted the mandates of the venal crew, on the night of what they called a day of *Jubilee*, and, in spite of the yells of their drenched mob, consisting chiefly of Jews and foreigners, refused to be guilty of that basest of all acts, namely, the exhibiting of signs of joy while (being a true friend to your country) sorrow and shame were at the bottom of your heart. Yes, it would, indeed, have been a cruel mortification to hear, that, from any motive whatever, and especially from the beggarly motive of saving a few pounds in glass, you, who, perhaps, of all men living, prove by your practice, that you best know the real use of money, and whose abhorrence of hypocrisy is proverbial amongst all those who have the honour to know you ; it would, indeed, have been a cruel mortification to hear, that you should, on any account that can be named or thought of, have been induced to give the proceedings of that day the semblance of your approbation ; and, I must confess, that, of all the numerous proofs of good sense, independence of mind, public spirit, and a contempt of hypocrisy, which have appeared upon this occasion, none has given me so much satisfaction as to hear that your hospitable dwelling became an object of the violence of a herd, whose attachment and whose services had been purchased with offal from the shambles, and with dregs from the cellar, to fill whose bellies and to turn whose brains a robbery had been committed upon the dogs and the hogs.

Of my sentiments, relative to the keeping of a jubilee upon account of the King's having entered on the fiftieth year of his reign, you are, through the pages of the Register, already put in possession. Here, therefore, I shall content myself with a few observations upon the manner of the celebration, and on certain remarkable incidents, which ought, while they are fresh in our memory, to be put upon record.

And, first, pray notice the trick resorted to, in order to excite a *shouting*, and other signs of joy amongst *the people*. You will remember, that, when any one, no matter whom, or upon what ground, has stood forward in defence of popular rights and privileges, though those rights and privileges are clearly established by the constitution, such person has, by those who have now called for a Jubilee, always been represented as a courter of the mob ; as appealing to the passions of the people, and not to their reason ; as a demagogue, whose object it was to seduce the ignorant crowd by flattering their vanity, and filling their heads with false notions of their own importance. Well, now, then, let these high-minded gentlemen, who have talked so prettily against flatter-

ing the mob into an adoption of one's views ; let them tell us, what, if it be base to flatter the mob into an approbation of one's doctrines ; if that be an act of baseness ; if it be an act of baseness to obtain the plaudits of the common people by the means of words ; if that be an act of baseness, let them tell us how we shall characterize the conduct of those, who have purchased, actually bargained for and bought, the shouts of the half-starved people, not with flattery, not with empty words, but with food and drink ; who have clubbed their pounds for the purpose of bribing those, *who wanted a meal*, to put up shouts of joy for the *prosperity*, in which they *have lived*, and are *still living*. Really the story you told me, during our journey from Honiton, about the fellows whom you saw in Morocco, hardly comes up to this. The Jews, Contractors, Pensioners without services, Sinecure Placemen, Nabobs, and the rest of the tribe, who set the Jubilee on foot, and whom, to prevent repetition, we may as well call the Jubilee crew : These people have the impudence to pretend, that it was proper for *the people* to rejoice on the 25th of October, because they were in the *enjoyment of prosperity* ; but, you perceive that they were not content to leave this *prosperity* to produce the wished-for shouts. If the people felt themselves so happy ; if they had enjoyed, and were enjoying, *such prosperity as to call for a Jubilee*, they would, of course, rejoice, they would sing and dance and shout, without being fed and drenched by way of hire to sing, dance, and shout. Of the particular time the mass of the people might, indeed, be ignorant ; but, then, it was easy to inform them of that ; and, if they felt an inclination to rejoice, they would, of course, have rejoiced. But, the hypocrites knew the situation of the people too well to expect them to put up *voluntary* shouts of joy ; and, therefore, they, as the least of two evils, resolved upon purchasing those shouts ; so that, as the thing now stands, those, to whom the gift of a single meal of food and drink was an object worth solicitation ; aye, these very wretches are said to have shouted for joy on account of *the prosperity they have enjoyed and are still enjoying*. As to the people of England, properly so called, the Jubilee crew knew very well that it was useless to appeal to them. They, therefore, addressed themselves to the *twelve hundred thousand* miserable creatures, called paupers ; to these they tendered their offal and their dirty drink ; to these they tendered that rarity, that luxury, a belly-full ; and, it is to the shouts of these poor creatures, thus purchased, that they bid us refer for a knowledge of the public sentiment. *Sentiment*, indeed ! Aye, if, like Congreve's soldier, their brains lie in their belly, these wretched beings may, upon this occasion, be said to have given utterance to their sentiments. Talk of Paine's *seducing* the ignorant ! What did he *give them* in exchange for their plaudits ? Men of honest minds count it very base to purchase, at an election or elsewhere, the shouts of those who are willing to sell them for food and drink ; but, the case of the Jubilee has this aggravated circumstance belonging to it, that the poor wretches *necessarily* expose themselves to the charge of falsehood and hypocrisy. The man, who shouts at an election, *may*, by bare possibility, be sincere, and may utter well-merited praise. But, the creature, *who is in want of a meal* ; for, observe, the Jubilee subscriptions were for the purpose of *feeding the poor* ; the receiver, the feaster, the *convive*, must, to entitle him to a seat at the festive board, be in want of a meal ; and, this wretch, whose very presence upon the occasion implies that he lives a life of almost starvation, shouts for joy for the *prosperity* he has enjoyed and is

still enjoying. There have, of late years, so many things taken place, degrading to the character of this country, that one cannot say, without much time for reflection, which of them is the *most* so; but, the *least* so, certainly is not this subscription (from the purses of those, who, in one way or another, live upon the taxes), for the purpose; for the openly avowed purpose, of giving the people a meal of victuals and drink; and, as if it were a subject of great national pride, our hireling prints announce to the world, that Englishmen have, for once, for once in this long reign, had a belly full. What a subject for national exultation! And, as if this did not render the mixture of folly and baseness complete, these same prints, and also the crew by whom they are paid, are continually reminding us of our happy state, compared to that of the people of other countries. Nay, one of the specific topics of rejoicing is, that we are much more happy than other nations are; and yet, in the very same breath, we proclaim, that there are thousands and hundreds of thousands of our countrymen, who are in want of a meal; to whom the gift of a single meal of victuals is an object of importance; with whom to have had a belly-full will become a *memorable* epoch.

Upon an occasion like the Jubilee, it would have been strange indeed, if any one of the pensioned rhyme-makers, and still more strange if that indefatigable grinder of doggerel, Mr. FITZGERALD, had been silent. The stuff, which has, within these three weeks, been poured, I had almost said puked, out upon the public, in the form of verse, upon the subject of the Jubilee, would add to the disgrace of any nation upon earth, England only excepted. The song of "*God save the King*," that piece of clumsy and stupid flattery, without one poetical thought or elegant expression, has, I perceive, been sung in *many of the churches*, whose congregations have, in this respect, become the rivals of the Covent Garden row. But, the pieces, written for the occasion of the Jubilee, are infinitely more fulsome, more gross, and, if possible, more stupid, than that song; and, in no other country upon earth would there have been found men so shameless as to give them circulation in print. I have, however, noticed these effusions of stupidity and baseness only for the purpose of showing the falsehood of a part of one of them, and I am desirous of exposing that falsehood, because it relates to a fact of some political importance, and with respect to which great pains have been taken to mislead, deceive, and abuse that part of the people, who are not, and cannot be expected to be, well informed upon such matters.

To those who were the proposers of the Jubilee, the question was put: "What has been done, during this long reign, in *favour of the freedom of the people*?" It was easy to point out how much had been done *against* that freedom; and, after long consultation, the advocates for the Jubilee discovered, that, during the present reign, that Act was passed, which "rendered the JUDGES independent of the crown." It would be easy to show, that the crown can, at all times, bestow, by promotion at least, great favours upon any of the Judges; nor, if every thing else be right, especially if the people be fairly and fully represented in parliament, do I think that, if it could be done, such power ought to be taken from the King. But, the thing alluded to, is of a very different nature indeed. The Judges *formerly* held their places *during the pleasure of the King*; that is to say, he could, at any time, without cause assigned, put any one of them out of his place, in the same manner as an officer of the army. *Now* the King cannot do that; for, by an express statute,

the Judges hold their places *during good behaviour*, and of that good behaviour the King is not the sole judge. In short, a Judge cannot now be displaced, unless upon proof, and very satisfactory proof, too, of his having been guilty of that which renders him unworthy of his high and important station, and upon the address of both houses of parliament.

This was a great thing done in favour of the real liberty of the people; a very great thing indeed; and accordingly, the pensioned poet, FITZGERALD, thus revives the memory of it in his "ODE for the Royal Jubilee," published in the Morning Chronicle of the 26th of October, and hawked about the streets of London on the day before.

"The upright Judges of the Land,
 "From Worldly Influence free
 "Were made by his benign Command;
 "The surest Pledge of Liberty!
 "This Act alone endears his Name
 "Beyond the Pride of Cressy's fame!
 "By this our Rights are made secure,
 "And the deep Spring of Justice pure!"

Lest this should not be clearly comprehended by every reader, the poet has put into a note, the following explanation: "The first act of his *present Majesty's reign* was, to render the Judges independent of the *Crown*."

Now, the whole of this, poetry as well as prose, is an *unmixed falsehood*; and, seeing that it must have been written for the purpose of *deceiving* the people, and, of course, of answering a bad end, it is what PALEY denominates "A LIE." There is not a word of truth in it from the beginning to the end; it is as false as it would be to say, that the King came down from Heaven in a coach, drawn by eight cream-coloured horses. It is, in short, a downright lie, and nothing can make it either more or less.

The act in question was that famous act of parliament, commonly called the ACT OF SETTLEMENT, and this act was passed in the 12th and 13th year of the reign of KING WILLIAM III. and in the year 1700, a hundred and nine years ago, before any of the family of Brunswick came to the throne of this kingdom.

The *twenty-third* act, passed in the reign of the present King, made a provision about the judges' commissions in case of the *death of a King*; because, upon such occasions, all commissions granted by the King die with him, and must be renewed by his successor, or else they cease. The commissions of the judges had, without any exception, been renewed by all the succeeding sovereigns from William III. to George III.; but, in order to put the matter at rest for ever, it was enacted, at the time referred to, that, at the death of a King, *the commissions of the judges should not need renewing*. That was all. *This King* gave up not one fraction of *his power*; an act was passed that took away the bare possibility of an exercise of a little kingly power; but, it took that, *not from this King*, but from *his successor*. Indeed, it is notorious, that this act of parliament had nothing at all to do in rendering the judges independent of the crown; and, of course, that the whole of poet Fitzgerald's assertion, prose and verse, is a gross falsehood, intended to impose upon that part of the people, who cannot be expected to have an intimate acquaintance with such matters.

Has it never struck you, as a matter of wonder, how these deceivers

these political impostors, can *look one another in the face*? It is Voltaire, I believe, who observes, that he wonders how two monks can pass one another in the street without bursting out into laughter. But, many of the monks are themselves the dupes of the imposters which they assist in supporting; whereas our political impostors cannot possibly be ignorant upon the subject of the deceptions they practise. That they should write and print and circulate barefaced falsehoods is not wonderful; that, when these falsehoods are detected and exposed, they should again publish them as admitted truths; that they should be base enough to rely for success upon the ignorance of those amongst whom their falsehoods are intended to circulate; that every one of these impostors should do all this, is by no means wonderful: but, really, how any two or more of them can meet, look one another in the face, and even hold council as to the best means of effecting their purposes, is wonderful even to me, who have so long been in the habit of examining their conduct, and exposing their detestable manœuvres. Only think of the state of mind, into which they must have fallen before they could meet and deliberate upon the lie most likely to succeed, and upon the means of circulation most cheap and extensive. Only think of that. When you have thought of it, I am sure you will be satisfied, that the human mind can conceive nothing too base for such men to attempt.

The wretched poetaster, who has led me into these remarks, would have performed but half his task, if he had not preferred the charge of *disloyalty* against all those who refused to join in the act of hypocrisy which he was celebrating. Accordingly, he says:

“ If there's a *Traitor* in the land,
 “ Who will not *raise for George his hand*;
 “ Whose heart malignant, grieves to see
 “ All England rise in Jubilee!
 “ Let the *detested Monster* find,
 “ Some cavern blacker than his mind!
 “ There let him waste his life away,
 “ Nor with his presence blast this day.”

So, you see, that you, who refused to put a single candle in your windows, and, of course, who did not “*raise your hand for George*,” on that day, are, according to this pensioned poetaster, a “*traitor*” and a “*detested monster*;” and this wretch, whose very bread comes, in part, out of your estates, has the impudence to send you to waste your life away in some black and dismal cavern. Verily, if your heart were no truer to your country than the heart of this impudent pensioner, you would, when you saw yourself thus insulted by those whom the government compels you to feed, care very little indeed what happened, or whose authority prevailed, so that you could but obtain vengeance upon those, from whom such insolence proceeded.

The “*Ode*,” as it is called, upon which I have been offering you some remarks, was, it seems, recited at a dinner of the *Merchants and Bankers* of London, at whose dinner, many of the ministers, and of the leading men of both factions, attended. It is said, too, that the *Ode* was received with *universal approbation*. Let the world judge, then, of the character of those, who could bestow their approbation, *FIRST*, upon so vile and gross a falsehood as that which I have noticed above; and, *SECONDLY*, upon an assertion, according to which every man, who disapproved of the Jubilee, was a “*traitor*” and a “*detested monster*.” The persons,

present upon this occasion, knew well, not only that the measure of holding a Jubilee had been distinctly disapproved of by many persons at public meetings, held even in the city of London; not only did they know this full well, but they knew also, that, in the whole kingdom, there were not, in all likelihood, one hundred men of sense, who did not, in their hearts, decidedly disapprove of the thing; that there was scarcely one, who took any active part in promoting it, who was not actuated by some selfish motive; that the shouts put up by the rabble, were actually bought with bread, meat, beer and gin; and, in short, that the whole thing was invented purely with a view of reviving, or exciting, if possible, a set of feelings in the popular breast, which *feelings might serve as a counterpoise to other feelings, excited by recent events and disclosures*, and which latter feelings were, it was perceived, making their way deep into the minds of even the least-informed part of the people. The Jubilee men at Merchant Tailor's Hall knew all this very well, at the moment they were cheering the pensioned poetaster's charge of *treason* against such men as Mr. Waithman and you.

At first sight, it appears strange, that, when it is their business to make the world, and especially the Emperor Napoleon, believe that the nation is *unanimous* on their side, they should let anything drop, which amounts to a confession that there are people who think differently from themselves, and, in fact, who, as you and I do, very anxiously desire to see them put down. One would suppose, that they would take all possible pains to disguise this fact; and so they would, if they did not love themselves much better than their cause. Regular mole-catchers will never catch in *breeding-time*; and rat-catchers of eminence hold it to be a pity to kill *females with young*. For reasons similar to those by which these regular tradesmen are actuated, and which are too obvious to be pointed out, the Jubilee crew, the regular traders in anti-jacobinism and loyalty, take special care to lose no opportunity that offers itself of inculcating a belief, that there are jacobins and traitors in the country. It is true, that in whatever degree they are believed, they give encouragement to the foreign enemy; but, though they do not wish to assist that enemy, *because it is not to be believed that he, if he became master of the country, would give them so much for doing nothing as they now get*; though they do not wish to assist that enemy, they wish to live upon the public; and it is upon the ground that the king has *enemies* at home, and upon that ground alone, that they can pretend to any merit in being his "*friends*," or, indeed, that they can justify the use of that appellation. How often has it been thus, and how many thrones have been overturned, in great part, at least, from this cause! It is in courts and governments as in private life: is there a base insinuating knave, who, for his own selfish purposes, wishes to be thought the *friend* of a man capable of doing him service? the first thing he does is to make that man believe that he has *enemies*. The persons, thus misrepresented, in consequence of being considered and treated as enemies, do, in time, become enemies in reality; and, as they have justice on their side, it is ten to one, that, in the end, they triumph, and that he who has been flattered into an abuse of his power experiences the mortification, or the actual punishment, due to his folly and his injustice. How often, in all ranks of life, public and private, have we seen this verified!

Without supposing the Jubilee crew to have been actuated by motives of this selfish description, it is quite impossible to account for their

placard respecting *me*, exhibited at *Charing Cross*, on the day of the Jubilee, and of which the STATESMAN newspaper gives the following account :

“ An ineffectual attempt to produce a riot was made at Charing-cross, where about four o'clock in the afternoon, a person in a sailor's jacket, mounting on horseback before *King Charles*, affixed to the neck of the horse a placard, with the following words :—

“ MAY GOD
“ disperse
“ The Votaries of
“ COBBETT
“ As the Clouds
“ Of this day.”

“ But, although the miscreant strained his throat till he was hoarse with huzzaing, he could not get a solitary individual to join him in this incitement to riot and bloodshed, and the spectators treated the attempt with the scorn which it deserved.”

Now, to be sure, if those who, *without doubt* caused this placard to be put up, and nobody will be at a loss to know who they are; if these people had not been full as much fools as knaves, or rather more; if knavery, when it overshoots itself, did not always become folly, and if this had not been the case in the present instance, these people never would have done a thing like this, which was, in fact, in terms the most distinct, in a manner the most impressive, in a place proverbially the most public, and on an occasion the most memorable, to proclaim what? Why, in the first place, that there were, at least, some persons, who disapproved of the Jubilee; but, in the next place, it was to proclaim, that I, the man whom they are known to hate, and whom they affect to contemn, has, in the country. what? Not readers; no, nor merely *partisans*, as some others have; not merely these, but that I have VOTARIES; that is to say, that I am a man, who is almost, if not quite *worshipped*, by a part, at least, of the people of England, and that, too, just after not less than *fifty thousand pounds* is well known to have been expended for the purpose of circulating gratis, publication upon the back of publication, and each teeming the most atrocious falsehoods, the sole subject of which publications was to put me down. Oh! these men, though precious knaves, are certainly less of knaves than of fools, or they never would have given me and the public this irrefragable proof of my having triumphed over them, aided by all the numerous herds of venal scribes.

“ Hated by fools, and fools to hate :
“ Be that my motto, that my fate.”

The Editors of the hireling prints, albeit not among the Solomons of the age, have, as far as I have been able to ascertain the fact, taken not the smallest notice of this famous placard, though it was hung upon the horse's mouth or neck, though every letter was, at least, three inches high, and though thousands and tens of thousands flocked to see it, and were continually flocking thither, till those who ordered it to be put up, thought proper to order it to be taken down, *in the night*. These hireling Editors, though no conjurors, could perceive, that this placard gave the lie direct to all their assertions about my being *a person of no consequence*; a person whose opinions and exhortations had *no weight* in the country; it would, with them, have been an act of political suicide to state, that, upon the day of the Jubilee, one of the acts of piety, performed

by those who call themselves the friends of the King, was to pray to God to disperse my *Votaries*, clearly implying, that the number of them was so great as to be not a little formidable. No: the hireling Editors could not bring themselves to give the history of the Charing-cross placard: they were not such shocking fools as he, who sent a man, in a *sailor's* jacket, to put it up; and to fasten it, too, to the horse bearing the statue of a king, whom Englishmen beheaded as a traitor, upon a charge of having been guilty of a violation of their rights.

The effect of this placard is worthy of being recorded. Some persons, amongst the many thousands, who composed the continually shifting crowd of gazers at the placard, asked a worthy friend of ours, who lives near the spot, what the thing meant, and who "COBBETT" was; to which he answered, that Mr. Cobbett was a gentleman who wished to see sinecure places and unmerited pensions abolished, who wanted all peculators and public robbers to be punished, and by such means to lessen the taxes and give the people encouragement to fight for their country. This ran, of course, from one to another; and, it is no wonder, that, on the fourth *night* after it was put up, the stupid wretch (he is the most vain and stupid in Christendom) who had ordered it to be hoisted, found somebody to beat into his addled brains the prudent measure of taking it down.

The best of it is, that, while these senseless creatures are plotting and conspiring against me, and are scratching their empty skulls for inventions whereby to injure, or, at least, annoy me, I am leading a life the most pleasant and undisturbed that can be conceived; and, it really is not unworthy of remark, that while the corrupt and venal herd, who waste so much time and money in the hope of tormenting me; while these people were engaged in the contriving and preparing and playing off their placard trick amidst the bustle and uproar of the "*jubilry*," as NOODLE or DOODLE calls it, in Tom Thumb; while they were so engaged, I was walking over a very beautiful farm and pleasure grounds, the hospitable occupiers of which are just as great despisers of hypocrisy as you yourself are; and it is quite curious, that, at the very moment when, as it appears from the newspapers, the placard was hoisted, and the disguised and hired ruffian, with hoarse throat and straining eyeballs, was endeavouring to raise a mob against me, in London, I was in a farm-yard in Berkshire, taking and noting down the dimensions of a sheep-crib.

Suffer me, now, by way of conclusion, to notice, in as brief a manner as possible, a few more facts, relating to this subject of the Jubilee, which, I look upon as being of very great political importance, it having, unquestionably, been intended (by those who set it on foot) to answer the double purpose of diverting the minds of the public from the terrible calamities and disgrace in Holland and Spain, and, as I before observed, to revive, or excite, a set of popular feelings, calculated to *counteract the popular feelings, which have been excited by recent exposures and by the busy and increasing WHISPERS, to which those exposures have led.* The thing was not badly imagined. The inventor is entitled to some praise for his cunning; for that *low cunning*, which it was quite happy to select for the occasion. But, for all this, the thing has failed as to *both* its objects; nor, is it necessary for me to say, that it is now *too late* for any such scheme.

Of the facts, which it is right that the world should know, and that

we should remember, the following are a few only; namely,—That, in several of the churches, the old battered song of “*God save the King*” was sung, and, particular public mention is made of this having been done in the church at Brighthelmstone; which puts one in mind of a saying of John Wesley, who, when he set one of his hymns to the tune of a jovial song, observed, that he did not see why the Devil should have all the pretty tunes to himself;—That the illumination in London, though a drenched rabble paraded most of the large streets, was not a quarter part so general, or so bright, as upon any common occasion of a naval victory, a fact very much to the honour of the people of the metropolis;—That very few people illuminated at all, any farther than to guard against stones and brick bats from the belly-filled rabble; and, that, in fact, the illumination, as far as *good-will* went, appears to have been confined to the *East-India House*, the *Bank of Threadneedle-street*, the *Post-Office*, and the several great *Houses of Taxation*, the *Public Offices in Whitehall and Downing-street*, the several Offices of the *Salaried Magistrates and Thief-takers*, the *Gambling Houses*, the *Quack Medicine Shops*, and certain other *Houses of resort*, which I do not think it necessary more particularly to point out;—That, in the country, not a soul, except those, who, in one way or another, live upon the public, made the smallest stir; but that the belly-filled rabble were every where in high spirits, and, at Winchester in particular, seemed extremely grateful to his Majesty for having lived long enough to occasion them one hearty meal in their lives.

The transparencies at a place called “*The Yellow Fever Remedy Warehouse*” exhibited the following:—

“ Besides the Star and Anchor (which are usually illuminated on days of rejoicing), the letters G. R. displayed by an immense number of variegated lamps, and a very beautiful transparency, in the centre of which was a Portrait of his Majesty, surrounded by *Hearts*, in each of which was written *Joy*; and in other parts of the transparency was written (in letters of gold) the *Fiftieth Year of the Reign of George the Third—a real Patriot—the best of Kings—and the only virtuous Sovereign in Europe.*”

“ Every Heart is filled with joy, for thy long Reign, O King!”

That was pretty well, I think, for a vender of *quack medicines*; but he was surpassed by one of the venal poetasters, who expressed himself thus:—

“ The Sun rules the day—the Moon rules the night,
 “ The King rules the Land—*by the very same right*;
 “ His lawful succession—just Heaven will secure,
 “ As long as the Sun and the Moon shall endure.”

The Morning Chronicle gives this, as a specimen of the *adulation* and of the *blasphemy* of the day; and, as such, I preserve it.

All the swarm of dependents in and about Kew and Windsor seem to have put themselves in motion. It is said, that “their hearts overflowed with *loyalty* and *love*.” I wish you or I could have overheard their conversation upon the subject, when they got into their bed-chambers at night; we should then have been able to ascertain to a nicety what is the real meaning of the words “*loyalty* and *love*.”

The conduct of the newspapers upon this occasion ought to be noticed. Most of them made awkward attempts to disguise the real feelings of the Editors; but, the STATESMAN (an evening paper which every friend of

the country ought to encourage) spoke out ; its columns were full of excellent matter, such as, if hypocrisy were not always backed by impene- trable impudence, must have put it to the blush.

The good which will grow out of this thing is not easily to be calcu- lated. It has provoked many persons to do what they never would have thought of, namely, revert to the several acts of this long reign ; it has revived Saratoga, York Town, the Helder, and all the other brilliant ex- ploits ; it has called upon us to discuss, and has, in some sort, compelled us to discuss, what we never should have thought of discussing, though, I must confess, we ought not to have wanted any such spur ; it will operate as most other feasts do, that is to say, it will leave a *head-ache* for those who were concerned in it. They have made the King's reign a subject for rejoicing ; we say that it has been a most unfortunate reign ; thereupon they accuse us of being *traitors* ; thereupon we must *show, that what we say is true* ; their drunken-bout is over ; it is now our turn to be heard, when they have no longer purchased shouts wherewith to drown our voices ; and, before we have done, it shall go hard, but we will make their Jubilee turn to good account. For my own part, I have already turned it to one most valuable purpose, which is to avail myself of this occasion publicly to declare, that I am, with great respect, and sincere regard,

Your faithful,

And most obedient servant,

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, Thursday, Nov. 2nd, 1809.

PAPER-MONEY.

(*Political Register, July, 1810.*)

NOTE BY THE EDITORS.—The following articles on "Paper-Money" stand in the original work mixed up with those on "Jacobin Guineas ;" but we have assembled them respectively together, for the obvious reason of keeping every subject as much as possible apart, so that the reader may have all that is said upon one topic under his eye at once.

As the time seems to be approaching, when even the most stupidly blind must, whether willingly or not, open their eyes upon this subject, it might, perhaps, be sufficient for me just to notice *what has happened* to the Paper-Money within the last few days, and there leave the matter. But, I cannot so far master myself as to forbear from doing a little more than this, upon the present occasion, especially when I recollect how much abuse the pretended "loyal," have, at different times, heaped upon me for the opinions, which I have expressed about the *paper system*. These persons, these "*King's friends*," these friends of "*Social Order and our Holy Religion*," have given to me every appellation expressive of baseness and maliciousness, because I have, upon so many occasions,

endeavoured to caution people against the consequences of trusting to this system of paper-money; and, I have been informed, that there have not been wanting paper-money men openly to declare, that I ought to be considered as much the enemy of the country as Buonaparte, and to be treated as such. It is curious enough, that, at the very moment when I am condemned to a jail, fear has come upon the paper-money people, and that, too, to such a degree as to cause some of them already to cut their throats, and, in other ways, to lay violent hands upon their carcases, notwithstanding their pious devotion to "our Holy Religion."

It is well known, and, when the names, nay, when the places of abode, of these my "holy" enemies shall have been forgotten, it will be well known, that I was the first public writer in England who warned the people against the consequences of this species of currency, and generally against the whole of the paper system. For the nation to do me justice in this respect, at least, will not require long. It will not require many years. There is this difference between sound and unsound doctrines, or, in other words, between *truth* and *falsehood*, that time, which is sure to destroy the latter, is as sure to cause the former to triumph in the end, and, in the mean while, to give it daily additional strength. It is not many years ago, that Mr. SHERIDAN denounced me* to the "Great Council of the Nation," as some of our bombastical editors call it; he denounced me as a "conspirator against the credit of the country," because I expressed, in plain language, my decided opinion, that the act of taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other could not be productive of *gain*; that the way to *redeem* a mortgage, be it on what it might, was to *pay the amount to the lender*, and take up his bond; and that it was not reconcilable to my notions, or to any notions that I could get into my head, that any part of a mortgage could be said to be *redeemed*, while he who had borrowed the money was obliged to *continue to pay interest for the whole of the sum originally borrowed*. Because I ventured to express this my opinion, the patriotic and loyal Sheridan denounced me as a conspirator against the credit and prosperity of the country. Because I was not able to comprehend the profound mysteries of the Pitt system of redemption, I was branded as almost a traitor.

Since that time, the system has been working on at a great rate. The war, which set out with almost a positive pledge of costing not more than *twenty-six* millions annually, now costs about *fifty* millions. I say *about*; for if one is within ten or a dozen millions now-a-days, one is as near the mark as can be reasonably expected. Such is the expense of the war grown to in the space of six years; and, what will it be, then, before another six years have passed over our heads? I always said that it would go on increasing thus: and, for so saying I was abused in the most foul and base manner.

But, to return to the PAPER-MONEY, how often, when I have been endeavouring to impress upon the minds of my readers the necessity of guarding betimes against its ruinous consequences; how often, upon such occasions, have I been called a "*libeller* of the credit of the nation," and tauntingly asked, whether my guinea would go, in the market, for more meat and bread than a *pound note and a shilling*? How often

* See Parliamentary Debates, 4th August, 1803.—Ed.

has this question been put to me within the last twelve months, by those who have attempted to answer my articles under the head of "*Jacobin Guineas?*" Where are *now* those who so questioned me? I imagine that their boldness is a little diminished; if it be not, they may be pronounced absolutely incurable. Who, of the whole of this paper-money loving tribe, would have asked this question at Salisbury last market day? The MORNING POST, of the 17th instant, gives the following, as an extract of a letter from Salisbury, of the 15th instant.

"*Salisbury, July 15th.*—The distress in this place is extreme, it being with "the greatest difficulty provisions can be procured here, as we have nothing apparently in circulation but the paper of the place, which is no longer current. "On Saturday night numbers of women and children were seen in a deplorable condition, from the unfortunate pressure under which we at present labour. "It is hoped that some means will be immediately taken to remedy the evil."

Remedy the evil, indeed! What means? Who can take such means? Is it the government? That would be making a precedent of a most dangerous nature and tendency.

The nation have been often told of the great effect which the paper-money system has had in advancing the *prosperity* of the country; it has been amused with glowing pictures of the *improvements* arising from the use of this species of currency; it has been by shallow-headed men, or by impostors, such as the *pretended* "AMERICAN," who has written a book under the title of "A Letter on the Genius and Dispositions of the French Government," and which work, in order to render the deception more complete, has been contrived to be first published in Philadelphia; by such persons every good thing now to be found in England has been attributed to the paper-money system. They have carefully kept out of sight that increase of misery, which is most clearly proved by the increase of the number of paupers; but, in the present situation of Salisbury, we have a proof of the effect of the paper system, which even the grossest of fools cannot misunderstand, and which no impostor can explain away. It was impossible to conceive how a paper-money, a fictitious currency, could cause the grass to grow or the grain to kern or the cattle to fat; but, here we have the plain visible fact, stated in so many words, that this paper-money did render it *difficult to procure provisions* for the people of one of the county towns of England, and that, in consequence thereof, *numbers of women and children were seen in a deplorable condition.* Women and children! Aye, and men too, I warrant you; for men cannot live without eating and drinking any more than women and children.

The light manner in which this calamity is treated by some persons is truly surprising to me; and, I am sure, that Mr. Perry cannot have duly reflected upon the matter, when he says, that what has happened "must make a *sensation for a week*;" but, that "the *slight shock* which credit "has suffered (arising, undoubtedly, in the first instance, from unwise "speculation) *will speedily subside*, and like a thunder-storm to the air, "it will serve to *purify* the trading hemisphere."

More civet, sweet Apothecary! *Purify*, indeed! I am sure, that this was written without thought. But, I must say, that I do not approve of a great public print, like the MORNING CHRONICLE, having suppressed (for not to publish is, in such case, to suppress) information of what has been going on at Salisbury, of which no London print, that I have seen, except the Morning Post, has taken even the slightest notice.

Yes, Mr. PERRY, the trading hemisphere may be *purified*, as you call it; that is to say, the paper-system may be propped up; but, in the mean-while, Sir, I beg you, who are a sensible, an honest, and a humane man, to turn your eyes towards the people in and about Salisbury and Shaftesbury, and, indeed, the whole of the West of England. You will there see the farmer, perhaps, his last sack of corn turned into paper-money, with not a pound left wherewith to get in his harvest. In many instances rents are due, and have long been collecting together in the now-worthless paper-money. The shop-keepers, the public-house-keepers, people in trade of every sort and size, have, in an instant, in the twinkling of an eye, been left pennyless; absolutely without a farthing of money; and, what is much worse, many of them in debt, the means of discharging which, the last remaining means, thus, in an instant, swept away, never to return. In such a state of things, every man runs at once to his books to see who are his debtors; every debt is instantly demanded, and not a soul has the means of paying. Judge you, Mr. Perry, what must be the distress; judge you what the ruin, that must inevitably arise out of such a state of things. Away, at once, goes all confidence between man and man; away goes, in a short time, the shame of acting fraudulently; as in the case of shipwreck, in the magnitude of the distress every act of unfairness and of cruelty sinks out of sight. "*Every one for himself!*," is the cry; and honesty and compassion are effaced from the heart.

Is this, Mr. PERRY, "a *sensation* for a *week*?" Is this calculated to "*purify* the trading hemisphere?"

What must be the situation of the *labourer* or the *journeyman*, in such a state of things? He can lose, you will say, perhaps, but one week's wages. Those who do not economise cannot; but, every labourer and journeyman has *rent* to pay and *fuel* to purchase, and has certain other motives that demand some little provision before-hand, especially if he be married, and has an *increasing* family. This provision is made in the currency of the place; and, Good God! how many poor and worthy creatures must, by the blowing away of that currency, have been plunged into misery unspeakable! Those, who were but one remove from pauperism, would, indeed, only become paupers; that is to say, be thrown for maintenance upon the farmers and tradesmen just at the moment when they themselves were half-ruined; but, how hard, how cruel the case of those, who, by dint of industry and care and economy were just enabled to keep the wolf from the door; just enabled to pay their rent, to have a comfortable meal, to dress decently, and to provide the means of fitting out their children for service? Such people must always have *a few pounds by them*. Such little hoard is a necessary part of their establishment. And, thus, at "one fell swoop," have all this very best description of persons been reduced to the most poignant misery, through the whole of the district, in which the now-dishonoured paper-money formed the currency of the country.

And, yet, I have been abused; I have been vilified; I have been represented as an enemy to my country, and as the advocate of Buonaparte, because I cautioned that country against the effects of this paper-money!

In another of the Morning Chronicles, it is observed, that there has been a consultation upon the subject of *affording relief* from the Bank in

Threadneedle-street. But what is meant by *relief*? " Is it that sort of thing which will enable other smaller banks to go on? This may be done, and, I suppose, will be done; but, will this *relieve* the people in Wiltshire and elsewhere, who held notes that are now little better than waste-paper? This is the description of person, to whom one would wish to see *relief* given; and, if the government cannot give them relief, of what use, conscientiously speaking, is its interference?

As to talking about *indiscreet speculation* having been the cause of this explosion, it is nonsense. The cause is, the *want of confidence in the paper*. Whence the *first alarm* has proceeded, is of no consequence at all. In proportion to the magnitude of the quantity of paper in circulation, men will be disposed towards alarm. They will be so disposed, without being able to assign any particular reason for it. Every man knows that paper-money has no intrinsic value; that a breath destroys it; and, when once a comparative view of the worth of paper-money and real money is taken by any considerable portion of the community, nothing that the human mind can devise will long keep the paper afloat, unless it be *openly pitted against the coin*, and a money price and a paper price take place. It is perfectly notorious that a traffic has long been carried on of paper for guineas, the latter bearing a value beyond their nominal value. It is decidedly impossible, that such a circumstance should not diminish the general confidence in the solidity of paper-money; not only of this or of that description of paper-money, but of all the paper-money current in the country. And, therefore, to talk of "purifying the trading hemisphere," by which, I presume, is meant, making the general confidence in paper-money greater than it was before, argues a great want of reflection upon the subject.

The MORNING POST of the 19th instant, has a remark, which merits some notice on account of the *source*, whence one may reasonably suppose that it has either directly or indirectly proceeded. It is this:— "The *depreciated* value of country Bank-paper has already occasioned a *reduction in the price of provisions of every description*. This is not "only of high importance, with reference to the *labouring classes* of "the community, but affords decisive conviction, that the *abolition* of "these *destructive assignats* would *reinstatate commercial confidence*." Would not one think, that the last part of this paragraph had been dropped on its way to my Printer, Mr. HANSARD, and picked up and carried to the office of the Morning Post? "*Destructive Assignats!*" Why, I never made use of any thing so contemptuous as this; and, does the editor of the Morning Post carry in mind, *who are the persons*, who issue these "*Assignats*," as he calls them; and who have so long been profiting from such issue?

Let me, however, put him right upon a point of doctrine here. He has a confused notion of *the effect of the quantity of money upon prices*, and seems not clearly to understand the meaning of the word *depreciation*.

When money *depreciates*, prices *rise*. This must be obvious to every one; and, indeed, most people, now-a-days, know that *high prices* is, upon a general scale, nothing more than another word for *depreciated currency*. Therefore, to say, that "the *depreciation* of the country bank paper has occasioned a *reduction* in the price of provisions," is clearly erroneous. The writer meant, or his oracle meant, to say, that *the*

lessening of the quantity, that is to say, the *annihilation* of part of the country bank paper, has occasioned a *reduction* in the price of provisions ; and, in this, he is, I dare say, nay, I know that he must be, correct.

But, what does he mean by what follows ? Does he mean to tell the public, that this circumstance will do the *labourer* any good ? Does he really believe, that, if provisions be lower in price, the wages of the labourer will not be lower in price too ? Does he seriously intend to persuade us, that, when the farmer sells his wheat for ten shillings a bushel, he will give the labourer as many shillings a week as he gives him when wheat is sold at fifteen shillings a bushel ? Absurd as this is, however, it is the meaning of the paragraph, or else the paragraph has no meaning at all.

A word or two more, now, about " these *destructive assignats*." The writers knows, I presume, that there is no *country* money, the issuers of which are not connected with some persons in *town*. He is aware, I presume, that there is scarcely a money-man in England, who is not, in some way or other, connected with the country mills. But, waving this, for the present, has it occurred to my "*learned friend*" (for, surely, he must be of that tribe,) to reflect on the *several consequences*, that might be reasonably expected to grow out of the "*abolition* of these *destructive assignats*," as he has the cruelty to call them ? Has he considered duly upon the *means of supplying their place* ? I have, at different times, heard much *talk* against the country banks, and their tendency to depreciate the value of money by increasing its quantity ; but, to me it appears as clear as day light, that the paper of this sort is full as necessary to the keeping up of the system as is the paper of Threadneedle-street. I can see no mischievous quality in the former, which does not belong to the latter, while, on the contrary, I can see, with respect to the former, some proportion, at any rate, of *real* property liable to the making of it good in case of failure, and can see no real property in the case of the latter. Be this as it may, however, what is to supply the place of the "*abolished assignats* ?" Would "*my learned friend*" have *no paper at all* to supply its place ? And, does he, learned gentleman, think that guineas, "*Jacobin guineas*," would circulate at Salisbury, while not a piece of coin was to be seen at Winchester ? Will he seriously say, that he believes, that, if such were the case on Monday, the Tuesday's Salisbury coaches would not be broken down by the weight of Jews, setting off with notes, wherewith to purchase up the said guineas ? This is too plain to be dwelt upon for a moment. Well, then, he would have *Bank of England notes* to supply the place of "*these destructive assignats*." Has he reflected on the consequences of that ? Is he quite sure, that, every one feeling, that the notes of the Bank of England *having thus been so greatly increased in quantity* ; is he quite sure, that that feeling would not transfer the want of confidence from one description of paper-money to the other ? Does he think, now, for instance, that, if *all* the country money were instantly destroyed ; does he think, *can* he think, can any creature with brains in his skull believe, for only one half minute, that, with their pocket-books full of dishonoured "*assignats*," with ruin spread all around them ; can he seriously believe, that, in such a state of things, *any sort* of paper-money would possess the confidence of the people.

For the reasons, which I should now state, if I had room, and which I will hereafter state, but which will, probably, suggest themselves to the

reader, I am of opinion, *that the country-money must be supported, or that the whole of the paper-money system will go to pieces.* Upon the consequences of which latter event it would be premature to calculate, but which consequences I, for my part, think, as I always have thought, would not at all tend to endanger the safety and well-being of the nation.

WM. COBBETT.

PAPER-MONEY.—Continued.

(Political Register, July, 1810.

We want our money on the nail ;
The Banker's ruin'd if he pays ;
They seem to act an ancient tale ;
The birds are met to strip the jays.

Riches, the wisest monarch sings,
Make pinions for themselves to fly :
They fly like bats, on parchment wings,
And geese their silver plumes supply.

Conceive the works of midnight hags
Tormenting fools behind their backs :
Thus Bankers, o'er their bills and bags,
Sit squeezing images of wax.

Conceive the whole enchantment broke ;
The witches left in open air,
With power no more than other folk,
Exposed with all their magic ware.

SWIFT.

In my last Number, I laid the ground for some further observations upon this important subject ; but, before I enter on those observations, it seems necessary to give a little sketch of the facts of what has now happened to the paper-money system.

About three or four weeks ago, a banker in London stopped payment, that is to say, he refused to pay (from want of the means, I suppose) those persons, who had been fools enough to put their money into his hands.

This man's breaking was followed by others ; but, more especially by some paper-money makers at Salisbury and Shaftesbury, and, they being money-grinders of the first rate and reputation, an alarm became pretty general all through the counties of Wilts and Dorset, which, it appears, spread itself even to the lower parts of Devonshire. Two paper-money makers are said to have *cut their throats* ; and, though one cannot help being sorry to hear of any such end to any human being, yet, neither can one help feeling indignation against those, be they who or what they may, who have been the cause of all the suffering and all the ruin, which have now taken place in the district just named. As far, indeed, as the ruined persons consist of fund-holders, of those who approve of the paper system, of those, many of whom would gladly see the massacre of all men who, like me, have written against that system ; as far as the ruin

confines itself to those people, it is pretty fairly due. All such persons are to be looked upon as participators with the actual makers of paper-money, and, indeed, they are associates with them; but, not so the people in Wilts and Dorset generally speaking; not so the shop-keeper, the publican, the handi-craftsman, the farmer, and the labourer, who, at the stoppage of the banks, had paper-money in their hands, where it instantly became as useless as a like quantity of cabbage-leaves. These people are not only to be pitied, but they ought to be legally indemnified, if the means are to be found in the hands of the makers of paper-money in any part of the kingdom; or, at any rate, the parliament ought, the moment it meets (and why should it not meet on purpose?) to take the matter into consideration, and provide a remedy of some sort; with this express declaration, however, that, *in future*, no relief of the kind would be granted.

It has been stated in the newspapers, that the Salisbury bankers can pay all their notes, from the sale of their estates and other sources. But, in the mean while, what becomes of the man who has laid up their notes to the amount of his rent, and has nothing else to pay his rent with? What becomes of the little shop-keeper, who is in the same situation with regard to his London dealer? What becomes of the shoemaker, the tailor, every journeyman and labourer, who had a pound note by him? All these, in their several degrees, are, in effect, bankrupts; they are all *insolvent*; as far as the want of money can ruin them, they are ruined. Those who are able to *work* may, indeed, yet live out of a poor-house; but, what are old or infirm men, and women, to do in such a case? Many a widow, who maintained her children decently by the means of a shop, must now be ruined; and, yet so *delicate*, so *just*, and so *humane*, are our public prints, that they take special care never to name those by whom this ruin has been occasioned. If a highway robbery be committed, or any theft whatever, and the hue and cry catches the perpetrator, the caitiff is *named* at full length, and is called villain at every second word, even before he is convicted: nay, if any one had counterfeited only one single bit of this very paper money, and only one day before it became worthless, "*hang him!*" would have resounded through the city of Salisbury. *He* would have been *named*, and described, and biographized, and put to the torture, if his mind had been susceptible of torture, in a thousand different ways. Yet what *forger* ever produced; or, did all the forgers that ever existed in the whole world, do, a thousandth part so much harm to the people as has been done by the paper-money makers, who have now left their promissory notes unpaid, and sought *shelter for their persons* under the bankrupt law? *They* will not even be sent to a prison. They are at large, and their persons are as safe as if they had never caused any injury to any human being.

It is a fact, well worthy of being recorded, that a number of persons of great property, with the *Bishop of Salisbury* at their head, published, in the shape of a *posting-bill* (of much about the same size as the bills stuck up against me) a declaration of their conviction of the solidity of the paper-money concerns in that city, and stating that *they* would take the said money. This was done, I believe, on the *Saturday*, and the paper-money shop stopped on the next *Monday!* It could not stop the run. The alarm was begun. *Want of confidence* had seized the people;

and when once that is the case, adieu to paper-money, be it of what sort it will, or let who will be its sponsors.

Let us now take a few facts, as published in the newspapers, respecting the paper-money and its consequences. There is some little to be inserted of the nature of observation; and which will be, hereafter, useful; because it will show *how* men, even men of sense, deceived themselves.—I copy from the MORNING CHRONICLE.

July 21.—“Yesterday was the settling-day at the Stock Exchange, and, by the heavy fall, it was severely felt by the Bulls. No fewer than ten or eleven lame Ducks waddled out of Capel-court. We do not believe that the differences amount to a great sum, because a sensible revolution had taken place in the spirit of gambling at this place within the last two or three years, and no extensive speculations are now attempted.—Indeed, both on this Exchange, and on the Royal Exchange, the failures have not extended to the *old established firms*, but have affected only the new and more desperate adventurers. *The persons who were so eager for commercial importance as to consign merchandise to every quarter of the world, where our shipping could find a port, without orders, and in which only they were to look for a market, are alone the persons who now find themselves embarrassed by the want of returns.* Their engagements to the manufacturers must be completed, and they have not even deposits to give to Government as a security for Debentures, even if relief should be thought advisable to be offered to them in that way. This is the case of those who went beyond their means in the way of exports.—Those persons, on the contrary, who are in distress by the depreciation of articles brought into the country, have incurred so severe a loss by the fall of prices that the original goods are not a sufficient security for the sum they are in want of, to answer the demands on them.—It is therefore a question, whether it will not be wise to permit the whole of these floating speculations to sink or swim, according to their specific weight. They will all then come to their proper draught, and whatever shall afterwards be found necessary, may be applied with more effect.”

This is one of the many ways, in which the public is deceived. The writer himself is deceived: there is no doubt of that; but, the deception will not be less fatal to the country. Here is an endeavour to account for what has happened upon other grounds than that of a *depreciated paper-money*. But, how is it reconcilable to common sense, that speculations in *foreign commerce* can have brought discredit upon the paper-money of New Sarum? Or, if the effect at New Sarum *can* be traced to such a cause, how insecure are *all* the holders of paper-money? What a pretty foundation does this money rest upon?

As a sort of specimen of the magnitude of the failure, take the following:—23rd July.

“Friday evening a meeting was held, consisting of the principal Bankers and Merchants of the City, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety and means of supporting such Merchants as were under *temporary* difficulties, and deserving of assistance. Among the Bankers who attended the meeting were Smith, Payne and Smith; Masterman and Co.; Everett and Co.; Vere, Druce and Co., besides several others, and a number of the most eminent Merchants. After some discussion, it was determined that a proposal should be made to the creditors of some of the houses under embarrassment, to receive the full amount of their several demands by four equal payments, in bills drawn at six, twelve, eighteen, and twenty-four months, bearing interest. This proposal was immediately accepted, and a list of debts and assets, of which the following is a copy, was laid before the meeting:—

	Debts.	Assets.
Grave, Sharpe, Fisher and Fisher,	£503,000 0 0	632,542 15 7
Rowlandson and Bates	285,898 7 10	330,444 10 2
Rowlandson, Isaac, and Co.	288,698 7 6	339,432 0 2
Hardy, Ottley, and Co.	311,982 19 0	377,775 13 3
John Goodair.....	381,952 12 9	487,209 9 9
	£1,766,602 6 6	£2,167,404 8 11

"Four of the most respectable merchants in the linen trade have been selected to superintend the affairs of the above parties, viz. Richard Fort, Sir Robert Graham, Mr. Shaw (of the house of Shaw and Fletcher) and another, whose name we have not been able to ascertain."

It was, I suppose, from the probable necessity of rags in abundance being wanted, that these "four most respectable gentlemen in the linen trade" were chosen to superintend this concern. But, what "relief" does this bring to the poor people at New Sarum and thereabouts? To those persons it is that I want to see relief given. Sharpe and Fisher and the others here named may be very good men, but, they are few in number. Any man, though a day-labourer, at Salisbury or Shaftesbury, is as much in my eyes as Mr. Rowlandson or Mr. Goodair, and, perhaps, is full as able and as likely to take a part in the defence of his country's rights.

"July 24.—Great fears are entertained that thousands of workmen will be dismissed in the manufacturing districts, from the shock that credit has received, particularly in Manchester. This is the only serious evil to be dreaded; for the stoppage has been confined to the new Adventurers, and it is perhaps salutary that they should be proved to the bottom; but unfortunately it was to the speculations of these new men, and not to the natural demands of trade, that employment was given to our weavers and workmen."

Thus, then, this trade is not such a fine thing as it has been thought? This is, however, all fallacious. It is another invention to turn the eyes of the public from the real cause of the distress. "New adventurers" are to be blamed now. But, the fact is, that there has been no more of adventure now than formerly, except what has grown out of the paper-money itself.

In Ireland the distress is still greater than in England, and from the same cause. A debate in the Common Council of Dublin proves, that the misery must be very great indeed. The public will, perhaps, (but I do not know that they will) remember, that some thousands a year were during the last session of parliament added to the salary of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; and, it will be seen by the following paragraph, that he has given three hundreds towards feeding, towards keeping from starvation, the people whom he is appointed to govern.

"July 26.—A meeting has been held in Dublin, of the bankers, &c. for the purpose of alleviating the public distress at this period, when the following subscriptions were immediately made, viz. the Lord Lieutenant, 300 guineas; Lord Chancellor, 200; Mr. W. W. Pole, 200; the Attorney-General, 100; Sir Charles Saxton, 100; and twelve other gentlemen, 50 guineas each."

So, the Lord Lieutenant gave the poor miserable Irish 300l., the Lord Chancellor gave them 200l., Mr. W. W. Pole gave them 200l., and the Attorney-General (I do not know his name, nor does it signify) gave the poor Irish 100 pounds! Well, if that be not a proof of kindness, and tenderness and mercy and so forth towards the said Irish, I do not know

what is! That the *bankers* should call the meeting, too, is a "monstrous good thing." The *bankers* call a meeting for the relief of the poor Irish!

An extract from the proceedings in the Common Council of Dublin, on the 20th July, 1810, will give us a full view of the object of this subscription.

"After the dispatch of the usual business relative to the admission of persons to the freedom of the city, Mr. Sinnett moved for the appointment of a Committee to take into consideration the condition of *their poor fellow citizens*, the manufacturers of Dublin, and to devise the method of affording them relief.

"Mr. GIFFARD seconded the motion. He thought it the bounden duty of every man to endeavour to alleviate the distresses of the poor artisans of Dublin; and hoped, however Gentlemen might differ on other topics, that there would be only one opinion on the question before them. He could assure them, that at the meeting of the Privy Council, men of opposite political principles had attended, and that all party dissention had given way to the feeling of humanity; that they all most cordially concurred in endeavouring to give effect to the benevolent intention of the Lord Lieutenant, to *alleviate the miseries of the wretched artisans of the City of Dublin*. He then recommended the consumption of home-made manufactures, and entered into a calculation to show the great relief that would be given the poor, if only 5000 persons could be found (though he was sure that more could be found), to expend 10*l.* each in the purchase of articles of wear. Let us imitate, in our little council, the unanimity which prevailed at the castle. I hope that all party dissention may be forgotten in our endeavours to relieve *the miseries of our fellow citizens*, and that our only contention will be in yielding to each other who will be the foremost.

"A Committee was accordingly appointed, who having retired, came to three Resolutions: the first, highly approving the plan of subscription proposed by his Grace the Lord Lieutenant; the second to promote the use and consumption of Irish manufactures: and the third to appoint Committees to go through the several parishes, and receive the signatures of such persons as were disposed to follow those humane and necessary measures.

"Mr. HUTTON then made his promised motion for the repeal of the Union. He prefaced it by a very short speech, in which he adverted to *the misery of his fellow citizens*, bereft of employment, and *perishing from absolute hunger*. He said, that their *unparalleled wretchedness* ought to awaken the feelings of humanity to make every possible exertion to alleviate their sufferings."

Now, is all this false? Are these inventions by Jacobins and Levelers and Reformers, the enemies of our "invaluable constitution, of social order, and our holy religion?" Are these *inventions*, or are they realities? Is it true, that the poor, the *laborious poor* of Ireland, are "*perishing from absolute hunger*?" And, if it be true, I wonder what will be said by the IMPOSTOR, who, under the name of "AN AMERICAN," has published an eulogium upon our paper-money system, and has described our people as being almost *too well off and too happy*? This vile impostor, who has received the unqualified praises of those conjurers, the Edinburgh Reviewers, has occupied several pages with assertions respecting the *solidity of our pecuniary means*, and with a description of the *happy and contented state of the people owing to that solidity*. What would the Impostor have said, if he had been at Salisbury the other day, and if some one of the ruined shop-keepers had caught him by the throat, and bidden him produce gold for the paper-money in his hands? What would the impostor have said to that? Would that he were now tossed down amongst the poor famishing people of Ireland! They would, as they ought, soon squeeze out of the mercenary wretch the fruits of his lying performance. They would make him, in one shape or another, disgorge his vile gains, and convince him, that a publication at *Philadelphia* is not a sufficient disguise.

The Morning Chronicle of the 24th July contains a curious paragraph, copied, it would seem, from a newspaper, published at Taunton in Somersetshire. I beg the reader to pay attention to it. The style of it is quite original, unless, indeed, one should be inclined to derive it from that of the celebrated Doctor Solomon.

"A great deal has been said, and much agitation has occurred, in most parts of the west of England, respecting the failures of the provincial banks; but it appears that the public have had, in fact, little or no grounds to justify the sensation occasioned on this subject. The insolvency in the House of Brickwood and Co. of London—the bankruptcy of Willcocks and Co. of Exeter—and of Bowles and Co. of Salisbury and Shaftesbury, occasioned what is termed a run upon almost every bank in the western counties; but it is very certain that a great deal of private malignity has been too successfully exerted in spreading the alarm on the present occasion. Almost every bank, however respectable its proprietors, and however well established its duration, has been reported to be insolvent. Little minds are amused by marvellous statements; and in the same proportion in which ignorance predominates over the sober sense of the community, as does the stories it adopts become transfused from one to another with a corresponding celerity. The truth is, that not more than four banks in the west of England have stopped payment, of which number Willcocks and Co. and Bowles and Co. may be considered as three.—All the Taunton banks have fully justified the high character for which they have been for many years so pre-eminently distinguished. The Honiton, Upottery, Chard, and Bridgewater banks have all alike been emulous in displaying a dignified competency to meet every requisition; and several of them, with an unaffected readiness, paid the demands on them in guineas, to an amazing amount. In a few days the impression occasioned by the late failures, will, we have no doubt, be entirely dissipated; and we are happy in stating that, with very few exceptions, no serious inconvenience had or is likely to ensue to the commercial or individual concerns of this or the adjoining counties. We believe it may with safety be averred, that no bank in the county of Somerset has suffered in its claim to public credit by any of the events which have recently transpired."

So those who felt alarmed at the prospect of losing every shilling they had in the world, were men of little minds, in which minds ignorance predominated over sober sense. These are very decent assertions to make to the poor people of Salisbury and in Ireland, who are starving amidst bales of paper-money.

"Private malignity," indeed! Just as if private malignity could shake any man's solid means. If I had a thousand guineas, does this Taunton gentleman suppose that it would be possible for any enemies of mine, private or public, to persuade the mass of the people, that it would be dangerous for them to take any of my guineas? Oh, no; you cannot persuade people to this. Here, then, is the distinction between real money and paper-money: the latter may be destroyed by a breath; while the former sets all whispering and calumny at defiance.

I will now leave these facts, which, though imperfect, and collected merely from the newspapers, which have been most obstinate in their reluctance to speak upon the subject, are quite sufficient to show what the effects of paper-money will, one of these days, be, unless timely provision be made for the prevention of those effects.

Of the observations that I have now to add, the first relates to what has been said about the wild speculations. It is said, that the sending of goods to the continent, where they cannot be sold; the importing of West India produce, for which there is no market; and the sending of manufactures to the Brazils, are the chief causes of this blow up amongst the bank-paper. Now, if this be true, what a pretty, plump, solid thing his bank-paper is! What a fine contrivance, then, that must be, which

exposes people in Wiltshire to be starved in virtue of operations at Tonningen and Rio Janeiro; and that, in fact, exposes the people of England to be thrown into confusion and ruin, in part at least, by the decrees of the Emperor Napoleon. Mind, I do not say, that this is the fact; but if it be, as is alleged by the friends of the paper system, what a fine contrivance that system is.

I thought, that the other day; or, at most, but a few months ago, I heard the cannon fire for the taking of Guadaloupe. And so I did. And I heard of new governors and judges and officers without end, appointed to rule this new conquest. Well, and what does it bring us? What is our gain in it? More sugar and more coffee to be added to the immense loads already rotting in our warehouses, and the want of a market for which is, as we are told, one of the causes of the blowing up of the Wiltshire paper-money. Yes, we fire cannons; we make bonfires; *we rejoice* at the taking of an island, the produce and the inhabitants of which must perish, or the former must be brought to England to assist in producing the effects now witnessed at Salisbury and in Ireland.

This is taking a very narrow view of the subject. It is *muddling* along half blind and half seeing. It is like a view of a chase through hollow ways and thickets. Let us, therefore, mount the eminence, and see the whole thing clearly at once.

It has constantly happened, that, when paper currency could no longer be, *at the will and pleasure of the holder*, changed into gold and silver to its full nominal amount, such currency degenerated; that is, it became of less value, and, in the end, of no value at all. The difference between *bank-notes* and *paper-money* is this: the former are, *at the will and pleasure of the holder*, exchangeable into gold and silver of the same nominal value; the latter is not. A bank-note is nothing more than a *promissory note* I have one now before me. It says, "I PROMISE " to PAY to Mr. Henry Hase, or BEARER, on demand, the *sum* of one " pound.—London, 28 June, 1810.—For the Governor and Com- " pany of the Bank of England.—(Signed) J. KNIGHT."

Well, now, this is all very regular. I am the "BEARER" of this note; and as Mr. Knight promises to pay me the *sum of one pound on demand*, I may, if I like, send my note in *for payment*. But, what will Mr. Knight give me in lieu of it? What will he pay it off in? Why, if he pleases, in *another note* as much like this one as if they were two twin brothers. Same colour, same substance, same weight and same feel. It is, in fact, therefore, a *promise* to give the Bearer, on demand, a *promise to pay*. I can compel the Bank in Threadneedle-street to give me no "*sum of one pound*," except in paper. Formerly, indeed, when a man chose to have gold instead of his bank-notes, he sent the latter to the Bank, where he was *paid a sum of money* in exchange for his notes, and he could compel the Bank by law to pay him such sum of money, but now he cannot. When once he has taken a bank of England note, he must keep it, unless any one may *choose* to give him any thing else for it.

When once this came to be the case, it would have been miraculous indeed if the paper-money had not *increased in quantity*, there being no check whatever other than the moderation and forbearance of those who had the making of it in their hands; and the necessary consequence was, that this paper depreciated; that is to say, it sunk in value when compared with money that had a real value in itself.

This fact of depreciation became visible enough in the year 1804, at the time when the restamped dollars were issued at *five shillings*, when their sterling value never had been more than *four shillings and sixpence*. And, I here wish to carry the reader back, for a while, to that period, for the purpose of introducing him to an article of some interest, contained in another part of this present number, the author of which was the REVEREND JOHN BRAND, late rector of St. George's, Southwark, and of Wickham Skeith in Suffolk.

This gentleman, who had written a great deal upon the sinking fund, and who was, upon all occasions, very anxious to uphold the credit of every part of the paper system, contended, in conversation with me, that the advance put upon the dollar was no proof of a depreciation in the value of the paper. Other symptoms of depreciation had begun to make their appearance in Ireland. And, an article or two written by me upon the subject, and published in the Register, induced Mr. WINDHAM, with whom Mr. Brand was very intimate, to request the latter to look into the question. In consequence of this request, and of a sort of *challenge* that I threw down to him in a subsequent Register, at which challenge he was a good deal stung, he wrote the Letter to Mr. Windham and the Letters to myself, which will be found in another part of this sheet.* They were

•LETTER I.—TO MR. COBBETT.

Wickham Skeith, May 9, 1804.

DEAR COBBETT: Without any ceremony I shall proceed, in the form of propositions, with what I have to say upon your writing about the Irish Dollars.

1st. If there be no seignorage in a time of hoarding, a new emission of coin being necessary, and the price of the metal in the market be higher than that of the Mint, the Mint price ought to be raised to equal it.

For there will be fewer pieces to hoard otherwise, and, *ceteris paribus*, there will elapse less time before the hoarding comes to a maximum, and the number of pieces then left in circulation will be less, or, in other words, the difficulty come on with greater celerity, and ultimately rise higher.

The gold price of the dollar being 4s. 9d. at the refiners: if there had been no seignorage, it must thus have been issued at 4s. 9d.: even if the average price taken in gold, which is sometimes much under the market price, had been 4s. 6d.

2. What is said of seignorage above being true, the current value of every piece should exceed the market value of the bullion it contains, in the ratio of 21 to 20.

Therefore the market value of the dollar in such a time as above-described being 4s. 9d. (57d.), the current value ought to be $\frac{21}{20} \times 57d.$ or 59 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. that is more than 4s. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

3. In a state where the coin is of different metals, every monied payment is to be taken not as made in one species separately, but partly in each: and of each in the proportion as its total sum in the country.

Now let the coin of a state consist of 3 parts: one of gold, its quantity as 44; a second silver of former denominations; its quantity as 3; and a third a silver coin of a new denomination (the dollar) its quantity as unity: let its first current value be 4s. 9d.

In every payment of 912l., each of the three species is here to be taken to be mixed in the proportion in which they circulate, as according to the equality of chance they will be, that is for 912l. in bank-notes I shall receive 19l. in dollars (i. e. 80 in number), in common silver coin 57l., and in gold 836l.

Let the current value of the dollar be now raised to from 4s. 9d. (57d.) to 5s. (60d.): or in the proportion of 19 to 20, being very near that of 21 to 20 mentioned above, the other two species remaining as before, then the value of the 80 dollars would become 20l., or the total sum pass current for 913l., and the paper to purchase it must be increased by a note of one pound, and in this case the value of paper would fall in the ratio of 913l. to 912l.

not published at the time, owing to an application from Mr. Brand to stay the publication till he came to town (he was then in Suffolk) in order that he might make some alterations. He was taken ill, and did not come up to town for some time, when the subject was grown out of date. He, however, made his intended alterations, and left the papers in the state in which I now publish them.

And if all our currency were coin, and the price of commodities were as its total amount, this would be the proposition of the fall of the value of money; but as a great part is paper the fall will be so much the less.

The doctrine contended against would be true in this mode of reasoning if all our coin were dollars.

4. The argument to show paper is depreciated exactly in the same proportion in which the current value of the dollar is increased, proves too much; and is therefore quite inconclusive.

I do not know the magnitude of the emission, but the reasoning, if true, must be true were it more or less; it would not be less conclusive if it be 700,000 or a million, 100,000*l.* or 900,000*l.*, or even if it were a solitary fourscore dollars mentioned above.

If a quarter of the silver coinage being raised one nineteenth in current value, is a proof paper is depreciated; the same would have been true if such an advance had been made to that of the copper; as, for instance, if to preserve Mr. Bolton's fine two-penny pieces from being hammered into flat plates, as some actually were, they had been ordered to be current at two-pence farthing.

Register, p. 572. "Guineas are depreciated;" the metal is degraded by the society of the paper.

Degradation of currency is two; 1st, of the whole mass; and second, of one part or species of it.

Let a nation possess coin to the amount of 47 millions, if to this 25 millions of current paper be added, and the value of money will ultimately fall, its products continuing the same, and the fall or degradation will be in the ratio of 72 to 47, the number of its operations in equal times continuing the same.

But the coin is not more degraded by the society of the paper, than it would have been by the society of 25 millions of new coin: the degradation follows equally from every addition to currency, whether made in paper, passing at its nominal value, or in the metals; in this case we only say money falls or prices rise.

In this case it seems improper and inadvertent to say singly, either that coin is degraded, or paper degraded, as neither is the whole of the fact.

The argument did not start with the degradation of the whole mass of currency, but of a part thereof; the paper, that is, the paper exclusively considered, how far paper is degraded by the issuing dollars at 5*s.* I have endeavoured to show above.

If it were established as universal belief that paper was degraded 5 or 10 per cent., the fall being thought to begin, it would go on rapidly to increase, nor can the limit at which it would stop be assigned. What it has been in this country is known, but it cannot be said it will again stop there; as it has gone far further in others.

At this juncture a great relative fall of paper would create at least a surprising defalcation and a long and great confusion in our public ways and means, and without the attachment of A. Smith to paper-money, or that of Mr. Thornton, or even with very strong objections to its existence, a person might very well wish not to see it come to *such an end at such a time.*

"In Ireland the guinea is worth 23*s.* in bank paper," the balance between the two countries is at this juncture against Ireland, and must be paid in guineas or bullion; in the latter, I believe that country not to trade, therefore guineas rise against paper there, as bullion rises against bank-notes here when the balance is adverse.

This comes in, I suppose, for a part of the cause, but supposing any current paper admissible in a state, this discount would not, I conjecture, prove that it is in too great a proportion in Ireland, its circumstances considered, that of a latent rebellion. Guineas will be hoarded, the effect of which is nearly the same

The reader will see, that these papers do nothing at all in the way of removing the charge of depreciation, which, even at that time, I openly urged against the bank paper. They contain a good deal of ingenious matter; but their ingenuity is, of itself, no bad proof of the difficulty in which the writer found himself involved.

as that of exportation, and the probability of an explosion, which will destroy the value of such notes. Banks of emission are not of a nature to guard against such shocks so well as those of deposit.

I am yours, faithfully,
J. BRAND.

LETTER II. TO MR. COBBETT.

Dear Cobbett:—What I have to observe on the subject you have desired me to consider, exceeding the limits of a postscript to a letter, I have made it the subject of a second to you. My observation upon it I shall enter on without further preface.

The market value of the dollar, being 4*s.* 9*d.* here, and being to be made current at 5*s.* as above; now passes in Ireland, at 5*s.* 6*d.*, as appeared by a letter from Dublin, dated April 24, in your Register of last week. Therein also referring to a former letter of mine you desire to know whether I can account for that still higher advance of the current value of the dollar in that country; and from a cause "other than the depreciation of bank paper."

The letter from Dublin contains also a second argument, distinct from that of the advance of the dollars, to show that the Irish bank paper has undergone a great depreciation; if that cannot be shown to be erroneous, the assigning such a cause would be useless, it must therefore come in its place to be considered.

The cause required (after what I had said in my letter) does not seem difficult to assign. The silver coin in Ireland was in so bad a state, that it was necessary to call in, at least, a great part of it; and it was determined to supply the vacancy so caused with dollars. These were to be purchased of the bank, or other holders, in England, where they were current, or determined immediately to be made current at 5*s.* each.

The operation was taken up ultimately by the Irish bank: the exchange with England had long been against that country; therefore all the Irish stock of dollars (if any such ever existed) had found its way to England, where they were to be purchased at 5*s.* each.

It follows from the letter of your Dublin correspondent, that the exchange between the two countries was 5*l.* per cent. against Ireland, at that time, as will be presently shown: for he paid in Dublin 105*l.* British for a bill of 100*l.* on London; or, which is the same thing, 63*d.* British must have been paid in Ireland for a bill to receive 60*d.* or a dollar in England; the prime cost of the dollar to the Irish bank was 5*s.* 3*d.* as its prime cost to that of England is 4*s.* 9*d.*; or, as it rose to that value in its coffers, as soon as it became the rate of the market.

Now the bank of Dublin, being a company of monied men, whose object is profit, it may be conceived that it would not undertake the trouble and expense of agency and transport, and the hazard of the sea, to be consequent on the operation, without a profit; which must be paid them either by the state, or by the persons for whose necessary accommodation (after the debased silver was called in) the import was made; that is, by the public at large, which profit they would derive from issuing their dollars, at a higher value than 5*s.* 3*d.*, the prime cost to them. And if 4*l.* per cent., with the minute addition of one hundredth more, be admitted to be a proper rate of profit, then was the bank entitled to put the value of (5*s.* 5*d.* and 99 hundredths) 5*s.* 6*d.* British upon each dollar, or 5*s.* 11*d.* Irish.

This supposes the dollars never to be called in. If Ireland had continued a separate kingdom, and the state had taken the operation upon itself, this would have been a proper and just rate of seignorage. And it is precisely the same thing, with respect to the receivers of the new coin, considered as such only, that a great monied company has engaged in this operation. And here the case

As will be seen by his letter to Mr. Windham, Mr. Brand was very anxious to show, that the advance in the price of the dollar *was not a proof of the depreciation of the bank paper*; and he says, in that same letter, that he *has traced* the high price of the dollar to *other causes*. Whether he was, or was not mistaken, the reader will be able to determine.

is precisely the same in Ireland as in England; the banks of each circulate dollars at 3*d.* above the market value, in each country, of the silver they contain. And if they be received at the bank and exchequer, and continue current at that rate, or be so allowed for when they shall be called in, a seignorage is effectively imposed upon them in Ireland of 4*½*l. as in England of 5*l.* per cent. And in the latter case the bank will reimburse to the ultimate holders, the greater part of the profit it made on the original emission.

§ 2. The bank of Dublin is here understood to have come to a resolution "to pay and receive dollars, at 5*s.* 11*½**d.* Irish each," and to act up to either part thereof. This resolution appeared in all the Dublin papers, as published by authority. If no such authority had been given by the bank, it was very faulty in availing itself of the public error to sell its dollars at a profit; and as the refusal to receive them back again at the same rate as expected would create great public confusion, they ought to have proceeded against the original author of the falsity, for a misdemeanour; or on the old statute as a spreader of false news. But if it was authorised, the breach of its engagement seems to admit of no palliation, even in the most quiet times. And the charge against the company is very much aggravated, when the difficulties then existing from the calling in of the bad silver are considered. But I hope the bank is able to give some better account of this: If the charge shall obtain an extensive belief, it will be incumbent upon them so to do, if in their power.

Upon the face of your correspondent's account also, no slight blame will attach itself to the Irish treasury; for an attempt, at a period of embarrassment in the national coin, to issue dollars at so high a rate as 6*s.* sterling, when their value in bullion in the Irish market was only 5*s.* 3*d.* This was in effect the same as imposing a seignorage of 14*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.* per cent. upon them. Under the French Monarchy, its rate was 8*l.* per cent., which, perhaps, may be regarded as the maximum.

The fault of the measure, according to this account, soon demonstrated itself: in a week's time the dollar could be passed for 5*s.* 6*d.* only: but in this the good sense of the people deserves praise: silver coin they greatly wanted, and although they refused to allow so high a rate as 14*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.* per cent. profit on the importation; yet by a tacit universal assent, evidenced in the value at which they received the dollar, they agreed still to leave a profit of 4*½*l. per cent. for the encouragement of further importation.

I have hitherto considered the argument for the depreciation of the paper in Ireland from the current value of the dollar, and on a more limited ground than you required; showing not only that its price had a cause "other than the depreciation of paper," but also that it was the same cause, operating in the same manner, raised that value by the same sum, 3*d.*, above its market price in Ireland and England.

§ 3. But your correspondent by another argument, endeavours to show the depreciation of the bank paper to be nearly 11*l.* per cent. He gives the elements from which he draws this conclusion: but in his process there is an error singular in its magnitude, for first it appears, even on his own statement, that it does not exceed 1*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* per cent. I repeat his reasoning:—

"The exchange between this country and England during last week, was about 16*l.* per cent.; so that had I wanted 100*l.* payable in London of British currency, I must have carried to market 116*l.* Irish in the national bank notes: but I did not carry 105*l.* only in specie, and I obtained 100*l.* British. I insist, therefore, that the depreciation of the bank paper is nearly 11 per cent.

This passage in several particulars is vaguely worded: what the writer obtained evidently was a bill of 100*l.* upon England, the consideration paid for it was 105*l.* in specie: he does not state whether the 105*l.* was Irish or British, yet circumstances prove that he paid for it 105*l.* British, for otherwise the ex-

There are only three or four passages, which I shall particularly notice, as applying more immediately to the present state of the paper-money.

I had said in a former Register, that *guineas* had *depreciated*; that the metal was degraded by the society of the paper. To this, Mr. Brand answers, that coin is not more degraded by the society of paper, than it would be by the society of more coin equal in nominal value to the paper.

change between the countries, at the time, must have been in favour of Ireland, which is contrary to the fact and his own admission; as at the par, 100*l.* English is worth 108*l.* Irish, exceeding 105*l.* money of that country, whence the additional 5*l.* was for the difference of the exchange and the rate of the day against Ireland; and the sum of 105*l.* British. He therefore paid for his order 105*l.* British, or which is the same thing 113*l.* 15*s.* Irish, being equal thereto, but he admits that he could have purchased the same order for 116*l.* Irish in the national bank notes: whence if there were any real disparity between them, 100*l.* Irish money would then have purchased 101*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* only in Irish paper, which would thus appear to have been depreciated (1*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.*) 2*l.* per cent. only.

§ 4. But there does not appear to me to be precision enough in his statement, to conclude the existence of this disparity, or any other. He says that the exchange of Irish paper for British money payable in London, was ABOUT 16*l.* per cent. against the former. And in the first place it is to be noted that the accurate rate might differ from this by no small fraction, reducing the depreciation of 2*l.* the paper 2*l.* found by the corrected process, by no inconsiderable part of so small a rate. Let this be omitted: still it is to be noted, that an adverse balance subsisting for a considerable term, has its average; from which it varies by temporary rises and falls. On the day on which your correspondent purchased his bill of 100*l.* on England, the exchange against Ireland might be lower than such average, and in the course of the week higher; and at each time by 1*l.* per cent., and this will amount to a variation of 2*l.* per cent. in the term. The statement not precluding the possibility of these suppositions decides nothing certainly. And we frequently see as great variations as this take place in the English stock market, from no very powerful causes, in as little time: and then Irish money and notes would have been absolutely at par; for, if immediately after he had obtained his bill for 100*l.*, during such temporary depression, it should have come to the knowledge of the exchangers, that there was a very considerable unforseen demand to come into the market for remittances to England, it would raise the price of such a bill to more than 105*l.* British or 113*l.* Irish; or even than 116*l.* of the latter, either in paper or specie. Neckar has said enough of the "imperious necessity" which such circumstances impose on merchants who have payments to make, to comply with the demand of the exchanger; who will make his full advantage thereof, to render this clear; and nothing but the transaction of the same day will serve the purpose to which your correspondent applies his elements, and even the average of several such, would be necessary to decide any thing as to the real existence of such small differences.

§ 5. It may be here added, that Banks whose obligations to discount their paper in money are in a state of temporary suspension, may be willing during such a period to purchase coin to assist an embarrassed circulation: but as they are not virtually compelled to provide it as at other seasons, they will demand a profit in the first instance on the advance of it, partly for the sake of the gain by keeping it in their hands until the new money be called in; and partly for the greater gain on the sum which never will return to them. And all the effect of the issue of such coin which I can see is, that by increasing the quantity of the national currency it may depress its value in proportion to its amount, but this depression will fall equally on paper and coin. Except that it is of the nature of a seignorage, and therefore in time of public alarm, money current at such advanced rate will be of less value to hoard; of less value to the workers in the metals, and the counterfeiters of coin to melt down, than if it had been of the standard weight, and will therefore remain longer in circulation and be less subject to frauds.

§ 6. But there is another mode in which it may be shown, that there has no fall taken place in the value of paper against coin from the cause assigned; it is

This is a very important point, and therefore I request the reader's attention to it.

Money, of whatever sort, is of *high* or *low* value in proportion to its *quantity* compared with the *quantity of purchase* which it has to perform. If, for instance, there be only ten horses to be sold in a year in any community, and there be ten *thousand* pounds to be laid out in horses,

as follows. If the issuing dollars here at 5 shillings has any effect to depreciate bank paper, that effect would not be done away by increasing the amount of that issue; or the proportion it shall bear to the whole of the other silver coin, in any assignable rate. Let now the silver money of a state be one million, and in a condition perfectly like our own; which let us admit to be so good, that the bullion contained in every 20 shillings, would, on the average, be worth 15 shillings in the market. I have not before me the trials relating to the state of the silver coinage lately made at the Tower, or a nearer value might be assumed which would be much inferior to this; while this money is current, nothing less than a bank-note of 10*l.* will exchange for 200 such shillings; the real value of which is 7*l.* 10*s.* only. And their nominal value, 10*l.*, is neither their value by the standard, which they have long ceased to possess; nor their legal value, for if each be of equal weight which must be supposed, having suffered other reductions than waste from wearing, all are liable by law to be cut and defaced when tendered in payment; nor is it their market value in bullion, as is the undeniable fact. It is therefore barely their nominal though current value; and a million in bank-notes so employed, will purchase or exchange against the whole of the debased silver. The current although nominal value thereof is one million also; but its real market value 750,000*l.*, and this coin debased 25*l.* per cent., circulating with the paper and exchanged by tale for it, the latter must, according to the principle of argument I am considering, be debased 25*l.* per cent also.

Let this debased silver be now all called in; and instead thereof, let one million be issued in dollars and convenient fractions of dollars, at 5 shillings each: And first by royal authority: And let the market value of the metal each contains be 4*s.* 9*d.* A note of 10*l.* will purchase 40 such dollars, the market value of which is 9*l.* 10*s.*; exceeding that of the old silver it would have purchased by 2*l.*: their value indeed is not equal to the standard, but the old coin is far less so, and in that they are superior. The law having provided, that the King can by proclamation fix the value at which foreign coin shall legally pass, their legal value is 10*l.* also; which cannot be said of 200 of the old shillings each of the average weight as shown above: and in this they are also superior. It is admitted that the bullion they contain is not in market value 10*l.*: but it is much more nearly so than 10*l.* of the old silver coin, to which therefore in all these circumstances they are superior. If in their standard and their market value they are somewhat deficient, the old silver was more so: their value is not purely nominal, for it is legal also; and when they are gotten into circulation they will instantly acquire a current value equal to the legal.

And if as before, we take a million of bank-notes to be employed in the purchase of these dollars, it must indeed be admitted that the market value of the silver so purchased will be only 950,000*l.*, and here according to the principle of the argument considered, the depreciation of the paper circulating with them will be only 5*l.* per cent; therefore in this mode of reasoning, this substitution of the dollars at 3*d.* each above their market value, in the place of the whole of the old coinage, would diminish the depreciation of bank paper 20*l.* per cent. nearly; or, which is the same thing, relatively raise their value at that rate: so by the mode of reasoning here considered an appreciation is proved from the issuing of the dollars, it is therefore erroneous.

This consequence from the principle of the argument which attempts to show, from the issue of dollars in England of the present value of 4*s.* 9*d.* for 5 shillings, that its bank paper is depreciated one twentieth, must be admitted. Or a clear reason must be assigned, why legal money, one twentieth below the value of the bullion it contains (to which the standard itself ought to be made as nearly as possible to conform) circulating with bank paper, depreciates it in that proportion; while the same notes, circulating with the old money, which taken all as of the average value was depressed 5 twentieths below the standard and there-

horses will be ten times as dear, or, which is the same thing, money will be worth only ten times as much, as they would be, if there were only an hundred pounds to lay out, and the same number of horses to purchase. If, to take another illustration, the quantity of money in England were to be doubled to-morrow, as there would be no addition made to the quantity of purchase in England, the price of every thing would instantly

fore not legal money, was not depreciated at 5 times that rate, but as the argument tacitly assumes, continued at par.

§ 7. And to infer a greater depression of the paper of Ireland, from the higher rate at which dollars pass in that country, involves a contradiction the same in nature and kind, but in magnitude much greater; for the market value of the bullion in a dollar being there 5s. 3d., and its current value 5s. 6d. British: if it be said that the bank paper circulating with it is thereby depressed 4½ per cent.; the principle of the argument will lead us to reason thus: the letter from Dublin states, "That the value of the best of the late silver coin was on the average 8s. in the pound only;" Now let it be taken that the average state of the whole of the silver was equal to that of the best; then the market value of 108½l. Irish silver (100l. British) or 2000 such shillings was 43½l. Irish (40l. British) or 800 good shillings, the notes therefore circulating before with coin, debased 60l. per cent, must according to the principles of this argument have been depreciated 60l. per cent. also; but it proceeds on a tacit assumption joined with that principle, that at that very time they were not depreciated at all: but that the bringing the whole of the silver coin 55½l. per cent. nearer the market value of the metal, or reducing its deficiency from 60l. to 4½l. per cent. set the depressing power of that deficiency free, and that it instantly and not before began to act.

§ 8. These observations have already run to a great length; but it must be added, in the mode in which the dollars are to be issued, there is another proof that they cannot depreciate the value of the paper with which they circulate. If the bank had flung into circulation a number of five-shilling notes equal to that of the dollars to be re-stamped at Birmingham; no one from that would have inferred, that their paper was at a discount, relatively either to gold or silver; any more than if they had issued the same amount in larger notes, although there might be other reasons against such an issue.

The paper itself on which a five-shilling note would be so drawn, may without doubt be said to have no saleable value. Now I would ask whether any one of these notes together with the total aggregate of bank-notes of all amounts which circulate with it, would be depreciated; if the substance on which the obligation was written should have a saleable value after the writing was expunged, as a shilling, half-a-crown, four shillings and nine-pence, nobody, I presume, could or would answer in the affirmative.

Now the dollars are to be issued as "tokens for five shillings." In the first case, the obligation would be written on a worthless piece of paper; in the second, stamped on a valuable piece of silver. It is a metallic bank-note for 5s., as a guinea has been called a bill for a certain quantity of commodities on the whole world, that is the civilized world. Has this new kind of bill less credit because it has a value independent of the solvency of the emitting company, and that nearly equal to its current value? or does this additional security debase it, and not only so, but all its paper with which it before was at par?

§ 8. I must yet in conclusion add, that the depreciation of one part of the national currency, the bank paper here spoken of, is a relative depreciation only, taking place when a discount to be fixed between the holder and the purchaser is allowed to obtain coin for a bill. And when such a discount takes place, the depreciation of the currency is partial. Such was truly the case with respect to bank paper in the reign of William; when only 85l. in money could be obtained for a bank-note of the then nominal value of 100l., or it was at 15l. per cent. discount. But the effect of such a fall will be to reduce the price of commodities paid for in coin; or as it has been sometimes called to appreciate the latter, for it will evidently produce the same consequence with respect to the value of coin, as taking fifteen 100ths of the paper out of circulation. I only add, that I think that the consideration of the rise of prices of commodities, or the reciprocal

be doubled. This holds good in speaking of coin as well as in speaking of paper; but, here is the difference, that, if the money be coin, which has a real value in itself, and, of course, is ready to carry that value along with it to any country upon earth, there is *sure never to be any more money than is wanted*; for, the moment there is a piece more than the society requires, away it goes into some other country, where it can better employ itself; where in fact, it will bring more food and raiment. But, the paper, which has no intrinsic value in it, must remain at home; and, upon the principle above laid down, as it increases in quantity, it must decrease in value. It must become less and less powerful in the way of purchase. In this state of things the coin must, as long as it continue to *circulate with* such paper, become of less value than it used to be. It is *degraded* by the paper. It sinks in value along with the paper. If, for instance, there were a thousand guineas only in a nation, and each of these would purchase *twenty* quartern-loaves, if there were to be issued nine thousand guineas in paper-money, and if the real guineas were to continue to circulate, each of them would, after this emission of paper, purchase only *two* quartern-loaves. But, the real guineas, having an intrinsic value in them, and being able to go into foreign parts, would not stay in such society. They would go where they could still get their twenty loaves. Hence it is, I think, very clear, that though guineas may and do, in passing from hoard to hoard, or from a hoard to the sea-side, circulate along with the paper, that it is impossible they should circulate in such society for any length of time.

This is the true cause of the disappearance of the gold. The law, as it now stands, forbids all *exportation* of the coin. Therefore it would be useless to purchase up. Yet it does, day after day, disappear from circulation. There is not, as yet, a money and a paper price openly made in the market. There have been many causes to prevent this; but, when the paper money has increased somewhat more, this distinction will be made, and then we shall see the guineas come back again immediately.

A very old and much esteemed correspondent of mine, referring to the close of my last week's article, expresses his surprise at hearing me say, that I should not dread any danger to the welfare of the nation if the whole of the paper-money system were to go to pieces. And then he points out the consequences as to *rents* and *taxes*. But, surely, he could not suppose, that I ever imagined that *rents* and *taxes* would remain what they now are? I see, however, no difficulty at all in providing against any injury, and even against any inconvenience in that respect.

Mr. Brand, at the close of his first letter, acknowledges that the paper

circumstance, the fall of the value of the whole aggregate of the currency taken collectively, should not enter into this question, which has nothing to do with the absolute value of the currency as measured by commodities, but which simply relates to the *ratio* which the values of equal nominal amounts of metallic and paper currency may come to bear to each other, when they shall vary from that of equality; and whether such variation has taken place; but to go into the reasons of my entering this caveat, would lengthen my letter too much.

I am, Dear Sir, Yours truly, &c.

J. BRAND.

now rests wholly upon opinion ; and he thinks that no one can, at such a time, wish to see it annihilated, which he apprehends would create a great defalcation and long confusion in our public ways and means. But a wish will neither hasten nor retard this annihilation ; and, what wise men will, therefore, endeavour to do, is, to prepare the public mind for the event. Indeed, the only real danger that I can see in the fall of the paper-money lies in the endeavours that are made to keep the truth from the people at large ; though, I believe, that such has always been the case in similar circumstances.

The best thing that could, in my opinion, happen (and, perhaps it soon will happen) is an open difference of prices in the market. Then the public confidence in the paper would be fairly tried ; the loss upon paper-money would be fairly divided ; and things would quietly jostle themselves into order, without any danger from popular commotion. If, on the contrary, the paper system should go on uninterrupted until a general want of confidence take place, what will then be the consequence ? The consequence may be easily imagined, if we attentively look at the situation of Salisbury the other day ; and add the circumstance of there being *no possibility of relief of any sort from any quarter*. Bundles of Bank of England notes have, in this instance, been hastened off to fill up the void made by the blowing away of the country-money ; but, if the paper-money system go on *unchecked* and the currency unmixed with coin, until all England, all the kingdom, be in the situation of Salisbury, without any source to apply to for a supply of currency, what must be the consequences ?* I leave the reader to answer this question, though he will find it much easier to imagine than to describe those consequences.

The view, which we have now taken of this subject, has quite driven away all thoughts about the "*speculations*" and other imaginary causes

* The state of things supposed above occurred in 1825 ; or something so very near it, that Mr. HUSKISSON declared in the House of Commons in that year, that we had approached to within "forty-eight hours of barter." Upwards of one hundred banks stopped payment, and the ruin of others may be conceived from that fact. The whole matter was sifted in a Committee of the House of Commons on the subject of renewing the Bank Charter in 1833, and, in the evidence given before it by Mr. HARMAN, Governor of the Bank of England in 1825, the reader will find (p. 150 to p. 166) a description of the miraculous escape of "*public credit*." He was asked what means the Bank took to lend assistance, and his answer is :—"We lent it by every possible means, and in modes that we never had thought of before ; we took in stock as security, we not only purchased exchequer bills, we made advances on exchequer bills ; we not only discounted outright, but we made advances on bills of exchange to an immense amount, and we were not upon some occasions over nice ; seeing the dreadful state in which the public were, we rendered every assistance in our power."—He says, further, that they were in communication with the Treasury from hour to hour ; that it was "an effort to stop the plague ;" that, the Bank had in April 1825, between ten and eleven millions of bullion in its coffers ; but that, in November, it came down to 1,300,000*l.* ; and, being asked whether during the crisis (called "*the Panic*") it came down to a lesser quantity still, his answer is, "*unquestionably*." He states, also, that there was a suggestion thrown out by Mr. HUSKISSON to the Bank, that if their gold was exhausted, "they should place a paper against their doors, stating that they had not gold to pay with, but might expect gold to recommence payment in a short period." Of this suggestion he says : "I hardly know how to contemplate it." He is then asked this question, the answer to which will show that the system of paper credit was saved by the discovery of a box of 1*l.* bank notes that had been overlooked : "The Bank issued 1*l.* notes at that period ; was that done to pro-

of the partial explosion that has recently taken place. We here see, that the cause is not a *temporary* or *accidental* one; but permanent, natural, and regular. That it is radical, and belongs to the system, as much as mortality belongs to the human frame. The time when the mortal principle shall produce its final effect, it is difficult to say; but as I observed in my former article, I am quite satisfied, that the country paper-money must be propped up, or, that the day of total annihilation is not far distant. The *Morning Post* may call the country-money "*destructive assignats*" as long as it pleases; but, that money must continue to go, or *all the paper-money must speedily come to an end.*

Rents and taxes are now paid in paper-money. Take it away, and where are the means of paying rents and taxes? Would you have Threadneedle-street money to supply the place? Where, then, is the difference to the people? Why not call this money assignats as well as the other? Besides, do you consider what *numbers of forgeries* would be committed, when the detection would become so very difficult? These forgeries alone would soon blow up the whole of the paper by exciting a want of confidence in it all over the country. But, were there none of these reasons, there is one other more than sufficient of itself; and that is, that the system would, if the country money were put an end to, lose the support of those who own the country money-shops, and who have so considerable a part of the influence of the country in their hands. All this description of persons are linked to the system by the interest they have in the issuing of the country money, and, if that interest were to cease, they would become as decided enemies, as they now are friends, of the system.—It is to me, therefore, utterly unaccountable how it came to pass, that a print like the *MORNING POST* should recommend the "*abolition*" of those "*destructive assignats,*" commonly called country bank-notes.

PAPER-MONEY.—Continued.

(*Political Register, August, 1810.*)

"They" (the French Revolutionists) "forget that, in England, not one shilling of paper-money of any description is received but of *choice*; that the whole has had its origin in *cash, actually deposited*; and that it is convertible, at pleasure, in an instant, and without the smallest loss, *into cash again.* Our paper is of value in commerce, *because in land it is of none.* It is powerful on Change, because in Westminster-hall it is impotent. In payment of a debt of twenty shillings a creditor *may refuse all the paper of the bank of England.* Nor is there among us a single public security, of any quality or nature whatsoever, that is enforced by authority. In fact it might be easily shown, that

"tect its remaining treasure? Decidedly, and it worked wonders; and it was by great good luck that we had the means of doing it, because *one bar, containing a quantity of 1l. notes had been overlooked, and they were forthcoming at the lucky moment.*" Then: "Do you think that issuing the 1l. notes did avert a complete drain? As far as my judgment goes, *it saved the credit of the country.*"—ED.

"our paper wealth, instead of *lessening* the real coin, has a tendency to *increase it*; instead of being a *substitute* for money, it only *facilitates* its entry, its exit, and its circulation; that it is the *symbol of prosperity*, and not the *badge of distress*. Never was a *scarcity of cash*, and an *exuberance of paper*, a subject of complaint in *this nation*."—BURKE. Reflections, 1790.

Look at the motto, English reader. Look at the motto; and, when you have looked well at it, you, too, will, I think, be disposed to make some "REFLECTIONS;" or, if you are not so disposed, I beg leave to recommend to you to lay this paper aside at once; for, I will venture to affirm, that no reading whatever upon political subjects can be of any use to you.

It was just *twenty years* ago when Mr. Burke thus described the state of the Bank-paper in England, and thus taunted (not altogether unjustly) the revolutionists of France, who had just at that time set afloat a paper-money system. But, view the state of things *now*!

The war, which Pitt began soon after these Reflections of Mr. Burke's were published, was, by Pitt and his followers, called a *war of finance*. How, then, has that war succeeded thus far? The reader must remember Pitt's frequent boasts of having reduced the French to the utmost distress as to pecuniary and financial matters. His notorious assertion, that they were "*in the very gulf of bankruptcy*," has frequently been quoted; and, the writings of Sir FRANCIS D'IVERNOIS and of GENTZ cannot be forgotten. Where are *now* all their foretellings?

The useful train of reflection for the English reader, upon looking at the motto, is this:

'How changed are things since 1790! What a great, and, to us, what a fearful change, has taken place! Whence has it proceeded? What has been the cause? Who have been the actors?

'Has the change proceeded from the superior wisdom and virtues of the French; No: that we will not allow. From the interposition of Divine Providence in their favour? No: for we cannot allow that such people, who have openly railed at religion, should be the favourites of Divine Providence; and, besides, is there a speech, made by the King to the parliament, during this long war, in which the King does not express his gratitude for the great aid which he has received and hopes to receive from Divine Providence? Is the cause to be looked for in the liking, which the people of the several nations of Europe have had for the French revolutionists in preference to their old rulers? No: for we all along have, and still do, aver most positively, that the people of the several countries of Europe love their good old rulers and hate the French revolutionists, and especially Buonaparte.

'Here, then, is for once, a great, a tremendous, effect without a cause.

'But, as to the *actors*: as to those, *who have had the management of things, on our part*, we know them very well. Pitt and his followers (for the poor Foxites were, in effect, quite sunk into that same description of persons) have had the whole affairs of the nation in their hands from 1790 to the year 1810, and in those hands the nation's affairs are to this moment. Let not the OUTS pretend, that they would have done better; for, there is not a single man of them, who has not eulogized Pitt, whose debts they voted that the nation should pay upon the score of his merits as a minister; and whose *system of finance*, in particular, every man of them has applauded.

'No: there are no distinctions to make; but, to get rid of all ground for cavil, upon this score, let us say, that, between them and amongst them, the two sets, the INS and the OUTS, have had in their hands all the resources of this nation, since the day when Mr. Burke wrote the passage here taken as a motto. Well, then, to whom, if not to them, are we to look for a responsibility for this awful change? Never tell about this accident or that accident; those accidents should have been provided against. You would have done so and so, perchance you will say, if the Dutch had fought or if the Neapolitans had not run

' away. Aye; but it was your business to foresee what the Dutch and the Neapolitans and the Prussians and Bavarians and every body else would do. At any rate, you cannot say, that this change is to be ascribed to Sir Francis Burdett! He has had none of the powers of the state in his hands. He has had the expending of none of our taxes. He has, indeed, and so have I, found fault with measures; given it as our opinion, that such and such measures would and must lead to harm; but these opinions, so far from being acted upon, have insured us an abundance of malevolent abuse. Of this fact, then, there can be no doubt: that, let what will be the state of affairs; let the change since 1790 be what it will, Sir Francis Burdett and those who think with him have had no hand, no act or part, in the producing of that change; and that the whole of the change, be it for good or for evil, belongs exclusively to the INS and the OUTS between them, and to those of the people, who approve of either the one set or the other. The change is the work of their own hands; to them it wholly belongs; to them, therefore, must be left the task of making the world see and the nation feel, that it is a change for the better."

I shall now add some observations to those which I made upon the subject of paper-money last week; but, before I proceed to those observations, it is necessary to correct an error, committed at page 365. It is this: instead of "*ten times*,"* read "*a tenth part*." The context does, indeed, pretty clearly point out to the reader to make this correction.

I now come to my intended observations, which have been suggested by a little paragraph that appeared in the newspapers of Saturday last, the 28th of July, in these words:—"A seizure of *nine thousand guineas*, intended for exportation, was, on Thursday, made in the river. The specie was discovered on board a small vessel which had cleared out in ballast. A captain in a volunteer corps was the fortunate detector of this prohibited merchandise."

Thus, then, on Thursday, the 26th of July, on the very day, and, perhaps, at the very hour, when I was writing my last Number: at the very time when I was telling my readers, that the guineas, being degraded by the society of the paper, would go away to countries where they would not be so degraded, and where they would pass for their real worth; that the guineas would still pass from board to board in company with the paper, or from a board to the sea side; but that it was impossible they should circulate in such society for any length of time; on the day, and, perhaps, at the very moment, that I was putting this opinion upon paper, it now appears, that no less than *nine thousand* of these Jacobin vagabonds were detected in the act of getting off out of the country. They were, it seems, got upon the river; fairly afloat; just about to hoist sail, when the volunteer captain discovered and stopped them. Jacobin rascals! What, then, they will not stay here to keep company with the loyal paper!

It would be a curious thing to follow these Jacobin guineas now, after their being brought back. It would be curious to follow them in their dispersion, and to see through what new channels they would endeavour again to make their escape.

Every one must, I think, be now convinced that the gold will never again circulate upon a footing with the present paper-money; and that the only way to bring it back again into circulation, and, indeed, into the country, is to remove every obstacle to the purchase or sale of it. A Jew was, as the reader will, probably, remember, sometime ago prosecuted for selling guineas for more than their nominal worth in bank-notes. *A bill of in-*

dictment was found against him. I have not seen, that has been *brought to trial*. But this prosecution, though left in this state, would be quite sufficient to prevent an *open traffic* in guineas; and, that being the case, the possessors will inevitably *hoard or smuggle*; for to suppose that any person will voluntarily lay out a guinea, while there is paper of our present sort to be had, is an absurdity too gross to be tolerated for one single moment.

In 1803, there was a work published under this title: "GUINEAS AN ENCUMBRANCE."

The author spent much more time than was necessary in showing, that if *paper* answered all the purposes of *gold*, it was a great saving to the nation to make use of a paper instead of a gold currency. Then, taking it for granted, that our paper *did answer* all the purposes of gold, he, of course, came to the conclusion, that the nation derived great advantages from the paper-system, and that *guineas were an incumbrance*, agreeably to the proposition in the title page.

The error of this gentleman was a very vulgar one indeed. He had no other notion of the purposes of money than *merely that of its passing from hand to hand*, without any reference whatever to its losing or retaining its original worth. He took up the notion that the mere circumstance of its passing was a complete proof of its goodness in *every respect*. And, hence he took it for granted, that the paper answered *all the purposes* of gold. But, we have now seen, and the people of Salisbury, Shaftesbury, Cork, and other places, have most severely *felt*, that paper does not answer *all the purposes* of gold; for, if there had been a gold in place of a paper currency, it is evident to every man, that the miseries recently occasioned, by the latter, would not have befallen the people, who now find, I fancy, *paper*, and not guineas, to be a sad *incumbrance*.

What has now happened is, however, but a *little taste* of the evils appertaining to a paper-money, not exchangeable into gold or silver at the will of the owner. There are many other evils which are now in operation, working heavily against the happiness of the nation; but, were there no other than that at this moment experienced, that one would be quite enough to silence the author of "GUINEAS AN ENCUMBRANCE."

The motto, which I have placed at the head of this sheet, was written long before the present system of paper-money took place. The author little imagined, at the time when he wrote that passage, that the day was so near at hand when a *law* would be passed rendering the tender of bank-notes to the amount of a debt a *protection against an arrest for such debt*. Since that time, the bank in Threadneedle-street has been quite another thing than what it was before. The bank-note *has now some power in Westminster-hall*. And, do we not see the consequences? Yes; some of them; but, good God! how small a part of those consequences, unless some means be soon adopted effectually to counteract the natural consequences of the fall of the paper-money!

I have some observations to offer now upon the still *more recent* failures; but, I will first notice the Letters of two correspondents.

The first relates to a remark of mine in the way of answer to a letter then before me, from this same correspondent, upon the subject of *rents and taxes*, as affected by the paper-money. The letter, now inserted from that correspondent (Mr. CAMPBELL), explains his meaning; and, at the same time, suggests to me the utility of proposing and discussing

beforehand, the measures that it would, in the contingency contemplated, be proper to adopt, so as to prevent the *spirit of contracts*, of all sorts, from being violated. Nothing would, in my opinion, be more easy. All that the government would have to do would be to appoint persons to examine into the matter, and the principle of adjustment* being so very clear, they would only have to revert to the time when the contract was made, and see what the value of money was then, and make their revision accordingly. I do not perceive how any serious difficulties or discontents could possibly arise from this source, if there were only common prudence used on the part of the government.

From the SECOND letter, it appears, that the writer *formerly* believed, that the high prices arose, not from the increase of paper-money, but from *the increase of gold and silver coin* in Europe. He has now discovered his error; or, at least, he now acknowledges, that the paper-money has depreciated; and says it must continue to depreciate, "*so long as the note shall not be readily exchanged for gold.*" He then goes on to say, that even if *light gold* were issued to put coin upon a level with the paper, the latter would sink beneath even that light gold, unless the paper was, at the pleasure of the holder, *convertible into gold*.

This gentleman calls upon the bank for SOME PLAN to give to a pound sterling of their paper *some certain value in gold*. It is very easy to call upon the bank for such a plan; but, it would be better to make an attempt at least to *chalk out* such plan, the people in Threadneedle-street being no more conjurors than other folks.

My opinion as to the *only* effectual remedy for the dreaded evil is so well known, that I need not repeat it here. It must, indeed, be now manifest to every person, capable of thinking, that an *open competition* between the paper-money and metallic money is the only thing that can bring gold back again into free circulation; and, without such circulation, what must, first or last, be the consequences?

The public have heard of a REPORT, made by a certain set of gentlemen, belonging to the Honourable House, called "*the Bullion Committee.*" This Report was, I believe, *ordered to be printed*; but, before it returned to the Honourable House in its typographical shape, that Honourable House adjourned. This Report is said to contain, amongst other useful things, a plan for the bringing back of gold coin into circulation; and, I have heard, that the plan is this: That the bank in Threadneedle-street shall pay, on demand, all their small notes (notes of *one and two pounds*) in metallic money, or coin; that is to say, in gold and silver; but that the said bank shall not be compelled to *begin* this sort of payment in less than *two years* from the time of passing this act!

I give this as mere *hearsay*, mind. I have not seen the Report, nor have I my information from any one who has given it upon his own word as derived from a sight of the Report. It is, therefore, merely hearsay; but it is very generally talked of amongst politicians, and, therefore, I notice it.

Now, not to waste our time upon the ludicrous idea of the *two years*

* We do not insert the letter of Mr. CAMPBELL, because our wish is to avoid, as much as possible, the loading of this work with any unnecessary matter. It is right, however, to remark, that, in the passage above, and in the concluding part of the last article, Mr. COBBETT contemplated what he afterwards called the "Equitable Adjustment."—ED.

postponement, what would be the effect of such a measure, if it were, at this time, adopted, all the other laws relative to money remaining in force? Suppose, now, that we were to read, in the newspapers, to-morrow: "The bank in Threadneedle-street is now ready to give gold and silver in exchange for all its one and two-pound notes." Does the reader imagine, that he would be able to get to the bank door, or even to Threadneedle-street? There have been seen crowds in London; but never such a crowd as such a notification would draw together. Every small note would be tendered instantly. And *how long* does the reader imagine, that the guineas would remain in circulation after they got out of the bank? But, really, it is to insult the understanding of the reader to dwell any longer upon the consequences of such a plan, which, I still think, never can have been seriously proposed.

Upon the subject of the more recent stoppages of payment at the banker's shops, it would be useless to say much; though I cannot help observing, that, in his paper of the 27th of last month, Mr. PERRY was rather premature in calling my observations *querulous*; and in saying that he was proved to have been right in his prediction, that, "the failures would not extend to old established houses; that the alarm would subside in a week; and that it was not on the side of want of credit that any serious calamity was to be apprehended." In announcing to us, however, as he has done to-day (1st August), the stoppage of Messrs. DE VAYNES and Co., of Pall-Mall, he has furnished us with a pretty good presumptive proof of his being wrong in all the above points. It is *want of confidence*, and that alone, which has produced the effects which we now behold: and that want of confidence has arisen from the currency of the country not being convertible into gold.

I do not say, that this want of confidence *will*, at this time, become general; but, there is no security that it *will not*; and, it is not, at any rate, to be supposed, that it will be stopped all at once. The fall of DE VAYNES must naturally produce the fall of others; and, if not of other banks, of other men, whose fate will be a warning to their neighbours.

While this is going on, the *hoarding* and *exporting* of the gold, and even of the silver, will proceed with redoubled activity. They are, in effect, the same thing for the present. The consequence of both is, an *increase of the paper*, to supply the place of the absconding Jacobin Guineas; and the consequence of that is a *further depreciation of the paper*, which as naturally produces a *further want of confidence*: and thus the system must and will proceed, until the day when there shall be an *open competition between gold and paper*.

LOCAL MILITIA AND GERMAN LEGION.

(Political Register, July, 1809.)

"THE mutiny amongst the LOCAL MILITIA, which broke out at Ely, was *fortunately* suppressed on Wednesday, by the arrival of *four squadrons* of the GERMAN LEGION CAVALRY from Bury, under the command of General Auckland. Five of the ring-leaders were tried by a court-martial, and sen-

"tenced to receive 500 lashes each, part of which punishment they received on Wednesday, and a part was remitted. A stoppage for their knapsacks was the ground of complaint that excited this mutinous spirit, which occasioned the men to surround their officers, and demand what they deemed their arrears. The first division of the German Legion halted at Newmarket on their return to Bury."—*Courier* (ministerial) Newspaper, Saturday 24th of June, 1809.

[NOTE BY THE EDITORS.]—We are now selecting from the articles written by Mr. COBBETT in 1810 and 1811, two years during which their author was a prisoner in the jail of Newgate, having been convicted of a libel, on the 15th June 1810, on an *ex-officio* information of the Attorney-General, Sir VICARY GIBBS. We cannot do otherwise than give Mr. COBBETT's account of the whole proceeding against him; because it forms too important an incident in his life to be omitted in a work which records his acts; and because it did, as it was likely to do, influence his manner and conduct in a way that the reader will be prepared for on reading the narrative. Mr. COBBETT had quitted London entirely, having bought an estate at Botley, near Southampton, consisting of a house in the village of Botley, and the two farms called Fairthorn and Raglington, with two other and smaller ones, all lying together, and within a mile of the village. He had determined on leading a country life, and had taken all the means to do so, when the Government prosecution was begun; and, as a considerable purchase, such as he had made, and partly upon the faith of the profits of his literary labours, required more than ordinary exertion and care, the reader can imagine better than we can describe how ruinous his mere *absence from home* was at this time; but, added to this, he lived at a cost of twelve guineas a week for the rooms that he occupied in Newgate; and paid a *thousand pounds fine* to the King.—We insert *the libel* first, and then the narrative of the prosecution.—*Ed.*

SEE the motto, English reader! See the motto; and then do pray recollect all that has been said about the way in which Buonaparte raises his soldiers.

Well done, Lord Castlereagh! This is just what it was thought your plan would produce. Well said, Mr. Huskisson! It really was not without reason that you dwelt, with so much earnestness, upon the great utility of the *foreign* troops, whom Mr. Wardle appeared to think of no utility at all. Poor gentleman! he little imagined how a great genius might find useful employment for such troops. He little imagined, that they might be made the means of compelling Englishmen to submit to that sort of *discipline*, which is so conducive to the producing in them a disposition to defend the country, at the risk of their lives. Let Mr. Wardle look at my motto, and then say whether the German soldiers are of *no use*.

Five hundred lashes each! Aye, that is right! Flog them; flog them; flog them! They deserve it, and a great deal more. They deserve a flogging at every meal time. "Lash them daily, lash them duly." What, shall the rascals dare to *mutiny*, and that, too, when the German Legion is so near at hand! Lash them, lash them, lash them! They *deserve* it. O yes; they merit a double-tailed cat. Base dogs! What, mutiny for the sake of *the price of a knapsack*! Lash them! flog them! Base rascals! Mutiny for the price of a goat's skin; and, then, upon the appearance of the *German soldiers*, they take a flogging as quietly as so many trunks of trees!

I do not know what sort of a place ELY is; but I really should like to know how the inhabitants looked one another in the face, while this scene was exhibiting in their town. I should like to have been able to see their faces, and to hear their observations to each other, at the time.

This occurrence at home will, one would hope, teach *the loyal* a little caution in speaking of the means, which Napoleon employs (or rather, which they say he employs), in order to get together and to discipline his conscripts. There is scarcely any one of these loyal persons, who has not, at various times, cited the *hand-cuffings*, and other means of force, said to be used in drawing out the young men of France; there is scarcely any of the loyal, who has not cited these means as a proof, a complete proof, that the people of France *hate Napoleon and his government*, assist *with reluctance in his wars*, and would *fain see another revolution*. I hope, I say, that the loyal will, hereafter, be more cautious in drawing such conclusions, now that they see, that our "gallant defenders" not only require physical restraint, in certain cases, but even a little blood drawn from their backs, and that, too, with the aid and assistance of *German troops*. Yes; I hope the loyal will be a little more upon their guard in drawing conclusions against Napoleon's popularity. At any rate, every time they do, in future, burst out in execrations against the French for suffering themselves to be "chained together and forced, at the point of the bayonet, to do military duty," I shall just republish the passage, which I have taken for a motto to the present sheet.

I have *heard* of some other pretty little things of the sort; but, I rather choose to take my instance (and a very complete one it is) from a public print, notoriously under the sway of the ministry.

TO THE READER.

(*Political Register, July, 1810.*)

Sir Walter Raleigh wrote his *History of the World* in a prison; and it was in a prison that Cervantes wrote *Don Quixote*.

AFTER having published seventeen volumes of this work, embracing the period of eight years and a half, during which time I have written with my own hand nearly two thousand articles upon various subjects, without having, except in one single instance, incurred even the threats of the law, I begin the eighteenth volume in a prison. In this respect, however, I only share the lot of many men, who have inhabited this very prison before me; nor have I the smallest doubt, that I shall hereafter be enabled to follow the example of those men. On the triumphing, the boundless joy, the feasting and shouting, of the peculators, or public robbers, and of all those, whether profligate or hypocritical villains, of whom I have been the scourge, I look with contempt; knowing very well, feeling in my heart, that my situation, even at this time, is infinitely preferable to theirs; and, as to the future, I can reasonably promise myself days of peace and happiness, while continual dread must haunt their guilty minds; while every stir, and every sound must make them quake for fear. *Their day is yet to come.*

Before I renew my usual intercourse with my readers, and offer to them, as heretofore, my remarks upon political subjects, and subjects connected with politics, I think it necessary to say something, relative to the proceedings in the Court of King's Bench, the end of which proceedings has been my imprisonment here. It is not my intention to publish a full report of the trial: that would be unnecessary; but, on many accounts, it may be useful merely to record the transaction, previously to any remarks upon any part of it.

FIRST, then, I was prosecuted by way of information of the Attorney-General, for an article, published in the Political Register of the 1st of July, 1809, respecting the *flogging of certain men in the Local Militia*, in the town of Ely, and also respecting the use made, upon that occasion, of a corps of foreign soldiers, called the *King's German Legion*.

SECONDLY, the trial took place on Friday, the 15th of June, 1810, when I was found *guilty*, by a special jury.

THIRDLY, on Wednesday, the 20th, I was compelled to *give bail* for my appearance in court to receive judgment; and, as I came up from Botley (to which place I had returned on the evening of the 15th) a tipstaff went down in order to seize me personally, and to bring me up to London to give bail.

FOURTHLY, I was brought up to receive judgment on Thursday the 5th of July, when, after the Attorney-General had made the speech, which I shall notice by-and-by, I was sent to the King's Bench Prison, and ordered to be brought up again on Monday the 9th of July.

FIFTHLY, on this last-mentioned day, I was sentenced to be imprisoned in this prison for two years, to pay a fine of a thousand pounds to the King, and, at the expiration of the two years, to give bail myself to the amount of three thousand pounds with two sureties to the amount of one thousand pounds each for my keeping the peace for seven years.

The Attorney-General was Sir Vicary Gibbs, who was assisted by Mr. Garrow; the Judge who sat at the trial, was Lord Ellenborough; the four judges who sat when the sentence was pronounced were Lord Ellenborough and Judges Grose, Le Blanc, and Bailey; the sentence was pronounced by Judge Grose; and the persons composing the jury were as follows:—

THOMAS RHODES, Esq.	Hampstead-road.
JOHN DAVIS, Esq.	Southampton-place.
JAMES ELLIS, Esq.	Tottenham-court-road.
JOHN RICHARDS, Esq.	Bayswater.
THOMAS MARSHAM, Esq.	Baker-street.
ROB. HEATHCOTE, Esq.	High-street, Marylebone.
JOHN MAUD, Esq.	York-place, Marylebone.
GEORGE BAXTER, Esq.	Church-terrace, Pancras.
THOMAS TAYLOR, Esq.	Red-Lion-square.
DAVID DEANE, Esq.	St. John-street.
WM. PALMER, Esq.	Upper-street, Islington.
HENRY FAVER.	Pall-Mall.

So much for the mere *names* and *dates* belonging to the transaction. Now, as to the publication itself; as to the sort of prosecution and the manner of conducting it; as to the charge of the Judge; as to the verdict of the Jury; as to the nature and amount of the Sentence: these are all before the public, whose attention to them has been very great, and to the judgment of the public I leave them. But, on the last of the Attorney-General's three speeches (for he had *three* to my *one*) I cannot

refrain from making some observations, and I think myself fully justified in doing this, because I was told, that I could not be permitted to answer him verbally. The speech, to which I here allude, was made on Thursday, the 5th of July, when I was called up for judgment; and, that no one may say, that I do not treat even this Attorney-General fairly, I will first insert here the whole of his speech, as it stands reported in the Morning Chronicle of the 6th of July, that report being the most correct that I have seen. In the charge of Lord Ellenborough and in the Sentence-Speech of Judge Grose, there were some passages relating to questions appertaining to general and foreign politics, and to the pro-founder departments of *political economy*. On these I shall hereafter have occasion to offer some observations; but, for the present, I shall confine myself to the speech of the Attorney-General, which is reported in the following words:—

“The ATTORNEY-GENERAL agreed in all that had been said by his Learned Friends, in behalf of the three Defendants, for whom they appeared, as to the distinction between their guilt and that of Mr. Cobbett, as to whom he should speak by-and-by. They had allowed judgment to go against them by default; they had never denied that the publication was a libel; nor that they themselves, in their concern in it, had acted a criminal part. They had not made their defence a vehicle for other calumnies and slanders, almost as bad as the original libel. In all these respects, their case stood contradistinguished from that of Mr. Cobbett. There was also another distinction between their case and that of most printers and publishers. They had not employed the author, as some printers and publishers did, but the author had employed them. Yet these Defendants, and every other person who might chance to stand in the character of printer or publisher, must understand, that these circumstances could never exculpate them. All who lend themselves to the publication of any work or writing whatever, must know that they become responsible for all the consequences thence arising.—He now came to the case of Mr. Cobbett. The Court would observe that from him the publication proceeded, and to him, as the author, all the profits, if any, appertained. Whatever of malignity resulted from the publication, to him was it attributable; and whatever there arose from it of base lucre and gain accrued to him alone. The court had heard the Libel read, and sentiments widely different from those of the author of it must, on the reading of it, arise in the mind of every honest man. At the present time, when from the ambition and increased power of our enemy, we were obliged to maintain a large military force, how necessary was it that a good understanding should subsist between the military and the people. How essential was it, that at such a period, the soldier should be convinced that no unnecessary hardship was thrown on him,—that he was not forced to engage in any disgraceful task? How essential that the community should be satisfied that however necessary a great military force at present is for the protection of the country, yet that nothing tyrannical, that no force beyond the law, is employed in compelling the inhabitants of this country into the ranks of our armies. The situation of the soldiers of this country was more comfortable than at any former period; every means that could be devised to add to their comfort had been adopted. Our armies had by their zeal and valour evinced what were the consequences of such liberal treatment; and by the glorious exertions they had made in their country's cause, had made more than an ample return for the comforts thus afforded them. These, he was satisfied, were, and must be, the sentiments of every good man in the kingdom. Need he call on the Court to look back to the libel, and show them that the sentiments there expressed were directly contrary to this, he presumed to think, almost universal feeling? What was its tendency? To encourage the soldiers to impatience, insubordination and disgust; to tell them that they were hardly, cruelly, and tyrannically dealt with by their superiors, and thereby to render that duty of obedience which they owe their superiors disagreeable and disgusting. To go back to the situation of matters at the time the libel in question was written. At that moment,

" instead of lending a ready obedience to the commands of their officers, a body
 " of Local Militia had in a mutinous manner surrounded those very officers
 " whom it was their duty to obey. The place where the transaction took place,
 " did not afford a force sufficient to quell the mutiny, but a reinforcement was
 " called in from the nearest place whence a military force could be properly
 " spared, and order was restored.—The aggressors, however, were not dealt with
 " as Buonaparte would have treated his refractory troops. The ring-leaders
 " were selected and brought before a tribunal where their cases were tried and
 " examined, and where, after the fairest inquiry, they were found guilty of
 " mutiny, and had an adequate sentence passed on them, part of which was
 " mildly remitted. What was the interpretation, however, which Mr. Cobbett
 " gave to this transaction? That it was not to be called a mutiny; that it was
 " a mere squabble between the men and the officers for a trifle of money; that
 " the men were persons who had just thrown off their smock frocks to put on
 " the garb of a soldier, and still continued so much labourers as to be ignorant
 " of their duty as soldiers, and had become so much soldiers as to have lost the
 " inclination to labour. What, he asked, would be the result of mutiny, if libel-
 " lers of this nature were to escape with impunity? What, however, was the
 " conduct of the same person to the men themselves? He taunts and upbraids
 " them with not having acted like men; and instructs them, that they ought not
 " to have submitted to the chastisement inflicted on them. Not only was this
 " so, but he held up to contempt and indignation the German Legion for having
 " assisted, when called in, in quelling the mutiny. He represents them as per-
 " sons who could be of no use in the general service of the country, whose aid
 " could only be useful in quelling disturbances among our native troops, and
 " that they were employed on this occasion only because the British troops
 " would not have interfered in such a service, for which the German Legion
 " alone were fit. Could we expect zealous and cordial co-operation on the part
 " of the foreign troops whom we were, in the present situation of affairs, obliged
 " to employ, if we suffered them thus to be taunted in their own persons, and to
 " be exposed to unmerited obloquy and disgrace in the eyes of the public of this
 " country? As if this, however, were not enough, the Defendant, Mr. Cobbett,
 " goes the length of telling the inhabitants of the place where the transaction
 " occurred, that they are base miscreants for having seen and not having as-
 " sisted in resisting so infamous and abominable a chastisement. 'I do not
 " know,' says Mr. Cobbett, in the libel in question, 'what sort of a place Ely is;
 " but I really should like to know how the inhabitants looked one another in
 " the face whilst this scene was exhibiting in their town. I should like to have
 " been able to see their faces, and to hear their observations to each other at
 " the time.' What was this but upbraiding the inhabitants of Ely for sitting
 " quietly by and seeing this punishment inflicted on mutineers who had been
 " regularly tried, convicted, and sentenced to receive this punishment; and tell-
 " ing them that they ought to be ashamed to look each other in the face, in con-
 " sequence of their not having assisted in resisting it? Black as this was, this,
 " however, was not the blackest feature in the present publication. The author
 " went on to hope that, after this occurrence at home, we would be a little more
 " cautious in drawing conclusions against Buonaparte, and that we should no
 " longer hear of the cruelty, and of the tyrannical acts of Buonaparte. By look-
 " ing back to former parts of the publication, the Court would find that this
 " meant, that the subjects of Buonaparte were subject to a less severe measure
 " of restraint than the inhabitants of this country. On this principle, alluding
 " to the means employed or said to be employed by Buonaparte to get together
 " and discipline his conscripts, the publication states that there is scarcely any
 " one of the persons who wish to cry him down that has not 'at various times
 " cited the hand-cuffings, and other means of force, said to be used in drawing
 " out the young men of France,' and who has not cited these as affording a com-
 " plete 'proof that the people of France hate Napoleon and his Government.
 " assist with reluctance in his wars, and would fain see another Revolution.'
 " Should it be suffered that the lawless libeller should tell the inhabitants of
 " this country that they were pressed into the ranks of our army with more
 " severity than that which was exercised by the iron hand of oppression em-
 " ployed by the Ruler of France? There was, indeed, a degree of delicacy per-
 " ceptible in the present publication, but it was delicacy only for the enemies of
 " this country. The author, after alluding to the means which Buonaparte em-

" ploys in filling up the ranks of his army, corrects himself, and represents them
 " not as acts practised, but said to be practised, by Buonaparte, in accomplish-
 " ing this object—'The means which Napoleon employs (or rather which they
 " say he employs) in order to get together and to discipline his conscripts.'
 " And who were these whom he thus marks out as the 'they?' whom he thus
 " taunts as with the term of the greatest reproach—'the loyal?' a term which
 " ought to ensure respect and regard, as embracing the first duty of subjects in
 " a well regulated state towards their Sovereign. This was the character of the
 " libel which the Defendant, Mr. Cobbett, was now called on to answer for.
 " If this was the character of the libel, which, he presumed to think, could not
 " be denied, their Lordships would readily see the tendency of such a publica-
 " tion, and they would easily estimate what the consequences would have been
 " if the publication had produced the effects which it was calculated to have pro-
 " duced. What if the soldiers had caught the spirit of dissatisfaction and dis-
 " gust, which was thus suggested for their adoption? What if the flame thus
 " sought to be kindled throughout the whole kingdom had been lighted up?
 " The consequences were too fatal even to be pointed at. It would have gone
 " to break up every thing that was estimable in society—it would have gone to
 " the destruction of civilization and good government in the country. It might
 " be said by the Defendant that the publication in question had no such ten-
 " dency, and that these effects had not been produced. That it had not the
 " tendency contended for, he (the Attorney-General) denied, though he ad-
 " mitted that, happily, it had not produced the effects which it was calculated to
 " produce. That the publication in question had not produced the effects which
 " might have been expected from it, we owed to the love of the subjects of this
 " country towards their Sovereign and the established Government. We owed
 " no thanks on this head, to Mr. Cobbett. It became, however, the duty of
 " that Court to prevent and guard against the recurrence of such libels in time
 " coming. Mr. Cobbett himself had taught the Court what the consequences
 " of passing by such publications with impunity would be. He had told the
 " Court that other libellers had been passed by, and argued upon that as a
 " ground for his own impunity. If he were to-day to be passed by, or to be
 " visited with a light punishment, would not this, to-morrow, be adduced as
 " a precedent in favour of other libellers? Would they not be entitled to
 " say, 'If I, by libelling, be enabled to make a fortune, and to amass wealth,
 " when, in return, I will only have to sustain so slight a punishment as
 " that passed on Mr. Cobbett, will I not cheerfully incur the penalty.' If
 " the Court should now visit Mr. Cobbett with a light punishment, could they
 " answer for it that their arm would be strong enough, next year, to check
 " the evil to which he (the Attorney-General) contended they were called
 " on to give a vital blow this day? It now lay in the Court to inflict on the
 " Defendant, Mr. Cobbett, a just and wholesome punishment, adequate to his
 " offence. They had had before them libellers on the private character of in-
 " dividuals; such they had esteemed proper objects of punishment; and that the
 " punishment so inflicted would tend to diminish the frequency of the offence, if
 " not to prevent it entirely. They had had before them those even who had
 " been guilty of libelling the administration of justice in the country. That was
 " a high offence, because it tended to take from the credit and authority due to
 " the judgments of the Courts of Law, and tended to make them of less effect.
 " Such offences, and justly too, were visited with a severe chastisement. But,
 " if that offence, great as it was, were to be compared with that now under con-
 " sideration, it must sink into utter insignificance. The present libel went to
 " subvert society itself, and, whatever might be thought of the atrocity of others
 " which had preceded it, the present was one of a much darker and blacker hue.
 " The Court were therefore called on to inflict such a punishment as should, at
 " least, make men pause before they embarked in libels similar to that published
 " by the Defendant, Mr. Cobbett. The army, against whom this libel was in a
 " peculiar manner directed, called on the Court for justice against its traducer.
 " The Government called on them for confirmation of its legal powers; for what
 " Government could possibly exist if it were not protected against such attacks
 " as these? The country; which looked with horror on the mischievous ten-
 " dency of the libel now under consideration, called on them for protection against
 " the numerous evils which the propagation of such publications were calculated
 " to engender, going, as they did, to the total subversion of social order, and to

“ the existence of this country as a nation. Being once brought before the Court, they (the Public) knew that they might have confidence in their protection, and that they would no longer have occasion to dread a repetition of such outrageous insult. He called on the Court, therefore, for judgment on the Defendant. He called for justice; and that justice he knew would be tempered with mercy, but he trusted, that the Court would not forget that “ mercy was equally due to the public as to the Defendant at the bar.”

Now, as to the necessity of a great military force in this country, and as to the *cause* of that necessity; as to the general treatment of the soldiers in this country, and their being better treated than at any former period; as to the punishment inflicted upon the Local Militia at Ely; as to the employing of the Germans upon that occasion; as to the use of German Troops in this country at all; as to the people of Ely being able to look one another in the face; as to the manner in which Napoleon would have treated the Local Militia; and as to my “ delicacy ” towards the enemies of my country: these are all matters upon which I shall say nothing at all. They have all been fully discussed; they are all well understood; there can be, in the mind of no man of common sense, a mistake with respect to them. There is, indeed, one little sentence, made use of by the Attorney-General, respecting the treatment of the soldiers, which is rather obscure; at least to me it is so. He is stated to have said: “ How essential is it that the community should be satisfied, that “ *nothing tyrannical, that no force beyond the law, is employed in compelling the inhabitants of this country into the ranks of the army.* ” I do not understand the meaning of this. These two phrases are, in my view of things, by no means synonymous; because, if they were, the oppressions, which, as we are told, and, perhaps truly, the people of France are compelled to undergo, would not properly form a subject of complaint, seeing that they are all exercised under the sanction of *law*. There are *Decrees* or *Senatus Consulta* for the forcing of the young men of France to go into the army; yet the forcing of them so to go has been, and yet is, represented, in this country, as being most abominably *tyrannical*. I perfectly agree with the Attorney-General, that it is essential that the community should be *satisfied* that “ *nothing tyrannical* is employed in compelling the inhabitants of *this* country into the ranks of “ the army; ” but, towards the producing of this desirable effect, his statement is not at all likely to contribute; and, indeed, unless he had stopped at the word “ *tyrannical,* ” and spared the subsequent *definition*, he would have done well to hold his tongue upon this part of the subject.

There are THREE assertions made by the Attorney-General during this memorable speech, which assertions materially affect me, and upon which, therefore, I must beg leave to trouble my readers with some observations. The FIRST of these assertions is, that I made my “ defence a vehicle for *other calumnies and slanders*, almost as bad as the original libel.” — The SECOND, that I wrote the publication in question, and, generally, everything I wrote, for “ *base lucre.* ” He does not say this in so many words; but, in speaking of the cases of the other defendants, as *contradistinguished* from mine, he says, that whatever arose from it (the publication) of “ *base lucre and gain* ” accrued to me alone. And then, in another part of his speech, where he is stating the evil consequences, which, in the way of example, will arise from a slight punishment of me, he asks if other libellers will not, in such case, be entitled to say: “ If I,

“ by libelling, be enabled to *make a fortune*, and to *amass wealth*, when, in return, I will only have to sustain so slight a punishment as that passed on Mr. Cobbett, will I not cheerfully incur the penalty ? ”

The THIRD assertion is, that *the Army called upon the court to punish me*. The words are these, as given in the report : “ The *army*, against whom this libel is in a peculiar manner directed, calls on the Court for justice against *its traducer*.”

There are several other assertions, which, as occasion offers, I may be disposed to notice ; but these three are all that I shall notice at present.

With respect to the FIRST, namely, that I had made my defence a vehicle for *other calumnies and slanders*, much more need not be said, than was said by every one who heard or read the speech, and that is, that it is very strange, that these new calumnies were not *named* by the person who was speaking in aggravation. He had had nearly a month to consider of, and to inquire into, the *facts* (for I dealt not in *insinuations*) stated by me in my defence ; and, how comes it that he did not *contradict* any one of those facts ? How came he to content himself with a general assertion, unsupported with even an alleged fact ? Had he not *time* to go more minutely into the matter ; or did he, out of mercy, forbear to *prove* these new calumnies upon me ? Was it compassion that operated with him upon this occasion ?

These “ calumnies,” as he calls them, were brought forth in *answer* to, and in *contradiction of*, assertions made by him in his first speech. It is, therefore, very surprising, that he should not have made an attempt, at least, to refute them. He seems to have been very anxious to *put every thing right* in the public mind ; and how comes he, then, to have left these “ calumnies ” totally unanswered, especially when he looked upon them as being “ almost as bad as the original libel ? ”

Upon the SECOND assertion, that I had written the publication in question for gain's sake ; that I had *amassed wealth*, made a *fortune* by libelling ; and that, I had, in short, in my writings, been actuated by a craving after *base lucre* ; upon this, the first observation to make, is, that it contains a beautiful compliment to the people of this country, and comes in with peculiar fitness close after the assertions, that their *good sense* prevented the mischiefs which the publication was calculated to excite, and that *they* even called upon the Court to punish me. No : the people of this country were so sensible, so discerning, so loyal, and held libelling in such abhorrence, that they were not to be excited to sedition by me ; and, in a minute afterwards, to publish libels in this country, the way to *make a fortune*. The *army*, too, abhorred this work of libelling, and even called upon the court to punish me for it ; and yet, but only a minute before, there was great danger of my creating disaffection in the army, of throwing every thing into confusion, and of producing the destruction of “ Social Order and our Holy Religion,” as John Bowles has it. The Attorney-General was in a difficulty. It would not do to say, that my writing had *no effect* upon either the people or the army ; it would not do to say, that what I wrote dropped still-born from the press, or, that it made no impression upon any body ; it would not do to say this, and yet it was paying me too great a compliment to suppose that I had the power of inducing any body to think or to feel with me ; therefore, I was, in one and the same speech, represented as a most *mischievous* and a most *insignificant* writer.

But, to return to the charge of writing for “ *base lucre*,” I think the

public will have perceived, that there was nothing *original* in this part of the Attorney-General's speech ; for, the charge had, in all forms of words, been long before made by the basest of my calumniators, by the vile wretches, who notoriously use their pens and their pencils for pay, and who do not, like me, look for remuneration to the *sale* of their works to the public. The idea of my having "amassed wealth," arose in the first place, perhaps, from the envy of the worst and most despicable part of those, who wished to live by the press, but who did not possess the requisite talents to ensure success to their endeavours, and at the same time preserve their independence ; or, who were so deficient in point of industry as to render their talents of no avail ; and who, therefore, resorted to that species of traffic, which exposed them to my lash. Such men would naturally hate me. Such men would naturally wish for my destruction. Such men would naturally stick at no falsehood, at no sort or size of calumny against a man, whose success was at once an object of their envy and the means of their continual annoyance. But, from a person in the situation of Attorney-General, one might have expected a little more caution in speaking of the character and motives of any man.

Let me, before I come to my particular case, first ask why the gains of a writer or of a book or newspaper proprietor are to be called "*base lucre*," any more than the gains of any other description of persons. MILTON and SWIFT and ADDISON received money for their works ; nay, POPE received more, perhaps, than all of them put together, and wrote, too, with ten times more severity and more personality than I ever did ; and yet, no one ever thought, I believe, of giving to his gains the name of "*base lucre*." This is a most sweeping blow at the press. Let no one connected with it, in any way whatever, imagine that his pecuniary possessions or his estate, if he has gained one, will, or can, escape the application of this liberal charge. The fortunes of Mr. Walter and Mr. Perry and Mr. Stuart and Mr. Longman and Mr. Cadell and of all the rest of them, are all to be considered as "*base lucre*." *Base lucre* is the fruit of the industry and talents of every man who works with his pen ; and those whose business it is to inform and instruct mankind are either to be steeped in poverty, or to be regarded as sordid and base hunters after gain. Dr. Johnson, if now living, must at this rate, be liable to be charged with hunting after "*base lucre*," for he really lived by the use of his pen. Paley also sold his writings, and so, I dare say, did Locke ; and why not, then, impute baseness to them on this account ? It is notorious, that thousands of priests and even Bishops have sold their writings, not excepting their sermons ; and is not that hunting after "*base lucre* ?" It is equally notorious that lawyers are daily in the habit of selling reports of cases and other writings appertaining to their profession ; and what can their gain thereby be called, then, but "*base lucre* ?" Burke sold his writings as well as Paine did his ; nay, the former, for many years, and being a member of your Honourable House all the while, actually wrote for pay in a periodical work, called the *Annual Register* ; and, of course, he sought therein after "*base lucre*." *Base lucre* it was, according to this doctrine, that set Malone to edit Shakespeare, and that induced Mr. Tooke to write his *Diversions of Purley* ; and, in short, every writer, whether upon law, physic, divinity, politics, ethics, or any thing else, if he sell the productions of his pen, is exposed to this new and hitherto-unheard-of-charge.

There is, indeed, a species of gain, arising from the use of the pen, which does well merit the appellation of "base lucre;" but the "learned friend" seems to have mistaken the mark. When a man bargains for the price of maintaining such or such principles, or of endeavouring to make out such or such a case, without believing in the soundness of the principles or the truth of the case; such a man, whether he touch the cash (or paper-money) before or after the performance of his work, and whether he work with his tongue or his pen, may, I think, be pretty fairly charged with seeking after "base lucre;" for he, in such case, manifestly sells not only the use of his talents, but his sincerity into the bargain, and drives a traffic as nearly allied to soul-selling as any thing in this world can be; nor does it signify a straw from *what quarter*, or in *what shape*, the remuneration may come, for the motive being base, the gain or lucre must be base also. Again, if a man receive from the taxes, that is to say, from the people's money, a reward for writing any thing, especially upon controverted political questions, the lucre accruing to him may fairly be called base; for here, as in the former case, he makes a base bargain for the use of his talents. It is the same with those, who are mere proprietors of works and not writers, and who vend their pages for a like consideration, coming from a like source. But, if a man *sell to the public*, sell to any one that *chooses* to buy with his *own money*, and resort to no means of cheating the purchaser out of the price of what is sold, there can be nothing of *baseness* attached to his gains. The article is offered to the public; those who do not choose to purchase let it alone; there is no compulsion; there is no monopoly in the way of purchasing elsewhere, and there is nothing of baseness belonging to the transaction; the gain is fair and honourable; it is the right of the possessor, and more perfectly his right, perhaps, than gain of any other sort can possibly be.

After these general observations, it is hardly necessary for me to say much upon my particular case, it being impossible that the reader should not have already perceived clearly, that the charge of seeking after "base lucre" is quite inapplicable to me. But, I cannot, upon such an occasion, refrain from stating some facts, calculated to show the injustice and falsehood of this charge, when preferred against me as proprietor of a public print. I have now been, either in America or England, sole proprietor of a public print for upwards of fourteen years, with the intermission of about a year of that time, and I never did upon any occasion whatever, take money or money's worth, for the insertion or the suppression of any paragraph or article whatsoever, though it is well known, that the practice is as common, as any other branch of the business belonging to newspapers in general. Many hundreds of pounds have been offered to me in this way, as my several clerks and agents can bear witness; and, had I hankered after "*base lucre*," the reader will readily believe that I should have received all that was so offered. From the daily newspaper, which I published after my return to England, I excluded all quack advertisements, because I looked upon them as indecent, and having a mischievous tendency, and because to insert them appeared to me to be assisting imposture. These advertisements are, it is well known, a great source of profit to the proprietors of newspapers; and, if I had been attached to "*base lucre*," should I have rejected my share of that profit? I lost many hundred of pounds by my daily newspaper, which failed, not for want of readers, but solely because I would not *take*

money in the same way that other proprietors did. Whether this were wise or foolish is now of no consequence; but, the fact is, at any rate, quite sufficient to repel the charge of seeking after "base lucre."

From my outset as a writer to the present hour, I have always preferred principle to gain. In America the King's minister made, and not at all improperly, offers of service to me, on the part of the ministry at home. The offer was put as of service to any relations that I might have in England, and my answer was, that if I could *earn any thing myself* wherewith to assist my relations, I should assist them, but that I would not be the cause of their receiving any thing out of the *public purse*. Mr. Litton, then our minister in America, can bear testimony to the truth of this statement. And, was this the conduct of a man, who sought after "base lucre?" Is this the conduct which is now fashionable among those, who call themselves "the *loyal*," and the "*king's friends*?" Do *they* reject offers of the public purse? Do *they* take care to keep their poor relations out of their own earnings or property, or do they throw them, neck and heels, upon the public to be maintained out of the taxes, as a higher order of paupers? I have acted up to my professions. I have, at this time, dependent upon me, for almost every thing, nearly *twenty children* besides my own. I walk on foot, where others would ride in a coach, that I may have the means of yielding them support; that I may have the means of preventing every one belonging to me from seeking support from the public, in any shape whatever. Is this the fashion of "the *loyal*?" Do "the *loyal*" act thus? Do *they* make sacrifices in order that their poor relations may not become a charge to the public? Let that public answer this question, and say to whom the charge of seeking after "base lucre" belongs.

I wonder whether it has ever happened to the Attorney-General to reject the offer of *two services of plate*, tendered him for the successful exertion of *his* talents? This has happened to me, though the offer, on each occasion, was made in the most delicate manner, though the service had been already performed, though the thing was done with, and the offer could not have a prospective view, and though the service had been performed without any previous application. I wonder whether Sir Vicary Gibbs did ever reject an offer of this sort? And I do wonder, how many there are amongst the whole tribe of "learned friends," who have, or ever will have, to accuse themselves of such an act? Yet has he the assurance to impute my writings to motives of "base lucre." The truth is, that I am hated by the pretended "loyal," because I am proof against all the temptations of base lucre. I have spoken of the offer made me, while in America. Upon my return home the ministers made me other offers, and, amongst the rest, they offered me a share of the *True Briton newspaper*, conducted and nominally owned by Mr. HERRIOT. I, who was what the country people call a *greenhorn*, as to such matters, and who was gull enough to think, that it was *principle* that actuated every writer on what I then deemed the right side; I was quite astonished to find, that the *Treasury* was able to offer me a share in a newspaper. I rejected the offer in the most delicate manner that I could; but, I never was forgiven. I have experienced, as might have been expected, every species of abuse since that time; but, I did not, I must confess, expect ever to be accused of writing for "base lucre." This is a charge, which, as I showed upon the trial, originated with the

very scum of the press, and had its foundation in the worst and most villanous of passions.

In general it is a topic of exultation, that industry and talent are rewarded with the possession of *wealth*. The great object of the teachers of youth, in this country, seems always to have been the instilling into their minds, that *wealth* was the sure reward of industry and ability. Upon what ground, then, is it that the "*amassing of wealth*," the "*making of a fortune*," by the use of industry and talents, is to be considered as meriting reproach in *me*? The fact is not true. I have not *amassed wealth*, and have not *made a fortune*, in any fair sense of those phrases. I do not possess a quarter part as much as I should, in all probability, have gained, by the use of the same degree of industry and ability, in trade or commerce. But, if the fact were otherwise, and if I rode in a coach and four instead of keeping one pleasure horse, and that one only because it is thought necessary to the health of my wife; if I had really a fortune worthy of being so called, what right would any one have to reproach me with the possession of it? I have been labouring seventeen years, since I quitted the army. I have never known what it was to enjoy any of that which the world calls pleasure. From a beginning with nothing I have acquired the means of making some little provision for a family of *six children* (the remains of *thirteen*), besides having, for several years, maintained almost wholly, three times as many children of my relations. And, am I to be reproached as a lover of "*base lucre*," because I begin to have a prospect (for it is nothing more) of making such provision? And, am I now, upon such a charge, to be stripped, in one way or another, of the means of making such provision? Was it not manly and brave for the Attorney-General, when he knew that I should not be permitted to answer him, to make such an attack, not only upon me, but upon the future comfort of those, who depend upon me for support? Verily, *this* is not to be forgotten presently. As long as I or my children are able to remember, *this* will be borne in mind; and, I have not the smallest doubt of seeing the day, when Sir Vicary Gibbs, and those who belong to him, will not think of any such thing as that of reproaching us with the possession of our own earnings.

During the time that I was absent from home for the purpose of giving bail, as before stated, a man, dressed like a gentleman, went upon my land in the neighbourhood of Botley, got into conversation with my servants, asked them how much property I had, where it lay, of whom I had purchased it, what I had given for it, whether I was upon the point of purchasing any more, and a great many other questions of the same sort. When he went away from one of them, he told him: "You will not have Cobbett here again for one while;" or words to that effect. I leave the public to form their opinions as to the object of this visit, and of the person who made it. The truth of the fact can, at any time, be verified upon oath. If this scoundrel had been put to the test, I wonder what account *he* could have rendered of the source of his means; of the money which had purchased the clothes upon his back. Not long before the time just mentioned, another person of a similar description went to another man who works for me, asked him what sort of a man I was, what he had ever heard me say *about the King or the government*, and told him that *some people thought me a very great enemy of the government*. The person went into a little public-house in the neighbourhood of my farm, where he got into conversation with those whom he found

there, and contrived soon to make that conversation turn upon me. He heard nothing but good of me as a neighbour and a master; and, as to *politics*, not a soul that he talked to knew what he meant, never having in their lives heard me utter a word upon any subject of that sort. Of the two servants, whom I have alluded to above, the name of the former is JOHN DEAN, and that of the latter JAMES COWHERD; both of them men, upon whose word I can rely, and who, as I said before, are ready to verify this statement upon their oaths.

The modesty and good manners of my men induced them to give answers to the questions of these base rascals, without suspecting any thing of their real character or design; nor had either of them the smallest notion of that design, until my return home, and until I had acquainted them with the nature of my situation. If the design (which must, I think, be manifest enough to the reader) had been known, their bones, or, at least, their skin, would, I am afraid, have carried off a testimonial of their baseness and of the indignation of my servants. The base miscreants would then have had a *feeling* proof of the sentiments entertained towards me by those who knew me best, and have had the greatest experience of my disposition.

I leave the public to ruminate upon what I have here stated, relative to the inquiries of these villains. The miscreant, who went to make the inquiries about the extent of my property, did not, it seems, go to Botley, but appeared to go from, and to return to, some town or village upon the Gosport-road, fearing, apparently, to be known, or, at least, traced, if he put up at the inn at Botley.

I leave the public, I say, to form their opinion upon these facts. It is, I think, quite unnecessary for me to give any opinion of my own.

One cannot, however, help observing how very finely all these things agree with the notion, now and occasionally heretofore endeavoured to be propagated, that I am *a person not worthy of notice*. This notion agrees admirably with all that the public has seen and heard for the last twelve months, during which time there has been more written and printed against me individually than would, if collected together, make twenty thick quarto volumes; and (melancholy to relate!) without producing the loss of one of my friends, the falling off of one of my readers, or the robbing me of one wink of my sleep, while my enemies, if upon any occasion they dare show themselves, become objects of public hatred and scorn; and I solemnly declare, that I would rather commit the horrid and cowardly act of suicide than change names and characters with the very best, or rather, the least bad, of all those enemies, whether I look amongst the young or the old, amongst the profligates or the hypocrites, amongst the daring robbers or the sly and smooth cheaters.

My readers know, that, besides the Political Register, I have undertaken, and am carrying on, three other publications, namely, The PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY, the PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, and the STATE TRIALS; and, under the present circumstances, I think it will not be deemed egotistic if I say something about them. These works, particularly the former and the latter, so far from being undertaken with a hope of merely *gaining money*, were undertaken with the *certainty of sinking* money, for some time, at least; probably for many years; and possibly for ever. They were works which, though absolutely necessary to the completing of our political libraries, none of the booksellers in London, though many of them are possessed of ten times my pecuniary means,

would venture to undertake. After long waiting they promise profit; but, it must be evident to every man at all acquainted with the matter, that "*base lucre*" could form no part of the object with which they were undertaken. I have heard others applauded for their *public spirit* in encountering what have been called *great national works*. What a clutter was made in this way about large editions of Shakspeare and Milton, which were, at last, got rid of by the means of a *Lottery*, authorized by Act of Parliament. The terms *liberality* and *munificence* were given to the undertakers of those works; but, was there any thing in them of *national utility* worthy of being compared with these works of mine? I have encountered these works, unaided by any body; I shall ask the Honourable House for no Lottery to carry them through; I trust solely for their real *intrinsic merit* for their success; and, if they do succeed, shall I therefore be accused of seeking after "*base lucre*?" This work, of which I now begin the *Eighteenth Volume*, has had nothing to support it but its own merits. Not a pound, not even a pound in paper-money, was ever expended upon advertising it. It came up like a grain of mustard seed, and, like a grain of mustard seed, it has spread over the whole civilized world. And why has it spread more than other publications of the same kind? There have not been wanting imitations of it. There have been some dozens of them, I believe. Same size, same form, same type, same heads of matter, same title, all but the word expressing my name. How many efforts have been made to tempt the public away from me, while not one attempt has been made by me to prevent it! Yet all have failed. The changeling has been discovered, and the wretched adventurers have then endeavoured to wreak their vengeance on me. They have sworn that I write badly; that I publish nothing but trash; that I am both fool and knave. But, still the readers hang on to me. One would think, as Falstaff says, that I had given them love powder. No: but I have given them as great a rarity, and something full as attractive; namely, *truth in clear language*. I have stripped statement and reasoning of the foppery of affectation; and, amongst my other sins, is that of having shown, of having proved beyond all dispute, that very much of what is called "*learning*" is imposture, quite useless to any man whom God has blessed with brains. The public, however much in many cases, some of them dissent from my opinions, will never be persuaded that my views are *inimical to my country*, or have any *dishonourable object*. Nothing will ever persuade *any man*, be he who he may, sincerely to believe this. There are many, who will pretend to believe it; but, they will not believe it, at bottom, and they will read on. The public has perceived in me a sort of conduct towards my adversaries, which they never witnessed in any other public writer. They have seen, that I always insert and give publicity to, whatever is sent in answer to myself. This is a proof of my love of truth ten thousand times stronger than any professions however strong. It is a *speaking fact*, which is always the thing to produce the most impression. The Register has created in England, and, even in other countries, a new taste in reading, and an entirely new set of notions upon political matters; and can it be possible, that any one is to be persuaded, that such an effect is to be produced by mere *libelling*? No: nor will any one believe, that it is to be produced by a mind bent upon "*base lucre*." If "*base lucre*" had been my principal object, or, indeed, if it had been a considerable object with me, I never should have written with

effect; because to write with effect, one's mind must be *free*, which it never can be if the love of gain be uppermost. Besides, how inconsistent is this charge of "*base lucre*" with the charge of *sedition intentions*? The two things are absolutely incompatible with one another; for, if insurrection and confusion were to take place, all the works above mentioned, all the numerous volumes of those works, whence my profits are to come, if they come at all, would at once, cease to be of any more use than so many square bits of wood. For a man, who has real property, to wish for the annihilation of those laws, by which alone that property is secured to him, is not very likely; for a man, who, like me is planting trees and sowing acorns and making roads and breaking up wastes, to wish for the destruction of order and law and property is still less likely; but, for a man, the chief part of whose property consists of what must of necessity become mere waste-paper in case of a destruction of order and law, for such a man to wish for such destruction is utterly out of belief, and quite *impossible* if he be a seeker after "*base lucre*."

So much for the two first assertions of the Attorney-General. The THIRD, namely, that the ARMY was anxious to see me punished, I will inquire into in my next.

The reader will, I am sure, excuse me for giving, under the present circumstances, the precedence to observations more immediately relating to myself; but, he need not fear, that I shall trespass much upon him in this way. I shall resume my usual course of proceeding, and according to my former practice, leave my calumniators to choke in their own gall.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Friday, July 13th, 1810.

TO THE READER.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register*, July, 1810.)

"The army, against whom this libel is in a peculiar manner directed, calls on the Court for justice against its traducer."—*Attorney-General's Speech.*

IN my last Letter I stated the *Three* famous assertions of the Attorney-General. On two of them I made my intended observations; and, if I may judge from the letters I have received upon the subject, and from other indications not less certain, the public are of opinion, those two assertions, though so boldly made, received from me a complete refutation. It remains for me to notice the THIRD, which was that THE ARMY called upon the Court to punish me. The words, as given in the report, were these:—"THE ARMY, against whom this libel is in a peculiar manner directed, CALLS ON THE COURT for justice against its traducer."

Now, in the first place, in what way have I, in writing and publishing the article in question, deserved the appellation here given to me? In what way have I traduced the army? Where is there, in that article, an expression levelled at the character of the army, or at the interest of the army? I was accused, indeed, by the Attorney-General, of endeavouring to injure the military service; but, what proof; what fact:

what argument, was produced, in support of this assertion of my having *traduced the army*? Not a word did I utter against the army, or against the military profession. Nay, that this assertion might not yield to any of the others in point of consistency, it is made in the same speech, in which I am accused of endeavours to *seduce* the army. I am represented as being, at one and the same moment, and with reference to one and the same act, both a *traducer* and a *seducer*. The audience were told of the dreadful consequences that might have ensued from my acts of seduction. I was represented as deserving of peculiarly heavy punishment on account of the dangerousness of my efforts, which efforts did, as was asserted, directly tend to excite the army to mutiny. Well? But was this to be done by *traducing* that army? Are men, or at least, men with brains in their skulls, given to yield to the incitements of those who *traduce* them? I deny the fact; indeed, there is not the semblance of truth in it; but, for a moment and merely for argument's sake, admit the fact, is it to be believed, is it credible, is it *possible*, that the army should look upon me as its *traducer*, that, as such, it should *call for punishment on my head*, and yet, that, at the very same time, my efforts obviously tended to *seduce* them from their lawful obedience, and to invite them to follow my wishes in works of mutiny. That this should be true is impossible. I was accused of representing the Local Militia at Ely of being *too hardly dealt with*. But, let us take the Attorney-General's own words. The former, in the speech now referred to, said, that the tendency of my publication was, "to encourage the soldiers to impatience, "insubordination, and disgust; to tell them *that they were hardly, cruelly, and tyrannically dealt with.*" That I said, that the affair at Ely "was *not to be called a mutiny*, and that it was a mere *squabble* between the men and their officers for a trifle of money." Well, no matter what was the fact, here the effect was not, surely, to excite *anger and resentment* in the bosoms of the army, and to induce them to call for punishment upon my head. Here was nothing of *traduction* at any rate. But, in this as in every other respect, assertion was quite secure; there being no *answer* on my part allowed.

Let us now view this assertion in another light. We have, of late years, grown wonderfully familiar with *military* notions and influence. From some cause or other; from the fear of invasion or of revolution, or from some cause that we ourselves, perhaps, do not clearly perceive, we have become most miraculously reconciled to military means. A bookseller advertises for sale "*A Digest of the Military Law of England.*" I could not help remarking, that during the debates upon the petition of poor CAPTAIN FOSKETT, the phrase "*military government of the country,*" was frequently made use of; and, I believe, in one or two instances, even by MR. WHITBREAD. But, I must confess, that, when the Attorney-General told the judges in so many words, that "*THE ARMY called upon them*" to do justice upon me, I was surprised. He had said every thing else that he could think of to induce them to inflict a heavy punishment upon me; and, as if nothing was sufficient without it, he concluded with a declaration, that I was a *traducer of the army*, and that, as such, the army *called upon the judges to punish me*. Very strange things have, at different times, been witnessed in that court; but, I believe, this was the very first time that English judges had been told to their teeth, in so many plain words, that the army, that the military, that men with arms in their hands, called upon them for such or such a sen-

tence on a man standing at their bar. A great deal has been said about the constitution prohibiting a standing army in time of peace, without consent of Parliament: such is our dread of the precious "*freedom of election*" being violated by the military, that soldiers are kept at a distance from places where elections are going on: the changes have, indeed, been rung upon the perfect *subserviency of the military to the civil power*: but, what, in the name of common sense, does all this mean, if the judges, when sitting to pass judgment, are to be told, and by an officer of the King too, that *the army calls upon them for such or such a judgment*? The prosecution was by information of the Attorney-General; that is, the Attorney-General, an officer appointed by the King and holding his office during pleasure, commences the prosecution in the King's name, and when he comes to apply for judgment, he tells the judges, that *the army calls upon them to punish the person prosecuted, because that person is a traducer of that army!* I will not ask what this is like, or what it is not like. I will make no *comparisons*, and, indeed, to make any, or to observe further upon this point would be quite useless. Every reader will turn the thing over in his mind, and will, I am sure, come to a proper conclusion.

But, let no one suppose for a moment, that I believe that it was *true* that the ARMY *called on the judges to punish me*. Let no one suppose, that I believe this to be true; for, I must first believe, that the army are the most ungrateful and most base of all mankind, I never having, in all my life, done or said any thing respecting the army, that was not intended for its good.

Those who have been in the habit of reading the Register for some years, must have witnessed the pains that I have taken, upon numerous occasions, to exalt the character of the soldier, to remove the prejudices that existed against his profession, and to make those engaged in the military service an object of respect and affection amongst the people in general. Many are the instances, in which I have been blamed for this; many are the instances in which I have been most grossly abused for this, aye, and by those, too, who are now my assailants upon the opposite ground. It will be recollected, that I have constantly objected to every thing, which tended to *lower* the military character; that every scheme (and schemes enough we have had) which had a tendency to degrade the profession of a soldier by giving of the military dress and rank to those who were not soldiers, has received my marked disapprobation; that the tinker and pastry-cook race of officers have always been an object of ridicule with me, not because I disapproved of them in their *proper place*, but because they were put forward in a way to do wrong to the really military men.

In the defence of *injured officers*, who is there belonging to the press, besides myself, that has devoted one single page of their works? And, when have I refused the application of any such officer? I have, at various times, urged the propriety of making legal provision that no commissioned officer should be cashiered without a previous sentence of a court-martial to that effect. This proposition might be thought very foolish by the officers of the army, who might like it best to be liable to cashiering at pleasure; but, it will, I think, be looked upon as very improbable, if not as quite impossible, that the officers of the army should harbour any resentment against me on this account; and, indeed, that they should not feel, for this cause alone, some small degree of gratitude

towards me. It is impossible, that they should feel anger towards a person, who, with all his means, endeavoured to render them somewhat more independent than they were.

Upon several occasions, I have recommended an advance in the *pay of the Commissioned Officers* particularly; and, in one instance, I showed the justice of this, upon the same principle that the salaries of the judges and other persons in office with fixed salaries, had been raised. I reminded the late Ministry of this, when they brought forward the proposition for augmenting the pecuniary allowances to the several branches of the King's family. The great argument in support of such augmentation was, that provisions of every sort, and, indeed, every article necessary to support life or to give splendour to rank, had almost *doubled in price*, since the salaries then in existence were fixed. It was not said, that *money had depreciated one half*. But, that was no matter. To vulgar minds a *rise in prices* is the clearest idea. Well, said I (without now questioning the propriety; or, rather, without making that a matter of discussion), if the *rise of prices* be a good ground for augmenting the allowances to the Duke of Cumberland, for instance, it is surely as good a ground for augmenting the *pay of the army*, and especially of the commissioned officers, who are not, like the non-commissioned officers and private men, protected, in some measure, against this rise in prices, by the rations of bread and meat, which they always have at a fixed price. I do not know, whether the commissioned officers have this allowance also; but, if they have, their mere eatables, their mere bread and meat, make but a very small portion of their expenses.

Here again I might be mistaken; there might be no analogy in the cases of the officers of the army and the members of the King's family; it might be quite fit to augment the allowances of the latter, upon an argument of a rise in prices, and not to augment the pay of the former; all this might be, and, of course, I might be wrong, and what I said extremely foolish; but, I am sure, that no one will believe it possible that *the Army should dislike me for it*; no one will believe it possible, that what I said upon that occasion could be construed into *iraduction* of the army; no one will believe it possible, that I, by the augmentation I then proposed to be made to the pay of the army, wished to render that army inefficient and mutinous; no; nor will any one ever believe, that the man, from whom that proposition came, was a secker after "*base lucre*," seeing that part of that augmentation must have been borne by himself, without the possibility of his ever deriving any individual benefit therefrom.

Upon a very recent occasion, when much ill blood existed against the Army, especially in this metropolis, did I join those, whose pens or tongues were at work against the military? On the contrary, every word that I said manifestly tended to allay the resentment that had been excited against the soldiers. I allude to the time of Sir Francis Burdett's commitment to the Tower, and to my Register, where I endeavoured to allay this popular resentment. In speaking of the blood that had been spilt, I said:

"I cannot help exhorting such of the people as my Register may reach, to reflect well before they fix upon the objects of their blame in this respect. Soldiers are but mere machines; they are bound to implicit obedience; a refusal to obey is mutiny; mutiny is punished with death. The people should, therefore, upon such occasions, bear this in their minds; and should, besides

“ consider, that men in red coats have *feelings* as well as other men, and cannot be expected to bear without resentment, the scoffings and peltings of the people, whom, in fact, *they* can have done nothing to offend. The people should bear in mind, that the soldiers are their *own countrymen*; that they have, in reality, all the same interests, as to public matters, that the people have; that they are their sons and their brothers and their nephews; and, though there may be, and doubtless are, persons, who may, upon some occasions, endeavour to persuade the soldiers, that they have an interest *separate and different from that of the people*, the fact is not so; for all of us, whether clad in red coats or in brown coats, must, in the end, be equally affected by every public measure.”

Was this spoken like an enemy of the army? Could the man, who wrote and published and sent these words to the ends of the earth, be a *traducer* of the army? And, will the reader believe, that any single soul in that army, worthy of the name of soldier or of Englishman, has now called upon the Judges to punish me as the *traducer* of the army? Read my work from the first page to the last, and, if you therein find a single instance of my having attempted, though in the slightest way, to detract from the character or profession of a soldier, and especially from the character of the English army, I will give you leave to treat me even worse than I have already been treated. It has been my constant endeavour, as often as opportunity has offered, to remove from the minds of the people all prejudices against the army, being of opinion that those prejudices must, in every way in which they can operate, be injurious to the country, and may, possibly, endanger its independence; for after all, in any case of great emergency, what would any army be able to do without the people were with them? The people are *the country*, and no country, as Prussia and Austria and Italy and Naples and many other nations can tell, was ever yet defended without its own aid, without its own native and cordial exertions. For these reasons I have constantly inculcated a regard and affection for those of our countrymen who are kept in arms; as far as my influence has been able to reach there is no prejudice existing against soldiers; I have endeavoured to show, and I have shown, that it is to be very *stupid* as well as *ungenerous*, to consider a man as being the worse because he has entered upon a way of life that exposes him to bleed in defence of his country; and, that, if there were no *other* reason for combatting this prejudice, it would be a quite sufficient reason, that the existence of it must of necessity be desired *by every enemy of the liberties of the country*. To such persons it must be gratifying in the highest degree to see an animosity existing between the people and the soldiery. It has made part of the system of every despot to keep the soldiers and the people in a state of hostility, in a state of constant suspicion and hatred of one another. Let the reader judge, then, whether I, who am accused of a desire to introduce revolution, am a likely man to *traduce* the army to the people; or to do any other act, calculated to make the people dislike the army. Were there not a single *fact* to show the contrary, reasoning upon general principles would forbid any man to believe, that I disliked the army, or that the army could possibly dislike me.

To the army, to every soldier in it, I have a bond of attachment quite independent of any *political* reasonings or considerations. I have been a soldier myself, and for no small number of years, at that time of life when the feelings are most ardent and when the strongest attachments are formed. “Once a soldier always a soldier,” is a maxim, the truth

of which I need not insist on to any one who has ever served in the army for any length of time, and especially if the service he has seen has embraced those scenes and occasions where every man, first or last, from one cause or another, owes the preservation of his all, health and life not excepted, to the kindness, the generosity, the fellow feeling, of his comrades. A community of monks hate one another, because they are compelled to live together, and do not stand in need of each other's voluntary assistance in the procuring of the things necessary to health and life. It is precisely the contrary with soldiers. And, a soldier has not only a regard of all the men of his own corps, but, in a degree a little fainter, for all the soldiers in the army. Nay, the soldiers of two hostile armies have a feeling of friendship for each other; and, this feeling and the acts arising from it, have, when occasion has offered, always been found to exist in proportion to the bravery with which they have fought against each other.

Of this military feeling I do not believe that any man ever possessed a greater portion than myself. I was eight years in the army, during which time I associated less with people out of the army than any soldier that I ever knew. This partiality I have always retained. I like soldiers, as a class in life, better than any other description of men. Their conversation is more pleasing to me; they have generally seen more than other men; they have less of vulgar prejudice about them; to which may be added, that, having felt hardships themselves, they know how to feel for others. This does not, indeed, apply to such as those of whom Mrs. Clarke was the protectress; but to those who have seen service, or who depend solely upon their merit for their success. Amongst soldiers, less than amongst any other description of men, have I observed the vices of *lying* and *hypocrisy*. I do not recollect a single instance of a soldier in any corps, having betrayed, or given up, or exposed, another soldier, even for the sake of saving himself from most terrible punishment; and, as for selfishness, a soldier, who would not give his dinner, his day's provisions, to a comrade in want, would be looked upon as an unnatural brute. It is not to be expected that such generosity of feeling should be found amongst the mass of mankind: those who have not known the vicissitudes and the many wants of the soldier's life, cannot be expected to have the soldier's feeling: I have known the one, and I possess the other; and, notwithstanding I have now been accused of hankering after nothing but "*base lucre*," upon this feeling I have always acted. Aye, and upon this feeling I shall have been known to have acted, too, in spite of all that can be done to misrepresent me to the army.

Under the present circumstances there is nothing which I can say of myself that can fairly be called egotism; and, there is nothing in praise of my conduct, which can with truth, be said, that ought not to be said. Being of this opinion, and being *sure* that every just and sensible man will join therein, I will here introduce a fact or two, which, under any other circumstances, it would be a shame to mention.

Lover as I am of "*base lucre*," no soul in distress was ever sent empty from my door, be the cause of that distress what it might. But, to soldiers, and their wives and children; to every creature bearing the name or mark or sign of military service about it, I, nor any one belonging to me, ever omitted to show particular marks of compassion and kindness. I wish the public could now pass in review before them all the unfortunate soldiers that have come to my door and those who have

been to the door of the man who has called me the "*traducer*" of the army. Would to God that this exhibition could take place, and that an inquiry could be made as to the reception that each had met with! I should not be afraid of the comparison, though he represents me as the *enemy of the army*; as a man whom *the army calls upon the Judges to punish*.

Late in October, or early in November last, returning home in the dusk of the evening, I found our village full of soldiers. There were about *five hundred* men (a number nearly equal to the whole population of the parish), who had arrived at Portsmouth, last from Portugal; many of whom had been at the battle of Talavera, and had served in both the arduous and fatal campaigns in Spain; and most of whom had suffered either from sickness or from wounds actually received in battle. These men, who had *landed at Portsmouth that same morning*, had marched *eighteen miles* to Botley, where they found for their accommodation *one small Inn* and *three Public-houses*. All the *beds* in the whole village, and in the whole parish to its utmost limits, including the bed of every cottager, would not have lodged these men and their wives and children, and all the *victuals* in the parish would not, of course, have furnished them with a single meal, without taking from the meals of the people of the parish. The stables, barns, and every other place, in which a man could lie down out of the way of actual rain, were prepared with straw. Every body in the village was ready to give up all his room to these people, whose every garment and limb and feature bespoke the misery they had undergone. It was rather unfortunate that both myself and my wife were from home when they arrived in the village, or I should have lodged a company or two of the privates at least. I found the greater part of them already gone to their straw lodging, and, therefore, I could do nothing for them; but, I brought two of the officers (the Commanding Officer and another) to my house, not having spare beds for any more, upon so short a notice. The next day, which happened to be a Sunday, the whole of the officers, thirteen or fourteen in number, lived at my house the whole of the day; and of all my whole life, during which I have spent but very few unpleasant days, I never spent so pleasant a day as that. After a lapse of sixteen years, I once more saw myself at table with nothing but soldiers; nothing but men in red coats; and I felt so happy at being able to give them proofs of my attachment. I never, upon any occasion, so much enjoyed, never so sensibly felt, the benefits of having been industrious and economical. My guests, on their part, soon found that they were at home, and gave full scope to that disposition to gaiety, which prevails amongst soldiers, and particularly after long-endured hardships. It was the first whole day of their being in England from the time they had quitted it; and certain I am, that not a man of them has since seen a happier. On the Monday morning, before day-light, my whole family, children and all, were up to prepare them a breakfast, and to bid them farewell; and, when they left us, the Commanding Officer, who was a modest and sensible Scotchman, observed, that he had, in his life, *heard* much of English hospitality, but that, at Botley, he had *seen* and *felt* it.

Now, this was no more than what it was my duty to do towards these gentlemen, some of whom had been wounded, and all of whom had greatly suffered, in *their* endeavours, at least, to serve their country, while I and my family had been living at home in ease, comfort, and

security; and, it was a duty peculiarly incumbent upon me, who had been a soldier myself, and who knew to what hardships they had been exposed by sea as well as by land. There might, too, perhaps, if the workings of my heart could have been nicely analysed, be something of vanity in my motives, though I do not believe that there was. But, at any rate, I think I may defy even the Devil, in whatever character he may choose to appear, to ascribe this action to *enmity to the army*; or to a disposition, or a feeling towards the army, that would lead me to *traduce* them. What, then! was it that army, to which these gentlemen belonged, who called upon the Judges to punish me? Did this call come from those who experienced the hospitalities of Botley? Did *they* accuse me of being their *traducer*, and as being such, call upon the Judges to shut me up in prison and to load me with fines and securities? And would *they* have accused me of being a lover of "*base lucre*?"

To bring forward to the public, and especially in a work of my own, the relation of a fact like this, would, as I observed before, be a shame, under almost *any* other circumstances than the present; but, under these circumstances, it will, I am confident, be, by every lover of truth, deemed perfectly justifiable. I am, however, less anxious to clear myself to the public from the charge of being a "*traducer*" of the army, than I am to clear myself of that charge to the army itself. I wish not to be thought, and I will not be thought, an enemy or a traducer of the army. I have always been a friend of the army; I have never traduced it. I have spent hours and days and weeks in studying how the bettering of the situation of the army might be combined with its efficiency, and both with the security of the country's civil and political liberties. The plan of *service for term of years*, which was so generally approved of, was, I believe, first suggested to Mr. Windham by me. Soon after he was in office, I drew up, in consequence of previous communication with him, the Plan which I afterwards published, on the 22nd of March, 1806; and, this Plan I will here republish. With some slight alterations (which, perhaps, I myself would now make) Mr. Windham would, if he could, have adopted this plan. I by no means look upon it as a perfect thing. I have not the vanity to suppose, that, in so great a matter, it was likely that I should devise a faultless scheme. But, the plan, such as it is, contains quite sufficient proof, that I was no *enemy of the army*; that I was no *traducer* of the army; and that I *wished*, at least, to see formed such a military force as should, at all times, under all circumstances, in all emergencies, render England perfectly safe, defended by the arms of her own sons, who, while they were soldiers, and well-disciplined and efficient soldiers, should have all the interests and all the feelings of citizens, and who, in defending the soil of their country, should be sensible that they were defending its rights and liberties. I must beg leave to press upon the reader the request, that he will have the patience to peruse the whole of this Plan, together with the *Introduction*, long as they are; for here I have put upon record a full statement of my opinions and principles, relating to the army. At the time when I was so zealously engaged in endeavouring to cause this plan to be put into execution, little did I imagine, that I was one day to be held forth as an *enemy to the army*, as a *traducer* of the army, and to hear the Judges told, that that army called upon them to shut my person up in a prison, and to fine me to the amount of, perhaps, more than what would fall to the share of one of my children; but, galling and grievous

as this is, I would rather endure it ten times told, than be for one moment thought a “*traducer* of the army,” and such, I again repeat it, *I will not be thought.*

I now insert my Plan, just as it was published in 1806.

A PLAN

FOR THE FORMING OF AN EFFICIENT AND PERMANENT ARMY.

“Whilst we describe, however, the advantages of standing armies, we must not conceal the danger. These properties of their constitution—the soldiery being separated, in a great degree, from the rest of the community, their being closely linked amongst themselves by habits of society and subordination, and the dependency of the whole chain upon the will and favour of the prince—however essential they may be to the purposes for which armies are kept up, give them an aspect in nowise favourable to public liberty. The danger, however, is diminished by maintaining, upon all occasions, as much alliance of interest, and as much intercourse of sentiment, between the military part of the nation and the other people, as are consistent with the union and discipline of an army.”—PALFREY: *Moral and Political Philosophy*; Book VI. Chap. 12.

INTRODUCTION.—Many have been the occasions upon which, from different motives perhaps, different persons have endeavoured to throw blame upon me for having, in a manner so unqualified, condemned the present military system (if, indeed, it be worthy of that name, or of any other conveying the idea of something resulting from fixed principles), without having proposed any other-system as a substitute for it; and, upon this ground, a correspondent, in one of my former numbers, who is, I think, more kind in his manner than in his matter, revives this subject of censure, for the effect of which censure he appears to consider the present time peculiarly favourable. But, as the “heaven-born minister” used to say with respect to *his* audience, I am in the hearing of my readers when I say, without fear of contradiction, that I have, upon scarcely any one occasion, ever condemned the constitution of our present military force, without at the same time, pointing out what appeared to me to be proper to be adopted in its place. In doing this, I have, indeed, confined myself, in most cases, to general terms; to the statement of principles; but, with those who read the Register, that must, I think, be regarded as quite sufficient to protect me against the blame of which we have been speaking; for, the principles being once laid down, the detail is a mere matter of professional arrangement. Now, however, when every man in the kingdom is so anxiously waiting to hear *precisely what is to be done* for the purpose of obtaining an efficient and permanent army; now, when the minister at the head of the war-department is so keenly pursued and so hardly pressed for an explicit declaration of his intentions relative thereto; at such a moment, though I think the impatience of some impertinent, and of all, unreasonable in the extreme, especially when the shortness of the time be compared with the magnitude of the subject; though I think it perfectly justifiable and proper in him to refuse to gratify such impertinence, and such childish impatience; yet, with respect to myself, I have no desire, and ought to have no desire, to suspend an ample declaration of my opinions, which, compared to his, are of trifling importance.

As, from the Plan which I am about to submit to the public, being in the form of a letter, addressed to a friend, it might, were I to observe a silence upon the subject, be concluded, that this is the Plan that Mr. WINDHAM intends, or wishes, or has intended, or wished, to put in execution, it is proper that I should, before I proceed any further, explicitly declare, that there is not, that I know of, and that there never has been, any intention or wish, on the part of that gentleman, to adopt this plan, or to see it adopted; and, that, if he has, as it is probable he has, been induced to take the trouble to read it, I am almost (and I might spare even the *almost*) entirely ignorant with regard to his opinion thereof. The advantage to have been derived from leaving this fact as a matter of doubt, will, when the weight justly attached to a supposed approbation from such a person be considered, be evident to every one; but, it is an advantage which justice to Mr. Windham commands me to forego, and of which, I am, besides, desirous not to avail myself; because I wish the Plan to come before the public without any other recommendation than that of its own bare merits, however small they may appear to be.

In speaking to the person, to whom the following Letter was (more than a month ago) addressed, it was unnecessary, in the preliminary observations, to express myself in a manner quite so full as I should have expressed myself had I been speaking to the public; and, therefore, I must beg leave to supply the deficiency by adding to the length of this INTRODUCTION.

The reader will not have forgotten, that, in speaking of what ought to be done for the purpose of effecting the great object in view, I have always given it as my decided opinion, 1st, That, there ought to be, as far as related to the nature of the engagement of the soldier, but *one sort of army*; 2ndly, That that army should be of an *efficient and permanent* description; and, 3rdly, That it should be constituted upon principles that would render it efficient and permanent, thereunto adding the important and most desirable property of being *necessarily innoxious as to the liberties of the people*; that, to express myself in the words of the admired writer, from whom I have borrowed my motto, its constitution should be such as "to maintain, upon all occasions, as much alliance of interest, and as much intercourse of sentiment, between the military part of the nation and the other orders of the people, as are consistent with the union and discipline of an army." Upon the two first heads I have nothing now to add; and, as to the third, a few remarks upon the opinions of the enlightened, the scandalously neglected, and the now lamented PALEY may suffice.

After describing in the former part of the chapter referred to, the many great advantages which a standing army has over a temporary military force, he comes to speak, in the words chosen for my motto, of the single disadvantage, namely, the possible danger to public liberty; but this danger, he says, is diminished by the means described in the passage just quoted. *How these means are to be obtained*; how that alliance of interest and that intercourse of sentiment, which he justly represents as so essential to the great purpose in view; how these are to be obtained and insured he does not state, in a manner, at least so full and satisfactory as one could have wished. "For which purpose" (the purpose of maintaining an alliance of interest between the military and the rest of the people) "officers of the army, upon whose disposition towards the commonwealth a great deal may depend, should be taken from the princi-

“ pal families of the country, and at the same time also be encouraged to establish in it families of their own, as well as be admitted to seats in the senate, to hereditary distinctions, and to all the civil honours and privileges that are compatible with their profession : which circumstances of connection and situation will give them such a share in the general rights of the people, and so engage their inclinations on the side of public liberty, as to afford a reasonable security, that they cannot be bought by any promises of personal aggrandizement, to assist in the execution of measures, which might enslave their posterity, their kindred and their country.” When the letter, which I am now introducing to the reader, was written, I had in my mind no recollection of this passage of PALEY ; and, I was not a little pleased upon discovering the perfect coincidence, as to principle, between him and myself, upon this very interesting subject. But, if this reasoning be sound, and that it is I think no one will deny, with respect to the *officers* of the army, is it not equally sound with respect to the *men* ? PALEY wrote at a time very different indeed from the present ; his opinions applied to a state of Europe and of England when a comparatively small military force was necessary in this country ; if he had written with the present awful scene before him, with the present difficulties of collecting together men to serve in the army, I leave the reader to determine, whether the principles he has laid down would not have carried him much further. He would now have perceived, that from the great number of officers necessary to command the army, the tie growing out of mere family connection would have been of little avail ; that, as to the admission of officers to seats in the parliament and to hereditary honours, it could not have been rendered sufficiently extensive to make it a motive powerful enough for the purpose he had in view ; and, that, in short new rewards, a new set of motives, not only of attachment to public liberty, but of love for the military service, must have been created in order to obtain an army of the description of that which he wished to obtain. For my part, I am of opinion, that, if the other motives which I should propose, were created, it would be quite unnecessary to admit, during their actual service, military officers into parliament, where, to say nothing of several other weighty objections, they cannot possibly attend, without a neglect of that duty for the performance of which they become military officers. The members of parliament are chosen for the purpose of assisting at the making of laws and at inquiries relative to the disposition of the public money ; therefore, to pass over the constitutional view of the matter, how can one reconcile to reason the choosing of men who are, at any moment, liable to be sent out of the kingdom, and who, in all probability, must pass, or ought to pass, more than one half of their time beyond the seas ? Yet, in the present state of things, in the present want of motives to a military life, in the present predominance of trade, in the present preponderance of every other profession over that of the military, in point of civil and political advantages, it would be hard indeed to shut the doors of parliament against military men.

I have now before me the plans of two writers, which plans have been recently published, for the forming of a complete system of military defence : the first, who puts no name to his work, addresses himself to Mr. Windham, in a pamphlet “ ON THE PUBLIC DEFENCE,” published for the author by SKELTON, at Southampton ; the other is Major CARR-WRIGHT, who, after a dedicatory address to Mr. Fox, proceeds, in a very

elaborate and ingenious performance, entitled, "ENGLAND'S ÆGIS, OR THE MILITARY ENERGIES OF THE CONSTITUTION," calls upon us, to awaken the spirit of ancient times, and to depend for our defence upon those exertions, which a love of the country ought to inspire, and which, were his plan adopted, he expresses his confidence it would inspire. The former of these writers strongly and ably represents the magnitude of our danger; he describes the nature and amount of the enemy's force; he contends that no force but that of a regular one is at all competent to our defence; he shows by an argument of experience the utter impracticability of raising a sufficient force by the means hitherto employed; and, the only means, that, in his opinion, remain, are those of mere compulsion, as far, at least, as relates to the raising of men. "The legislature," says he, "must lay its hand upon the people; and, the levy must be immediate, *personal*, and *compulsory*." To attempt, in the short compass that I have before me, to present the reader with an analysis of a work so full of information and of thought as that of Major CARTWRIGHT, would be to deceive the reader, and to do great injustice to the laborious, the ingenious, and public-spirited writer. He does not exclude the establishment of a *regular* military force; but, his reliance for efficient, permanent, and *safe* defence, is upon the hearts and the arms of the people, animated by a love of their country, a love founded in their feeling of the super-excellence of its constitution, insuring to them the enjoyment of that freedom, and of all those blessings attendant upon freedom, which no other country enjoys. "Without freedom," says he, "complete military defence is only the evidence of complete subjugation; and, as the Batavians can tell you, my countrymen, the more triumphant the success, the more hopeless the condition of the defended. But, would we know how freedom and defence are to go hand in hand, and how civil liberty is ever to gain strength with the increase of military power, then that constitution, which is the table of our duties, the record of our rights, and the depository of our liberties, must be the object of our study and the guide of our steps."

Upon a proposition for the government's "*laying its hand upon the people*," it must, surely, be unnecessary to say any thing; or, if it be at all necessary, one may content oneself with asking the author of the proposition, what could be the *object* of a *defence* to be effected by such means? *What* he thinks that a people, so "*laid hands on*," would have to *defend*? Whether, in speaking of the defence of the nation, we are to consider the *people* as not at all interested in the result? In short, and to make but one question of it, what, in his opinion, Buonaparte could do to the people *more* than "*lay his hand*" upon them? Until this question be answered, it would be loss of time to attempt to reason with this writer, to whose motives, however, I am inclined to attach nothing calling for blame. As to the principles, generally speaking, upon which the plan of Major CARTWRIGHT is founded, they are such as every man, who wishes to see the energies of the constitution exerted to the best of all ends, must agree in. But, though the Major has evidently bestowed much time and thought upon the subject, has he duly considered the great change which has now taken place in this country as well as in Europe? Has he duly considered what is that species of force which we shall have to resist? Has he duly considered how much depends upon celerity in preparing our means of resistance? Has he duly considered what are the real causes of the state of decline in which he

finds the constitutional energies of England? Has he duly reflected upon the *where-about*, if we would obtain success, we must *begin* in effecting the restoration of those energies? And, which is, perhaps, all I am entitled to ask of him, does he, upon a calm view of all the circumstances of our situation, not think that some such plan as that now proposed by me, would, under these circumstances, be likely to render the defence of the country efficient, without endangering the liberties of the people or the constitutional prerogatives of the Crown? I ask him, and not by way of rhetorical figure, but really with a view of obtaining an answer, whether he does not think, that, while my plan would not fail "to give strength to civil liberty at the same time that it increased military power," it would not be more likely to be attended with immediate effect, than the plan which he has proposed? He will observe, that I take the state of things as it *now is*; I view the nation loaded with a debt demanding twenty-seven millions annually to pay the interest; I see two or three millions annually raised for the purpose of paying tax-gatherers and other dependents upon the ministry of the day; I perceive the existence of a trading and fiscal influence over-shadowing and over-bearing every thing; and, my object is to aid in the cure of these evils, by the very means that I provide for an efficient defence of the country and of the throne.

I am not so wedded to this or to any other project as to be deaf to the voice of reason; and, if objections are made to it, I shall give them my attention, and shall not fail to communicate them to my readers. But, of one thing all reasonable men seem to be thoroughly convinced, namely, that some change is absolutely necessary; some great change; something new and something great; something capable of producing a powerful effect upon the minds of the people; something even, that shall produce a renovation in the public mind with regard to military service and national defence. *Money* has been tried in all the shapes that it can be presented; and, I am, for my part, perfectly satisfied, that *compulsory enrolment*, supposing it to succeed, would, if the day of trial came, prove to be much worse than nothing. We are now arrived at that point, when a mere hired army will no longer suffice; when we want the hearts of the people wherewith to preserve the independence of the country; and, to make a successful appeal to this excellent and never-failing mass of means, what can be better calculated than the plan I propose? England, fortunate in her local situation, in the form and natural tendency of her constitution of government, in the industry, the honesty, the bodily and mental capacities, the hardihood, and the bravery of her sons, has, notwithstanding the present unfavourable and even ominous appearances, many solid advantages over her enemy, all covered as he is with the brilliancy of war and of triumph. She has, as I have recently heard it well remarked, a settled government; he has none. She has laws and institutions which, at the most, want only amendment, or reform; he has neither laws nor institutions that are as yet held in habitual reverence. She has an order of things that depends not for existence upon the life, or the lives of any man, or any number of men; the order of things which he has founded hangs, perhaps, upon a single life. If she be cut off from the continent of Europe, she is, by the same means, relieved from all the burden of dependence upon foreign aid; while he, in proportion as he extends the arm of his power, multiplies the object of his attention and the chances of demolishing the rampart, by which he is

surrounding himself. The world has never yet witnessed a long duration of harmony amongst numerous contiguous states, more especially when held by sovereigns connected by ties of consanguinity; and, therefore, even from the recent disasters, even from the general overthrow of Europe, there breaks forth a prospect of future hope to England. But, to be able to profit from the events that time may bring with him, we must have the wisdom and the virtue to put ourselves in a condition to wait for his arrival. We must now place no dependence on the immediate success either of war or of peace. Whether at war or peace, the enemy will seek our subjugation; and, therefore, to meet this his settled purpose, we must be equally steady, persevering, and patient, in our plans and our execution. No man should now throw away his time in devising any means, whether for external or internal effect, which are not, in their very nature, durable, which have not in them consequences of twenty years or of fifty years to come. The man, whose mind stretches not forward beyond the days of his probable life, is now fit neither for statesman nor legislator. Before the preservation of the liberties and of the renown of England all views of personal aggrandizement, of family interest, and of party triumph, must now vanish like the pleasures of the world before the awful approach of eternity, or, we may indeed anticipate the disgraceful hour when we shall be numbered amongst the slaves of France, having, for our sole privilege, the conferring upon our children the infamous entail. With such reflections in his mind (and what mind is there unvisited by some such reflections?) where is the man that can hesitate to make sacrifices for his country's defence? And, where, then, is the man who can grudge to its defenders a share in its privileges, its immunities, and its marks of distinction, especially when the request comes so strongly supported by the reason and the justice of the case?

With an anxiety proportioned to the apprehensions whence it has arisen, I now commit my Plan to the cool and impartial consideration of the public, beseeching them to try it upon its own merits, and to discard from their minds, during the perusal, at least, whatever degree of error they may, as to other matters, be disposed to attribute to the opinions of its author.

Parson's Green, Fulham, 20th February, 1806.

SIR: The attention with which you have, upon different occasions, listened to my representations upon the subject of the regular army, encourages me to submit to you, in a more methodical way, my opinions as to what ought now to be done, in order to obtain an efficient, safe, and permanent military force, for offensive as well as for defensive operations. As to the Volunteers and the Militia, as I cannot bring myself to regard either of them as being of any thing more than a mere temporary nature, I shall trouble you with nothing respecting them, except with an expression of my earnest hope, that, at all events, the ballot, the terrific, the disgust-creating ballot, will be at once gotten rid of; for, until this be done, the military life must always be looked upon with hatred.

The measures, which I am about to propose, would certainly cause a great change, not only in the character of the army, but also in that of the whole nation. But is not a great change necessary, absolutely ne-

cessary, to the efficiency of the former and to the safety and honour of the latter? Is not this the very thing we want? Have not little temporary expedients been long enough upon trial? In short, if we do not come to the consideration of this subject with minds deeply penetrated with the truths, that the state of Europe has undergone a great change; that our enemy must, in the common course of things, subdue all that is not military; and that England must become a really military nation, or must become, at no distant day, a dependence of France: if we do not come to the consideration with minds thus penetrated, we shall, I am fully convinced, act wisely to keep aloof from it altogether. But, if such be the impression upon our minds, the only question, left for us to decide, appears to be this: *How is the nation to be rendered military?* How is it to be rendered truly military; military, not in show, not in the abundance of red coats; not from terror and merely upon the spur of the occasion: but, military in spirit, a spirit arising out of a permanent system, founded on principles of sound philosophy, interwoven with the civil and political institutions of the country, and, from its very nature, obviously tending to support, from all internal as well as external dangers, the just prerogatives of the King, and the due rights and privileges of the people?

That this most desirable object is not to be accomplished by any of those means, which have heretofore been employed, no man will now venture to deny. These means have been of three descriptions: *fraud, money, and compulsion*. The plan, which I am about to submit to you, has in it nothing of either. Its main principle is, the exaltation of the profession of arms; the raising of that profession to a level, at least, with trade and agriculture, in point of respectability in society. I am aware, that, with those whose minds are filled with the notion, that national power is only another term for national wealth, that this wealth is to be obtained and secured only by a continued extension of trade and a continued improvement in agriculture, and that these again, are to be secured only by the rights, immunities, and advantages, which await, now almost exclusively, the successful exertion of trading and agricultural ingenuity and industry; with all those whose minds are thus filled, I am aware, that there will be much to overcome. But, to all such persons the answer is: Will you not let the profession of arms share with you in the privileges and immunities which the nation has to bestow? If you will not, you will have no army, wherewith to protect you in the enjoyment of your own; you will have no permanent force, a consciousness of the existence of which will enable you to lay your heads down in safety. Long enough have you been tendering your money; in all manner of ways you have found it to fail; and, now, after the expenditure of millions upon millions for the avowed purpose of providing for your safety, you proclaim from your palace of commerce, that the question at issue is, whether you shall remain as you are, or become the slaves of Frenchmen. Another set of objectors will, perhaps, still reason upon the old ground of prejudice against a standing army. But, not to dilate upon the absurdity of applying the maxims of a century and a half ago to the totally altered circumstances of the present day; not to dilate upon the greater absurdity of objections to a standing army (upon the score of danger to public liberty) from those who approve of the present system, according to which the soldier is cut off for life from civil society, and is rendered perfectly hopeless, except solely as to what

he may be able to obtain from the crown; not to dilate upon the absurdity of these objections, it will soon appear, from the bare statement of my plan, that it would be to suppose an utter perversion of nature in the soldier, to fear, that, in consequence of his enlistment into the army, his attachment to the rights and liberties of the people should not be, I will not say not diminished, but that it should not be increased. The army as it at present stands, is made up of persons entirely divested of all those prospects, all those hopes, all those feelings, which bind men to their country. "*The Liberties of England*," which, in every battle, ought to be the signal for the onset, is an empty sound, nay, a galling insult, to those and to those only, who have abandoned their homes, and who are destined to spend their days and to shed their blood for the preservation of those liberties.

In addition to these preliminary observations, some others will be made with reference to particular parts of the plan. You will perceive, that for the sake of avoiding complication, I have spoken only of the army; but there can be no doubt, that the navy must also feel the cherishing hand of the government. You will also perceive, that as to the commissioned officers I have said but little. But, the *principles* once established, the application of them in detail will be matter of very easy accomplishment.

- I. AS TO PAY, that of the soldiers and non-commissioned officers is quite high enough; and, in case of a great advance in prices, arising either from the depreciation of money, or from scarcity of produce, a specific additional grant, for a limited time only, should be made. And, with regard to men, thereafter enlisted, a diminution might, at any time, be made, if rendered politic either by the abundance of recruits, or by a rise in the value of money.
- II. TERM OF YEARS to be the condition of enlistment; each term of five years, and three terms in the whole. The service of fifteen years will, in general, be found quite as long as is useful; and by ending at fifteen years, you will throw back into society a much greater number of men accustomed to the use of arms, and, upon occasions of emergency, able to be eminently useful, than could be so thrown back, if the service were continued to twenty years. The force embodied would, also, be much more efficient; for, if we take the average age of enlistment at 25 years, we shall find, that the age of 40 is the time, especially after hard military duty, when a man becomes unfit for the endurance of great bodily fatigue, and particularly for very rapid movements; and, besides, the other parts of the plan will render a very long service unnecessary, as it will ensure you an ever-teeming source of young men.
- III. PARENTS of Soldiers. As one great obstacle to the entrance of men into a military life arises from the remonstrances and lamentations of parents, about to be bereft of the probable aid of their children; as this is generally a powerful tie, and is always strong in proportion to the goodness of the heart upon which it operates, it should be a main object with us, not to weaken the tie, not to ease the filial feelings of the soldier, but to enable him to gratify those feelings, and that, too, by the very act which severs him, though for ever, from his parents and his home. To this end, and for the purpose of establishing the principle, that to every mother

who has borne and to every father who has reared a son ready to venture his life in the service of his country, some mark of that country's gratitude is due: for the establishing of this just, this high, this valour-inspiring principle, as well as for the purpose of removing a great obstacle to enlistment, I would allow to the parents, or the survivor of them, whatever might be their pecuniary circumstances, 3 pounds a year for each son that they, or either of them, might have serving in the army, to be paid out of the King's Exchequer, without deduction of any sort, or upon any account whatever, taking care that it should be duly paid to them at their homes. In case of the son being of illegitimate birth, the mother should have the allowance; but, if no mother alive, there should be no allowance to the father. These allowances I would not suffer to work a diminution of the claim which the parties might otherwise have to parish or other relief; and a heavy penalty should be imposed upon all attempts of parish-officers or others to thwart, in this respect, the intentions of the law. The allowance to parents should continue during the actual service of the son. If the son die, or be killed, in the service, or, if he serve out the three terms, the allowance should then be settled on them for their lives, or for the life of the longest liver. But, if the son desert, or be dismissed for bad behaviour, or quit the service before the expiration of the third term, then the allowance to the parents should cease, the reasonableness of which will be seen, when we come to contemplate the advantages with which, in case of good behaviour, the son is restored to them, in prime of life, at the end of his first or his second term. But, as a further mark of distinction, and more firmly to establish the great principle upon which I proceed, that the mother who has borne and the father who has reared a son for the service of the country is entitled to its especial indulgence and protection, I would give to the parent or parents of every soldier the faculty of becoming, in virtue solely of their son's service, a parishioner or parishioners in any parish immediately adjoining that to which they may belong at the time of his enlistment; and this right they should enjoy thereafter for their whole lives. I would, besides, restore, with respect to them, and for their whole lives, the spirit of the famous and cherishing act of *Forma Pauperis*, making the sum of qualification 50 pounds instead of 5, which, when the depreciation of money is considered, is much about what it ought to be, in order to place these meritorious persons upon the same footing that all the people of England were placed upon in the reign of Henry the Seventh. The cost of this allowance to parents will hardly be objected to by those who reflect that, supposing the army to consist of 200,000 men, every individual of whom has a father or a mother alive, the amount would be only 600,000*l.* annually; a sum which is a mere trifle when compared with the annual charge on account of apprehending deserters, on account of depots for lodging and guarding recruits, and on account of remuneration to crimps and others belonging to the odious establishment for the entrapping of men, and, as if it were expressly, for the exciting of a hatred and a loathing of the military service. Think, too, of the effect of having scattered over the country 200,000 fathers and mothers, deriving, and known to be deriving, benefit

and honour for the faithful military services of their sons! Proud of this honour; boasting, instead of lamenting, that their sons are soldiers; while those sons, at whatever distance from their homes, and even in the hour of death, would have the grateful recollection, that, by their services, they had added to the comforts and had exalted the character of the parents from whom they sprang. As things now stand, the common saying of parents, even in the most wretched state of existence, is, that they "would rather see their son clad in a shroud than in a red coat;" and the son, if, perchance, he be suffered ever to see their face again, sneaks home and away again in the dark, unless he be able to procure a dress, wherewith to disguise the unfortunate fact, that he is a soldier, which fact is sure to make him an object either of compassion or of scorn. This is the primary cause why we have not such an army as we can at all times safely rely upon; and, never shall we, never can we, have such an army, while the same engagement that binds the son breaks the heart of the mother.

- IV. REWARDS. Proceeding always upon that principle so congenial to honourable minds, that distinctions in society, and not mere money, is the motive that is wanted to fill the ranks of the army, I would propose the following rewards for faithful military services.—For the 1ST TERM, duly completed, the man should have a right of settlement, merely as a parishioner, in any parish in the United Kingdom, without a single exception. In the like extent, he should have a right of pursuing any trade or calling, whether as journeyman or master. He should (subject to the local laws and customs as to degree) have a right of common and forest, in any parish where he may be settled, though the nature of his tenure would, according to the existing laws and customs, give him no such right. He should be exempted from serving on juries, from the services of all civil and parish offices, and from all offices growing out of the revenue, unless he chose to perform any such duties, in which case, as well as in all others, his military service should work no injury to the claim thereunto which he would otherwise have. For his whole life he should have the benefit of the act of *Forma Pauperis* as revived in spirit for the protection of his parents. And, finally, he should have a right to kill game (subject to the laws upon that head), or, in other words, should be placed upon the footing of a mere "qualified man," within the limits only of the parish where he was born. Of the reasonableness, of the justice, of granting this privilege, more will be said hereafter, when it will have been seen that the men born in towns will have an equivalent for it, and, the force of example being duly considered, the policy of sending men, as far as may be, back to enjoy their privileges in the places where they were born will not need to be dwelt upon.—For the 2ND TERM the man should acquire all the rights and immunities, before mentioned, with the following additions; to wit: all the privileges and capacities of whatsoever nature or degree appertaining to the corporation of any town or place wherein he may have been born. A right of common and of forest within the limits of the parish, the church of which shall be the nearest to that of the parish in which he may, at any time, reside. If born in a place which sends burgesses or citizens to parliament, he should have a vote in their election; and if not

born in any such place, he should have a vote for the knight of the shire in which he was born; so that every man, having duly completed his military service of ten years, should, after his return to civil life, have a claim to and enjoy the elective franchise. And, lastly, his right of killing game (under the laws as aforesaid) should extend as far, and in like manner, as his right of common and forest, with this difference, that the latter applies to the parish of his settlement, whereas the former applies to the parish in which he was born.— For the 3RD TERM the man should acquire all the rights and immunities given to the second term, and with this extension and addition, that he should have a right of common and of forest in any parish, and in all the parishes, immediately adjoining that in which he may be settled; that, to the other exemptions, should be added that of an exemption from the operation of impressments of waggons, carts and horses, for the public military service, except in cases of invasion; that, as to his corporate rights and capacities, they should extend to any corporation in the kingdom where he may have been a year settled; that as to the elective franchise, he should be put upon the footing of a territorial freeholder, and, if born in an election borough or city, should, of course, have a vote for the county where he was born also; and, that, as to his right of killing game, it should (subject as aforesaid) extend to the utmost limits of all the parishes immediately adjoining that in which he was born.

- V. RELIGION. There should be no distinction as to religious creeds, except that it should be provided that none but Christians, in the common acceptation of the word, should be admitted. An oath, merely of fidelity to the King, should be taken upon the Holy Evangelists.
- VI. ALL ALIENS, having faithfully completed one Term, should be considered as being, to all intents and purposes, subjects of the King, and should be rewarded accordingly. Having no birth-place in the realm, they should be allowed to fix upon a place for the enjoyment of privileges arising from birth. No allowance should be made to the parents of Aliens; and all Blacks and Mulattoes should be carefully shut out of the army.
- VII. INVALIDS. For men disabled or worn-out in the service, an annual provision should be made, and punctually paid, without bringing them from their homes, equal in amount to the annual full-pay and clothing of the private soldier upon actual service; and such men should, besides, enjoy the several rights and exemptions allotted to the several terms, during, or at the end of either of which, their disability longer to serve may have produced their discharge from the service. In case of discharge on account of disability in the son, the parents, of course, would be entitled to the allowance for life.
- VIII. SOLDIERS KILLED in battle, or dying, from whatever cause, while in actual service abroad, should have, in the Church or Church-yard (the latter if possible) of the parish where they were born, a stone erected to their memory; stating the names of their parents, the time of their birth, the length of their service, and the time and place of their death; and the charge in this case, as well as in all others arising out of this code, should be defrayed out of the King's Exchequer.

IX. FORFEITURES. A soldier who deserted should (besides being subject to banishment, or other lighter punishment, but never to whipping), from the day of his return, begin his terms anew; and, after his quitting the army, a conviction of treason, misprision of treason, or of felony, should work for ever, a forfeiture of all the rights and immunities acquired by his military services. And, in the parents of soldiers, a like conviction, for crimes committed by themselves or either of them, should for ever, work a forfeiture of all their claims, arising from the military services of their children. But this forfeiture would take place, of course, only on account of conviction in consequence of crimes committed after the entrance of their sons into the army, the provision in no case, being made to have a retrospective effect.

Such are the principal parts of the plan, which I have long had in contemplation for the forming of an efficient, cheap, honourable, and perfectly safe military force for this kingdom. Much would, of course, require to be said with regard to rewards and distinctions for the commissioned officers. It is easy to conceive, that, with an army like this in existence, loan-jobbers, Jew-brokers, whether native or alien, that contractors and purasers, would stand a very poor chance of becoming lords or baronets; and, that barkers of Moorfields, though with millions of money in their pockets, would not easily become knights. But, this is all a matter of degree and of detail; and, if the principles as embraced in the above-proposed part of the plan, be rejected, it will be useless to take up your time with any thing naturally growing out of them. There are, however, some things, which, as it is possible that they may be regarded as omissions, I shall, for the purpose chiefly of saving you trouble, here notice.

And, first, you will perceive, that I contemplate no sort of provision for the wives or the children or the widows of soldiers. This, at the first glance, appears hard, if not unjust. But, we are here proposing a permanent system; we are considering what is the most likely to ensure the safety and the greatness of the nation; and, though a natural feeling of compassion may arise in behalf of soldiers' wives and children, we shall, upon due reflection, find, that in whatever way a provision for them may be made to arise out of military services, such provision must necessarily operate as a premium for marriage and for population, than which, independent of the military consideration, which is, however, very important, nothing can be more contrary to all sound principles of political economy. The institution at Chelsea, ascribed to Mr. Windham and the Duke of York, and, in itself considered so amiable, and discovering so tender a regard for the army, I must nevertheless, regard as having been determined on without due reflection as to the probable, nay the inevitable consequences. It must operate as an encouragement for the breeding of beggars, just as the Foundling Hospital, and all the fine sermons preached there, operate as an encouragement for the begetting of bastards. How great is the nuisance of women and children in the army, how miserable the life of those women and children, may be asked of those who have been upon service abroad, or who have even seen a regiment in camp, or moving from place to place, at home; and, we may rest assured, that if our men of war were but tolerably well furnished with women and children, we never should have heard of battles like those of Copenhagen and Trafalgar. Besides, there is nothing unjust in

the omission. The soldier will see that no provision is made for wife, child, or widow; no man will be forced from his home; and the parishes will not have to accuse the military code of inviting husbands to leave them burdened with starving families.

Another omission will, perhaps, appear in the not having made provision for the advance of pay, in the second and third terms of service. But, after full consideration, I have been induced to reject all distinctions of this sort; first, because money, in the hands of a soldier, beyond what is absolutely necessary for his subsistence, is not only unnecessary to his good, but is really mischievous; and secondly, because such distinctions must give rise to invidious feelings amongst men, whose rank and whose duties are exactly the same.

As to a distinction in the rewards bestowed, after service, I once thought, that a man who had served a certain time as a sergeant, for instance, might, with propriety, be rewarded with privileges and immunities somewhat higher than those allotted to men, who had never attained that rank; but, upon further reflection, this does not appear either just or politic. Not just, because the promotion to the rank of either corporal or sergeant, though, generally speaking, it argues superior capacity, is, of itself, during the time of service, attended with a competent reward, in ease, comfort, respectability and emolument. Not politic, because promotion arises, in many, not to say in all cases, from the circumstances of advantageous figure, engaging address, good voice, or an understanding in reading, writing and arithmetic; all of them, in their different degrees, estimable, but none of them proofs of intrinsic merit, and not all of them together, to be, for one moment, placed in competition with the great virtue which we are seeking to inculcate, to encourage, and to cherish; namely, a *disposition to serve*; which, upon reflection, I am sure you will be convinced is not to be cherished by holding out a premium for scholarship. A disposition to serve, is what we want; and to obtain it, there is no other rational scheme than for the nation to measure its rewards by the length of service, and by no other standard whatever.

After what has been said, I really do flatter myself, that no solid ground of objection can be made to the principles of this plan; nevertheless, my anxiety for its adoption will not permit me to close this letter without offering a few additional observations. Upon the doing away of all distinctions as to religious sects, for which distinctions we have paid and are paying so dearly; upon the admission of aliens, when we see so many Jews and jobbers daily naturalized in order to enable them to retain the blood they have sucked from our veins; upon the making of a competent provision for invalids, instead of suffering them to starve in the streets, a shocking disgrace to the nation, and a most awful warning for men to shun those ranks wherein the privilege to beg has been earned: upon these parts of the plan I shall add nothing, because, where any serious objection can be raised to them there cannot be the most distant hope of accomplishing any change worthy of the attention of a cabinet for a single hour. The privilege of voting for members of parliament and that of killing game, are all, for the granting of which, I think it necessary to offer any thing in the shape of an argument. As to the former, the addition which this plan would make to the number of persons exercising the elective franchise will not be very great, and, whatever it may be, it will certainly not be urged as an objection by those who still feel an alarm

at a standing army, as the means of destroying the liberties of the people, by giving to the monarchical and aristocratical branches, too much power over that of the democracy. Indeed, to give the soldiers this privilege appears to be absolutely necessary, in order to make them feel, that they have rights in common with their fellow subjects ; in order to make them feel, that that country which they have to fight for, is theirs as well as others ; in order to make them feel, that they are not mere mercenaries, that they are not selling their blood for the protection of more happy and more highly privileged mortals. And, in itself, what can be more just or more reasonable ? For what can be more unjust or more unreasonable, than that the elective franchise should be acquired by seven years apprenticeship to the hammering of a lapstone or the driving of a needle, or by the gaining in trade wherewith to purchase a cottage of 40 shillings a year, while, to the service of ten years in a military capacity, venturing health and life in a thousand ways, such acquirement is denied ? It is not merely a privation to the soldier ; it is a punishment for his service ; for, as in the case of free-boroughs, he is deprived of the privilege which he would have had, if he had remained at home and served an apprenticeship. And, while this continues, while there is a bounty, the most tempting of all bounties too, held out for staying at home, and plodding along in peace and safety, in pursuit of self, is it not madness to think that, generally speaking, any but the profligate, or the miserable will enter the army ? And, is it not still greater madness to hope, that they will be faithful and zealous soldiers ? Am I told, that the armies of France are formed without the granting of any such privileges ? I answer, that, in France, there are no such privileges to grant ; there are no privileges or immunities whereof a military life can deprive a man ; every man, soldier or not, is, in these respects, upon a footing ; but, great care is taken to give the soldier, and the parents of soldiers too, favours and marks of distinction ; and, without this we may be well assured, that the military power of France would not, at this hour, have been an object of terror to England. In France, the soldiers are at the absolute command of the Sovereign ; but they themselves are the masters of every body else. All that I wish to see in England, is, to place the soldier upon the same footing, in point of rights and immunities, with his fellow subjects in general.

With respect to the right, or rather the permission to kill game, a privilege of little value in itself, but become most highly esteemed by all the people of this country, it arose, you must well remember, not out of success in trade, not out of acquisitions of wealth, not out of the inheritance or the occupancy of lands, but, out of military services, performed by the Nobles, the Knights and Esquires, to whom the King granted permission to kill part of his game. That this assumption, on the part of the monarch, of the sole proprietorship of wild animals, might be too great a stretch of the kingly power, too bold a deviation from the law of nature, which gives to every man as free an use of wild animals as it does of the air and of the water, may be a question ; but, there can be no question, that when the Sovereign's permission, granted in consequence of services, for the defence and honour of the realm, has degenerated into a right to be claimed, exclusively or almost exclusively, by those, who have been able, no matter how, to obtain a certain portion of wealth deposited in house or in land ; when this is become the state of the case, there can be no question as to the justice, not to say the policy, of re-

storing a part, at least, of the much esteemed privilege to that service, as a reward to which alone, it was, at first, most justly and most wisely confined. Every vender of ribbons or of pins, who has accumulated the sum of about two or three thousand pounds, and who feels a disposition for the chase, lays out his money in a box and a few acres, and thereupon he swaggers about with his gun and his dogs, in any and every parish and county in the kingdom: and, in the name of justice, of reason, of common sense, I ask, shall not the man who has served his country, who has ventured his life for the safety of this same esquire and haberdasher, have a right to kill a hare within the narrow precincts of the parish, or the neighbouring parishes, where he was born? Yet, little as it is in itself, perfectly costless as it is to the nation, its value in the eyes of the common people is beyond all estimation; and, I have no scruple in saying, that the prospect of enjoying it, and the examples of its enjoyment, would send more countrymen into the army, than any other, and than all the other, inducements, that the most eloquent description could present to their views.

Now, in closing the letter, I shall only say, that, with respect to the practicability, the easy execution of the whole of this plan, after a due consideration of every difficulty that my mind can conceive, after asking myself how all this is to be done without confusion, without bustle, without clashing, without embarrassments either at the seat of government, or in the parishes, or in the army itself, I am fully convinced, that a new office, consisting of a superintendant of the civil and political concerns of the soldiers and their parents, aided by a secretary and about six clerks, the whole establishment costing about ten thousand pounds a year, would completely manage the business, leaving all the other departments connected with the army precisely as they are, and without one additional object to divide their attention. If this be too much, nothing can be too little; and it were better that nothing at all should be done.

I am, &c. &c.

WM. COBBETT.

COMMERCIAL RELIEF—"OVER-TRADING."

(*Political Register*, March, 1811.)

NOTE BY THE EDITORS.—The reader has read the arguments of Mr. COBBETT on depreciation of money, and he has read the case of DE YONGE, in the articles on "Jacobin Guineas." He is now brought down to 1810-11, when the depreciation was avowed by one party in the House of Commons—the Whigs. In 1810, a committee was appointed to inquire into the causes of the high price of bullion, and it has, therefore, always been called the "Bullion Committee." Mr. HORNER was the principal actor in it and in the House; and, in 1810, the committee made a report, in which it attributed the *high price of bullion to the low value of money*, and the low value of money to its *great quantity*, caused by what was called the "restriction" on the Bank; or, what was, in fact, the protection given to the Bank against those who held its notes. The proposition of the Bullion Committee was, that the Bank should not be protected against its creditors for any longer time than two years, and that then it should be compelled to give gold for its notes to any holder of them. Mr. HORNER moved a resolution to this effect in the House of Commons on the 22nd of April, 1811.

But, between the making of the Report in 1810, and this resolution of Mr. HOBBS in 1811, the bare mooted of the question of paying in gold produced effects that are recorded and remarked upon in the following articles on "Commercial Relief." As to the amount of failure that took place at the period of commercial distress referred to, we find, in Mr. BURGESS's "Circular to Bankers," No. 264, that, in Liverpool alone, merchants stopped payment for an amount exceeding *eight millions*.—ED.

On the first day of this month, Mr. PERCEVAL moved, in the House of Commons, for a Committee to be appointed to inquire into the state of Commercial Credit.

He said, as the report states,

"Various representations had reached him from manufacturing and mercantile people, of the *disadvantages under which trade suffered*, and which they attributed to the *state of credit and the condition of the markets* with which they were formerly in the habit of *communicating*. At first he did not believe that the evil prevailed to such an extent as had been stated, but so various were the representations, that he now thought it his duty to submit the present motion to the House, that they might ascertain its existence, and *provide a remedy as soon as possible*. He deprecated all discussion upon this occasion as premature, and recommended that they should wait to have the advantage of the Report. It was his intention that all the surviving Members of the Committee which was appointed upon a similar subject in the year 1793, should be upon the present, and that the number of the whole should be 21. He concluded with moving, That a Committee should be appointed to inquire into the State of Commercial Credit, and to report it to the House, together with its opinions and observations thereupon."

A little debate ensued, during which it was thrown out, that the embarrassments of the country arise from *over-trading*. What is meant by over-trading? Why, surely, people making or importing more goods than they can find *customers* for. Chaffer about it as long as the pamphleteers will, this is the true meaning of the words over-trading.

However, without going any further, let us take Mr. Perceval's own account of the thing.

"*Disadvantages under which trade suffers owing to the state of credit and the condition of the markets, formerly open to the sufferers.*"

State of credit! why, man, every body suffers from a want of credit, or, from having less of it than he formerly had. And, what is meant by the "*condition of markets formerly open*;" why, to be sure, that these markets are now *shut*. And, this being the case, the remedy is very obvious, namely the finding of *new markets*, which, of course, would in an instant, remove the "*disadvantages*;" but, *how or where or when* to find these new markets, *abroad*, I, with all due deference, leave to George Rose and the Board of Trade, observing, in passing, that this description of Mr. Perceval does not seem to correspond very well with the opinions of SIR JOHN SINCLAIR as to the prosperous effects of an increase of Bank-notes.

But, let us take a little closer view of the matter.

What is the object? For *what* have all these suffering merchants and manufacturers applied to the Treasury? Why, a *loan of money*. A very natural application. Most men, who are in distress apply for money where they think it likely to get any one to lend it them.

What a very pretty system this is, which was begun by "the great statesman now no more," to prop up the commerce in 1793; what an

influence it must create ; how completely dependent it must render these men upon the minister of the day ; what very important effects it must produce in political and party matters, and how it accords with the principles of free representation and a responsible ministry, every man with only one grain of sense in his skull will easily decide ; but, it is not in that light that I now wish to view it. I wish to view it merely in a commercial light. The immediate object of the applicants is to obtain *a loan of money out of that which the people have paid in taxes*. To determine whether it be advisable or not to grant their request, we ought to consider many things ; but, at present, I will only inquire what *end* such loan would be likely to answer. The distress arises from *the want of markets for the sale of goods* ; which is only another name for a *falling off in the value of the goods* ; or, to express it in another way, it is another name for *losses in trade*. And, pray, if the present applicants are to be, by *gift or loan* (for it, in the end, is the same ;) if these applicants are to have their losses in trade made good, or lessened ; if they are to be thus propped up by the government, or, more properly speaking, by the people at large, why should not the same sort of support be extended to the 1670 Bankrupts who appeared in the Gazettes of last year, and to the 3000 Bankrupts who will appear in the Gazettes of this year, if the rest of the year be as prolific in Bankruptcies as the first two months of it have been ? I really should be glad to know *why* all these persons are to be overlooked, if the present applicants are to have money lent to them to prop them up ? The bankrupts have failed from various causes ; from indiscretions of one kind or another. But, is not *over-trading* an indiscretion too ? They have, at any rate, all failed from *losses in trade* ; and, it is, state it how you will, from losses in trade that the present applicants have been reduced to the necessity of asking for a loan out of the produce of the taxes.

Take this in another light. Inquire how many of the people are severely suffering in their pecuniary circumstances *from the weight of the taxes* themselves. Aye, how many have been reduced to the greatest distress ; how many have received their last, their falling blow, from the taxes ; and then what a thing is here ? One part of the community sinking into ruin in the yielding of the means to prop up the credit of another part of that same community !

But, though it is hardly possible to withhold the reflecting mind from diverging at every step into views of this sort, let us, if we can, confine ourselves to the bare question, whether the proposed loan is likely to answer any good purpose, even as to the borrowers themselves.

Now, suppose a sum of this money to be given to a great manufacturer, who has a large stock of goods and cannot sell any. What is he to do with the money thus borrowed out of the taxes ? Pay his debts ? Very well. But what good will that do him in the *end* ? He has the money to *pay back again* to the Treasury, and where is he to get it ? Why, "from the *sale of his goods*, to be sure." Aye, to be sure he must, if he can sell them ; but, then, this argues the finding of a *new market*, or the *re-opening of the old ones*, which latter, so far from being re-opened, become daily more firmly closed

Is he to use the money for the purpose of continuing his expenditure, either on himself and family or on his work-people ? If the former, how is he to *repay*, and ought he not to reduce his expenditure as the only means of enabling him to keep out of the Gazette ; and, if the latter, if

the money you lend him is to be laid out upon labour in his manufactory, and upon materials, he will have *more goods* instead of less, and you will, by your loan, have insured that ruin, from which, if left to himself, he might have escaped; or, at least, you will have added to the weight of his fall, and have made it more destructive to all around him.

It is exactly the same with the West India Merchant. What good will you do him by enabling him to pay his debts from a loan for the repayment of which his goods are to be held, I suppose, as a *pledge*? I do not know what the terms of the loan are proposed to be; but, I know that if *re-payment* is to take place, that the merchant, who *stands in need* of the loan, must find the means of re-payment out of *the sale of his goods*; and, that this sale must necessarily suppose some outlet, or market, which he cannot *now* find; some market *that does not now exist*; for, if it did exist, he would not stand in need of the loan.

This I am not afraid to assume as conclusive; and, therefore, the question is reduced to this simple point: is there the smallest probability of the *old markets being re-opened* or of finding *new ones*?

As to the former, I have, I think, submitted ample reasons for deciding it in the negative; but, as to the latter, the finding of *new markets*, I have myself a proposition to offer, for which, though it should be rejected, I shall, I flatter myself, be entitled to some little commendation from those classes of my fellow-subjects, with whom I have reason to fear I have been no very great favourite.

The *new markets* which we have gained by the sword, in South America, have, alas! as I said they would, proved little less fatal than the South Sea Bubble of immortal memory; and, besides, these markets cost so much in the obtaining, that the full amount of the goods sold in them (or rather, carried to them) would not half defray the cost of getting the market. I think it must be pretty certain, that four times as much money has been sent hence to the Brazils and to Spanish America as has come back in payment for goods.

As to ISLANDS; as to SUGAR colonies, we have been taking them, till we know not what to do with the produce, and may exclaim with the Copper Captain: "Haste, haste, let us hence! I am like the people in the *sweet islands*; if I stay here, I die!"

New markets then we can have none, unless, in return for sugar and coffee which we cannot sell, and for which we cannot much longer find room, we send out our manufactures and clothe the negroes.

This brings me, at once, to *my* project of a new market; a market, capacious, convenient, sure, and durable, setting Napoleon and all the world at defiance.

I have often been reproached with pointing out *evils*, and not, at the same time, pointing out a *remedy*. This reproach is quite unfounded, though very catching, and it was always resorted to during the administration of the first successor of "*the great statesman now no more*," Mr. Addington. But, must we find fault of nothing for which we cannot find a remedy? Who was to find a remedy for the Walcheren expedition? Who were to bring the men to life again? And, *therefore*, was no one to find fault of it? Must no man find fault with the state of the paper-money, unless he can make gold come back again? This would be a fine security for folly and vice of all sorts, and would suit the case of peculator or murderer as well as that of any political offender.

Well, but, at any rate, I have now *my* remedy, and shall, with all

becoming deference to the superior wisdom of the Committee, propose to state it.

It has been shown above, that all this commercial distress arises from the want of a market for our goods; that is to say, for *sugar* and *coffee* and for divers articles of *wearing apparel* and *household furniture*; for, as for *food*, or, as it was called in Queen Elizabeth's days, *vittal*, we find none too much of that, having at home an abundance of mouths for dispatching it.

Aye, and have we not *backs enough too for the cloths, and houses for the furniture?*

The reader needs no more. His eyes are opened in a moment. Light bursts in upon him from every quarter. He sees all my plan in a moment; and wonders how it came to escape him. He has been looking *abroad*, seeking in foreign lands what was under his nose, as I have very often looked about the room for my pen while it was in my mouth.

Backs! Are we in want of them? Look at Ireland; look at Scotland; look at Wales; nay, look at many parts of England; look even at those very manufacturing towns where the goods are piled up to the cracking of the warehouses, and see if you can find no backs to cover! How many of these towns does the traveller pass through without being way-laid at the entrance and the exit by a swarm of children *more than half naked*, running and tumbling and bowing and praying and crying in the hope, often disappointed, of obtaining the means of buying an ounce of bread? Enter their dwelling places; see misery in all her horrors, hunger, filth, disease, the blood poisoned, and the heart hardened to a flint.

Talk of *national prosperity*, Sir John Sinclair, look here, and say, if you can, that I have exaggerated the picture. Talk of improvements in *roads and canals!* What is that, while the misery of the people, as the poor-rates will tell you, is daily increasing?

Talk of *roads and canals and bridges!* These are no signs of *national prosperity*. They are signs of *accumulated*, but not of *diffused* property, and this latter alone can insure *national prosperity*, which rightly understood, is only another name for *the general happiness of the people*.

But, I have been led, I perceive, into another digression.

To come back to my subject, why should not all the goods, which cannot find a market abroad, be disposed of *in clothing the naked at home?* A couple or three millions would shoe and breech the people of the Hebrides and the Highlands, and twice the sum might clothe the Irish, and about the same as the former might very well be disposed of for a similar purpose in England and Wales. *Sugar and Coffee*, though not much known amongst any of the persons in my view, would soon teach the possessors the use of them. And, as to the household furniture, clothing and the use of sugar and coffee would naturally call for tables and chairs and drawers and hooks and crockery-ware and spoons and kettles and locks and keys; and hence the whole would go hand in hand.

Here would be 12 millions of mosey laid out! but it would not be *thrown away*; it would not be sunk in the sea; it would not be sent abroad; it would not be swallowed up in distant lands; it would produce no misery any where; it would occasion nobody to bleed or to suffer in any way; it would give immediate and effectual relief to the merchants

and manufacturers, while it would give comfort to the hearts of millions of their countrymen, and might lay the foundation of permanent happiness amongst those who are smarting under keen and constant misery.

Now, if Sir John Sinclair should tell me, that this is a foolish scheme, and that, in taking money out of the taxes to give to the poor to make up for the inadequacy of their means, I am acting contrary to all the sound principles of political economy, I beg leave to ask, whether this is not as reasonable as it would be to take money of the taxes to give to the rich to make up for the inadequacy of their means, especially as my scheme includes the *effectual* means of relieving both rich and poor?

At any rate, here is my scheme; and, if Sir John, or any body else does not approve of it, let him *find out a better*; and, till that be done, let him not *laugh*.

COMMERCIAL RELIEF—"OVER-TRADING."—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, March, 1811.*)

"Aid slighted Truth with thy persuasive strain,
 "Teach erring man to spurn the love of gain;
 "Teach him, that States, of native strength possess'd,
 "Though very poor, may still be very bless'd;
 "That Trade's proud empire hastes to swift decay,
 "As ocean sweeps the labour'd mole away;
 "While self-dependant pow'r can time defy,
 "As rocks resist the billows and the sky."—GOLDSMITH.

In my last, I concluded some observations on the proposition, then and now before the House of Commons, for lending part of the money, raised in taxes, to certain merchants and manufacturers. The loan, as I then stated, is proposed to be made in *Exchequer Bills*, which are, in fact, nothing more than *promissory notes issued by the Government*, and bearing an interest, payable by the government. But, though this is an issue of notes, it weighs upon the people; because, that which the government issues in this way, for the use and advantage of private persons, it has not to issue for the use and advantage of the public at large; so that, in fact, it is making use of the public resources for the benefit of individuals; it is making the people at large pay taxes to be lent to private persons in order to sustain them in their trade.

And, it is very well worth observation, that, at the very time that this project is going forward, the government, has just accomplished the very neat object of *making a loan for the use of the public*, under the shape of *funding Exchequer Bills*!

This is a curious operation: but it does, perhaps, with some persons, require to be explained a little.

I have just said, that Exchequer Bills are promissory notes, *issued by the government*, and bearing an interest as long as they are out.

Sometimes (and usually, indeed) they are *paid off*, after a certain time, and then they become extinguished. But, at other times, they

undergo a transmutation called *funding*; that is to say, the holders of them give up, and receive *Stock* or *Funds* in exchange for them; and thus, a new parcel of *Stock* or *National Debt*, is created; and that which was, at first, a *note of hand* out-standing against the nation, becomes a *mortgage* upon its taxes. The case, in fact, is just the same as that of an individual, who, having a note or bond out, for which he pays the holder interest, and finding himself unable to pay off the note or bond at the appointed time, gets the holder to give it up, and take, in lieu of it, a mortgage upon his estate; with this difference only, that, in the case of the individual, the real, solid, immoveable estate is taken as security; while, in the former case, the holder has no security but upon *the taxes*, that is to say, the mere *income* of the nation.

Such is the nature of that operation, that pretty work, so thrivingly carried on by "the *great statesman* now no more," called *funding of Exchequer Bills*, which, as the reader will clearly see, is only another name for a *loan*.

So that, to return to our subject, while the nation is going to *lend* money to the merchants and manufacturers to prop them up; while it is, by the measure now proposed, going to *lend* to one part of the community, it is, at the same moment, *borrowing* from another part of the community; upon which, surely, it is necessary to do nothing more than just ask this question: What would be said of the steward and attorney of any Gentleman, if they were to lend his money upon bonds or notes or pawns, while his affairs were in such a way as to make it necessary to mortgage his estates?

In another part of this Number will be found the Report, made, last week, to the House of Commons, on the subject of this loan to the merchants and manufacturers. I beg the reader to turn to this Report, and to go through the whole of it very carefully; for, unless he does that, he will not fully understand the matter.*

The Committee state that the extent of the failures of manufacturers has been very great, particularly in Scotland: and upon the evidence of Sir ROBERT PEEL (who gave 16,000*l.* to a voluntary subscription for carrying on the war against the *Jacobins* and *Levellers*, who has since been made a Baronet, and whose son is in office under the government), the Committee state, that the manufactures in Lancashire have fallen from 40 to 60 per centum in value; that the greatest of the manufacturers have been forced to reduce their work one third; others one half; and others, to discharge their workmen altogether; and, that those workmen who were continued in employment worked at one half of their former wages.

They state also, that the extent of the evil amongst the owners, or holders of West India produce is very great; but, they do not apprehend, that, in the clothing line, the evils are of such an extent as to call for parliamentary aid.

Well, this is a pretty picture to be sure. People stopping payment with half a million of debts, in promissory notes, out against them. What a sweep of ruin and misery!

But, what is the *cause*? Aye, the *cause*; that is what we are next to look to.

* The Report is too long to insert; and we think that its substance is sufficiently given in the remarks upon it above.—ED.

They state, as one great cause, the want of *returns*, that is to say, *payments*, for the immense quantities of goods sent to South America, in the first place. Why, did I not say that this would be the case? Did I not warn the country against it, *at the time*? Did I not tell the manufacturers what would be the consequence of their shipping goods thither? Yes, and I was called a *Jacobin* for my pains; I was accused of *undervaluing our glorious conquests*; and was represented as a man who repined at my country's *successes*. Those who so called me have now their reward. *Time*, which tries all things and does justice to every body, has paid those calumniators in their *proper coin*; that is to say, in paper as worthless as that through which the base calumnies against me were promulgated.

In commenting upon an article describing the *speculations to the Brazils*, I said: "There needs no assurance, on the part of this writer, to convince me, that the event has produced great satisfaction amongst the inhabitants of Finsbury-square and Thames-street; nor have I the least doubt that the Brazils will soon become a *grand out-let for the produce, or fruits, of the industry of the people of England*, having, indeed, shown in my former number, that this would be the case. But I see, in this, nothing to give *me satisfaction*, and nothing that ought to give satisfaction to any man, who has the *good of England at heart*."* Again, in another part of my work, I said: "Already, we are told, that a hundred thousand pounds, taken out of the taxes of England, has been sent off, in specie, to the Brazils, to assist her most faithful majesty. And this, after all, is the result of that 'glorious event,' which was to produce so much good to England! When will this *commercial and colonizing rage* cease to beggar and enslave us? Never, till the *CORRUPTIONS*, which are found to be so conveniently carried on through the medium of commercial and colonial associations, are banished by a wholesome change."†

Over and over again did I exhort my countrymen not to be deceived by the representations in the *Morning Post* and the other bragging newspapers. I exhorted them not to suffer any one to persuade them to send their property to the *BRAZILS*. I assured them, and I *proved* to them, that the adventure *must* be attended with ruin. My advice, grounded upon a thorough knowledge of the subject, was scouted, and not without imputations upon my "loyalty:" and the advice of presumptuous ignorance, joined to hypocritical zeal for the royal cause, was followed. The adventurers, and those who trusted them, now feel the consequences: consequences the just reward of their credulity; or, rather, of their perverseness in preferring falsehood to truth.

I have said all this before; and it will not be the last time that I will din it in their ears.

The Committee say, however, that there are *other causes*; and, they must have had a pretty good face if they had attempted to deny or disguise the fact. It comes out with manifest reluctance; but, out it comes, and it is this, or, rather, the causes are these.

Great part of the *returns*, they say, for manufactures sent to the *West Indies*, come home in *sugar* and *coffee*, which remain on hand for want

* Register, Vol. XII.* p. 2, Jan. 2, 1808. (* It is Vol. XIII., and not XII.—Ed.)

† Register, *ibid*, p. 175, Jan. 30, 1808.

of a market; aye, and that is the case too with the manufactures, else why have they fallen in value from 40 to 60 per centum? It is the want of a market all through the story; for, the non-payment for goods sent to the Brazils would not have lowered the value of those in England. There is scarcely any one brute enough to believe that.

The Committee state, that, as to West India goods, the glut is enormous; and that there is no market for it; and they add, in speaking of the produce from Guadaloupe and the other conquered islands, that even our conquests have largely contributed towards the present alarming distress! Aye! indeed! But, did I never tell you this before? Did it want a Committee of the House of Commons to find out this? Oh, no! I told my readers of it long ago.

If he turn to Vol. 18 (the last) at page 106, he will find the following passage:—

"I thought, that, the other day; or, at most, but a few months ago, I heard the cannon fire for the taking of Guadaloupe. And so I did. And I heard of new governors and judges and officers without end appointed to rule this new conquest. Well, and what does it bring us? What is our gain in it? More sugar and more coffee to be added to the immense loads already rotting in our warehouses, and the want of a market for which is, as we are told, one of the causes of the blowing-up of the Wiltshire paper-money. Yes, we fire cannons; we make bonfires; we rejoice at the taking of an island, the produce and the inhabitants of which must perish, or the former must be brought to England to assist in producing the effects now witnessed at Salisbury and in Ireland."

These sentiments were strongly reprobated by "the loyal," at the time they were published, and the MORNING POST and the COURIER affirmed, that I mourned over the glories of my country; that I was a fallen and miserable wretch myself, and that I wish to pull others down to the same state.

But, now, behold! here is a Committee of the House of Commons saying the same thing, expressing the same sentiments; and, which delights me beyond measure, giving a practical demonstration of their truth. Here it is, in the House of Commons, declared that our conquests have contributed towards the distresses of the country. So that, our fleets and armies have been employed, at this rate, for some purpose! This is not an assertion made in the way of speech. It is contained in an authentic report from a Select Committee consisting of great merchants, manufacturers and political economists. It is their opinion, well weighed and decidedly expressed, that our conquests have been one of the causes of the failures, distress, and misery that now pervade the country.

Look well at this, reader. Consider well what these conquests have cost. How many millions in taxes; how much in appointments and salaries and pensions which end not; how many thousands of lives! And, all this for what? Why, as it now stands declared in this Report, as it now stands confirmed by a vote of the Honourable House, and as the records of Parliament will hereafter show; it will thus stand recorded, that all this treasure and blood have been expended to purchase for the country failures, distress, misery, such as are described in the Report; to purchase bankruptcies without end; to purchase the means of rendering the country more exposed to the attacks of the enemy. Such are the effects of the conquests, which were such favourites of "the

great statesman now no more," and which, by him and his equally wise successors, have been called "the truly British objects of the war."

The Committee do not say, that any part of the evil has arisen from the decrees of the Emperor Napoleon. They do, indeed, talk of other causes; but they do not speak out here. They mention the exclusion of the British flag from Europe; but they are extremely shy upon that part of the subject. Well they may! The merchants and manufacturers of the description now applying for relief, were the great cause of the war against the Jacobins and Levellers, which war has now produced, or, rather, is beginning to produce, its natural effects.

The American States are also mentioned with a great deal of shyness. It is merely observed, that the American ships are no longer permitted to be the carriers of West India produce to the Continent of Europe. Not a word about the Orders in Council and the dispute with America, which Orders (whether wise in themselves or not) have been the sole cause of the effect here stated as a great evil.

But, in certain Resolutions of a Meeting of Merchants of London, and the Deputies from Glasgow and Paisley, on the 12th of last month, there is a cause assigned that will make the reader stare.

These Resolutions state—

"That the distress which in the origin was considered to be attributable to the imprudent speculations to South America, has been in a certain degree occasioned by other circumstances of a different nature, and far more extensive influence. That the system of warehousing goods for re-exportation, without payment of duty, and the events of the two last years, have made Great Britain the emporium of the trade, not only of the Peninsula, but also of the Brazils, Spanish America, St. Domingo, Guadaloupe, &c., but even of countries under the direct influence of the enemy, whose traders have been anxious to avail themselves of the PROTECTION OF BRITISH LAWS, and the HONOUR OF BRITISH MERCHANTS—that the POWER, WEALTH, AND HIGH CHARACTER of the nation have in fact contributed TO PRODUCE A MOST ALARMING EVIL. And the measures of the enemy having been especially directed to the preventing the exportation of the immense quantities of merchandise of all descriptions thus accumulated, the CONSEQUENCES are, that THE GOODS ARE BECOME A BURTHEN, and the advances to the owners on account, and the payment of freight and insurance, have become grievous, in such a degree as to threaten THE MOST SOLID AND RESPECTABLE HOUSES WITH ALL THE EVILS OF INSOLVENCY."

This is something like the thing! This is famously fine! There is immortality stamped upon the very front of this! There never, surely, was any thing like this uttered before. Yet, it is no hasty effusion. It is not the language of a drunken toast at a London Tavern Dinner; at a Turtle Feast; at a meeting of Turtle Patriots. It is a document of authority sufficient to be subjoined to the Report of the Select Committee, and to be placed upon the records of the House of Commons; and here it is directly stated, in so many words, that the protection of British laws, the honour of British merchants (in the existence of which latter we must believe, of course, since they themselves, who ought to be the best judges of their own hearts, have declared the fact), the wealth, power, and high character of the nation have. . . what? Why, contributed to produce a most alarming evil! Bravo! Take wind, and at it again.

This wealth has had the effect of exposing the most solid and respectable houses to all the evils of insolvency!

There! If any thing like that; or coming within many degrees of it, ever was uttered before, I'll suffer my hand to be chopped off.

No: it is not *wealth* that you mean. You mean paper-money; you mean *promises to promise to pay*. You mean *bills and stock* and the like, all which, my good gentlemen, are so many certain signs of the *want of wealth*, the only true sign of which is *real money*. That the sort of wealth of which you speak, or to which you allude, has contributed towards the producing of a *most alarming evil*, I know very well; and I only beg you to note, that it is *not wealth*; but the sign of a want of wealth.

"*The power of the nation.*" Here you are wrong again. It is not the *power* of the nation that has caused Napoleon to shut the ports of the Continent of Europe against you. Oh, no! it is *want of power* in us to prevent him from doing it. If we could have prevented it, he would not have united Flanders and Holland and the Hans Towns to France; he would not have taken possession of Italy and Naples; he would not have forced Prussia and Russia and Sweden to shut us out; he would not have broken up Spain and Portugal. He would not have done this, if we had had *power* to prevent it; he has done this, and this it is that has produced the evil; and, how, then, do you make it out, that the evil has arisen from the *great power* of the nation? Ay! you could not bring yourselves to acknowledge the real fact; but whether *you saw it* or not, the rest of the world, and particularly Napoleon, will see it; and, you may be assured, that he will act accordingly.

But these merchants do confess (with what consistency let the reader say), that "*the measures of the enemy*" preventing the exportation of our merchandise, have produced this *consequence*, that the *goods are become a burthen*; and they futher say, that this threatens even *the most solid and respectable houses with all the evils of insolvency*.

Enough! There needs no more. It is finished. Where Napoleon had one douanier* he will now have two. The efficacy of his measures, the complete success of them, is here most explicitly recognised. The British merchants here declare, and the parliament receives and promulgates the declaration, that, *if Napoleon persevere in his measures*, the commerce of this country must be ruined; that insolvency must come upon the most solid establishments. If the Emperor of France does not believe this, what will he believe? And, if he be not hereby encouraged to persevere in his measures, what upon earth can give him such encouragement?

Why was this declaration made? It was necessary to make out the case of *distress*, and to lay the ground for a claim for *relief*; else it certainly would not have been made. The tendency of it as to the enemy must have been manifest enough; but if not stated, there was nothing whereon to claim relief. It will, however, tend to aggravate the evil; for, it is impossible for any man not to perceive, that the system of Napoleon will now be more rigorously enforced than ever. We have now told him, that, if he persevere, we are totally ruined in commerce.

So much for the *nature, extent, and cause* of the failures and misery prevailing; now, as to the *remedy* recommended by the Committee, which is simply the lending to certain merchants and manufacturers, in

* Custom-House Officer.—Ed.

Exchequer Bills, the sum of 6,000,000 of pounds of Bank Paper, which, according to Mr. HUSKISSON'S statement, is worth *seventeen shillings in the pound*. The precedent for this measure is drawn from the achievements of "the great statesman now no more," who made a similar loan, but to a less amount, in 1793, at the commencement of the war against the Jacobins and Levellers.* But, very different indeed were the circumstances of the times. There the stoppage of trade was merely temporary. France was soon crippled in her navy. The rest of Europe was all open to us, and so were the American States. There was no power in the world able to throw any material impediments in the way of a revival of commerce. Now what is the case? Why, there is nothing in it of a temporary aspect. The system of Napoleon is a settled thing; durable, at least, as his life; and, though he has very poor health, and has had all the disorders that the human frame is subject to; though he has been dying a thousand times, and dead several times; still he is, somehow or other, able to plague us, and has even lately married, and is about to become the father of a family.

His system is a settled established thing, as much so as our Custom-house system; and there is no more hope of seeing it done away, than of seeing the Bourbons upon the throne of France or the Stadholder replaced in Holland. And, as I have before amply shown, not only are the American ports shut against our goods, but, it is the policy of the American Government that they should continue shut against our goods; and, further, that it cannot be more than four or five years before America will be able to export, in large quantities, those sorts of goods which she has heretofore imported from England. Let any man read Mr. LIVINGSTONE'S book upon the subject of sheep and wool, and doubt of this if he can.

I shall be told, perhaps, that Mr. PÉRCEVAL has said, that "he looked forward to the probability of new openings presenting themselves by degrees, and to the progressive vent of the goods now locked up in our warehouses." I dare say he had my last Saturday's proposition in his eye; but, if he had not, I wish he had named those new-openings to which he looked forward; or, at least some of them. Portugal, indeed, and Spain, which are upon the eve of being delivered, as we are told by the Morning Post, may present new-openings; for, it is pretty clear that the people will stand in need of almost every necessary of life by the time that they are completely delivered of the French. Other new openings than these two it is out of my power to discover, unless we can destroy the power of Napoleon in the rest of Europe, for the doing of which I do not, however, pretend to say that Mr. PÉRCEVAL and his colleagues may not have devised the means.

The sum of 6,000,000*l.* was, however, voted without a division, in the House of Commons, on Monday the 11th instant, upon the motion of Mr. PÉRCEVAL. Mr. WHITBREAD intimated his intention of moving for

* It appears by the Report of the Commissioners for the issue of Exchequer Bills in 1793, to assist commercial men, that the whole number of applications for loans was 332, and the amount of the sums applied for 3,855,624*l.*—of these 238 were granted, and the amount lent was on personal security 2,015,000*l.*, on deposit of goods 187,200*l.*, total 2,202,200*l.* The whole sum was repaid, a considerable part before it became due, and the remainder regularly at the stated periods.

an inquiry as to what part of the money (or rather bills) was received by *members of the Honourable House*; but, as this is a rather "delicate" matter, we will leave it untouched for the present.

It was repeatedly acknowledged in the debate, that a *market*, that *customers*, that backs to wear and mouths to swallow the goods, were wanted; and, indeed, the whole of what I said, in my last Number, was fully confirmed; though no one appears to have thought of *my remedy*, to which I beg leave again to refer the reader; and I cannot help repeating my earnest wish to see it adopted.

Why should we go wandering about the world for customers, while we have such an ample market at home? We are acting in this, like Mr. BROUGHAM and the other emancipators of the black slaves, who seem always to forget, that there are any other in the world, and especially within their reach; and, I shall certainly never give them much credit for their endeavours, as long as I see them pass quite unnoticed the *Scalags in the Hebrides*. "Charity begins at home," and so ought *humanity*. I have no objection to doing all that can be done for the black slaves. I have no objection to see the trade and the slavery all done away. But, *first* let us do all that can be done in the Hebrides. Why should these islands not have our attention? A clergyman of the Church of Scotland has written and published a comparison between the treatment of the negroes and that of Hebridians, and he gives *the preference to the former*.* I will, therefore, never hear of *humanity* as connected with measures in favour of the black slaves, while a part of my own countrymen are in this situation.

To return to the subject before us, it is, I think, as clear as daylight, that the *relief* proposed to be given, and now voted by the House of Commons, can have none of the effects which its advocates seem to anticipate. Mr. RICHARD WELLESLEY, in his *maiden* speech, expressed his confidence in "the *reviving* spirit of the British merchant;" but, is this measure a sign of it? Mr. HENRY THORNTON, in the debate on Monday, said, that "he wished the loan to be applied on a *charitable* and *humane* principle." Good luck! What, a loan to our great merchants and manufacturers upon principles of *charity* and *humanity*? Does this savour of a *reviving spirit*? Mr. CURWEN (I quote the Morning Chronicle) said, "that it was impossible not to see, that *public confidence was gone*;" and, that this, *therefore*, rendered the measure imperious, though all "the money lent were finally to be lost." But, without asking for the *why* or the *wherefore* here, if it be true, that public confidence is gone, what becomes of the *reviving spirit* that Mr. Richard Wellesley talked so much of?

That man must be most completely hoodwinked, who sees any hopes of revival of the commercial spirit, which, of course, is engendered and kept alive by the prospect of gain. Indeed, he must be very stupid who does not see, that commerce, I mean *external commerce*, has *run its race*; and that it is now producing all those effects, which the ABBE RAYNAL long ago delineated, and which he said would take place if ever France became mistress of the Continent, or acquired a great and decided preponderance in the affairs of Europe. He was a friend to England, because he looked upon her as a friend to freedom; and he therefore lamented, that she

* *Travels in the Western Hebrides, from 1782 to 1790. By the Rev. J. L. Buchannan, A.M., Missionary to the Isles from the Church of Scotland.*

seemed to be abandoned to a system, which, if persevered in, must finally lead to a crash which might endanger her independence.

Commerce, in its free and natural course, produces many good effects besides that of the extension of knowledge, which is generally accompanied with an extension of virtue and of freedom; but, when it swells out to an extent that makes the country dependent upon other countries; when it grows into great masses and companies, and when these become closely connected with the government; then commerce becomes an enormous evil; and, whoever will candidly trace the present external dangers of the country to their real source, will find them to have arisen, in a great measure, from commerce. The war against the Jacobins and Levellers was full as much a war of commerce as of aristocracy. Between them they succeeded in putting down the democrats; but, what have either of them *gained* by it? The merchants and great manufacturers subscribed and resolved and toasted and addressed in favour of a war against the Jacobins and Levellers. Well: they *succeeded*. They said and they swore that all that PITT did was right. They stood by him in every thing. And, shall they now complain, when the natural consequences of the contest begin (for they are only *beginning*) to come upon them? They, perhaps, do not wish to look at the matter in this light; but that is no reason why we should not. Because they do not like to look back to the glorious days of PITT and SIR BROOK, there is no reason why the people should not take the retrospect. *Now* is the time to look back; when men complain of an evil and call upon you to assist them, you have a right to inquire into the cause of the evil. They will freely go back as far as the decrees of Napoleon, and endeavour to enlist your feelings against him as the enemy of us all. Aye; that is very well; but, who was it that enabled Napoleon to put such decrees in force? Whose plans and execution was it that gave him the possession of those countries whence he now excludes our commerce? Who was it that made France an armed nation; who caused her to pour forth a million of men to subdue Europe; who goaded her into this? "What signifies talking of that *now*?" Oh! it does signify a great deal to talk about it; and *now* is the very time, because you are now feeling the effects of it, and because it is of infinite importance to us all, that the *real authors* of the evil complained of should be known.

At any rate, the Jacobins and Levellers had no hand in it. They were beaten. They were compelled to hold their tongues. You had all the affairs of the nation in your own hands. You did what you pleased, amongst you, with its resources. You made war, you made peace, you made war again; and you did what you liked. Never were the Pittites one single day without a decided majority in parliament. You will say, that the *people* were with you. Be it so. I am not at all solicitous about that. All that I contend for is, that the Jacobins and Levellers had nothing at all to do with any of the measures, which have produced the present state of things. If you are well off; if you like your situation; if you think it an enviable state, it is well; but, be it good, be it bad, all I have to say is, that the Jacobins and Levellers had no hand in producing it.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Tuesday,
March, 12, 1811.

CONSOLIDATED FUND.

(*Political Register, April, 1811.*)

THE reader has seen, in the newspapers, a report of the Speech of Mr. PERCEVAL upon the SURPLUS of the Consolidated Fund. Mr. BANKES, we are told, heard it with *great satisfaction*, and, from appearances, the whole of the Honourable House seemed *quite pleased* with it.

The newspapers took it up the next morning, and off they went upon a full cry. One would have thought that a mine, an inexhaustible mine, of pure gold had been discovered, and that the nation were actually beginning to finger the precious metal.

The COURIER broke forth thus :—

“ By the Report of the parliamentary proceedings of yesterday, the public will perceive, *with great pleasure*, the very *flourishing state of the Revenue*, notwithstanding the embarrassments our commerce has had to sustain, and the gloomy predictions of men who have no confidence in any thing but the irresistible ascendancy of the enemy. The surplus produce of the Consolidated Fund during the last year, ending on the 5th instant, exceeds by nearly a million and a half, the estimate of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, an estimate for which he was reproved as being too sanguine in his expectations. The circumstances of the moment are indeed *most flattering*, the Regent's Government is *most auspicious*! Our Revenue, amidst difficulties, in defiance of all the artifices and hostility of our enemies, rising *above the most sanguine calculations*, of those even who have *the highest confidence in its solidity*.”

Solidity, did you say? Show us this Surplus in *gold and silver*, and then we will hear you talk of *solidity*.

The public, in general, employ their time much too well to know what the *Surplus* or the *Fund* itself means.

It would be a waste of time to give them a description of these things; but, one of these days, when we have leisure to laugh, I will tell them what they mean. At present, let me beg of them to bear in mind, that, *every year*, from the outset of the war against the Jacobins and Levellers in 1793; *every year*, let who would be minister, we have been told, that our money affairs were in a *more prosperous way than they were in the year before*. Every year has the *Debt increased*; every year have the *Taxes been augmented*; every year have the poor become more and more miserable, and the *poor-rates more and more heavy*; every year has the *paper-money augmented*; every year have the *gold and silver diminished* in quantity; and yet (Oh, wondrous people!) you have every year been told, that your money affairs have been more and more prosperous; and, so you will be told to the very end; nay, you will be told so after the end; for, I verily believe, that, if the dollar were worth fifty pounds in paper, the same thing would be told you about the “*flourishing state of our finances*.”

The French paper, the MONITEUR, in answer to a speech of Mr. ADDINGTON, like this of Mr. PERCEVAL, said, “*Pay your bank-notes in gold and silver, and then we will believe in the solidity of your finances; but not before.*”

Indeed, it is an insult to common sense to talk of *flourishing finances* where nothing but *paper* is to be seen. Who is to tell any thing at all about the matter? What *standard* is there? How is any one to know the *value* of what is brought to account? There is such a working about with paper, that no one can tell what any thing is worth. All is uncertainty and confusion; and so long have we been accustomed to hear these assertions of pecuniary prosperity made, that, at last, they are, with all men of sense, become a mere sound.

Amidst all this prosperity, however, our minister is, it seems, about to *borrow money for our use!* It is stated, that he means to make a loan of *nineteen millions*, and we know that he has obtained an Act for funding twelve millions in the shape of Exchequer Bills; making together thirty-one millions to be added to the National Debt in this one year!

Now, is there any other country in the world where, under such circumstances, any body would think of coolly telling the people that their finances were in a *most flourishing state*? I ask you, reader; I put it to you, whether you think, that there is any other country in the world, where any body would dream of uttering such an assertion, under such circumstances?

But, the state of mind in which the people are, in this respect, is owing to the operation of the paper-money system. Men see and talk of paper-money as property so long, till, at last, the confusion in their minds makes them stupid; and they see nothing in a clear and rational light. They lose all distinct notions as to property, money, debts, credits, riches, and poverty; till, in the end, they become great, overgrown babies in every thing relating to such matters.

I, for my part, believe, that the minister himself is perfectly sincere upon this point. His clerks make up the account; there stand the *figures*, in rank and file, marshalled for attack upon the enemy. But, alas! the *figures* is all! It is all mere names and signs. And, to his utter astonishment, he finds, amidst all this plenty of money, this *surplus*, or *overmuch*, of funds, he is obliged to borrow immense sums for the use of the nation, and to make enormous additions to the mortgages upon that revenue, which he represents as being *superabundantly* productive.

In my garden there was an *Ant*-hill. Fifty times did I and my gardener disperse the little creatures with our feet; and still would they return and proceed again as if nothing had happened. At last, said I, "Let the poor devils alone, Robinson; for they are just like us English people."

But, I know of nothing except the *Ants* that are like us. Every thing else, that has eyes and ears, seems to be able to profit from experience. We are, however, doing no more than fulfilling the predictions of Hume, even to the very letter. Year after year we listen to the same story, and our credulity really appears to increase with the number of the times that we are deceived.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Friday,
April 12, 1811.

AUSTRIAN PAPER-MONEY.

(*Political Register*, November, 1811.)

IN page 569 of the last Number will be found an official paper, issued in Lower Austria, on the 3rd of September last, which is very well worthy of the attention of the English reader at this time.*

They have a great quantity of bank-notes in that unfortunate country. Formerly these notes were at *par*; that is to say, they were as good, in the purchase of commodities, as gold and silver; every florin in bank-notes was equal in value to a florin in silver. This is not the case now, and has not been for a good while past. The bank-notes became, gradually, of less and less value; they depreciated; they became lower and lower in comparison with gold and silver; and, at last, naturally arrived at a state of open and notorious discount.

What has been the consequence? Why, simply this: the government, or the Bank (for I do not know which it is) is now prepared to *put an end* to these bank-notes, by *redeeming* them. They are to be taken up by "*Redemption Bills*," which bills will be paid, it is said, to their real amount in gold and silver. Why not pay off the bank-notes themselves, then? the reader will ask. Oh! I will tell you why. The man who has a bank-note for *fifty* florins, is to get a redemption-bill for *ten* florins in exchange for it; he who has a bank-note for *twenty-five* florins, is to get a redemption-bill for *five* florins in exchange for it; and so on; and, after the 31st of December, those who hold bank-notes are to get nothing at all for them, and they are to be suffered to pass no more.

Here are pretty sufficient reasons for the scheme. The holders of bank-notes will only lose four florins out of five; that is all. This is no "new way of paying old debts." It is what the French did with regard to their *Assignats* and *Mandats*; and, it is what must always be done

* *The Regency of Lower Austria has published the following Circular:—*

1. On the 16th of this month, redemption-bills of 10 and of 5 florins shall be issued, in order to withdraw from circulation the bank-notes of 50 and of 25 florins.
—2. The above two sorts of redemption-bills are severally to pass in exchange for bank-notes of 50 and of 25 florins; but the holders of bank-notes of a lower denomination are permitted to exchange them for redemption-bills of 10 or of 5 florins, provided they present, in one or more sorts, 50 or 25 florins in bank-notes, for 10 or 5 florins in redemption-bills.—3. From the date of the 16th of September, the exchange of bank-notes of 50 and of 25 florins, for bank-notes of a lower denomination, shall cease to take place.—4. From the 15th of October next, bank-notes of 50 and of 25 florins are put out of circulation. From that date, they shall no longer be received at the Treasury, nor in payments to individuals.—5. However, permission is given, till the 31st of December, to carry the above two sorts of bank-notes to the office, created by the patent of the 20th of June last, under the name of Redemption-bill Office, and to exchange them for redemption-bills of 10 and of 5 florins; but this exchange must be entirely terminated on the 31st of December: and after the expiration of this period, the said office shall no longer receive any note of 50 or of 25 florins; because, from the 1st of January, 1812, these two denominations of bank-notes, are, by supreme order, declared null and of no value.

Vienna, Sept 3, 1811.

FRANCIS COUNT DE SAURAU,
Governor.

first or last, when a paper-money once becomes depreciated ; for, the bare fact of depreciation proves the want of ability *ever* to pay off to the full amount. A *bankruptcy* does, indeed, take place, and the creditors receive a *poundage*.

The sight of this Austrian circular naturally forces the mind back to the causes of the humiliation of the haughty dynasty who govern that unhappy country. Twenty-six years ago, the House of Austria was contending for the free navigation of the Scheldt ; it had begun to open the port of Antwerp, and to construct vessels there ; it had erected Ostend into a sea-port of considerable consequence ; it was aiming at the subjugation, or, at least, the oppression, of the United Provinces. The Dutch were compelled to submit, for the sake of safety, to all sorts of humiliations ; and they, at last, secured their safety only by *throwing themselves into the arms of France*. Hence is to be dated the attachment of the Dutch to the French ; and, indeed, from that time, they became "*Frenchmen in heart*," a phrase, which, having recently proceeded from the lips of the Mayor of Amsterdam, has given such offence to the wisacres, who, for our sins, conduct the press of England.

The House of Austria, with its half million of soldiers, and with English money to aid, took the lead in the coalition against the republicans of France. A nation rose up and humbled those immense armies ; and that same Belgium, which had so lately been the scene of the Austrian power and arrogance, received, with open arms, its republican invaders, whom it hailed as its real deliverers. That city of Brussels, which had seen the Austrian minister treat the Dutch Plenipotentiaries like scavengers, opened its gates to the French, hailed their arrival with joy unbounded, and revelled in the defacing and destroying of every vestige of its former subjection.

Ambition, revenge, shame, pushed on the House of Austria to recover its lost ground and fame. At every plunge it got deeper in disgrace ; till, at last, that haughty house, which had set out in the war with a declared resolution to dictate a government to France, had to yield its very capital and its palaces to Frenchmen, and to accept, as a boon at their hands, of leave to reign over a part of its former dominions, driven out of Germany and stripped of its most elevated titles. Reduced now to comparatively a petty patrimony, which it holds by a precarious tenure, its voice is become nothing in the affairs of Europe ; and, amongst its own beggared subjects, it is compelled to act a part as humble almost as even those subjects can wish ; and, to crown all, it is forced, by the French, to be *at war* with England, with whose aid it so long carried on war against those French.

Such, to the House of Austria, have been the consequences of the coalitions against France ; such, to that House, have been the consequences of erecting itself into a dictator as to the internal affairs of the French nation.

If the French had met with no opposition in the making of their revolution ; if they had been suffered to arrange their government in their own way ; if their internal enemies had not met with countenance and encouragement from without ; if war had not, in short, been made upon them ; how different might have been the situation of the House of Austria at this day ! The example of France might, indeed, have done much ; and, it would have been next to impossible, that, with a free people on their confines, the people of Belgium should have remained in

their former state. But, what then? The House of Austria would have lost Belgium; and, has it not lost it now? It would have lost Belgium; but it would have lost it without defeat and disgrace. It might still have retained the *title* at least of Emperor of Germany and King of the Romans; and it certainly would have avoided those pecuniary distresses that now press upon it.

It is curious enough that the rulers of Austria and Prussia, who combined against the republicans of France, because, amongst other things, they had seized upon *the property of the Church*, should both have been driven by their necessities to seize upon the Church property in their dominions; that is to say, to commit themselves, that which they warred against as sacrilege in the people of France; and that the war, which was to ruin France through her finances, should have ended in leaving her rich, and in reducing these her principal opponents to beggary.

These are great lessons for princes and statesmen. They are well calculated to make a deep impression; but, after all that we have seen, it is, perhaps, too much to hope, that the dictates of reason will at last prevail over the dictates of passion.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.

(*Political Register*, December, 1810.)

NOTE BY THE EDITORS.—The King's illness in 1788 had caused the question of the Regency to be debated at great length; but, it was so long before Mr. COBBETT's political career began, that there is no allusion to it in his writings, excepting in one of his letters to Mr. PITT, in 1804, and which the reader will find in Vol. I. p. 459, of these Selections.—ED.

FROM the reports and statements published in the newspapers since my last, it would appear that his Majesty is in a worse state than he has been, at any time since the commencement of his malady. Of the *truth* of this, however, I can *know* nothing; and, a very good rule for the public to observe is, to believe *nothing* that they see upon the subject in the newspapers; for, the fact is, none of us *know*, or can *know*, any thing at all of the matter.

With regard to the proposed *Regency*, however, every man may know something, and may offer his opinion thereon. I have offered mine pretty fully already, and I was, I believe, the first public writer who did express any opinion at all upon the subject.

Every day's events since that time, and every opportunity for reflection, have tended to convince me, that my opinion was correct.

There has appeared, in the ministerial newspapers, and particularly in the *COURIER* of the 21st instant, an article giving a history of what has taken place between the Prince of Wales and his brothers and the Minister, Mr. Perceval, relating to the proposed Regency. I shall insert this article here, not only as a document to be referred to hereafter, but as a subject for present commentary:—

“ The Chancellor of the Exchequer has not yet had an interview with the Prince; though it was confidently stated yesterday that he had had. But he requested to be honoured with one in a respectful letter which he addressed to his Royal Highness, inclosing for his Royal Highness’s consideration, the plan of the proceeding for a Regency, with certain limitations, which it was his intention to submit to the House of Commons; and expressing a hope that he might be honoured with his Royal Highness’s command to wait on him to know his pleasure on the subject. The Prince of Wales signified to Mr. Perceval, that as no step had yet been taken on the subject in the two Houses of Parliament, he did not think it consistent with his respect for the two Houses to give any opinion on the course of proceeding which had been submitted to him. On a former occasion it was not until the resolution had been come to by both Houses, that the matter was submitted to him; and then he had felt it to be his duty to express his opinion distinctly on the subject; and to that opinion he had ever since invariably adhered; and the answer of his Royal Highness concludes with expressing his most earnest wishes that the speedy re-establishment of his Majesty’s health would make any measure of the kind unnecessary.—This answer was sent to Mr. Perceval on Wednesday evening.—The Prince of Wales communicated to all the branches of his illustrious family, the plan of the Regency, which had been transmitted to him, upon which the *whole of the royal Dukes*, with one consent, drew up a declaration and protest, which they signed, stating in substance:—‘That, understanding from his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, that it was intended to propose to the two Houses, the measure of supplying the royal authority, by the appointment of a Regency, with certain limitations and restrictions, as described; they feel it to be their duty to declare, that it was the unanimous opinion of all the male branches of his Majesty’s family, that they could not view this mode of proceeding without alarm, as a Regency so restricted, was inconsistent with the prerogatives which were vested in the royal authority, as much for the security and benefit of the people, as for the strength and dignity of the crown itself; and they, therefore, most solemnly protest against this violation of the principles which placed their family on the throne.’ To this declaration and protest we understand an answer was last night received by the Prince; from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in which, after the usual recital of the tenor of the royal document, he proceeds to state:—‘That he had submitted it to the consideration of his Majesty’s confidential servants,—that however much they had to regret that the course of proceeding which they had adopted on the melancholy occasion of his Majesty’s illness, had not had the good fortune to receive the approbation of the illustrious persons, the male branches of the royal family, yet they continued to consider it as the only legal and constitutional course in which they could be supported by precedent; that it was the course prescribed in the year 1788-9,—when it had not only been adopted, after long and painful discussion, by the two Houses of Parliament, but had received the universal approbation of the country at large,—and they were still further gratified by the reflection, that on the re-establishment of his Majesty’s health, the proceedings pursued in Parliament upon that occasion had received his Majesty’s gracious confirmation, and had been even honoured with expressions of his personal gratitude.’ ”

Now, if all this be *true*, it will serve to explain a good deal of what was before not easily to be reconciled to reason.

The Prince tells Mr. PERCEVAL, that he remains firm in his opinions, expressed in 1788; and this Mr. Perceval learns from him on the *Wednesday*. On *Thursday* the parliament meets, and now, for the *first* time, we hear that the limitations of 1788 are to be again resorted to; we hear this, for the *first* time, after the Prince has *declined to admit Mr. Perceval to an interview!*

The public will bear this in mind. They will also bear in mind, that the *ministerial prints*, for several weeks, and from the moment that a Regency was first talked of, always were *forward* to say, that, as to *limitations*, the difference of circumstances would render those of 1788 *unfit* for the present time. This, as the public will well remember, was stated

by those prints over and over again. But, they THEN said, that they were well informed, that his Royal Highness the Prince, MEANT TO MAKE NO CHANGE IN THE MINISTRY.

The public will bear this in mind. This is what ought never to be lost sight of. The two assertions ran together; 1st, that the circumstances of the present times *did not call for the limitations of 1788*, and, 2nd, that the Prince meant to make *no change in the ministry*.

At this time they affected to *laugh* at the Opposition, whom they described as having received "an intimation from a *certain quarter*, that their *talents would not be wanted*." They told them that they would still have to wander in the dreary shades of Opposition. They jeered them without mercy. All the town knows, that a report was, all this while, industriously spread, that the Prince had settled every thing with the present ministers, who were to propose for him an *unlimited* Regency, and who, in return, were *to be kept in place*.

But, now behold! when this report turns out to be false, as every man of discernment know it to be from the first; when it appears that the Prince of Wales adheres to the principles declared by him twenty-two years ago; and, when it further appears, that he has *declined to admit a visit from Mr. Perceval*; now these same prints defend the project for *reviving the limitations of 1788 in their full extent*, though they had, while they told us that the Prince meant to make *no change in the ministry*, expressly said, that those limitations would be *unfit* under the *change of circumstances* that had now taken place. Now that these venal prints find, that the Prince *would not admit Mr. Perceval to an interview*, they can no longer see any unfitness in the limitations of 1788, and have entirely lost sight of all the important changes in the circumstances.

This is too plain for any man to misunderstand; and, understanding it, what man is there, who does not applaud the conduct of the Prince, and who does not clearly perceive, that he has pursued that line of conduct which was dictated by honour and by a just estimate of his own rights and of his duties towards the people? It is, therefore, for the people to show, in a regular and constitutional way, that they entertain a due sense of what is due to him *from them* upon this momentous occasion.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Tuesday,
December 25, 1810.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register*, December, 1810.)

It is, it would seem, now become impossible any longer to disguise the fact of the King being extremely ill; and, it is worth observation, that in the chief of the venal prints, the *Courier*, a letter appeared on Saturday last, stating that the King was *much better*; that a *material change*

for the better had taken place; when, as it now appears, the King was, at the very time spoken of in this sham letter, in a very dangerous way.

All that we read in these venal prints is calculated to deceive and cheat the public. The falsehoods, which they have promulgated, upon this subject, since the fact of the King's illness could no longer be kept wholly from the public, surpass, perhaps, any thing of the kind that even this nation has ever before witnessed.

What a shame is this in itself! But, when one comes to look into the *real cause* of it, how much blacker does the thing become? *Why* these falsehoods? *Why* should the truth be withheld from the public? *Why* should these frauds have been thus continually practised? Every man's mind will suggest the proper answer, and will, at the same time teach him to hold in detestation the men, in whose minds the falsehoods have manifestly been hatched.

In my last Number, I pointed out very clearly how the language of the venal prints had *changed*, upon the subject of the proposed *limitations*, since it was discovered, that the PRINCE would not admit Mr. PERCEVAL to an interview. They were all decided for *no limitations at all*, while they were asserting that His Royal Highness would *make no change in the ministry*. They coupled the *opinion* with the *assertion*. They were equally clear and unqualified as to both. But, the moment they had to confess, that the PRINCE had refused to see Mr. PERCEVAL, that moment they discovered, that *all* the limitations of 1788 ought *now* to be imposed. They had before said expressly, that the material *change of circumstances* that had taken place since 1788, called for a change in the plan of a Regency, and particularly, that the limitations *then* thought necessary, could not be thought necessary *now*; but the moment they found that the PRINCE had refused to see Mr. PERCEVAL, they tacked suddenly about, and could perceive that those limitations, in their full extent, were absolutely necessary, and, indeed, the COURIER of the 26th instant says, that "*the circumstances have changed, but the change is in favour of the necessity of restrictions!*"

One would wonder how any man was to be found capable of baseness like this. The fact must be seen to be believed of human nature. It serves, however, to show us what are the sort of men and the sort of means opposed to the lodging of the Royal Authority, full and undivided, in the hands of the Heir to the throne.

We have before taken a general view of the tendency, in a constitutional point of view, of imposing limitations upon his Royal Highness. But, are the people aware of the way in which some part of these limitations would operate, in a *pecuniary* point of view? Are they aware of the new and heavy burdens that must, in consequence of such limitations, be imposed upon them?

Some explanation is necessary here.

One part of the project of 1788 was to withhold from the Prince the appointment of the several offices *connected with the King's Household*, and also to keep from him the allowance for the King's *Privy Purse*. Both these were to be placed in the hands of Her Majesty, the QUEEN, who was to have a Council to aid her.

The offices of the Household are very considerable in point of number and emolument, and, of course, of influence. The allowance for the King's *Privy Purse* is a sum of not less than 60,000 pounds a year,

which, as the reader will observe, is wholly *independent of*, and *over and above*, all the expenses of the household and all the settled and *known* expenses or disbursements of the King. It is so much money which he may, and does, dispose of *just as he pleases*. He may give it away, or lay it up, or do what he likes with it.

This, in a kingly government, may, or may not, be proper; but, however men may differ in opinion as to the general propriety of it, all must agree, I think, that the privy purse ought to go with the *Royal Authority*, because it is given for the purpose of supporting the splendour of the throne, which is regarded as necessary to the welfare of the people.

The project of 1788, is, it would seem from the language of the venal prints, to be acted upon, if the two Houses agree to it; and, of course, His Royal Highness, the Prince, would, in such case, have to exercise the functions of Royalty, without a *Household Establishment*, or a *Privy Purse*; or, the people would have to bear *new taxes* to defray the expenses of both; so that, the King's incapacity to perform the duties of his high office, would bring upon the people the burden of *two households and two privy purses*.

And *for what?* Can any man answer me that question? Will the most venal of the venal tribe tell me for what *reason* this ought to be? Can any such man find out, or attempt, a justification of such a measure? Can any man discover an apology for it; can he make up any, even the slightest pretence or excuse for it?

Let us hear what has been said by the COURIER of the 25th instant, as to this point, which will enable us to judge of the reasons that can be urged in defence of such a measure.

He first tells us what passed in the House of Commons respecting it:—"After the Gallery was cleared, Mr. Wynn asked Mr. Perceval "whether, in the event of the House agreeing to the Restriction, which "would deprive the Regent of the nomination of *the Officers of the "Household*, he proposed to follow the plan given notice of by Mr. Pitt "in 1788, of allowing to the Regent *an additional regal establishment*, "and imposing fresh taxes, to defray the expense of it, *to which Mr. "Perceval answered in the affirmative.*"

Having quoted this passage, the venal man sets about an anticipation of what will be objected to such a measure; and he then, in the manner that we shall see, endeavours to *answer* the objections which he anticipates.

"From the above paragraph we are led to apprehend it is the design of opposition to make the same absurd cry against assigning the Prince a due income "for the maintenance of his new dignity, which was raised in 1789. Do the "opposition now intend to raise the same silly objection? 'Fresh taxes!' "This it is supposed will touch John Bull in the tender point! Under the idea "that John is a sordid ungenerous wretch; is this a bait thrown out to catch a "little popularity? If it be, those who have thrown it are *shallow panders of the "base passions of the people*, the most mischievous advisers the Prince of Wales "can have about him. Is it not obvious how *many unpleasant recollections must "arise from a discussion of the Prince's pecuniary affairs*; recollections which all "good men must wish *buried in oblivion*? Will not *ill-natured* remarks be made "upon the offer of conducting so high an office, without any additional provision, by a personage *who has found the provision already assigned insufficient "for his support*, and the *chief grounds* of whose *unpopularity*, now happily *nearly "obliterated*, were his debts? Would these gentlemen have the Prince declare, "that *mortgaged and hampered* as his income already is, insufficient as he has "found it, yet still he is willing and able to undertake an office of far greater ex-

"pense, without any additional allowance? Would they have the Regent, so
 "nearly our King as he will be, live in a private style, walking the streets in a
 "brown coat, *maintaining neither state nor dignity?* And all this for the low
 "grovelling motive of *catching a little popularity from the mob*, by not imposing
 "fresh taxes? Were the ministers to propose such a plan, then indeed they
 "might be accused of degrading Royalty; and there would be heard against
 "them a loud cry of just indignation. It is singular, that while a clamour is
 "raised against cramping the Regent's power, those persons who raise it, who
 "call themselves his friends, should *advise him to cramp it in the most essential*
 "*point—the pecuniary provision for his state and dignity.* Such canting may
 "*please Sir Francis Burdett, and his rabble;* and were this the first time of its
 "being heard, we should ascribe it to the counsels of the worthy Baronet. No:
 "The Regent must have a provision suited to his rank and dignity; and suitably
 "to that rank and dignity he must live. He must hold a Court, have Levees
 "and drawing-rooms, and appear surrounded with splendour in public. *All men*
 "*of sense allow that this splendour is essentially necessary to ensure a due respect*
 "*for Royalty;* and least of any can it be dispensed with in these times. Many
 "instances might be given of Royalty falling into contempt by the plain appear-
 "ance and familiar habits of those on whom it had devolved. The sages of the
 "Burdett school have *often recommended that the servants of the State should*
 "*work without pay;* but we trust they will not be gratified by seeing a Regent
 "without any pecuniary provision as such, and without a regal establishment;
 "even although such an arrangement should render necessary the imposition of
 " "*Fresh Taxes!*"

Now, reader, after repeating to you, that this is taken from the COURIER
 newspaper of the 25th instant, and begging you to bear in mind what
 the character and description of that paper is, let me ask you if you, in
 your whole life, ever cast your eyes upon any thing in which the MEAN,
 MERCENARY, and MALIGNANT mind was so clearly visible? The
 man, who penned, or who dictated, or who approved of this, must join
 to the most profound *hypocrisy*, a degree of *malignity* rarely to be met
 with even in that malignant school, in which he has been educated. In
 most other writings, however false and base upon the whole, we find
 something of an unexceptionable sort; but here *all* is falsehood or mis-
 representation; *all* is malignant and base.

No *answer* is here given, or attempted to be given, to the complaint
 which is anticipated, that the people would have to sustain the burden of
two Regal establishments. No: to *answer* that complaint was impos-
 sible; and, therefore, in the *vindictiveness* of his heart, the author of this
 paragraph, this leader of those venal men who call themselves "the
loyal;" who have assumed the exclusive appellation of King's friends;
 this man, who has, at the same time, the impudence to impute disloyal
 motives to others, makes use of the occasion to endeavour to excite
 popular dislike of the Heir Apparent to the throne, and that, too, by in-
 sinuations as false as they are malignant.

The Prince is here told, that, if any objection be made to the contem-
 plated measure, the discussion will give rise "to many *unpleasant recol-*
lections belonging to his pecuniary affairs, which all *good men*" [Oh!
 the base hypocrite!] "must *wish buried in oblivion,*" and then he is told,
 that the "*chief grounds* of his *unpopularity,* are his *debts.*"

In the first place, it is false to say, as it is here clearly said, that His
 Royal Highness is, or ever has been, *unpopular* with any part of the
 people, except such as were misled by the hypocritical cant of those,
 whose selfish purposes it answered to misrepresent him, to discolour all
 his actions; to spread out every speck into a broad and odious blemish,
 and who, be it well remarked, while they were the unqualified defenders

of the unbounded profligacy of foreign courts, for the sustaining of whom against their indignant people, they were willing to see wasted the blood and sweat of England, hunted, with the nose of the Beagle and the eyes of the Lynx, for faults in the Prince of Wales. In short, that man must not have lived in England; that man must have heard nothing of England, who does not know, that to misrepresent, to undermine, to blacken, to pull down and to keep down, to render of no weight or consequence, the Prince of Wales, has, for many years, been the leading feature in the policy of those, who have been the worst enemies of the people of England that the people of England ever knew; the merciless enemies of them in their property, their liberty and their lives; and who, under the garb of loyalty, have really done all that in them lay to extirpate all the just and useful prerogatives of the Crown.

“The debts of the Prince!” And, *why* had he debts that he was unable to pay? Not because he expended more than it became him to spend; but because that which he ought to have received was withheld from him. He never ought to have been reduced to the necessity of making any application to parliament, or to any body else. It was as necessary that he should have the means of munificence as that the King should have such means. But, it was always the wish of the persons spoken of above, that he should, as often as possible, be reduced to a state that compelled him to make applications for money, and that, upon all such occasions, there should issue forth a fresh swarm of insinuations against him, while a hundred times the amount of his wants was expended upon others without calling forth the slightest animadversion.

The reader will not fail to observe, that the very persons, who are now promulgating these revived insinuations against the Prince, and who, as was before observed, have, for many years past, taken every opportunity of exhibiting him to the people as a squanderer of their money; these very persons, have, upon all occasions, been the defenders of grants, however enormous and unmerited, *to others*. In all such cases, they have talked of the necessity of such grants to the support of the splendour of the throne and the kingly government; they have insisted that the King ought to have the power of granting even the *reversions*, three or four deep, of sinecure places; they have defended the sinecure system; they have called such places the freeholds of the patentees; they have, in all *such* cases, called it *cant* and hunting after *popularity* to oppose such grants; but, in cases, where money was wanted for the Prince of Wales, they have assumed the language of *economy*, have talked of the *burdens* of the people, have caused the matter to be discussed till it became the topic of every farm-house, and have, in their detestable publications, of various sorts and endless number, held him forth as the great, and almost the only, spender of the public money.

How unjust this is, how flagrantly false, any one will see who looks into the Lists of Places and Pensions, where he will find that Lord ARDEN, the brother of Mr. PERCEVAL, receives, as the proceeds of a sinecure, full *one third part* as much as is allowed to His Royal Highness, the Heir Apparent to the Throne, and of which sinecure, be it not forgotten, Mr. PERCEVAL himself has the *reversion*! His Royal Highness is not allowed more than *twice* as much as has been, for years, received by the Marquis of Buckingham; and he is not allowed more than about *four* times as much as is received, in net profits, by Mr. GARNIER, the patentee of the Office of *Apothecary-General* to the Army!

Now, I put it to the reader, whether there ever was a more foul attack, ever more base insinuations, than those now revived and propagated by the enemies of the Prince; and whether the people ought not, by all the constitutional means in their power, to show their abhorrence of such proceedings and attempts.

The reviving and propagating of such insinuations clearly demonstrate the *real character* of the persons, with whom they evidently originate, and whose "*loyalty*" and "*friendship for the King*" have now received a most satisfactory explanation. These are professions calculated to deceive and to cheat the nation, and intended for that sole purpose. Those who use them would now tear to pieces, if they could, the kingly government, rather than see it in the hands of the Prince of Wales; and this only because they are aware, that his Royal Highness would not use it for purposes for which *they* would wish to see it used. If he were ready to make the use of it that *they* desire, not a word should we hear from them about the *necessity of limitations*; not a word about *regard for the King*, for, in fact, they have no feeling of affection or of COMPASSION, as is clearly shown in the whole of their publications, of every sort and shape.

Such is their "*loyalty*;" such is the conduct of those, who, by way of excellence, call themselves "*the loyal*;" and against all such, and men of such principles, let us hope that it is quite unnecessary to put his Royal Highness upon his guard.

This venal writer chooses to suppose that which no man has said or meant. He chooses to represent those who are opposed to the measure of limitations generally, and to the creating of a *new Household* in particular; he chooses to represent these persons as *wishing the Regent to have no regal establishment, but to see him walking the streets in a brown coat*. This he chooses to assume, *because* he anticipates, that we shall object to *new taxes* in order to uphold an *additional regal establishment*.

What an impudent misrepresentation is this! And what a contempt must such a man have for the understandings of his readers!

No: we do not wish the Regent to walk the street in a brown coat, and to be unable to cope with Lord ARDEN or Mr. PERCEVAL in point of expenditure. We do not wish the Regent to be without a regal establishment. We do not wish him to be stripped of all the splendour belonging to the kingly office. We wish *just the contrary*; we wish him to have *all the powers and all the splendour* of a King of England: but, as we know that there *already is* a regal Establishment, we wish him to have *that*, as long as it shall be necessary for him to fill the high Office, to which that establishment belongs.

This venal writer impudently takes it for *granted*, that we consent, or, at least, that it will finally be determined to *withhold from his Royal Highness the PRESENT Household*, the present regal establishment; when the fact notoriously is, that it is now a question to be decided, in the two Houses, whether the present establishment is to be withheld from the Prince, or not: it is notorious that this is *the question* now at issue; and yet this writer, with impudence truly characteristic of venality, speaks of the thing as *settled*; speaks of the question as *decided*; speaks of the thing, in short, as if the present regal establishment was, by common consent, to be withheld from the Prince. Such barefaced misrepresentation as this *may* impose upon some people; but one would

hope, that the number capable of being so imposed upon must be very few indeed.

Another trick resorted to is to speak of the imposing of *new taxes*, for the purpose of providing a household for the Regent, as an act of *magnanimity* on the *part of the Minister*; as if *he* were willing to face the *unpopularity* that might arise from such a measure. And here the example of Mr. PITT is quoted, who, in answer to the complaints of the Opposition in 1788, said, that, before *he* went out of office, *he* himself would propose the taxes necessary for a new establishment for the Regent.

How *magnanimous* this was! *He* would incur the unpopularity of imposing new taxes *for the sake of the Regent*! What a flimsy pretence! The new taxes were to be imposed *for the sake of himself and his party*, who would, of course, have been the *Council* of her Majesty, in whose hands the old establishment was to be kept. There then was, as there now is, a regal Establishment; and, *in order that that might remain under his influence*, the Minister would lay on new taxes to make another for the Prince. He would have made the people pay the expenses of a new establishment, in order that he and his party might still possess all the influence belonging to the old one. What rare magnanimity! What kindness towards the Prince!

The enemies of kingly government have always placed amongst its evils the great *expenses* attached to the regal state. Its friends have been obliged to acknowledge that the thing was, *in itself*, an objection; but that it was far overbalanced by certain advantages; and, they have, at the same time, contended, that such expenses were, in fact, made *for the sake of the people*, and not for the sake of *the King*, that they were *necessary to the kingly office*, which office was necessary to the *welfare of the people*. Now, what becomes of all this reasoning, what becomes of this defence of Kingly establishments, if we are to see the present establishment *withheld* from him, who is to fill the *office* of King; if we see it separated from the office, and held in hand as a mere *personal* possession? If we see it kept back for the use of the King, and that, too, during the time that he shall be *known*, and officially *declared*, to be incapable of performing any of the functions of that *office*, to render which efficient for *the service of the people*, such establishment is held to be necessary, and upon which ground *alone* the supporting of it is justified.

Then again, suppose the King should recover? The Prince, in that case, would have to lay down his *new establishment*. There would be another change, and that too, of no very agreeable kind. Whereas, if he take, as I trust he will, the present Household and Establishment, there would be no change at all of a nature to produce any disagreeable impression. He would merely have to give up the Office, with all that belongs to it, to his Father, without any new expenses, or any of those difficulties that must inevitably arise in the other case.

And, *why* should not this be? What *reason* is there for keeping the old establishment in the hands of *other persons*? The King himself cannot use it? To him no splendour can be necessary; and, as to the Queen, it is well known, that she could not *retain* the establishment a moment after the King's *death*, and, of course, that it cannot be fitting, that she should possess it now. Indeed, it in nowise belongs to her; she has a provision of her own, or, at least, appropriated to herself; the

household belonging to the *Office* of the King, and that, too, for the *benefit of the people*. For whom, then, is this vast establishment to be kept up at the same time that the people are called upon to support another for the Prince? For whom? Who is to have the management of it? Who is to possess the benefit of it? Who is to have the political influence derived from its possession? In short, how is it possible to find out a pretence, even a shadow of reason, for such a measure?

The venal writer, after having, in the manner above described, misrepresented the question; after having impudently taken for granted, that, by common consent, the old establishment is to be withheld from the Prince, and that the opponents of the Ministers wish that no new taxes should be imposed for the purpose of making a new regal establishment; after this, he says, that all men, "except Sir FRANCIS BURDETT and his rabble, wish the kingly office to be surrounded with splendour. He then says, that the *cant* against taxation may please them, who have often recommended that the servants of the state should work "without pay."

If in falsehood there can be degrees, these are the most false of this venal and malignant man's assertions. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT has never represented taxes as unnecessary; he has never attempted to represent taxes, in the abstract, as an oppression. He is too wise to entertain such an opinion, and has too much integrity and sincerity to affect to believe it. I might content myself with this denial, and leave the malignant accuser to prove his charge; but, I will not so content myself. I will prove the *negative*, and hold up the malignant accuser to public scorn.

On the 2nd of July, 1804, when the Minister came to Parliament for a large grant (591,842*l.*) to pay off the *arrears* only of the King's Civil List, Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, upon the subject of taxation, said:

"I repeat, that feeling the pressure of the times, and the misapplication of the public money, I am averse to every thing that has a tendency to increase our difficulties. I am, however, far from wishing to make a general declaration against every species of taxation. I am of opinion, on the contrary, that taxation, properly applied, may be as beneficial as the moisture absorbed by the sun from the earth, which, falling again in rains and dews, fertilizes the soil. But, how different that taxation, which is extorted from the industry of the people, and applied only to corrupt their morals, and undermine their freedom! Such is the system which has been the ruin of other countries, and is likely to be the ruin of this, if the constitutional interposition of Parliament does not prevent it."

This has always, upon similar occasions, been his language. Let the malignant son of venality, therefore, regorge his accusation, or let his foolish readers believe him, if they will. He knows well, that neither Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, nor any man of his principles, has ever expressed a sentiment resembling those here imputed to them; but, he also knows, that Sir FRANCIS BURDETT is the implacable, the mortal, foe of *seat-selling* and of *corruption* and *public robbery* of every sort; and it is for *this* that the MEAN, MERCENARY, and MALIGNANT men hate him, and would willingly see him broiled alive. For *this* it is that they thus labour, that they incessantly toil, to misrepresent his opinions and his views; being well assured, that, if his wishes be accomplished, they are destroyed.

Very unfortunate indeed was this venal man in introducing Sir FRANCIS BURDETT as one of those, who would wish to see his Royal

Highness the Prince walking the streets in a brown coat, and stripped of all the splendour belonging to his rank; for, not only has the honourable Baronet never let fall an expression to warrant such a charge, but he has, upon divers occasions, and upon every occasion when he with propriety could, expressed sentiments of an exactly opposite cast. He has not only, upon every such occasion, expressed his wish, that the several branches of the Royal Family should have a suitable and splendid establishment, observing, that it was not *this* that would oppress the people, that *this* was comparatively nothing, that the people never did, and never ought to grudge *this*, and that, indeed, one of the great sins of the system of which he complained, was, that it kept down the Royal Family, while it oppressed the people. This has been uniformly his language, as often as occasion has served; and, he has been particularly strong upon all these occasions, in protesting against the *illiberal treatment*, as to pecuniary matters, experienced by his Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales. Of this fact those who are at all acquainted with what has passed in the political world will want no particular proof; but, as the MEAN, MERCENARY, and MALIGNANT men have put forward the accusation, I cannot refrain from quoting another passage from Sir FRANCIS'S speech of 2nd July, 1804, upon the Civil List grant then proposed:—

“My most serious objection,” said he, “to the vote proposed, refers to the *unconstitutional application* of the public money. I advert to the sums advanced to the princes of the blood, *without the consent of Parliament*. I do not think it decent or becoming that the princes of England should be *dependent on the minister of the day*. If they wanted relief, they ought to have made application to the House of Commons, and not condescend to receive *bounties from the Chancellor of the Exchequer*. I recollect, however, and the *reflection gives me pain*, that whenever they have applied to this House in a constitutional way, for that relief to which they were entitled, their claims have been *rejected*. This has been particularly evinced in the applications of THAT ILLUSTRIOUS MEMBER OF THE FAMILY, who enjoys, as he deserves, the *particular affection and confidence of the people*; and is therefore, perhaps, AN OBJECT OF JEALOUSY TO SOME. But, whenever these princes have appealed to ministers *privately*, that assistance has been *unconstitutionally granted*, which ought only to have flowed from Parliament. It is a subject of regret and surprise, that what Parliament *has refused* should be *bestowed by ministerial influence*.”

Such have always been the sentiments of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT upon this subject; and yet, these venal men have the impudence to hold him forth as a person, who wishes to *degrade* the Royal Authority and the Royal Family; as a person who wishes the Regent “to walk the streets in a brown coat;” as a person who is desirous of using his great influence with *the people* to persuade them, that *all taxes* are unnecessary and *oppressive*, and that the several branches of the Royal Family, and the Prince of Wales in particular, ought to be regarded as *squanderers of the people's earnings*.

And this these venal men do at the same moment, that they are exerting all their influence to revive the base insinuations respecting the Prince's expenses; at the same moment that they have the impudence to talk of “the *unpopularity* arising from his *debts*;” at the same moment that they are taunting him with having his income anticipated, “*mortgaged*, and *hindered*,” and are, in short, leaving nothing untried to place him in a light at once the most odious and most contemptible. These are the men who assume to themselves the appellations of “*the loyal*,” and of “*King's friends*;” these are the men, who have, for

years, been representing as *Jacobins* and *Levellers* and *Traitors*, all those who wished, and who still wish, for a reform of abuses, a destruction of seat-selling and of corruption, but who have never wished for any thing that should take from the King or his family any part of their just prerogatives, or any of the means of supporting the dignity and splendour belonging to their high rank and station.

There are, too, I have been told (and I heard it with a mixture of surprise and indignation) men, who call themselves "the PRINCE'S FRIENDS," who have taken upon them to say, that Sir FRANCIS BURDETT was *not to be considered in that character*. If they meant by *Prince's Friends*, those who may have espoused his cause *for their own sakes*; who have been looking *to him*, because it was their last and only hope; because it was useless for them to look elsewhere; if this be what they mean by "Prince's friends," Sir Francis does, certainly, not make one of *them*. But, will any one of these gentlemen (and, I trust, they are few in number) show me *how* and *when* they have shown their *friendship* towards the Prince? Will they show me *how* and *when* they have given *proofs* of this friendship? And, will they show me; will the best of them show me, how they are so ABLE to serve the Prince as Sir Francis Burdett has been, and now is? Will they show me, will any of them undertake to prove to me, that *their* opinions are likely to go further with the nation, than the opinions of Sir Francis Burdett? Will they attempt to say, that, either in England, in Ireland, or in any part of the world, the opinions of Sir Francis Burdett will not, upon any public matter, and especially upon a matter of this sort, weigh as much as theirs?

Sir Francis Burdett, as I once before observed, wants nothing of the Prince but what every man may reasonably wish for, namely, his good opinion: he appears from his publicly declared sentiments, always to have regarded him as having been treated in an illiberal manner, and as having been, by foul means, attempted to be undermined in the public opinion. He has looked upon his treatment as *unjust*, and that, without any other motive, was sufficient to put an independent and honest English Gentleman on his side; and especially when he saw the Prince assailed by those foul insinuations, which seem now to be revived with all their original malignity.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Friday,
Dec. 28, 1810.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, January, 1811.*)

"———He who contends for Freedom,
" Can ne'er be justly deem'd his Sovereign's foe;
" No, 'tis the wretch that tempts him to subvert it,
" The soothing slave, the Traitor in the bosom,
" Who best deserves that name; he is the worm
" That eats out all the happiness of kingdoms."—THOMSON.

Look at the motto, English reader! Look at the motto! It contains a truth, important at all times to be borne in mind, but especially

at the present time, and as connected with the conduct, and the apparent views, and expectations of public men.

In my last Number, I took a view of the language and sentiments of the notoriously venal prints with regard to a prominent feature in the intended limitations to the powers of the Regent; and, I think, I left no ground at all for doubt as to the *real* object of withholding the *Household and Privy purse* (for, I have seen no exception with regard to the latter) from the Prince; nor do I think that I left any doubt as to the impropriety of such a measure. I noticed, and, I think, I refuted, the revived insinuations against his Royal Highness with regard to his debts and pecuniary embarrassments, which, as I there observed, ought never to have existed, and which did not arise from extravagant expenditure, but from his having had withheld from him that which was his *due* as much as the rents of the Duke of Northumberland, or the Duke of Bedford, is the due of either of them; and, I flatter myself that I left no doubt at all with regard to the malignity of the motives, which dictated the revival of those insinuations.

I showed, too, that those who had been, and still were, most strenuous in their endeavours to obtain a reform of abuses; those who were most desirous to see corruption torn from its seat, had uniformly reprobated the means that had been used to keep the Prince of Wales in the background, to misrepresent him, to whisper away his character, and to deprive him of all weight and consequence.

Upon this last topic, which is one of the greatest interest to both Prince and people, I think it necessary to say something more, especially after what has appeared in the venal prints within the last week.

The *COURIER*, which seems to be the chosen channel of attack and insinuation against the Prince of Wales, has represented, of *late*, that is to say, since it was announced that Mr. Perceval had been refused an interview by the Prince; *since* that time the *COURIER* has been extremely industrious to find out *reasons* for reviving the limitations of 1788; and amongst these *reasons*, is, the *hopes* and *expectations* in the Prince, which appear to be entertained by those, whom this venal gentleman chooses to call the "*Burdett gang*;" that is to say, all those (four-fifths of the people of England) who wish for a reform of abuses, and, as the effectual means of accomplishing this, for a *reform of the Commons' House of Parliament*.

The words of the venal man are these:—

"When it is considered, that the *gang* of Burdett, Cobbett, and Co. seem to expect *something in their way* from an unlimited Regent, we agree that the circumstances have changed, but the change is *in favour of the necessity of restrictions*."

So, then, the necessity of restrictions, in the view of the venal and corrupt, is increased by the circumstance, that those who are for a *reform of abuses* have expressed their expectations, or *seem* to expect, "*something in their way*" from an unfettered Regency. What a compliment to the Prince! What an argument, with *the people*, constitutionally to oppose the intended limitations!

Here the views of the corrupt, here the views of those vile men who deal in and fatten upon corruption, here the views of the people's enemies, are completely exposed. For, though they do not, in so many words, say, that they wish the Prince's powers to be limited, lest he should promote a reform of abuses and corruptions; though they do not

directly say that they wish to abridge his power, to shackle and to hamper him, lest he should use that power for the purpose of giving the people a Reform of Parliament, and effect the great purpose of putting an end to seat-selling, and all its train of jobs and wickedness and national degradation and ruin; though they do not, in so many distinct words say, that this is one of *their* strong reasons in favour of limitations, they here clearly discover that such, in fact, is one of those reasons, and, I should not be at all surprised, if this was the very strongest of the reasons for which they wish for limitations.

If, then, it be true, that you ought to avoid that which your *enemy* wishes you to do, the people must see, that they ought, by all the constitutional means in their power, to show, that they are opposed to such limitations; and, to give his Royal Highness a proof of their confidence in him. If he, for a year, or for whatever length of time, be restrained, either directly or indirectly, from adopting such measures as he would, if possessing full powers, be disposed to adopt, the people can, in reason, expect nothing in the way of that *change of system*, which every disinterested man, that I have ever heard of, has long been wishing for. To act *freely*, the Regent, like other men, must be *free*. He may be, and I hope and believe, he would be, disposed to gratify fully all the just wishes of the people, in the whole of the kingdom: but if he be hampered with restrictions, how is he to do any thing which would be likely to give any satisfaction at all? For, though he would not, in direct terms, be prohibited from giving his assent to a measure for the reform of Parliament, for instance, yet, if by means of limitations, such a weight of influence was opposed to him as to render it impossible for him to carry such a measure, the effect would be the same; and he would be compelled to *act* upon the system, though, at the same time, he might *protest* against it. What the effects of such a state of things would be, the mind of man cannot conjecture. The *people*, therefore, at a time like this, when they have more at stake than they ever had before, should let their voice be heard, in a legal and constitutional way; and should prove to his Royal Highness, that *they* are willing to confide in his wisdom and justice, in spite of all the insinuations that the venal and corrupt are, in their divers sorts of publications, pouring forth against him.

Another of the reasons of these venal men against putting full powers into the hands of the Prince, is, that he would be likely to grant, as far as in him lay, those claims, which have so long been put forward by *the Catholics of Ireland*. The *COURIER* of the 29th of last month dwells very emphatically upon this point; and, as a proof of the justness of its suspicions, cites what has recently been said in Ireland with regard to the views of his Royal Highness, respecting what is called the Catholic Question.

“The Prince of Wales’s name is made use of at these meetings in a way which should be known to the whole empire. His word is asserted to be *solemnly pledged* to accede to the Catholic claims. We quote the speech of Mr. O’Connell. ‘His Royal Highness’s sentiments on this subject were neither concealed nor doubtful. He had communicated them, as became him, unequivocally, and without disguise, amongst others, to Catholics of rank and respectability. We therefore do not proceed on precarious grounds, when we announce emancipation is at hand. The word of the Prince is pledged; we require not, neither could we have, any more certain guarantee. We know that his understanding, clear, manly, and unimpaired, cannot be imposed on, nor his conscience surprised by any idle or unfounded scruple.’—Meaning,

“ we suppose, by this last sentence, to set the Prince's *intellects* in opposition to “ and *above that of his venerable Father*. If the sentiments of his Royal Highness be misunderstood by the Catholics, he will, no doubt, feel it necessary to “ state the fact without loss of time.”

Here, again, it is not *openly avowed*, that one object of the limitations would be to prevent his Royal Highness from assenting to any measure for the relief of the Irish Catholics; this is not openly avowed, but that these venal men would wish that object to be accomplished by the limitations, there can, after the reading of this paragraph, be no doubt at all.

What, then, this impudent son of venality, calls upon the Prince to *deny* that he wishes to see the Catholics relieved! He presumes, or has, at least, the impudence to affect to presume, that it is an *offence* in the Prince to wish for such a measure, and especially to have *pledged his word* for it, if it came within his power; and this, too, observe, while it is well known that *Mr. Pitt* and his colleagues gave the same pledge, in words as explicit as men could give any pledge. Let us hope, that the difference between them and the Prince would be, that *his* pledge would be faithfully redeemed.

This venal gentleman affects to take it amiss, that the Prince's intellects are, by *Mr. O'CONNELL*, supposed to be less liable to expose him to be imposed upon than those of his venerable Father are so to expose the latter. This is very fine, to be sure, and especially after the publication of the evidence of the physicians, who have given *proofs* of the melancholy state of his Majesty's mind.

It is, besides, notorious, that the objection to the measure of what has been called Catholic Emancipation, was, the *scruples* of the King. How far it was constitutional, or decent, to urge such an objection to a measure proposed to Parliament, I shall not now inquire; but, as to the fact, nobody will attempt to deny it; and, if the Prince has no such scruples, the measure would by him, if he were unshackled, be, of course, assented to, and, indeed, brought forward by his ministers.

So far from the Prince's disposition towards the Catholics being an argument in favour of any limitations that might tend to thwart his views and clog his measures, it is a strong argument against all such limitations, with all those, at least, who desire to see Ireland tranquillized, and rendered invulnerable to the attempts of the enemy. The state of Ireland is not better known to us, than it is to that enemy. He regards Ireland almost as an *ally*. He may be mistaken in his opinion; but, while our venal prints themselves declare, that a *regular army is necessary to keep Ireland safe*, can we blame the enemy for his opinion? These venal men tell you that Ireland is harassed with *French* machinations and factions. How did they come there? How comes it that Ireland engenders these factions and machinations? Why, because the people are *discontented*; and, therefore, the way to put an end to the French factions and machinations, is, to put an end to the discontents of the people.

That the Prince, if left unshackled, would do this, there can be no doubt; and would not this be a very great blessing to the country? I mean, not merely to Ireland, but to the kingdom at large; for, those are very narrow-sighted people who suppose, that England is not affected by this discontented state of Ireland. We help to maintain *the army*, which we are told is so necessary to the guarding of Ireland. We pay *fifteen* parts out of *seventeen* of the expense of maintaining that army. From this

expense we should be relieved by measures that would render the army unnecessary by doing away the discontents of the people of Ireland; and yet, would these venal men fain persuade us, that the Prince's known disposition to adopt measures calculated to remove those discontents is one reason why he should *not be entrusted* with the powers belonging to a King of the United Kingdom! He ought not, according to them, to be entrusted with kingly powers, because he would, in this instance, at least, adopt measures likely to restore harmony to the people, and to place the country in a state of secure defence; because (for there is the *rub*) he would adopt measures likely to make the people of one part of the kingdom an *united* people, than which there is nothing that venal and corrupt men more sincerely dread.

It is, as applied to this point, asked, how would the King feel, if, upon his recovery, he were to find, that the measure concerning which he had such scruples, had been adopted during his incapacity? The argument is a monstrous one, to be sure. It outrages common sense. Yet it is no wonder to hear it urged, considering the quarter whence it comes. What a pretty state must the country be in, however, if such an argument were to have any weight? Admit this argument, and there is, at once, an end of all notion of the kingly office being established and upheld *for the good of the people*. It becomes a personal property, and the exercise of it dependent upon mere whim and caprice. What lessons of republicanism are these "loyal" writers now inculcating! They have long told us of the *scruples* of the King; these scruples have long been urged as an obstacle to a measure so anxiously desired by a considerable part of his subjects, a measure promised by one set of ministers and actually brought, in part, into Parliament by another set of his ministers, where it was received without any opposition, and was proceeding towards its accomplishment, till those scruples were expressed;* the King, who had those scruples, is now declared in a state of incapacity, in a state between delirium and insanity, in a state of mental derangement; and we are now to look upon it as a bar to giving his son full powers to act in his stead, lest he, when he recovers, if he should recover, should feel displeased at this measure having been adopted during his incapacity! Anything so monstrous as this has seldom been broached in private conversation, and to put it in print requires, one would think, more impudence and mere perfect contempt of public opinion, than has ever been known to be possessed by mortal man. If such an argument can have any weight, what a state, I again ask, must this nation be in? To what a degree of degradation must we be fallen, if such an argument can have weight with any considerable number of people? Nay, the bare commission of it to print is but too strong a proof of the tameness, not to call it cowardice, which the writer, at least, believes to exist in the nation; for, were not such his opinion of the public, he never would have ventured to use such an argument.

Another argument against vesting the Prince with full powers, is, that, if unchecked, he might put an end to *the wars in Spain and Portugal*; and, then, if the King should recover his senses, what would be his feelings to see his measures, as to this important point, totally changed. This was the argument made use of by corrupt men at the outset of the disputes upon the Regency question; and, indeed, it was saying nothing

* See History of George IV.—Catholic Relief.—Eo.

more than that, if the Regent *changed the ministers*, he would do all that was wrong; and the plain truth is, that the limitations upon him are nothing more, and can be nothing more, than so many means in the hands of those who would be in opposition to his new ministers, to thwart his views and his measures. It does not suit the venal writers to say, in plain terms, that measures ought to be taken to render it impossible for the Prince to go on without keeping the same ministers that now are in place: that, *if he will not agree to keep them*, he ought to be so hampered as to be nearly *disabled from carrying on the government*; it does not suit them to say this in plain terms, but that this is what they mean there can be no doubt at all, and to this object have all their efforts tended. And, indeed, why not this as well as any of the other reasons? For, what would be more likely to injure the King's feelings, than finding, upon his recovery, that *his servants had been dismissed*? It would, therefore, be much fairer dealing, if the venal and corrupt authors of the divers publications in question were, at once, to tell us, that they wish for such limitations as shall compel the Regent to keep the present men in their places, during his and their natural lives.

The public have often heard me say, that the venal and corrupt, who have been incessantly accusing us of Jacobinical principles and traitorous views and intentions; that the venal and corrupt crew; that tribe of hypocrites, who have assumed the appellations of "*the loyal*," and "*the King's friends*;" the public have often been told by me, that this crew have a regard for the kingly government only in so much as it may be useful to them in their venal and corrupt practices; and, that, if they were once to perceive, that they could no longer profit from it in this way, they would not scruple to become its most deadly enemies.

This I have always thought. It was reasonable that it should be so. But, though I am not, when I reflect, at all *surprised* at what I now see, I did not, I must confess, *expect* to see such undisguised hostility as these corrupt men now discover towards the Prince of Wales and his Brothers, who have come in for their share, from the moment it was known, that they also were opposed to a limited Regency; that is to say, that they were opposed to the measure intended to keep part of the kingly power in the hands, in all probability, of those men who are now in place; the moment the venal and corrupt writers discovered this, they fell, tooth and nail, upon the Prince's Brothers as well as upon himself.

The history of the Protest of the Royal Dukes has been given in a preceding page, but, as the Copies of the papers which passed between them and Mr. PERCEVAL have not been before inserted by me, I here subjoin them in a note.*

After this protest, there could remain no doubt as to the part which

* *Letter to Mr. PERCEVAL, dated Wednesday night, 12 o'clock, 12th Dec. 1810.*

SIR: The Prince of Wales having assembled the whole of the male branches of the Royal Family, and having communicated to us the plan intended to be proposed by his Majesty's Confidential Servants, to the Lords and Commons, for the establishment of a restricted Regency, should the continuance of his Majesty's ever-to-be-deplored illness render it necessary; we feel it a duty we owe to his Majesty, to our Country, and to Ourselves, to enter our solemn Protest against measures we consider as perfectly unconstitutional, as they are contrary to, and subversive of the principles which seated our Family upon the Throne of this Realm.—(Signed.)—Frederick; William; Edward; Ernest; Augustus Frederick; Adolphus Frederick; William Frederick.

the Princes would take ; and, as I before observed, from that moment the venal and corrupt fell upon them without mercy ; and, since the debate in the House of Lords, in which the Dukes of Sussex and of York took so decided, so manly, and so efficient a part, the rage of the corrupt writers, of all sizes and descriptions, has been unbridled. They have now shown themselves in their *true* colours ; their mortification has now deprived them of the use of their hypocrisy and cant ; they seem to have made up their minds that fawning and professed loyalty can no longer serve their turn ; and they have now given the public a specimen of what *they* can do in the way of degrading dignities and pulling down kingly government.

The article, which I am about to insert from the COURIER newspaper of the 31st of December, surpasses, perhaps, any thing of the kind. There is certainly nothing to beat it either in PAINÉ or in BARLOW ; and, the reader has only to bear in mind the print that it comes from ! for then he will be at no loss to guess at its source, and at the real object of its author. After inserting it I shall offer such remarks upon it as it seems to me to call for.

“ The *public jealousy* of the *new Estate* which has so unexpectedly sprung up in the realm, should not be allowed to sleep. ‘ *The College of Princes*,’ asserting an *initiative*, is a new, extraordinary, and alarming institution in this country. One of the most important principles in our Constitution is, that public servants shall be responsible. Hence it has been truly affirmed, that no son or brother of our King can constitutionally be permitted to hold any office of trust, as family feeling would rescue him from punishment in the event of misconduct. *A great and striking instance of this nature lately occurred*. But if that doctrine be sound, what should be our astonishment at finding not a Prince or two holding public offices, but a new class, a *new estate* starting up to assert a right of giving an opinion on any great measure in the contemplation of government. The College of Princes ! Such a College existed in the Germanic Constitution, lately laid low ; but now, for the first time, it is heard of in the armies of Great Britain. The Princes protest against certain proceedings contemplated for the establishment of a Regency ; their protest is solicited and organized by the intended Regent. ‘ Once a Captain, always a Captain,’ it is said in the play ; and so, no doubt, will say the Princes. ‘ Your Royal Highness the Regent has called upon us, in our character, as a Class, as Princes, as the Blood Royal, to exercise our initiative on the proceeding founding your government ; and if we have the power upon the most important measure, we must, of course, have it upon inferior proceedings. In future, therefore, we shall assemble in a body, discuss and decide upon every step in the contemplation of government. We have got a veto, and are established in the right of deciding what measures shall or shall not come before parliament. Show us the ministry that shall, in future, attempt any great measures, without the previous sanction of our initiative ! We ; the superior class in the State, the Princes, the Blood Royal !’ Such might justly be the language of the Princes, if their Protest were any thing more than waste paper, at which the lowest Clerk in the Treasury must sneer. Sad and melancholy is the prospect to the country arising from this most unwise and unconstitutional proceeding ! Who is the evil genius that could advise the Prince of Wales to resort to it ? It is an unconstitutional and arbitrary in its nature, as the attempted cry against ‘ Fresh Taxes ’ for a due income to support the Regent, is mean, narrow-minded, and vulgar.—That the Princes, themselves, have resorted to this course of their own free-will and mere notion, is a fact incredible. They must know, that, as Princes, they were nothing more than *great babies*, with royal corals and bells, just learning to walk in the paths of State ; and that by making them *English noblemen*, with seats in parliament, the King breeched them into political manhood. As Prince Ernest and Prince Adolphus they were nothing more than *great boys*, kindly regarded by the public, but without power or weight in the community ; *pretty creatures* for a Duchess to have dancing at her ball, but of no influence in the government. To give

"them this influence they were made Peers of Parliament, to associate them with the most powerful class they were made English Noblemen of the most exalted rank. If the character of Prince be not inferior to that of Duke, why were they created? Why not left with the title to which they were born? As English Noblemen of the highest title they command respect, because their class is most eminently respectable. As Princes they sink back into the character of great looby boys, with toys and rattles. What evil genius has persuaded them to drop their parliamentary for their princely character? To take a step which, as they knew it would be disregarded, must expose their impotence and excite derision? Let them act in parliament, but let them never be heard again in their princely collective capacity, if they do not wish to become obnoxious. *The history of the class of French Princes is not forgotten.*"

Well said, "*the loyal!*" Well said, "*King's friends!*" Well said, "*Anti-jacobins!*" Where is now Mr. YORKE's "Jacobinical Conspiracy" to destroy the House of Brunswick? Where are all the associators against "Republicans and Levellers?" Where are now all, or any of, those myriads of "the loyal," who seemed ready to tear out the heart of Mr. WARDLE about two years ago? Where are they all now?

But, thus are our assertions completely verified. We always said, that when these corruption-mongers, these publishers of fawning paragraphs, these flatterers of the Princes, these varnishers of their faults, these hypocritical and canting slaves, these MEAN, MERCENARY, and MALIGNANT men; we always said, that when these corruption-mongers should no longer find their private interest to square with the cry of "*loyalty,*" they would discover themselves to be the most bitter of all the enemies of the Royal Family and of kingly government. And, here we now see them actually at work to insult, degrade, and blacken the whole of the Princes in a lump; to hold them up as objects of public jealousy, and at the same time, as objects of contempt and derision. The lowest clerk in the Treasury, we are told, must sneer at their protest; and, we are told, that they have sunk back into great looby boys, in putting their names to that which must excite derision; and, further, that this act of theirs, gives the country a "*sad and melancholy prospect*" for the future.

Leaving all these contemptuous expressions to be digested as they may by the persons upon whom they have been bestowed, and who may now, perhaps, begin to perceive, that there really are men in this kingdom, who would wish to see a power that should "*lord it over king and people,*" let us take a view of the merits of the question.

The charge against the Princes is, that they have arrogated to themselves the right of exercising a *veto*; the right of *discussing and deciding upon every measure in the contemplation of government*; the right of *deciding upon what measures shall, or shall not, come before parliament*. And, the assertion of this right is, by this "*loyal*" man, put into the mouths of the Princes; they are, by him represented, as having *expressed themselves* in those very terms; they are, by him, exhibited to the country in this odious light; and they are further represented as *having called themselves* the "*College of Princes.*" And, upon that ground, he calls them a *new estate started up in the realm*; and, he thereupon asserts, in the fulness of his "*loyalty,*" that the *public jealousy* is awakened against them, which he declares it to be his object *not to suffer to sleep.*

How barefacedly false this is the reader will not need be told, when he has read the Letter of the Princes to Mr. PERCEVAL, in which they do

not call themselves a "College;" in which the word *college* is not used; in which they assert no right at all to dictate to either any ministry, or to either House of Parliament; in which they assert no right, and hint at no right, to decide upon, or to discuss, any measure to be brought before parliament; and, in which they do no one of the things which this man, this mouth-piece of corruption, has not only represented them as having done, but has hinted pretty broadly that the having done which ought to bring upon them the fate of the Princes of France.

But, "have they not meddled with a measure which was in the contemplation of the government, and which was about to be submitted to the parliament?"

To this question I answer, first, that, when we speak of the government, in this country, we always include the King as the head of it; and will it be pretended, that the King had this measure in his contemplation? The Princes were speaking, not to the government, as we understand that word, but to the servants of the King, who, it is well known, can legally do no act without his authority. There is, therefore, a great deal of difference between meddling, giving their opinion, upon a measure contemplated by the ministers, as they now are, and upon a measure that should be contemplated by the government with the King at its head.

But, how came they to meddle with this measure? What was it that gave rise to their interference? Why, it was the notification made by Mr. PERCEVAL to the Prince. It was Mr. Perceval who elicited the interference. It was he who took the first step. If the two Houses have a right to make what sort of Regency they please, without any appeal to either prince or people, why was the plan of the intended Regency communicated to the Prince at all? If it was right to communicate it to him, he, of course, was expected to give his opinion upon it; he, of course, was, by those who communicated it, supposed to have a right to express his approbation, or disapprobation, of it; and, if he had this right, what was there, and what can there be, to prevent his brothers from having a similar right; in short, what is there to prevent any man in the kingdom from having such a right?

If to write a letter to Mr. Perceval against a measure which he is going to propose to Parliament, be to assert "a right of deciding previously upon what measures shall, or shall not, come before Parliament;" if this be so, how is Mr. Perceval to find a justification for having laid that measure *preciously* before the Prince of Wales? He, in that act, did not, surely, mean to mock the Prince; he must, however, so have meant it, if he did not mean to lay it before him as a matter for his consideration as to its propriety, or impropriety; and if he was right in doing this; if he was right in submitting the measure to the Prince, to one of the Princes, for his approbation or disapprobation, had not the other Princes a right to give their opinions upon it too, they being all contingently interested in whatever shall affect the power and stability of the kingly office?

Mr. Perceval, in this transaction, can be considered merely as a member of the House of Commons. In that House he must propose the measure as a member of the House. Any other member might propose it. Any other member has the same right to do it that he has. He has but a vote like other members. It was as a member of Parliament, then, that he communicated his intention to the Prince of Wales. How far this was right, or wrong, in a member of Parliament, I shall not now attempt to ascertain; but, of this I am quite sure, that the making of the

communication argues, on the part of him who made it, a clear acknowledgment of the right of the Prince to express his approbation or disapprobation, of it. And was he not to *consult* any one upon the subject? Was he to keep the thing to himself, and not communicate it to a living soul? Was he not to show it even to his brothers? And, were not those brothers, if they chose to express their opinions upon a thing, which a member of parliament had submitted to the consideration of a person *out of the House*, without incurring the charge of erecting themselves into a *new estate*, into a *college*, having a *previous veto* as to all measures to be brought before Parliament?

It is notorious, for we see the fact stated in the public prints several times in every year, that, when the minister has (how properly I shall not now decide) communicated some contemplated parliamentary measure to the president, or chairman, or something else, of some trading or mercantile body, the body of traders, after taking it into consideration, send him the result of their deliberations, which is sometimes for, and sometimes against, the contemplated measure; and, we have generally, or, at least, very often seen the measure persevered in, abandoned, or modified, agreeably to such decision of the parties appealed to. But, in case of the measure being persevered in, did any one ever hear, or dream, of such trading body being accused of dictating to the government or the Parliament? Did any one ever attempt to represent such body as having erected themselves into a new estate in the realm; as having assumed a right to decide upon what should and what should not be brought before Parliament: as having assumed a right of *veto*; as having erected themselves into a *college* with a previous negative upon all parliamentary measures? Did any thing so absurd and so monstrous, so offensive to truth and to common sense, ever before enter into the mind of man?

But, it is not *folly* by which these venal and corrupt writers, of all sorts and in all forms, are actuated. They are actuated by the blackest of malice, that which arises from the fear of being deprived of the profits of their venality. They see, or they think they see, the days of delusion drawing to a close; they fear that things will change for the worse with them; they fear that to be the steady advocates of corruption will no longer be a thriving trade; and they are ready to tear to pieces, to reduce to atoms, every thing which, to them, appears to have this tendency. The cloak of "*loyalty*" will, they think, no longer serve their mercenary and corrupt purposes; they have, therefore, cast it off, and are ready to destroy that to which they have so long affected an inviolable attachment.

I am, however, by no means sorry, that the MEAN, MERCENARY, and MALIGNANT men have thus fully disclosed themselves. The country, the deceived country, will now, or *never*, see to the bottom of their corrupt souls. They will see that these advocates of corruption had, at heart, nothing but their own private gains, while they were accusing others of *disloyal* intentions. The Prince and his brothers, too, will, one would fain hope, perceive, that, it is not the friend of *freedom* who is their foe, but, according to the sentiment of my motto, the wretch who would tempt them to subvert it; that this is the *real traitor*; that this is the worm, that eats out all the happiness of kingdoms. In short, they must now be as blind as the stones they tread on, if they do not see as clear as day-light, that *their true interests* and the *people's* are the same; that the best friends of the people are also their best friends; that those who are the people's enemies are, at bottom, their enemies; and that,

with the people they must stand or fall. Let the Prince say, in the language of MALLETT:—

“ ——— If not to build the public weal
 “ On the firm base, which can alone resist
 “ Both time and chance, fair *liberty* and *law* ;
 “ If I for this great end am not ordained,
 “ May I ne'er poorly fill the throne of England !”

Let the Prince say this, let him *act* up to the sentiment, and he need fear no intrigues and cabals: he will want none of that support which corruption yields; he safely may, as I trust he will, scorn all disguise, all the arts of affectation and hypocrisy: he will be strong in that in which alone real strength is found when the day of trial comes, *the interest of the people* to defend their country, from which country the fate of himself and his family is inseparable. He has now had a pretty fair specimen of the reliance which is to be placed upon venality and corruption. He must now see, or he never will see, that he can safely rely upon none of those who are hostile to the liberties of the people. He has the example of Europe before him. He has seen many dynasties fall; and he has seen, in every instance, without a single exception, that the fall has been produced by those fawning slaves, who, after having seduced their sovereign to oppress and insult his people, have, in the hour of danger, been the very first to desert him. In such an hour, how can such a sovereign look his people in the face? How can he call upon them to risk their lives in defence of him and their country? Wretches that they are, they have *no country*; they have nothing to risk life for; they are stripped of their property, they are degraded in character; of the soil on which they feed they own nothing but the “*six by two*,” and of that it is not in the power of any conqueror to deprive them. Thus it is that countries are conquered and that dynasties fall. Political institutions are not now-a-days to be upheld by mere *prejudice*. The world cannot unlearn what it has learnt. Nations now well know their *rights*, and, if they submit to oppression and insult, it is because they are *unable* to resist; and, their submission has no other measure than that of inability.

Never was there so fair an opportunity for producing a great and salutary effect as the Prince of Wales now has. It is in his power, if the necessity of investing him with the kingly powers should continue, to rivet the affection of the people to him in a way to enable him to laugh to scorn all the attempts, which the venal and corrupt are now making against him. But, he should never forget, and those are his greatest enemies who would endeavour to make him overlook the fact, that it is in these days, only by the arms and the hearts of *the people*, that kingly governments, or, indeed, governments of any kind, can long be preserved. It cannot be unknown to him, that the people of this kingdom most anxiously desire a reform of abuses, and, as the only means of effecting that, a reform of the Commons House of Parliament; and, one would think, that if he had not before, he must now have seen enough to convince him, that such a reform is not less necessary to the support of the just prerogatives of the throne than it is to the freedom and happiness of the people. Those high-toned gentry, who are never wanting to a court, may tell him the contrary; they may tell him, that, while he has *armies*, he has nothing to fear from the people; but, after the experi-

ence of so many dynasties, now laid under his eyes, in the dust, he will, besides the integrity of his own heart, want nothing more to make him turn from such advisers.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Tuesday,
January 1, 1811.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, January, 1811.*)

WE have now before us, in the shape of RESOLUTIONS, proposed in the House of Commons, Mr. PERCEVAL's project of limitations of the Royal Authority in the hands of the Prince of Wales. We will, therefore, now take a regular, though, perhaps, concise view of this project; and, at every look, we shall, I am persuaded, imbibe fresh conviction of its unfitness and injustice, and of the evil consequences, which, if adopted, it must tend to produce not only with regard to the Crown, but with regard also to the interests of the people.

The Resolutions were *five* in number, and were, in substance, if not exactly word for word, as follows:—

1. Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee, that for the purpose of providing for the exercise of the Royal Authority during the continuance of his Majesty's illness, in such manner, and to such extent, as the present circumstances, and the urgent concerns of the Nation appear to require, it is expedient, that his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, being resident within the Realm, shall be empowered to exercise and administer the Royal Authority, according to the Laws and Constitution of Great Britain, in the name, and on the behalf of his Majesty, and under the style and title of Regent of the Kingdom; and to use, execute, and perform, in the name and on the behalf of his Majesty, all Authorities, Prerogatives, Acts of Government, and Administration of the same, that belong to the King of this Realm to use, execute, and perform according to the law thereof, subject to such limitations and exceptions as shall be provided.
2. That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for a time to be limited, the power so to be given to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales shall not extend to the granting of any rank or dignity of the peerage of the realm to any person whatever, except such person or persons as may perform some singular naval or military achievement.
3. That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for a time to be limited, the said power shall not extend to the granting of any office whatever in reversion, or to the granting of any office, salary, or premium, for any other term than during his Majesty's pleasure, except such offices as are by law required to be granted for life or during good behaviour.

4. That it is the opinion of this Committee, That such parts of his Majesty's private property as are not vested in trustees, shall be vested in trustees for the benefit of his Majesty.
5. That it is the opinion of this Committee, That the care of his Majesty's Royal Person, during the continuance of his Majesty's illness, shall be committed to the care of the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty; and that, *for a time to be limited, her Majesty shall have the power to remove from, and to nominate and appoint such persons as she shall think proper, to the several Offices in his Majesty's Household; and to dispose, order, and manage, all other matters and things relating to the care of his Majesty's Royal Person, during the time aforesaid;* and that, for the better enabling her Majesty to discharge this important task, it is also expedient that a Council shall be appointed to advise and assist her Majesty in the several matters aforesaid: and with power, from time to time, as they may see cause, to examine, upon oath, the Physicians and others attending his Majesty's Person, touching the state of his Majesty's health, and all matters relative thereto.

The four first Resolutions were moved by Mr. PERCEVAL, on Monday last, the 31st of December; and after a long Debate, were *carried* by a majority of 16, there being 226 for them, and 210 against them. On the 1st instant the 5th Resolution was moved by him, and was lost, by 13 votes, there being 226 for an *amendment*, moved by Lord GOWER, and 213 against the amendment; which was as follows: to leave out that part of the Resolution, which is distinguished by *italics*, and to insert other words in their stead, so that the Resolution was, when passed, changed into this:—

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That the care of his Majesty's Royal Person, during the continuance of his Majesty's illness, shall be committed to the care of the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty: *together with the sole direction of such portion of his Majesty's Household as shall be deemed suitable to a due attendance and regard to his Royal Person;* and that for the better enabling her Majesty to discharge this important task, it is also expedient that a Council shall be appointed to advise and assist her Majesty in the several matters aforesaid; and with power, from time to time, as they may see cause, to examine, upon oath, the physicians and others attending his Majesty's person, touching the state of his Majesty's health, and all matters relative thereto.

Such were the proceedings thus far. What may finally be the fate of the Resolutions; how they may fare when they come to be embodied into a Bill; what they will have to encounter in the House of Lords; this cannot yet be known; but, thus far the thing has *gone*. We have the *project* before us; and, though it should finally fail, nothing can do away the *intention*. That is beyond the power of retractation or disguise. Let us, therefore, now proceed to take a view of this project, as it here lies before us.

The FIRST RESOLUTION is exceptionable only inasmuch as it talks of *limitations*, and as it implies the conferring of the powers by *Bill* instead of by *Address*, and as it may be construed to mean, that the two Houses of Parliament alone have the right of appointing *whom they please* to

supply the place of the King, during his incapacity. All this, however, is little as to the *substance*. There is, in fact, no question as to *who* shall be Regent; and, though there is a good deal to be said as to the mode of proceeding, as to the mode of conferring the authority, still the great question is, whether the authority shall be really conferred *entire*, or whether it shall be partly withheld from the Regent.

The SECOND RESOLUTION withholds from him the power of *making peers*, for a time to be limited, except in cases of singular naval or military achievements.

As to *time*, there is no argument that can have any weight for a year, which will not have equal weight for any longer period. Such arguments have been attempted; but they have all failed, and, indeed, they have all been anticipated and answered by me long enough ago.

I have shown before, that, if the power of creating peers ought ever to exist in the hands of *the King*, it ought to exist in the hands of the Regent; that, to withhold the power from the Regent, is to declare, in acts, that the power is not necessary to the well-governing of the nation; and that, if it is unsafe to entrust it in the hands of the Prince, who is now 48 years of age, and who, in the course of nature, must be expected soon to be King, the inevitable conclusion is, that it is a power *that ought never to be entrusted to the King*.

Has this objection been *answered*? I have seen no answer to it at all. Nay, I have seen no *attempt* to answer it. What said Mr. PIERCEVAL in his defence of this part of his project? The following is given in the report of his speech of the 31st of December: "It cannot surely be " be gravely argued that any serious inconvenience is to be apprehended " from withholding the honours of peerage for twelve months, when it " is recollected that during the last four years, excepting for naval and " military services, but *two new Peers have been created*. When it is " also remembered, that in the short administration which preceded the " present, no less than *eleven were added to the number of the other* " *House*, it is obvious that this is a prerogative which may be *converted* " *to purposes of an ambiguous nature*; that it is a power which may " possibly be *abused*."

Now as to the exception with regard to Naval and Military Officers who may perform some great national service, what does this amount to? Why to a very good reason, *if it be worth any thing at all*, for taking from the King for ever the power of creating *any* peers but men who shall have performed some *singular* Naval or Military service. Besides, who is to be the *judge* of the nature of such service? Who is to say, whether it be *singular* or not? Who is to have the final determination of such a question?

But, why suffer him to advance Naval and Military officers rather than any body else? It has been truly observed by some one, that it is *statesmen* that we now stand in need of more than Naval and Military officers. The latter, from the state of the war, cannot be reasonably expected to have any occasion soon offered them for performing wonderful and *singular* exploits, such as those of Lord *Gambier* and *Talavera*; while of *statesmen*, if to save a sinking nation; if to rescue the kingdom from the greatest danger that ever kingdom was placed in; if this be work that calls for the talents of statesmen, of great need do we stand of them; of great need do we stand of the immediate application of their talents; and, of course, if the prerogative of making peers be at any

time necessary as a mean in the hands of the Sovereign of calling such talents into exertion, it would be necessary in the hands of the Regent ; and, if not necessary then, if not necessary for a year, can never be necessary at all.

Can Mr. PERCEVAL discover nothing for statesmen to do, at this time ? Does he look upon the state of the kingdom, whether with regard to its domestic or its foreign concerns, as being so *prosperous* as to require the application of no talents and exertions of a kind to merit the highest reward that the talents and exertions of statesmen can receive ? Suppose some one were to discover and put in practice the means of *tranquilizing Ireland*, and of rendering an army unnecessary there ; or, of putting a stop to the *further depreciation of money* ; or, of giving us a *constitutional reform of parliament* and uniting us heart and hand against the enemy ; or, of making *peace with Napoleon without disgrace or danger*. Would not such a man have a stronger claim to the gratitude of the nation, and to the highest reward which the sovereign has to bestow, than any Naval or Military man could possibly have ? Where, then, is the reason for shutting such a person out from the peerage, while it is left open for Naval and Military men ?

But, though Mr. PERCEVAL did not observe, there is no objection, I take it, to our observing, that *all* the Naval and Military men, now in actual service, have had their appointments from *him* and his predecessors of the PITT school, who have had the making of all appointments for the last *twenty-six years* ; so that, what he would be willing to leave, as to peerages, in the hands of the Prince, would be the promotion to the rank of peers, any men, from amongst those, who have in fact, been selected by *himself* and *his party* ; which, to be sure, is a very generous and gracious concession, and, to which, in order to round the proposition, and give it a finished turn, there really does appear nothing wanting but a further exception in favour of those candidates for the peerage, of whom Mr. PERCEVAL and his colleagues might think proper to approve.

He says, that the power of creating peers may be *abused* ; and he couples this with an observation, that no less than *eleven* members were added to the other House, during the short administration that immediately preceded the present, while he and his colleagues, during four years (it is only $3\frac{1}{2}$) have added but *two*, excepting Naval and Military officers.

I do not recollect, who the eleven new peers were ; but, this I know very well, that, *one half of the whole House*, or thereabouts, have been promoted to or in the peerage by *him* and his predecessors of the *same party* and *school*. He appears to have quite overlooked this circumstance ; but, it is a very material one for the *people* to bear in mind ; and, if they pay due attention to the *main drift* of his argument, they will clearly see what is the *real* object in withholding the exercise of this prerogative from the Prince, and, the seeing of that object is quite enough to convince them, that the prerogative ought not to be withheld.

I shall not here enter into an inquiry respecting the wisdom or justice of the practice of promoting men to the peerage merely on account of their *wealth*. It is, perhaps, a very nice question to determine how far such a claim to the peerage ought to be admitted. But, it is perfectly notorious, that many men have been, and especially since the power of

Mr. PITT began to be felt, promoted to the peerage upon no other visible, or assignable ground. What reason, then, can be given for withholding this power from the Prince? Royal favour has flowed all in one channel for an uninterrupted series of 26 years; and is there not, therefore, reason to suppose, that it might now with propriety flow in the *other channel*? If the Prince were Regent only for six months, or for one month, is it likely that he would do much mischief in selecting men from the party opposed to the *Pittites* to promote to the peerage? What *harm* could arise from his causing the Royal favour to flow in a new direction for a *short space of time*? And, if you suppose, that the King will never resume his functions, there is, at once, an end of Mr. PERCKVAL's reasoning; unless he will go the length of refusing, in future, the power of the peerage creation, to the King as well as to the Regent.

There is one more point, and that, too, admitting of a practical illustration that all the world will understand.—Who is the Prince to have for a *Lord Chancellor*? “*Lord Erskine, to be sure.*”

Aye, with all our hearts; but who is to insure *Lord Erskine's life* for a year? Who is to make him *live*, and make him *well* for a year?

Oh! there is *Lord Eldon*, or, who may do full as well, there is *Lord Redesdale*, or *Lord Ellenborough* (for a Chief Justice may, as used to be the case, exist without a peerage); so that the Prince would have *free* liberty to choose his *Lord Chancellor*, would be *quite at liberty* to choose the person highest in office under him, would have *perfect freedom* to choose the “*keeper of his secrets and his CONSCIENCE*” from amongst those who had been promoted to the peerage by *Mr. Pitt* and *Mr. Addington*.

But, after all, even these men, however pure and perfect as human beings, are not *immortal*. They too might die, or they might become incapable of performing the functions of Chancellor. What would the Prince then do? He might, to be sure, make *any body* Chancellor, and the House of Lords *might* choose a Speaker; but, *why* should this be? *Why* should *he* not have the power of adding *one* lawyer to the number of the peers? Is he less capable of judging as to who ought to be promoted than his father was? Is he more likely to be deceived by evil counsellors? Has he less capacity; is he less qualified for the office of sovereign; or, is there any fact that can be stated that warrants a suspicion that he would abuse his trust, a suspicion that would and must be conveyed in any restriction of any sort that should be imposed upon him, and that was not imposed upon his father. To impose such restriction is, in itself, a mark of degradation, and must be a cause of weakness; and, for the adopting of such a measure the reader will, I am satisfied, not be able to discover the smallest reason, other than *that reason* which the people, with heart and voice, ought to join in rejecting; that is to say, that his having the power to create peers would strongly tend to enable him to disregard the opposition of those, who now contend for the restriction, and to carry into execution measures for changing *that system*, upon which they and their predecessors have invariably acted for the last twenty-six years, and of which system the country is now, in so many ways, feeling the fatal effects.

To the THIRD RESOLUTION, which prevents the Prince, for the intended year, from granting any office whatever, *in reversion*, and from granting any office, or salary, or pension, for other term than during the KING'S PLEASURE, except such offices as are by law to be granted for life dur-

ing good behaviour; to this resolution almost all the arguments against the second resolution equally apply.

Of grants in *reversion* it is hardly necessary for me to say, that I am no advocate; but, such has been the profusion of these grants, that the Prince, unless he meant to give offices to children the *fathers* of whom are *not yet born*, would find very little room for the exercise of his power in this way. Therefore, I should be very willing to prevent him from taking away the patronage of *his* natural successor, if, in the same bill, provision be made, that *the King*, if he ever should recover, shall not grant any more reversions; shall not *any further* grant away the patronage that would fall to the Prince or his heir, in due course of time. But, is it not a little too hard upon him, that he should be bound up from granting away what would naturally fall into his hands, while the way is left open for his father, in case of a resumption of his power, to grant away that which would naturally fall into the hands of his son?

This proposition is the more strikingly unjust as coming almost immediately after the struggles of this same Mr. PERCEVAL to keep the power of granting reversions in the hands of the King. It is well known, that bill after bill have been brought into the House of Commons, have passed there, and have been rejected by the Lords, the object of which bills was to prevent the King from making any more grants of offices in reversion; that is to say, from granting away *any more* of those things that would naturally fall into the hands of his successor. To these bills Mr. Perceval made constant and persevering resistance. He represented the power of granting reversions as necessary to the maintenance of the Crown; but, now he would *withhold* from the Regent, though the Regent is the person into whose hands the grants would naturally fall, if not made in reversion.

I before observed upon the measure of withholding the power of granting any *place* or *pension* for *life*. Why should it be adopted? Suppose Lord ARDEN were to die and his sinecure place, of twenty thousand pounds a year, were to fall into the hands of Mr. Perceval, who has the snug *reversion* of it; and suppose that Mr. Perceval, by some mishap, were to go off also. Here, if the place were still left in existence, would be a good thing to give away; and *why* should not the Prince have the giving of it? Is he not as well qualified to choose a person for the office as the King would be, if the latter should recover?

But the limitation is to go further. It is to prevent him from granting any *pension*, any *office*, any *salary*, except for during the *King's pleasure*; so that, any person thus appointed, or granted to, would be liable to be displaced, or have his pension taken away, at any moment, when the King might recover; and that the thing would *actually be done* there can be very little doubt, if we suppose that the King would take for his advisers those, who would have been in opposition to the Prince.

Thus, then, one of two things must become clear to the people: either that this power being withheld from the Prince, must *shackle and weaken his government*, or, that the power is *never necessary to the due discharge of the Kingly office*.

But, indeed, there can be no doubt at all as to the *real* object of this intended restriction. When the operation of it is thus pointed out, there is no man so dull as not clearly to perceive the motive for imposing it. There is no man who must not see, that to make the King, in case of his recovery the judge of whether the grants made by the Prince, should or

should not, stand good, is to *make the Prince as much as possible dependent upon those who propose such restrictions*, and, for one year, at least, to prevent him from making any material change in that system, which has brought us into our present situation.

The **FOURTH RESOLUTION** takes from the Prince all power over the King's *real or personal estate*, except as far as may relate to the *renewing of leases*.

Now the real estate of the King is, in fact, the property of the people at large, to whose account, in the annual statements laid before Parliament, the proceeds (*such as they are*) are brought. And why should not the Prince of Wales be allowed to make grants of *new leases of Crown Lands*? Is it likely that he would grant them away improperly? Is not he as fit to have authority of this sort as those were who granted the lease to *Colonel Gordon, at Chelsea*? And, as to the *personal estate* of the King, that being supposed to be enjoyed for the *public benefit*, why should he not have the same power over it that the King had?

There is no reason that can be urged, except that of *suspicion* of the Prince's character and views; and this, though not openly avowed, is what is conveyed in every one of the limitations, which it has been intended to be imposed upon him, but which intention will not, I trust, be put in execution.

The subject of the **FIFTH RESOLUTION** was so fully discussed by me, in my former article, that I have very little to add to what was then said. There was in the debate upon the subject, which took place on the 1st instant, nothing worth notice urged in defence of such a proposition. Indeed it was impossible to assign any reason for leaving sixteen Lords to be removed or continued, or appointed by the *Queen and a Council*, and leaving all the vast influence of the household expenditure in the same hands; it was impossible to assign any *reason* for this, other than that of keeping so much of the kingly power in the hands of such *Council*, which Council, be it well observed, is to be (if at all) appointed in the Regency Bill, that is to say, of course, *by the same persons who propose and support the restrictions*. And, for *this* purpose, the people were to be taxed to provide a separate regal establishment for the Prince, during the time that he should be Regent!

This was the grand stroke of all. This seems to have been intended for the purpose of trying to *what length* things could be pushed against the Prince.

Indeed, the **COURIER** of the 31st of December, pretty plainly said, that the most "glorious periods of our history are those in which *females* "have reigned; and **MANY PERSONS** doubt, whether, as a "question of *right* or of *experience*, **THE QUEEN WITH A "COUNCIL**, would not form the *most constitutional and auspicious "Regency."*

After reading this passage, and considering the source whence it comes, the reader can entertain very little doubt as to the *real* object of the measure in question.

This venal man was, you see, preparing the way for a defence of even a more bold attempt than that of the measure itself. He was sharpening his mercenary pen for a defence of keeping the whole of the kingly power in the hands of the Queen and a Council; that is to say, in the hands of the present Ministers!

But, here we see, fairly let out, the true grounds upon which these venal and corrupt writers have called for restrictions. "The Prince of Wales, it is believed, intends to change all the King's servants, and his whole system."

Mind they call it *his* system. They do not call it the *minister's* system. Whatever there is odious or ruinous in the system is to fall upon *the King*, for whom these corrupt writers and publishers in all shapes are professing such a *tender regard and concern*.

But, we will not have it so. We will have it to be the system of the persons, by whom the King has, unfortunately, been advised for the last twenty-six years; and then we will say *let it in God's name be changed*, and all the people will say *Amen*. Why, this is the very reason that the people wish the Prince of Wales to have full powers. Does any one believe, that I, or that any man who has the good of the country at heart, can want to see a mere change of *ministry* in the *old way*? Oh, no! we want to see no such thing. We want to see *a change of the old system*; a radical and a sweeping change of it; and, it is because we hope, that such a change would be the consequence of giving full powers to the Prince, that we wish to see full powers given to him. And, is not the Prince of Wales as likely to be able to judge of political systems as his father, afflicted as the latter unhappily has been, in more ways than one, and bent down with age as he now is? Is not the Prince as likely to be able to choose proper advisers as his father was, or ever can be? What a monstrous thing to suppose that he is not? And, why then, should power of any sort, belonging to the kingly office, be withheld from him, while, at the same time, he is called upon to exercise that office?

There was an argument of Mr. PERCEVAL, in the passage above quoted from his speech, which applied generally to all the restrictions proposed. "We may feel," said he, "some surprise that they, who in their warm attachment to the doctrines of liberty, assert that all power is a trust, should be, on this occasion, so fearful of diminishing the power of the Executive, or of lessening the checks and restrictions upon the exercise of its authority."

This, as thus given in the published report, is a fallacy.

It is not proposed "to diminish the power of the Executive;" it is, by the resolutions, proposed to *divide* it. It is proposed, indeed, to make an *addition* in a new establishment for the Prince. No *diminution* at all is proposed. If, indeed, he had proposed to *take away for ever* the power in the Crown to make peers, to grant offices in reversion, to grant pensions and places for life, to grant fees or leases of Crown-lands, and to appoint lords of the household; if he had made such a proposition, the point at issue would have been wholly different. But, no such thing does he propose: he proposes, that all the powers and emoluments, and all the cost to the people, shall still exist; and that a part of the power and money shall be withheld from the Prince, who is to exercise the office of King, and shall be kept in the hands of the *Queen and a Council*, which Council he proposes to be appointed by the same persons who are for withholding the powers and money from the Prince, and as to *who* would compose such Council there can, therefore, be little difficulty in guessing.

The question, therefore, which he puts to the *friends of freedom*, is, not whether the powers of the Crown shall be diminished; but, whether

they shall be divided between the Prince and those who are proposing and supporting the intended restrictions. This is the question, upon which the *friends of freedom* are called upon to decide; and they must be the most inconsistent of all mortals, if they hesitated, for one moment, in deciding in favour of the Prince, especially when they are told, that the great reason for withholding power from him, is, to prevent him from being able to effect a *change of system*, to prevent him from being able, though he might be willing, to do any of those things, for which they have for so many years, been petitioning in vain. In these petitions, and in the language of the *friends of freedom*, Mr. Perceval will find no desire expressed to diminish *the prerogatives of the Crown*. These prerogatives are part of the legitimate powers of the King. They are such as the constitution of England sanctions. The *friends of freedom* have complained of CORRUPT INFLUENCE; they have complained of that which the constitution and the laws stigmatise and abhor; and, one of their grounds of complaint always has been, that this *corrupt influence* is hostile to the just prerogatives of the King, as well as to the *freedom of his people*. This has always been the language of the friends of freedom.

The *friends of freedom* have no jealousy of the Prince; they have no suspicions of him; he has never done anything to make them suspect to find in him an enemy to their just demands. There may be men who have so treated him as to have a natural dread of seeing him invested with all the kingly powers; but the *friends of freedom* have never treated him in a way that can inspire them with any such dread. They can see, in none of his actions or words, any cause for fearing that he would use his powers *against* them; and in the *hostility towards him* shown by *their enemies*, they think they perceive no very weak grounds to hope that he would prove himself *their friend*. This is the view that the *friends of freedom* take of the matter. These are the principles by which they are actuated; and whatever the venal and corrupt writers, of all sorts and in all shapes, may think; however sure they may believe themselves of having *the people* with them; they will soon find, that the whole nation is with the Prince, and that, too, upon this very ground, namely, that his having full powers will enable him to effect a *radical change of system*; a complete and total change of that system, which has existed for the last twenty-six years, and which has brought the country into a state, which, on all hands, is acknowledged to be one from which it has only a *chance* of escaping without being subdued by a foreign enemy.

This leads me to notice, by way of conclusion, a sort of *episode*, which arose and became of great importance in the debates of the 1st and 2nd instant, relative to the public character of Mr. PITT.

In the proposing and supporting of the Resolutions, on the former day, the *precedent*, as it is called, of 1788, was urged, and, in order to *give weight* to that precedent, the name of its author, Mr. PITT, was introduced, accompanied with an *eulogium* upon his character as a *statesman*.

Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY spoke against the Resolutions, and, in answering that part of the argument which was built upon the precedent of 1788; he also, in answer to what had been said of its author, observed, that he could see *no good reason* for thinking Mr. Pitt a *great man*. A deriding shout from the other side of the House called from him, in his mild and dignified manner, an observation, that those who differed from him in

opinion would better consult the credit of the character they were so zealous in supporting, by citing *any one instance*, in which Mr. Pitt had proved himself a *great man* by being the author of measures that had produced benefit to his country.

The Morning Post says, that Mr. WILBERFORCE answered it thus :—

“ That throughout the course of a long public life, it had been marked by more of forgetfulness for his own situation, by more of veneration and regard for his country and for the general interests of the world, than any other man placed in a similar situation. He had therefore experienced much of pain, to find that the hon. and learned gentleman should have thought it necessary to rake up the ashes of that great man, in order to pass a fleeting censure upon his memory. It was not however the testimony of his (Mr. W.'s) sentiments, that could rescue his character from aspersions so unmerited, that testimony was recorded in the minds of his countrymen, his public actions were before the world, and those were best able to judge of him who knew him best ; but his character would be done justice to by future historians, as indeed it had been by the historian of the day.”

Now, what answer was this ? What was there here to oppose Sir Samuel Romilly ? What was there here to show, that his opinion was not well-founded ? What was all this general talk about forgetfulness of his own situation, veneration for his country, love of mankind ? What was this ? Why did not this defender of Mr. Pitt's character give the instance which Sir Samuel Romilly called for ? Mr. Wilberforce ought to be very familiar with all the instances to be referred to, having been his most constant supporter. Why, then, did he not give the single instance, in which he adopted a measure, which had proved beneficial to England ? The reason is plain ; for, it is not to be believed, that he would not have done it, if he could.

Instead of such instance ; instead of proof that Sir Samuel Romilly was wrong in his opinion ; instead of proof that Mr. Pitt was a great man ; we are, forsooth, to be content with Mr. Wilberforce's assertion, that “ those were best able to judge of Mr. Pitt who knew him best.” Oh, no ! Mr. Wilberforce ; we shall not yield to this. Those are best able to judge of him, who are best able to ascertain and to estimate the effects of his measures. These are the persons best able to judge, whether he ought to be called a *great man* or not. We shall not take his character from those who dined and drank with him ; Oh, no ! nor from those “ historians of the day,” though they may be Police Magistrates, and thought, by some persons, worthy of pensions, paid out of the public money. We shall not pin our faith upon such sleeves, I assure you. We have his acts before us, and the fruit of his acts. We have the *Statute-Book* ; we have the *Paper-money* ; we have the *million of paupers* ; we have the *state of Ireland* ; we have the *Conquests of France*. We have all these before us, and, with these before us, we shall not ask the character of Mr. Pitt from Messrs. Boyd and Benfield, or from Mr. Thomas Steele, or from Mr. Villiers, or Mr. Hunt, or even from Lord Melville, or G. Rose, or Mr. Canning or Mr. Huskisson. All these were amongst the most intimately acquainted with Mr. Pitt ; they, therefore, according to Mr. Wilberforce's notion, *knew him best* ; but, we shall not, for that reason, trust to their judgment upon the subject, when we have all the acts of the man before us, and while we feel so grievously the consequences of these acts. Those are the best able to judge of Mr. Pitt who feel the Assessed Taxes, the Income Tax ; and who, according to the

statement of Mr. Huskisson get *fifteen shillings in the pound* for their money in the funds. These are the persons to judge of Mr. Pitt, and not those who dined and drank with him, and who got *titles and places and grants and pensions and other good things*, which, though not of a *direct* sort, are not the less gratifying to some people, or less likely to warp men's judgment. Oh, no! Mr. Wilberforce, we shall not, I assure you, take his character from persons of this description; but, shall judge from facts, facts which we are all acquainted with, and that no man can now disguise from us.

In the debate of the 2nd instant this topic was revived by MR. CANNING, who having taken 24 hours to collect his materials, took occasion (amidst loud cries of *question*) to come out with what some people call an *eloquent eulogium* on Mr. Pitt, during which, as the newspapers say, he charged Sir Samuel Romilly with having *calumniated* the character of his dear departed friend.

Sir Samuel Romilly, whose answer is said to have been most admirable, coolly told him, that he would better have consulted the credit of his departed friend's memory, if he had pointed out *one single act of his by which England or any part of mankind had been benefitted*. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT followed; and, though I do not see his speech reported, I am quite sure, that he did not fail to point out acts enough, of the "*great man*," which had been a cruel scourge to England and to mankind.

I have not room for a quarter part of what I wish to say upon this subject; but I will return to it in my next; though I cannot even now forbear to notice what is said to have fallen from Mr. PONSONBY, namely, that he and those with whom he *acted* (I was in hopes that this sort of *acting* was over) *disclaimed* attacks upon Mr. Pitt's character. What! do they mean then to *cling to the system*? I want no other *test* than this; and observe, that this was said too (if it was said) during a discussion in which Mr. Pitt's character as a statesman had been brought forward to *give weight* to a *precedent* which was urged in order to cramp the power of the Prince of Wales, and, which is still stronger, against which precedent the *Prince had himself protested at the time!* I can hardly believe, that this was said by Mr. PONSONBY; but, if it was said, and said deliberately and with the concurrence of his party, I am quite sure that the designs of that party, be they who they may, are hostile to the interests of the people of England. The people are greatly indebted to Sir Samuel Romilly for having stood forward in defence of *their* character upon this occasion; for, if they deserved what they received at the hands of Mr. Pitt, how is it possible to find terms sufficiently degrading to describe them. The more that man's character is discussed the better. It is vitally essential that it should be brought to its proper level. Discussion, if free, will bring out *truth*, and truth is all we want. What disgrace, what misery, what incalculable mischiefs, would England never have known if Mr. Pitt had died the day after he first became minister! But, I have no room, and must, therefore, postpone all further observation till my next.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Friday,
Jan. 4th, 1811.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.—*Continued.**(Political Register, January, 1811.)*

“The defect of Representation is the National Disease; and, unless you apply a Remedy directly to that disease, you must inevitably take the consequences with which it is pregnant.—Without a Parliamentary Reform the nation will be plunged into new wars; without a Parliamentary Reform, you cannot be safe against bad Ministers, nor can ever good Ministers be of use to you. No honest man, can, according to the present system, continue Minister.”—MR. PITT'S SPEECH, in the House of Commons, 1782.

BEFORE I proceed to notice the state into which the project of limitations has been brought by the debates, which have, since the 1st of January, taken place in the House of Lords, I shall return to the subject of MR. PITT'S PUBLIC CHARACTER, upon which I had not room fully to offer my remarks at the close of the last article.

This subject, though it arose *incidentally*, in the debate in the House of Commons, on the 1st inst. is one of the greatest importance to the country; of more importance than the nature of the Regency itself, because in this question of the PUBLIC CHARACTER OF MR. PITT is involved the question, whether *his system* is still to be persevered in, or not, by those who are now looking to office and power. This is, in a word, the TEST. It cannot be blinked. It must be met, fully canvassed, and clearly settled; and, accordingly as it is decided; accordingly as men are *for* this character, or against, will be, and must be the opinions, the *hopes* or the *suspicious* of the people, with regard to those men.

Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY has been accused of *raking up the ashes of the dead*. How is this charge made out? It was not he who raked them up. It was they who *first brought forward* Mr. Pitt's name; and, who not only brought forward his name, but who urged it as *an argument* in support of the proposition, which Sir Samuel Romilly had to oppose. Their reasoning was this: “We build our propositions for limiting the powers of the Regent upon the precedent of 1788; and that that was a just and wise measure, that that measure was congenial with the principles of the constitution, that that measure was calculated for the benefit of the country, we have a right to assume, *because* it was the invention of that GREAT STATESMAN, Mr. Pitt.”

And, when Sir Samuel Romilly came to *answer* the arguments in favour of the projected limitations, was he not to notice this argument? And, if he did notice it, was he not at full liberty to deny the assumption grounded upon the assertion that Mr. Pitt was a GREAT STATESMAN? And, in denying this assumption, was it not right for him, if he thought it, to deny that Mr. Pitt was a GREAT STATESMAN? And was *he*, for doing this, under such circumstances, to be charged with *illiberality*, and with *raking up the ashes of the dead*? The affirmative of the proposition is too monstrous to be endured, for a moment, by any man of sense.

The friends of the Pitt system were, it seems, to be at free liberty to say what they pleased in *praise* of their hero; they were, if they had chosen it, to *eulogize* his finance schemes, his taxations, his suspensions of the Habeas Corpus Act, his India system, his schemes and transactions

with the Bank, and even his *subsidies* and his *expeditions*; they were to make use of his name in the way of praise as long as they pleased; but, if any one spoke of the *mischievousness* of his measures, the person so speaking was to be accused of *raking up his ashes*.

If, however, they are alarmed at this sort of raking up, they have, I imagine, a great deal of unexpected mortification to experience.

So far was it from being *illiberal* or *indecorous* in Sir Samuel Romilly to deny that Mr. Pitt was a great statesman, as he did, in the way of *answer* to an argument built upon the affirmative of the proposition, that he would have been fully justified in stating his opinion of Mr. Pitt in the way of *proof* of the *jolly* or *injustice* of the project he was opposing, if he looked upon Mr. Pitt as a minister whose acts showed him to be a man whose example was to be shunned.

If, for instance, a measure were now proposed that had formerly been proposed by LAUD or NOY or JEFFERIES or any other of the tyrannical villains who disgraced the reigns of the Charleses and the Jameses, and whose principles finally brought their masters to the scaffold or drove them from the throne; if a measure were now proposed that had been, in their day, proposed by them, would not the opponent of that measure have a perfect right to speak in the terms which he thought they merited, of the CHARACTER of Laud or Noy or Jefferies? Would he not have a right to speak in reprobation of that character? Would he not have a right to urge the nature of that character as an argument against the measure?

It is almost to insult the understanding of the reader to put these questions to him; and yet has Sir Samuel Romilly been charged with *illiberality*, because he, and that, too, in the most gentle manner, denied, in answer to an argument built on the assertion, that Mr. Pitt was a GREAT STATESMAN!

Thus far as to the charge preferred against Sir Samuel Romilly, which charge, if he spoke what *he thought* of the character of Mr. Pitt, as we have every reason to suppose he did, stands in need of nothing further to show how groundless, how futile it was. But a much more important point remains, namely, *whether his opinion was just*.

And here we ought first to observe, that his opinion was not dogmatically expressed; he did not give a flat and unqualified denial to the assertion of Mr. Pitt's being a *great man* or a *great statesman*; he did not, as he had a full right to do, oppose assertion to assertion, but made his denial conditional, and invited proof of the truth of the assertion of his opponents. "I do not," said he, "think him a great man, because, look which way I will, I can discover, not a single instance of his ever having invented or adopted what was *beneficial to the country* or *to mankind*."

To this what was said in answer? I stated in my last, that Mr. WILKINSON, one of the constant supporters of Mr. Pitt in all his most important measures, and especially in his Bank-stoppage measures, did not accept of Sir Samuel Romilly's invitation; did not produce any such instance as that which the latter had called for; did not attempt to show, that, by any one measure of Mr. Pitt, the people, in any part of the King's dominions, had been benefitted; but contented himself with an eulogium, in loose and general terms, upon Mr. Pitt's character, and with the assertion, that his departed friend was to be judged of by those who *knew him best*.

This was *no answer* to Sir Samuel Romilly. Alas! Mr. Wilberforce, this was no answer to a precise, pointed, pinching proposition. It might do admirably in a funeral sermon, where the orator fears no contradiction; but, in an argument, where discussion is, if men have but spirit, still free, it cannot be expected to pass for much.

Mr. CANNING, however, seems to have been of a different opinion; for after having taken twenty-four hours to ruminate upon the matter, he, if the report of his speech be correct, did no more than follow the example of Mr. Wilberforce; and, like him, to pass a loose and general eulogium on the character of Mr. Pitt, whom he asserted many times to be a *great man*, but, to decline the polite invitation to produce *any one instance* in proof of the truth of the assertion. Sir Samuel Romilly, as well he might (for upon such ground a man may stand till doomsday), still called for the *instance* in which Mr. Pitt's measures had been beneficial to any part of his Majesty's subjects; and in the course of his speech, which is highly extolled by those who had the advantage of hearing it, he is, in the newspapers, reported to have observed, that the right honourable gentleman, especially after having taken twenty-four hours to collect and arrange his materials, would have better consulted the honour of his departed friend's memory, if, instead of a mere eulogium, in general terms, however eloquent, he had called to mind, and had stated any one instance, in which, by the measures of Mr. Pitt, any part of the people of this kingdom, or any part of mankind, had been benefitted.

This was ground from which it was impossible to move him. It was quite unnecessary for him to budge an inch from it. His opponents had first introduced the name and character of Mr. Pitt; they had put forward that character in support of their argument; they had built their precedent upon it; and with *them* it lay to *prove* that the foundation of their precedent, the foundation which they themselves had chosen, was solid and good. Sir Samuel Romilly said that that foundation was not good, and it was *for them* to prove that it was. It was *not* for him to *prove* that Mr. Pitt was *not* a great man, but for them to prove that *he was*; it was for him to deny the affirmative, without, unless he chose it, proving the negative.

But, with us, *out of doors* (I mean out of the House, for some of us are *in doors*), who have more leisure, and are very deeply interested in the question, it may not be amiss to prove this negative, if, indeed, it can stand in need of any proof to a nation who are so severely feeling the effects of Mr. Pitt's administration. Sir Samuel Romilly merely said, that he did not think Mr. Pitt a *great man*, and called for proof to the contrary, which proof no one attempted to give; I say he was a very *little man*, and I will produce *the proof*.

First, then, what is meant by the words *great man*? Certainly in this case, a *great statesman*. Men may be great in other ways, as a poet, a chemist, a political economist, a lawyer, or a divine, and in many other ways; but, in this case we are, and so was Sir Samuel Romilly, to view Mr. Pitt as a STATESMAN; and not merely as a statesman in the undefined sense of that word, but as FIRST MINISTER OF ENGLAND, a person responsible for all the acts of the government, and, in *character*, responsible for all the evils that befall the country during the continuance of his sway, or in consequence of any measures adopted or invented by him.

It is in this character that we must view Mr. Pitt; it is in this charac-

ter that his memory is responsible to us ; it is in this character that I am of opinion he was a *very little man* ; and if I fail in my proof of it, I will (without, however, acknowledging the propriety of the expression) be content to pass for one of the propagators of those "*calumnies*, out of doors," of which Mr. Canning thought proper to complain.

The criterion of *greatness* in a STATESMAN, who has been prime minister, is not the duration of his power ; not the length of time that he was able to keep his place ; not the majorities that he kept at his back, in the Houses of Parliament ; not the number of peers that he created ; not the grants of money, sinecures, and pensions that he made ; no, nor the increase of commerce and manufactures, however such increase may dazzle some men. The true criterion is, *the effect produced by his measures upon the state of the nation at large* ; upon the situation of the people ; upon their means of living, upon their freedom, their morals, their love of country, their happiness ; and upon the state of the country relatively to other countries, particularly any country, the augmentation of the power of which must endanger the independence of the country of which the person in question has been minister.

If this be the true criterion whereby to judge of a minister, and not the opinions of his close companions, or his party adherents, let us proceed to judge of Mr. Pitt by it : first observing, that, for 21 years, he had all the means of the country and of the whole of the King's dominions at his command. He gained, by means of the popularity which his professions in favour of Parliamentary reform had given him (and a specimen of which I have taken for my motto) ; by these means he gained a victory over his great opponent in 1784. From that time to the day of his death his power lasted ; for he chose to make way for Mr. Addington ; and, as was proved by the result, he was in a state to resume the office of minister whenever he pleased.

During 21 years he had a decided majority in the two Houses of Parliament. One half, or thereabouts, of the upper House had been either created or promoted during his ministry ; and, in the lower House, what is there that can be named, in the way of gaining influence, that he had not had the power of doing, and that he had not actually done ? In the long course of these 21 years, he never proposed or espoused any measure that was rejected ; and he never opposed or joined in opposing any measure that was carried ; with the exception, as to the former, of the measure of *Parliamentary Reform* and the *Abolition of the Slave Trade*, of which we shall have to speak hereafter, when we come to the question of his *sincerity*.

During these 21 years he adopted, then, what measures he thought proper, he levied what taxes and what armies he thought proper ; he made war and peace when and how he thought proper ; he had all the resources of the nation in his hands ; he employed them in what manner it seemed meet to him ; he was under no control ; and, of course, to him, and to him alone, we are to look for all the changes that have taken place in the internal state of the country, and in the situation of its affairs with regard to foreign nations.

The farmer who has just entered upon his farm, may justly apologize for its ruinous state by alleging that he found it in that state, and that he has not yet had time to better it ; but, when you survey a farm at the end of a 21 years' lease, you have a right to charge the renter with all the signs of poverty and misery that you perceive. Such a cultivator has no apology to offer ; and, as to a minister, he is, if possible, still more

destitute of excuse, because, if he had found any thing to thwart his views, he might, and it was his duty, *quit his place*, and state to the nation his reasons for so doing. What, then, are the *changes* produced in the affairs of this nation since 1784 (for, let it be observed, that the *system* of Mr. Pitt has been acted upon to this hour); what are these changes; what is the state of England *now*, compared to what it was then, with regard both to its *domestic* and *foreign* affairs?

George Rose will tell you, that you are to judge from the imports and exports, the cotton-mills and spinning-jennies; and Sir John Sinclair will say, look at the increase of canals, turnpike-roads, new inclosures and threshing-machines; while it is not improbable that Messrs. Perceval and Ryder may endeavour to draw our admiration to the fruitful Statute-book, where we shall find a greater bulk of laws passed during the sway of Mr. Pitt and his successors of the same school, than was passed from the origin of Parliaments in England to the reign of George the Third; but,

“Ye friends to truth, ye statesmen who survey
“The rich man’s joys increase, the poor’s decay,”

it is yours to judge by other signs than these; it is yours to judge by those effects which regard the *happiness of the people* and the *permanent security of the country’s independence*.

If, in a single family, consisting of ten brothers, all engaged in industrious pursuits, and gaining each a comfortable subsistence, such a change was introduced as should lift one or two into a coach and four, and plunge the other eight into misery or dependence, would any rational man, any man having a due sense of real good and evil, any man having just notions of happiness and of honour; would any man say, that that *family* had been *prosperous*? Would he not say, that, upon the whole, its affairs had been badly managed? And, if he could point to the person who had been the cause of the change, who had had the absolute control over the affairs of the whole of the family, would he not charge that person with having been the cause of a great evil?

Just such has been the great and general tendency of the system of Mr. Pitt; a system, which has taken the earnings away from the nation at large, and heaped them upon selected individuals, who have been found, in various ways, necessary to the support of the minister’s power.

This is *proved* by facts that no one can deny, and which facts stand recorded in the official documents laid before Parliament, exhibiting the increase of the *National Debt*, the *Taxes*, the *Expenditure*, and the *Paupers*.

	Millions of Pounds.
He found the National Debt.....	257
He left it	640
His successors of the same school have carried it to	811
<hr/>	
He found the annual Taxes	13
He left them	44
His successors have carried them to	70
<hr/>	
He found the annual Expenditure	21
He left it	70
His successors in the system have carried it to	82

Well! exclaims the true Pittite; but, what signifies this, if *all go on increasing together*? If the *means* increase along with the *expenditure*?

Aye, but do you, then, take it for granted, that an *increase of taxes* implies an *increase of means* to pay them? That would be a strange way of reasoning. Say, rather, that it argues an *increase of the distress and misery occasioned by additional burdens*; and, then you have the *proof* at hand, in the increase of the parish rates.

He found the annual Parish Rates for England and Wales.. £2,167,749
He left them (three years before his death)..... 5,348,205

And, if they could now be ascertained, they would, it is fair to presume, be found amounting to not less than *seven millions*. The number of paupers, in 1803, exceeded 1,200,000, exclusive of a dreadful increase of common beggars; and, indeed, is it not notorious to every one who has eyes or ears, that *pauperism* and misery have increased almost beyond conception, since the fatal day when Mr. Pitt, through the folly of a deluded nation, obtained a predominance in England? Since that day, the *character* of the people has been changed; by the pressure of misery they have had gradually worn out of them that independence of spirit, that dread of becoming dependent, that pride in keeping their names from the parish books, that shame to be entered on the list of paupers; by the pressure of misery, occasioned by taxation, all these feelings have been swept away, and now no one seems to care what are the means by which he can make shift to satisfy the cravings of hunger, and to keep the cold from his carcass. In the year 1780, or thereabouts, in a parish in Hampshire, which has in it more than a hundred labourer's families, there were but *seven* families on the parish books; about five years ago, in that same parish, there were only *seven not upon the parish books*. This is, perhaps, rather a striking instance; but, who does not know that the increase of pauperism and the consequent degradation of character has been dreadful?

What, reader, can ever compensate us for this? The *plague*, or *civil war*, are trifles to such an evil. Half a people swept away by either would have been preferable to this general degradation of character; to the fatal operation of this system, which has made the higher ranks of life dependent upon the minister of the day, and has thrown the lower upon the higher in the character of paupers; thus forming and cementing into a chain of dependence the whole of the community, of which chain the minister of the day holds the end and turns the swivel.

Such, deny it who will, has been the effect of Mr. Pitt's measures upon the *internal* state of the country. "But," I shall be told, "that great as such a sacrifice is, it is no more than ought to be made for the *maintenance of the nation's independence against the designs of a foreign enemy*."

Why, if you could prove to me that the *degradation of the people* was the best means of providing for *national defence*, I might *argue* with you upon such a proposition. But, to discuss this point will be unnecessary, if we only cast our eyes towards the theatre of our *wars*; if we only look at the continent of Europe, were we see that all Mr. Pitt's wars have failed, that all his subsidies have been thrown away; and that the *sweat* of England, while it purchased the *blood* of the allies that he gave her, has, in the end, in every instance, insured the destruction of those allies; till, at last, we see France, that France whom he found in a state of distraction and debility, the absolute mistress of all Europe, holding the keys of all the rivers and ports, building fleets in places

whence from the top-mast may be seen the mouth of the Thames, and, in short, making it a *question* with us when and how she will invade us, there being no one, not even Lord Liverpool, that now ever dreams that we have, or shall have, the power of retaliation, either in the way of act or of menace.

Is not this the real state of the case? Will any one deny it? Is not this our situation with regard to France? For what, then, have there been expended NINE HUNDRED MILLIONS of pounds in these wars against France! If, indeed, the wars had succeeded; if he and his successors of the same school had *diminished* the power of France; then there might have been some room for saying that there was, in our security from without, a compensation for the fatal effects of taxation; nay, if France had been kept within her ancient limits, within the limits in which he found her; but, who is the man that will now find a consolation for our internal sufferings and degradation? Who is the man that has the hardihood to look us in the face and deny, that the whole of this minister's system has been the most fatal that ever nation endured?

"But," say his advocates, "consider the *difficulties* which he had to encounter." I do; but, I also consider, that *he* was the *maker* of those difficulties. It was he who made the war with France; for, as to the quibble about the *first act of hostility*, all the world knows the worth of that. He was the author of all the difficulties that ensued. Instead of following the advice of Mr. Fox and others, he pursued his own plans; he conceived the project of beating France through her finances, he repeatedly predicted, in the most confident words, her defeat from that cause; and, at the end of four years of his war, he saw her replenished with gold and silver, while he had to announce to that same parliament that had so often been charmed by his predictions, *that the Bank of England could no longer pay its notes*. How often did he promise this credulous nation "*indemnity for the past and security for the future*?" How often did he say, that he could consent to no peace in which both should not be obtained? Have we obtained it? What indemnity shall we ever see for our nine hundred millions expended in these wars, and for the flower of the country who have therein shed their blood? And, alas! when will England again know that state which shall merit the name of *security*?

Still, there might have been something to say in his behalf, if he had not been *forewarned* of the consequences of his measures. But, at every stage, he was so forewarned. He was told, from the very outset, that, "Should he succeed in *stifling liberty* in France, he would cause "the erection of a despotism a thousand times more dangerous to England than any free government could be." So that, the consequences were not "such as *no human foresight* could reach," as his advocates have pretended. They could be foreseen; for, they *were* foreseen and foretold; and the only answer those who foretold them received was, that they were *jacobins, friends of France, traitors, and atheists*, and as such were they treated; till, at last, scarcely any man dared to open his lips in opposition to any measure of the minister.

And yet, we are now to be told, that it is *calumny* to deny that he was a *great man*! We are to have before our eyes this deplorable situation of our country; we are to behold the situation of the Bank, where paper is exchanged for paper; we are to hear one of his own creatures acknowledge, in print, that the Bank-notes have depreciated *three shillings* in

the pound, and that the fund-holder receives them in this state with the certainty of a daily further depreciation; we are to see the East India Company, which he promised us should contribute towards the expenses of the country, come to the parliament for assistance out of the taxes; we are to have fresh in our memories his loan to Boyd and Benfield of 40,000*l.* of the public money, without interest, to enable them to make good a *loan* to that Public, upon which *they received interest*; we are to see him sliding out of office while Mr. Addington made peace and funded the sums for which the Income Tax was pledged, and, afterwards joining his own old opponents to put Mr. Addington out of place, coming in himself with a part of Mr. Addington's colleagues, whom he had declared weak and inefficient; we are to see him set out with professions in favour of Parliamentary Reform, and we are afterwards to hear his evidence in the case of Mr. Horne Tooke, who was *tried for his life*, under his administration, for endeavouring to accomplish that which he had originally brought forward in conjunction with that very Mr. Tooke; we are to see him in a *minority* on the question of the Slave Trade; we are to have upon record all his predictions about French assignats, all his military projects, we are to remember his cars and catamarans and sympathetic battalions; and, with all this and a thousand other proofs of his real character before us, we are to be called *calumniators* if we deny him the title of A GREAT MAN!

But, do we deny him *talents*? Oh, no! We never did. He had talents, and, of their kind, very great talents. All the merchants and manufacturers who ever approached him were struck with admiration of his talents. He, according to the vulgar saying, "knew their meaning by their gaping." He knew all their business better than they did. His quickness was astonishing. He was an incomparable accountant, a consummate clerk, and he was, besides, a matchless *debater*. To a fluency, a command of words, that, perhaps, no man ever equalled, he added a readiness of conception, an adroitness in parrying the force of an argument, a command of temper, political courage, at once a decorum and disregard of means, surpassing any man of whom we have ever heard. He was a showy and a shallow man; but, his talents were precisely of the right kind for the theatre on which he had to act, and all the machinery and tactic of which he understood and knew how to use better, and used with greater successes for his objects, than any man that ever lived. Here are an abundance of *talents*; but, they are not such as mark the GREAT MAN, a character, which, when we are speaking of statesmen or ministers, belongs to those only, whose wisdom is proved in *the benefit which their measures produce to their country*, not one instance of which can, I am firmly persuaded, be produced with regard to the measures of Mr. Pitt, with the single exception of the *Mail Coach* establishment, which has in it the rare union of effects productive to the revenue, and beneficial to every individual in the nation, but of which he was not the projector, and the manner in which he treated that projector takes from himself, in my opinion, more than the merit of the adoption.

Now, whoever is offended at this my opinion, may be well assured, that I am not to be *answered by imputations* of bad motives, or by charges of *calumny*. If my facts be not true, or if my inferences be not fair, the proving of the falsehood of the one, or the unfairness of the other, will be an answer to me; but, to call me a *calumniator*, in answer

to fact and argument, will serve no other purpose than that of exposing the accuser to contempt.

I should apologise for having taken up so much of my room, and of the reader's time, with the foregoing statements and observations, were I not thoroughly convinced of the great importance of the subject, and did not experience of the past convince me, that the making of a question of Mr. Pitt's character ought not to be considered as a mere effusion of friendship or gratitude, but an indication of a settled purpose to involve *the Prince's ministry in a participation of the Pitt system of rule*. Indeed, this appears evident enough from what is published as a report of the debate last referred to, where Mr. Canning is represented as having asked, whether he was to consider the opinion of Sir Samuel Romilly as an intimation, that the coming ministry meant to depart wholly from Mr. Pitt's system. The answer of Mr. Ponsonby, *disclaiming*, apparently, what had been said by Sir Samuel Romilly, was noticed in my last; and, Mr. Canning is reported to have said, that he was *satisfied* with Mr. Ponsonby's declaration.

So am not I, and so is not, and never will be, *the people of England*, who, if they were polled, would be found, ninety-nine out of a hundred, of Sir Samuel Romilly's opinion, and who are now against all limitations on his Royal Highness, because they hope and believe, that he never can be prevailed upon to suffer a ministry to act upon the Pitt system; but that, on the contrary, he will be surrounded by men determinedly hostile to that system, which has brought so much misery upon the country.

This casting of Sir Samuel Romilly overboard has produced already a deep impression; and for an opinion, too, to which every heart responds. What! is his Royal Highness to be saddled with this system? Are his ministers never to dare to open their lips upon the evils of the measures of the last twenty-six years? Is *he*, who has been one of the *victims* of that system, now to take it under his fostering care? Is he, indeed, heir-apparent to Mr. Pitt's measures, his taxation, his wars, his Bank Restriction, his paper-money, all his pauperising measures? Oh, no! He is heir-apparent to none of them; he had no hand in their invention or their adoption; he is, as yet, free from all connection with them; and he will not be so easily persuaded to ally himself with them; to embark his fortunes and his fame in the same boat with measures so hateful to the people.

Whoever may become ministers, their fate, as such, will *wholly* depend upon whether they do or do not pursue that fatal system, which it is necessary for them *distinctly to disclaim at the outset*, if they mean to possess the confidence of the people, or *even to retain their power*. If they temporise; if they attempt to steer a middle course between the *people* and *Pittites*, they will share the fate of all temporisers; they will verify the old saying of the *two stools*.

Their adversaries understand the system better than they do. George Rose or Mr. Huskisson would beat them off their ground, and render them an object of ridicule with the very clerks in their offices. They have no idea of the ludicrous fate that awaits them, if they attempt to bolster up this hated system; and, if they do attempt it, they will, to all their other mortifications, have to add that of hearing me remind them of this prediction, and seeing me take my motto from the Political Register. There never were men so deceived as they, if they imagine, that they will be able to jog quietly on in the *old track*. The country expects

a *change of system*. This is the expectation of the country ; the promise of it would be, in itself, a tower of strength ; but, without something in that way be done, there will be no real strength, and the thing will exhibit something worse than weakness.

What is it that has made the people cold and silent, upon many late occasions ? Is it supposed, that they did not feel for the sufferings of our armies under Sir John Moore and Lord Chatham ? Is it supposed, that they were indifferent to the fate of so many of their countrymen and kindred ? Is it supposed, that they had no feeling for them ; and that they were also insensible of the *cost* to themselves ? Is it supposed that they were deaf alike to the voice of humanity and of self-interest ? There is no one who can suppose this. No ; the truth is, that the people were withheld from stirring upon these occasions, which were of a nature to move inanimate clay, because they saw no hope in any change of *ministry* that their stirring might tend to accelerate ; because they, in the conduct of those who were candidates for office, saw no indications of an intended *change of system* ; because, in short, they saw, that, when the accusation of *seat-selling* was brought before the Commons House, and proof of the fact offered to be produced at the bar, both sides join in "*making a stand against popular encroachment.*" This was the cause of their silence ; this was the cause why their voice was not heard ; this was the cause of their taking no more interest in the questions than they would have done in a question of who should possess such or such a sinecure. Their feeling is very different *now*. They are well convinced of the benignant intentions of his Royal Highness towards them, and they hope, from his long experience and sound judgment, for such a selection of ministers as shall give operation and effect to those intentions. This is the reason why they now take an interest in what is passing ; this is the reason why they are anxious to see him possessed of all the powers and attributes of the kingly office. But, if they could suppose, that there was *no change of system* intended ; if they could suppose, that they were still to hear measures proposed and defended upon the ground of the example of "*the great statesman now no more,*" does any one think, that they would stir an inch ?

The public expectation is on tip-toe. It never was more alive. Every man asks his neighbour *what* his hopes are ; but all hope for *something* ; and, if nothing is to be done, if every one is to be thrown overboard, like a Jonas, who does not believe Mr. Pitt to be a great man, it is hardly necessary to say, that this pleasing expectation will be changed into disgust.

It is thought by some, perchance, that a *peace* would do every thing. It would do just nothing, if unaccompanied with a reform. And, besides, what sort of peace could be made ? Sweden, Holland, the Hans Towns, Spain, Portugal, Naples, all must be left in the hands of France. All the sea-ports, all the arsenals, all the maritime means of Europe. Could we *disarm* in such a peace ? What, then, would be the use of peace ? But, reform and tranquillise Ireland and reform England, and you may almost *disarm in war*. It is at *home*, therefore, that the preparations for peace ought to be begun. Being all right at home first, we might talk of peace in a bold tone ; and, if we obtained not safe and honourable terms, we might still set the enemy at defiance, and convince him that we dreaded not perpetual war.

I know it has been said, that we (for be where I may I will ever ven-

ture to rank myself amongst the friends of freedom) are *bidding* for the Prince. And, who have a better right? Who can bid above us? We have to offer him *hearts* and *sinews*, and *lives* if he need them, and we ask for nothing but our well-known *rights* in return. We want nothing from him but those rights. We want to strip him of nothing. We grudge him and his family nothing that the constitution awards them, or that they would ever wish for in the way of splendour. All we have to beseech of him is, that he will, whenever he shall be invested with Royal authority, resolve to be *the ruler of a free people*, and not *the leader of a faction*.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Tuesday,
8th January, 1811.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, January, 1811.*)

A DEPUTATION from the two Houses have waited on the Prince of Wales and the Queen, and presented to them the RESOLUTIONS finally agreed to in the House, relative to the Regency. To the communication, thus made, there is the answer of his Royal Highness, accepting (with a declaration of adherence to his principles formerly expressed) of the office of Regent, as limited by those resolutions.* And, from the Queen, there is an answer, accepting of the portion of power (for power it is) allotted to her.

* *Answers of the Prince of Wales and the Queen to the Deputations from the Houses of Lords and Commons, presenting to them their Resolutions relative to the Regency.—Friday, 11th January, 1811.*

At two o'clock precisely, the deputation from the two Houses went up to Carlton House to present to his Royal Highness the Resolutions to which the two Houses, after long discussion, had agreed. The Lords and Gentlemen, all in full dress, were ushered through the superb suite of rooms to the Drawing-Room, where his Royal Highness stood. His Chancellor, William Adam, Esq., and Earl Moira on his right hand; the Duke of Cumberland and Mr. Sheridan on his left; behind him four Officers of his Household, Mr. Tyrwhitt, Colonel Macmahon, Colonel Bloomfield, and General Turner. The deputation advanced according to their order of precedency. The Lord President, the Lord Privy Seal, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Ryder, the President of the Board of Control, and the Master of the Rolls; and they made the usual reverences.

The Lord President then read from a paper in his hand: That they were a Committee appointed to attend his Royal Highness with the Resolutions which had been agreed to by the Lords and Commons, for the purpose of supplying the defect of the personal exercise of the Royal Authority, during his Majesty's illness, by empowering his Royal Highness to exercise that authority in the name and on the behalf of his Majesty, subject to such limitations and restrictions as shall be provided.

And that they were directed to express the hope which the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, entertain, that his Royal Highness, from his regard to the interests of his Majesty, will be ready to undertake the weighty and

Upon these answers I should have made no remark at all, had there not appeared, on the part of the MEAN, MERCENARY and MALIGNANT men an article, in the COURIER newspaper of the 14th instant, which calls for animadversion.

The object of this article manifestly is to add, if possible to the embarrassments, which his Royal Highness will have to encounter. It is as full of poison as the asp-like author could make it.

It professes to *lament* the bad advice which the Prince has received ; it calls the answer an ungracious answer ; and it resorts to the meanest of the sophistry and quirkery, in use among the meanest of lawyers, in order to give a false colour to the conduct of the Prince.

important trust proposed to be invested in his Royal Highness, as soon as an Act of Parliament shall have been passed for carrying the said Resolutions into effect.

The Lord President then read and delivered to his Royal Highness the Resolutions, which are as follow:

RESOLVED,—That for the purpose of providing for the exercise of the Royal Authority during the continuance of his Majesty's illness, in such manner, and to such extent, as the present circumstances and the urgent concerns of the Nation appear to require, it is expedient, that his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, being resident within the realm, shall be empowered to exercise and administer the Royal Authority, according to the Laws and Constitution of Great Britain, in the name, and on behalf of his Majesty, and under the style and title of Regent of the United Kingdom ; and to use, execute, and perform, in the name, and on behalf of his Majesty, all Authorities, Prerogatives, Acts of Government, and Administration of the same, that belong to the King of this Realm to use, execute, and perform, according to the Law thereof, subject to such limitations and exceptions as shall be provided.

RESOLVED,—That the power so to be given to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales shall not extend to the granting of any rank or dignity of the Peerage of the Realm to any person whatever.

RESOLVED,—That the said power shall not extend to the granting of any office whatever in reversion, or to the granting of any office, salary, or pension, for other term than during his Majesty's pleasure, except such offices as are by law required to be granted for life, or during good behaviour.

RESOLVED,—That the said power shall not extend to the granting of any part of his Majesty's real or personal estate, except as far as relates to the renewal of leases.

RESOLVED,—That the care of his Majesty's Royal Person, during the continuance of his Majesty's illness, shall be committed to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, together with the sole direction of such portion of his Majesty's Household as shall be thought requisite for the care of his person, and that, for the better enabling her Majesty to discharge this important task, it is also expedient, that a Council shall be appointed to advise and assist her Majesty in the several matters aforesaid ; and with power, from time to time, as they may see cause, to examine, upon oath, the Physicians and others attending his Majesty's person, touching the state of his Majesty's health, and all matters relative thereto.

To which Address his Royal Highness returned the following most gracious Answer :

The Answer of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.

My Lords and Gentlemen : I receive the communication which the two Houses have directed you to make to me, of their joint resolutions, on the subject of providing for "the exercise of the royal authority, during his Majesty's illness," with those sentiments of regard which I must ever entertain for the united desires of the two Houses.—With the same sentiments I receive the expressed "hopes of the Lords and Commons, that from my regard for the interest of his Majesty and the nation I should be ready to undertake the weighty and important "trust proposed to be invested in me," under the restrictions and limitations stated in those resolutions.—Conscious that every feeling of my heart would have prompted

But, I must insert the whole article; for, it is right, that the world should see, and that we should have upon record, the means that these MEAN men have resorted to, and are making use of upon this occasion; these MEAN men, who take to themselves the exclusive appellation of "*King's friends*," who brand us with the names of *Jacobins* and *Levellers*, and who would now tear the kingly office to atoms, because they suppose (and, I hope, truly,) that it will not be exercised for their private advantage.

When the reader has gone through this article with attention, he will indulge me while I offer a few remarks upon it:—

"His Royal Highness, or rather perhaps, his advisers, say, 'conscious that every feeling of my heart would have prompted me, from dutiful affection to my beloved Father and Sovereign to have shown all the reverential delicacy towards him inculcated in these Resolutions, I cannot refrain from expres-

me, from dutiful affection to my beloved father and sovereign, to have shown all the reverential delicacy towards him inculcated in those resolutions, I cannot refrain from expressing my regret, that I should not have been allowed the opportunity of manifesting to his afflicted and loyal subjects that such would have been my conduct.—Deeply impressed, however, with the necessity of tranquilizing the public mind, and determined to submit to every personal sacrifice consistent with the regard I owe to the security of my father's crown and the equal regard I owe to the welfare of his people, I do not hesitate to accept the office and situation proposed to me, restricted as they are, still retaining every opinion expressed by me upon a former and similar distressing occasion.—In undertaking the trust proposed to me, I am well aware of the difficulties of the situation in which I shall be placed; but I shall rely with confidence upon the constitutional advice of an enlightened Parliament, and the zealous support of a generous and loyal people. I will use all the means left to me to merit both.

My Lords and Gentlemen: You will communicate this my answer to the two Houses, accompanied by my most fervent wishes and prayers, that the Divine will may extricate us and the nation from the grievous embarrassments of our present condition by the speedy restoration of his Majesty's health.

In like manner the deputation appointed to wait upon the Queen, viz., Earl Harcourt, Earl of Moretown, Lord Viscount Palmerston, Lord Vis. Clive, Lord John Thynne, and Col. Desbrow, proceeded to Windsor, and being admitted to her Majesty's presence, they presented the humble address of the two Houses, expressing the hope which the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons entertain, that her Majesty will be graciously pleased to undertake the important duties proposed to be invested in her Majesty, as soon as an Act of Parliament shall have been passed, for carrying the said resolution into effect.—Lord Harcourt read the fifth resolution; upon which her Majesty was pleased to return the following most gracious answer:—

Answer of the Queen.

My Lords and Gentlemen: That sense of duty and gratitude to the King, and of obligation to this country, which induced me in the year 1789 readily to promise my most earnest attention to the anxious and momentous trust at that time intended to be reposed in me by Parliament, is strengthened, if possible, by the uninterrupted enjoyment of those blessings which I have continued to experience under the protection of his Majesty since that period: and I should be wanting to all my duties if I hesitated to accept the sacred trust which is now offered to me.—The assistance, in point of council and advice, which the wisdom of Parliament proposes to provide for me will make me undertake the charge with greater hopes that I may be able satisfactorily to fulfil the important duties which it must impose upon me.—Of the nature and importance of that charge, I cannot but be duly sensible, involving, as it does, every thing which is valuable to myself, as well as the highest interests of a people endeared to me by so many ties and considerations, but by nothing so strongly as by their steady, loyal, and affectionate attachment to the best of Kings.

The deputation then withdrew.

“sing my regret that I should not have been allowed the opportunity of manifesting to his afflicted and loyal subjects that such would have been my ‘conduct.’ Were his Royal Highness so situated as to have advisers officially responsible for his conduct, I would speak of this passage in very strong terms of disapprobation, considering it as their language. As it is, I shall only lament he should have any persons about him, capable of advising the adoption of such sentiments, the meaning of which is, that his Royal Highness should be granted unlimited authority on the faith of his personal abilities and virtues, rather than of *law and restraint, the unerring marks, the indispensable props of a free state.* All arguments which bring the conduct of the Government home to the Prince in person, holding him *personally forward* as the prime mover of public measures, seem to me inconsistent with the principles of our Constitution.

But the censure of the provisions made by Parliament, while obedience is yielded to the main decision, is the most to be lamented. *The King has uniformly bowed to the wishes of Parliament, never in language reproving their conduct;* and this has been the secret of the strength of his Government. Nay the Burdett rabble seem to have thought that the King acted improperly in daring to convey an *indirect censure* of the designs of the Corporation of London. A year ago, when the City addressed the Throne respecting the Walcheren Expedition, and the King answered, that *he confided in the wisdom of his Parliament;* the streets rung with invective. But now the Prince may rebuke the united Houses of Parliament, solemnly delegated before his person, in very broad terms, without animadversion. To the mob any thing *lowering the Parliament,* from whatever quarter it comes, seems to be agreeable.

The Prince says he still retains every opinion expressed by him on a similar former occasion, meaning the Regency of 1789. This was sufficiently understood; his answer to Mr. Perceval, published in substance by all the Newspapers, had avowed it; and I lament that the Prince should have shown so much tenacity, *so eager a desire to re-assert his opinions,* they being hostile to those of the authorities he was addressing, and such a re-assertion being wholly unnecessary.

Neither do I approve of the passage wherein he says he will ‘*use all the means left to him*’ to merit the approbation of Parliament and the People by his government, a passage containing a notion that his power is greatly curtailed, which I deny. He is to have the full powers of the executive authority, the means of political influence being, in a small degree only, withheld from him for a short time.—In his answer to the Deputation from Parliament, his Royal Highness was under no necessity to say more, in substance, than that he would accept the trust, ‘notwithstanding any opinions respecting the conditions.’ This passage would have been a sufficient reservation. The detailed and strong manner in which his Royal Highness’s sentiments, or rather those of his advisers, is expressed, in opposition to the solemn decisions of the two Houses of Parliament, gives ground for *much uneasiness,* if not of *positive alarm.* His was *not a gracious answer.*”

What! *uneasiness* and *alarm*? Amongst *whom*? Amongst what description of persons does this give ground for *uneasiness* and *alarm*? Not amongst those, who really love the country; not amongst those who wish to support the Crown because they looked upon it as held in trust for the nation; not amongst those who have no hand in contracts and jobs, and who never desire to share in fleeing the people; not amongst those who have had no hand in peculations and seat-sellings and the other abominable corruptions that have, from time to time, been brought to light. No: to such persons the passage of the answer here complained of, gives grounds for no “*uneasiness,*” no “*alarm.*”

To say the truth, I, after the best consideration I was able to give this answer of his Royal Highness, thought it deficient in *strength of expression as to the measure tendered to him.* I thought, that it fell rather short of what might reasonably be expected from him by those, in parliament, who had opposed the measure by such powerful arguments, and

also by those out of parliament, who have, in a public and constitutional manner, expressed their disapprobation of that measure. At the time when his Royal Highness gave this answer, there were lying upon the tables of the two Houses of Parliament, Petitions from the City of London, earnestly praying, that no limitations might be imposed upon his Royal Highness; expressing confidence in him, and beseeching the Houses that nothing might be done to mutilate the kingly power in his hands. After this, I, for my part, should have expected something stronger from him in disapprobation of the measure; but, if he had been *silent* upon the subject, what would the opponents of the measure, in Parliament as well as out, have said? Would they not have had just ground of complaint? Would they not have said, that he had been wanting in justice to them as well as to himself? And, what man would have relied upon him in future?

It was absolutely necessary, that he should mark the measure of limitations with his disapprobation, sooner or later; and, was it not best to do it at once; was it not best to do it the first moment the measure was regularly brought before him? Would not *delay* have produced, in part, at least, the effect above described; and, let me ask these MEAN and MALIGNANT men, whether, if he had been silent on this topic upon this occasion, they would not have cited that silence, and flung it in the faces of the minority in parliament and of the city of London, as a proof that the Prince either disapproved of their conduct or held them and their efforts in contempt?

This is what his and the people's enemies wished for above all things, and in this they were disappointed.

We are next told, by the MEAN quirker, who is the author of this article, that this part of the Prince's answer means, that he ought to have had "*unlimited* authority on the faith of his personal abilities and virtues, " rather than of *law* and *restraint*, the unerring marks, the *indispensable* "*props*, of a *free state*."

How often must one expose these worse than pettifogging quirks!

No: the Prince asks, and we ask for him, no *unlimited* authority; he asks for no power without *law* and *restraint*. But, he wishes, and very naturally wishes, and the people wish it too, that he should have no other restraints than those imposed by the *constitution*, that is to say, by the *laws already in existence*. He has asked for no authority upon the faith of his *personal abilities* and *virtues*; none at all; but he thinks, and the nation think with him, that he ought to possess all the authority that his Royal Father possessed, and no *reason* has ever been assigned why he should *not*, while an abundance of reasons have been produced on the other side.

To hear these MEAN and MALIGNANT men one would imagine, that they had a scheme on foot for *diminishing* the kingly powers. Not at all. What they urge is, not any diminution of the powers, but a *division* of them, by giving a part to the Prince, a part to the Queen, and keeping back a part to be exercised by the King, or his advisers, in case he should again be declared to be *recovered*, though for ever so short a time. The power of *making peers*, and of *granting pensions* and *offices for life* is, for instance, kept from the Prince. So that, if the Prince should find any persons meriting these honours and rewards, he cannot bestow them; but, the King, if he should be declared well, and should remain so only for one day, may make as many peers as he

pleases, and may grant away any of the life-offices that may have fallen vacant, during the time that the Prince has been filling the kingly office. And thus the powers and prerogatives of the Crown, which are vested there in trust for the good of the people, are to be *separated from the office*, and to be exercised by the King, if he recover, after the time is over. He, who is, unhappily, declared *incapable of exercising the functions of King*, is, if he should be declared recovered *only for one day*, to have, not only all the kingly powers again in his hands, but is to have the *additional* power of making peers and granting places and pensions in *retrospect*. And, it is those who support such a measure, who have the impudence to censure the Prince of Wales for expressing his disapprobation of withholding the powers from him for the time being!

This writer, whom I could almost name, and whose MALIGNANT soul and quirking brain are so strongly depicted in every line of this article, next, in order to excite as much jealousy as possible against the Prince, tells the public, that "the *King* uniformly bowed to the wishes of *parliament*, that he never reprov'd their conduct, and that this was "the SECRET of the strength of his government."

Secret? What secret? Will you, dare you tell us; dare you fully to explain this *secret*? I know of no *secrets* of this sort that ought to exist; but, I am sure, that the people will easily understand what it means.

"Bowed to the *wishes of parliament*," indeed! I wonder how any thing in human shape can muster up the impudence to make use of such a phrase. Surely the day will come, when no one will dream of thus insulting the understandings of the people. Mr. PITT "uniformly bowed to the *wishes of parliament*," did he not? He bowed to those *wishes*, did he not, when he entered upon his mad wars; when he contrived that series of measures that produced the Bank Stoppage, and that have finally led to the conquest of all Europe by France and to the present state of Ireland. He bowed to the *wishes of parliament*: that is to say, he always had a majority there. Is this what is meant by *bowing* to the wishes of parliament? He bowed, did he, to the *wishes* of the Lords and the Secretaries of the several Boards, to the Lords of the Bed-chamber, to all the Placemen and Pensioners? He bowed to *their wishes*, did he? What impudence a man must have to put forth such an idea; and what MALIGNITY thus to put the *King* in contrast with the *Prince*, and for that purpose setting at naught the transferring of the acts of the *King's* reign from his *ministers* to *himself*. But, this, the "loyal" have invariably done. They have never hesitated to saddle the *King* personally with the acts of his ministers. They have said, and sometimes nearly in so many words, do not blame the *ministers*; if you must blame, blame *the King*. The thing was *his* doing; it was his *scruples*; and, therefore, hold your tongues, or attack *him*. Thus have they always thrown him personally as a shield over the ministers, and this game they are, it seems, resolved to play to the last.

We have next, from this quirking gentleman, an endeavour to confuse the understandings of the public by a case, in which the City of London complained of reproof received from the King. That case was this. The City of London, partaking in the feelings of the whole nation, went up to the King with an Address, in which they besought him to cause strict inquiry to be made into the circumstances of the *Convention of Cintra*. They did the same in regard to the *Walcheren Expedition*. In answer to the first they were told, by the King's advisers, that he thought they

knew him too well to suppose, that *their interference was necessary*; and, in the latter case, they were told, that he should leave the matter, as he safely might, to the *wisdom of his parliament*.

Now, what similarity is there between these cases and that now before us? In these cases the King spoke to a body of his subjects complaining of grievances, and exercising their well-known *right* in making that complaint, which, too, was directed against grievances of a most crying nature.

His Royal Highness spoke to a body who came to tender him the exercise of authority, and in which exercise he would, in reputation, become responsible. Besides, they came to tender him the exercise of authority, to which he was *Heir*, which, some day, in the common course of nature, must fall wholly into his hands, and which he was bound by every tie that can stimulate the mind, to preserve unimpaired, unshaken in the opinion of the people; authority, too, *held in trust for the people's benefit*, and only in that view sacred.

Is there the smallest resemblance in the two cases? Is there any thing, in the smallest degree, analogous? In the one case, the advisers of the King tell the City of London, that *they have no business to interfere in the things of which they complain as sore grievances*; and, in the other case, the Prince tells the Parliament, not that they have no business to interfere, but, that they have *imposed conditions upon him* which he does now, as he was well known to do before, disapprove of.

Away, then, goes this flimsy, this miserable sophistry, and there stands the pettifogging quirker exposed to the reader's scorn.

Applying this quirker's doctrine to the House of Commons, how will it suit? If the Prince's answer, which merely re-stated opinions that the parliament and that all the world well knew him to entertain; if his answer, which merely told the parliament, that they *imposed improper conditions upon him*; if this was *ungracious*, what epithet are we to bestow upon the treatment of those humble petitions, in which the people complained of the exercise of certain powers, or privileges, by that House? That House exercised the power of taking a man up and sending him to jail *during their pleasure* for an act done out of their doors; for a publication made by him; and, they imprisoned, in the Tower, one of their members, *during their pleasure* for asserting, out of their House, in terms that displeased them, that they had no right to send the people to jail at their pleasure, for acts done out of their House.

Against their doing this, the people presented petitions to them; and, what was the *answer*, that these petitions received?

The question is not, here, whether they were right or wrong; but, both being cases, wherein the parties *answering were tenacious of power*, I only beg the reader to compare the answer of the Prince to the Parliament with the treatment which the petitions of the people met with from the House of Commons.

I remember, and so must the reader, that, during the discussions relating to that matter in the House of Commons, it was contended, that the power of imprisonment at pleasure, claimed by that House, was a power *for the good of the people*; and that those were enemies of *real liberty*, who denied that the House had the right to take any man who offended them, and shut him up in jail, during their pleasure, without any trial, and without any mode of redress. The reader must remember this well; and yet, we are now told, by the very men, who contended for that power

in the House of Commons, that the Prince of Wales has behaved *ungraciously* to the parliament, because he has expressed his disapprobation of a measure, which is to impose upon him the kingly *duties*, while it withholds from him a part of the kingly *powers*; powers well known; well established; and constantly exercised by the kings of England; powers which it is not proposed to *diminish*; not to take away *for the future*; not represented as *unnecessary in general*; represented as absolutely necessary to the King; but, powers that are to be withheld from the Prince. And, he was to have communicated to him this measure, the effect of which upon his reputation was so evident, and was to say not a word in disapprobation of it, upon pain of incurring the censure of the whole of the MEAN, MERCENARY and MALIGNANT crew.

This answer, however, especially as to the part blamed by these men, will not fail to receive the hearty applause of the country at large; of, indeed, every man in the country (and a vast majority are so) who was opposed to the limitations upon the Royal authority in the Prince's hands. The *friends of freedom* must, for consistency sake, approve of this answer, in this respect; because they hold, that, according to the Prince's former declaration, the powers and prerogatives of the crown are vested there as a *trust for the "benefit of the people;"* and, of course, any *suspension* of them; any *division* of them; any *reservation* of their exercise for the King, when he shall recover (be it for a day or a year) is a violation of that great principle; whence it ensues of necessity, that the friends of freedom must approve of an expression of disapprobation of a measure, causing such suspension, division, or reservation; and, the Prince of Wales may be assured, that he has, from the feelings of the people, nothing to apprehend, whatever these intolerant and malignant men may endeavour to do in the way of exciting, even before he forms a ministry, prejudices against him, endeavours the more detestable as they are cloaked under the garb of *attachment to his Father*, than which nothing can be more base and hateful.

I wish particularly to put the reader upon his guard against *this device*, which is truly diabolical. The object is to make the people believe, that there are grounds of *suspicion* of the Prince, and that he will make a King when the time comes very *different* from his father; nay, and further, that we ought to suspect him of a wish to become King *before the due time*. And these are the men, who rail against *Jacobins!* These are the men, who apprehend dangers from a *conspiracy against the House of Brunswick*. Of this House they do not appear to look upon the Prince as making a part. They are men of strange notions. In short, what they mean by the *House of Brunswick* is that alone by the means of which they are enabled, without labour and without talents, to get a good fat living for themselves and an equally fat provision for their families. This is what such men mean by the House of Brunswick; and, that being the case, it is quite natural that they should dread, even in their dreams, a *conspiracy* against it.—The matter may, however, be looked upon as being thus far settled; and the country, after having gone on without a King, capable of discharging any part of the functions of royalty, for *nearly a quarter of a year*, has, at last, a *prospect* of seeing the exercise of those functions committed, in part at least, to a person capable of performing the task! Here alone is food for some hours of serious reflection; and, the reader will do well to consider a little what may be the consequences of this *precedent*. Here is a precedent for the nation being

left during nearly a quarter of a year (it will be more before the Regent can be completely installed) with a King, declared to be *in a state of incapacity to govern*; here is a precedent for the nation being left in that state, for its being left to be governed by men, appointed to their offices by that same King, for nearly a quarter of a year.

Now, suppose His Majesty should be, by Physicians chosen by these same ministers, declared to be *recovered*, to-morrow? All that has been done respecting the Regency falls to the ground at once. Then suppose, that, in a week afterwards, his Majesty were to have a relapse, than which nothing could be more likely, seeing what a load of various matter it would be absolutely necessary to press upon him, and what painful reflections must crowd into his mind. Suppose this relapse to take place? What then? Why then we have, according to this precedent, *another quarter of a year* to go on without a King capable of discharging the functions of the kingly office; and thus, with shorter or longer intervals, we may, upon this precedent, go on for a whole year, or, for years together.

Then, observe, too, that, *during the intervals* of recovery, the grants of titles, lands, leases, places for life and reversion, and all appointments to offices of profit and power would be made; though, one must confess, that it is difficult to see, why these may not as well be made during the King's *known* incapacity, as that money should be drawn from the Exchequer, troops sent abroad, and the like, during such *known* incapacity.

Then, *who* is it that is to make known any sorrowful return of the malady? The ministers? Those men who have been appointed by the King during his intervals of sanity? These very men who have the power in their hands? Are they to be relied upon for punctuality and readily making known the moment when the King shall be again unfortunately incapable of discharging the functions of royalty?

I do not say, that they *would* be the last men upon earth to be trusted with such a duty; I do not say, that they *would* hide the fact from the public to the last possible moment that disguise should be thought practicable. I do not say what would be, nor do I consider it at all as a personal question; but, I ask the reader, whether, upon the known principles and rules of action amongst men, persons so situated should be the depositories of such a trust?

But, all these considerations aside, and leaving the interests of the country quite out of the question, let us consider a little the situation of His Majesty himself.

If any one of us were to find ourselves recovered from such a malady; if any one of us were to find ourselves in such a state, should we not seek retirement, quiet, tranquillity; should we not rest our hope of final and perfect re-establishment upon the having kept from us all those things which require mental exertion? Nay, is not this the invariable practice of the world? Is it not always the practice of those, who are the real friends of persons in such a state, to resort to every possible means of relieving and diverting their minds; of amusing them with light and trivial matter, of presenting them with a variety of unimportant objects; and, in short, of preventing the necessity and even the chances of *serious thinking*.

If such be what compassion points out, and what the universal practice of the world has stamped with its authority, can it be supposed to be proper to leave the King so situated, that, in the very hour of his recovery

he must necessarily have pressed upon his mind a multitude of objects, any one of which is of weight quite sufficient to excite trouble in the strongest mind? The Recorder of London would be amongst the first of his visitors, to present him with a long list of his unhappy subjects, condemned to an ignominious death, during his incapacity. Would he not *feel* upon beholding that list? Would the sight of it, or, still *more* the hearing of it read, give no trouble to his mind? Would he, *could* he, with a serene mind, decide upon the fate of so many persons? Could he, in a moment, by his breath, at once consign them to or give them a respite from eternity without feelings that must deeply affect his mind? To suppose it possible that he could is to pronounce a satire upon human nature.

But, though I must believe, that this would be his most dangerous trial, must he not very sensibly feel for the fate of the campaign in Portugal? When he is informed how things stand there; when he learns the real situation of his own army compared with that of the enemy, who, as he had been before told, *had not an inch of ground but that which his army stood upon*; when he learns this, will there arise nothing to trouble his mind?

Sweden, since his incapacity, has been added, not only to the long list of the powers at war with him, but has also been added to the vassals of France. Will this give him no trouble? Will he hear of this without any danger of producing a relapse? Is it the office of a *friend* to present an object like this to his mind?

Then, *at home* is there nothing to trouble him? Is there nothing which would be likely to weigh heavily on a mind anxious for the safety of the country, on the fate of which wholly depends that of the Crown and the Royal Family? Is there nothing *in Ireland* to awaken new anxieties? Are there flowery prospects for his advisers to present to him in that, or in any other, quarter of his dominions, or in any department of his government?

I, therefore, put it to any impartial man, whether, if, in addition to all these and many other most serious concerns, the multitude of *routine business* be added, the incessant attention and toil, necessarily arising from this long suspension of the King's capacity for business, it is not improbable in the highest degree, that a relapse should not almost instantly succeed recovery; and whether it would not be cruelty in the extreme, thus to expose him to such manifest danger; the danger of being replunged into a state, the most humiliating to human nature, and the bare apprehension of which is enough to produce insanity. I put this to the serious and impartial consideration of the reader; and, I am quite sure, that, if he do seriously consider the matter, he will agree with me, that a moment ought not to be lost in making *permanent provision* against the evils of which we now feel the effects.

It appears to me, that provision should be made, which may prevent the necessity of the King's being compelled to attend to business for *some weeks*, at least, *after* he shall have been declared to have recovered the perfect possession of his reason. *Some months* would be better; but some considerable space of time appears to me to be absolutely necessary in order to afford the best chance of his final re-establishment; and, at the same time, to guard the interests of the country against the dangers above pointed out. Something of this sort does, indeed, seem to be in the contemplation of some members of parliament; but it is a matter

that admits not of *delay*; it is not less pressing than the measure of the Regency itself; for, as was before shown, that measure, without some such provision, may be rendered nugatory in an hour, either before or after its consummation.

Let us now turn to other matters connected with the Regency.

The *limitations* may yet be done away in the two Houses, during the discussions of the intended bill; and it is to be hoped, that they will be done away; but, at any rate, it is time for us now to begin to think a little of the situation of *the country*, and to form to ourselves something like settled notions as to *what a new ministry ought to do*, and what the people are justified in *expecting at their hands*.

As to *men*, though it will be impossible to prevent the people from liking some better than others, and quite impossible to reconcile them to the eulogisers of Mr. Pitt, whose measures must be considered as included in the eulogy; as to *men*, however, the people are little interested. It is the measures they look at, because they *feel* them; and, it is not *now* mere measures of what is called *policy*, but measures that affect us so closely, that *we cannot divest ourselves of the thought of them*. Their effect comes home to the *pocket* of every man of us; we feel it in our incomes, in our means of living, in the distribution of our earnings amongst our children, in our means of making a figure in the world, in the looks of our poor neighbours, who, if they have not a *legal*, have an *equitable*, or, at least, a *natural* claim to partake with us. That creature is unworthy of the name of *man*, who can enjoy his dinner and his bottle, while he has, almost before his eyes, a *neighbourhood half-starving*. Their vices! Good God! what have they to make them virtuous! Hunger, cold, and nakedness never yet made men abstain from crimes; never made them industrious, honest, or sober.

To a man, who feels as he ought to feel, this *general misery* is the greatest grievance; and, to such a man it is perfectly useless to talk; it is perfectly useless to philosophise; he never will be contented, till he sees this enormous grievance redressed. He knows, that it was not thus *formerly*; he knows well, for *his parish books will tell it him*, that, before the Pitt system began its dire operation, the people of England were comparatively happy.

The *precise measures*, which ought now to be adopted, and even a general view of them, I have not now time for; but I cannot commit this Number to the press without again urging the necessity of doing something for *Ireland*.

We know, that we have recently been told, that a *regular army* is necessary to keep down *French factions* in Ireland. *How came there to be French factions* in Ireland? What should make the Irish prone to French factions, any more than anybody else?

In 1785 and the three or four succeeding years, we heard of French factions in *Holland*. The history of the conquest of Holland is before us; and, will not his Royal Highness and his ministry *profit* from that history?

What caused French factions in Holland? Why, *the refusal of the government to redress the grievances of the people*; and, at last, when the war of words had been carried on as long as possible, the war of arms succeeded. This is the natural progress. It is thus that nations are laid open to invaders; and thus that they finally become conquered.

To adopt such measures, therefore, as shall make Ireland quiet, and enlist her under the same banners with ourselves is absolutely necessary.

But if this can be done without a reform of the House of Commons, which I greatly doubt, still that reform will be wanting to the happiness and even the *defence* of the kingdom.

Major Cartwright has digested the best plan of internal defence that I have ever seen or heard of; but that plan is interwoven with a *reform of the Commons House of Parliament*, without which, indeed, it is now too late to expect, that we shall ever again see an hour of safety in *peace* or in *war*.

We have had *expeditions* enough now; we have sent out armies enough to *divert* the French, and pretty *diversions* we have made. Each of them has cost some country its independence. It is high time for us to consider how *this land*, how *these islands*, are to be defended. And, does any man think that they are to be defended by a *divided* people? If he does he must have shut his eyes to the cause of the fall of every nation upon the continent; and, to expect to see an united people without a reform in Parliament, is, in my view of things, something worse than madness.

If it be supposed, that the thing will *jog on* and *last our time*, the notion, to say nothing of its baseness, is excessively absurd. It will not jog on; it must and it will have a change of one sort or another. A change *made* may be as gentle and easy as you please; but if it *make itself*, its manner and extent must be left to chance. A change *made* may be under the guidance of reason; if it *make itself*, it must be under the wild guidance of *passion*.

The cry of those who oppose reform, is, that it is not wanted *by the people at large*. Never was anything more false than this. All the nation, except those who are self-interested in the continuation of abuses of all sorts, anxiously wish for it. All men, who have no such interest wish for a reform of the Parliament, as the only means of putting an end to abuses. They necessarily must wish for it. They must be the most unnatural wretches upon earth if they had not such wish; and, their expectations are now greater than ever.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Tuesday,
January 15, 1811.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register*, January, 1811.)

In my last Article I had not time to enter fully into the observations that I wished to offer, respecting *the measure; which, in my opinion, ought to be carried into effect by the Regent's ministers.*

The questions relating to the formation of the Regency may now be looked upon as being settled; or, at least, the opinions of the public are

now made up as to those questions ; and, though it may be necessary to agitate some of them again, still I deem it now to be time to speak of what the public expect from the Regency.

They expect, generally, *a change of system*. They expect, in particular, measures *to tranquillize Ireland*, and *a reform in the Commons House of Parliament*. Not hasty and crude innovations, but well-digested plans, as beneficial to the throne itself as to them. They expect, at least, that their petitions will be patiently listened to ; that the subject of reform will be cheerfully entertained and permitted to have a fair and full hearing and discussion.

As to Ireland, there is no man, of any party, who will pretend, that, if, by any chance, a French army of only five thousand men were to land there, the danger would not be extreme ; and, we are repeatedly told, in the venal prints, that "*a regular army is necessary to guard Ireland against French factions and machinations.*"

To observe the apathy of some persons upon this subject, one would imagine that they knew no more of Ireland than of the lands in the moon ; and, that it never entered into their minds to conceive, that Ireland composed *a part of the kingdom*, and that the people of that country contributed to the same Exchequer with ourselves. The East Indies, which is an eternal drain upon ourselves, which swallows up no small part of our taxes, which contributes not one farthing towards the national defence ; that country appears, with some Englishmen, to be an object of great importance, compared with Ireland ; and, in short, with some men, Ireland seems to be of no consequence at all ; or, at the most, a mere mill-stone about the neck of England.

I am the less inclined to censure these persons with severity, because I can remember the time, when I viewed the matter in the same light ; but, having now had an opportunity of correcting my former opinions, it is my duty to endeavour to produce a similar change in the opinions of others, who may still retain their errors.

Ireland is not a mere unimportant colony, as some men would seem to consider it ; but, she forms, in point of population, about *a third part* of this kingdom ; and, in spite of all her absentees, in spite of her being deprived of dockyards, and of other great means of local wealth, she, besides the expenses of her internal government, which are very great, contributes nearly *an eighth part* towards the expenses of the general government of the kingdom, the maintenance of fleets, armies, and the rest. I wish to make no invidious comparisons, but, I cannot help stating, by way of illustration, that *Scotland* does not contribute more than about *a seventeenth or eighteenth*.

Whence, then, is the cause of this indifference towards Ireland ? What reason is there in it ? It is utterly impossible to ascribe it to any cause, grounded in reflection or common sense.

But, at any rate, if we are determined to look upon Ireland as a country of no consequence, in any other respect, let us for our own safety's sake, consider it as a country that may possibly become the theatre of war. The venal writers tell us, and they are very forward to tell us, that there are French factions in Ireland. Indeed, there are acts of parliament in force, grounded upon the admitted fact of those factions being really in existence there. These acts I have before described. They authorize the Lord-Lieutenant, upon representation made to him, by the magistrates of any county, to *declare* such county to be in a disturbc:

state : and, when such declaration is made, *all persons whatever*, in that county, are compelled to remain *within their houses or hovels, from sunset to sunrise*. The magistrates have authority to enter their houses or hovels *at any hour in the night* ; and, if any man bring an action against any magistrate *for abusing his power*, the man who brings the action is even *to pay his own costs*, though a *verdict* should be given in his favour, if the *court* think it right to order it to be so.

The acts contain much more, many other things worthy of notice ; but, to any man, who takes one moment to reflect, who will, for one moment, consider how *he* should like to live under such laws in England, this specimen will be amply sufficient.

Whether these laws are, or are not, necessary to prevent open rebellion in Ireland, is a question that I shall not now discuss, and, indeed, it is a question of which I am not a competent judge. But, of this I am quite certain, and I am sure the reader will agree with me in the position, that such acts can be justified upon no other ground, than that of *absolute necessity* in order to prevent open rebellion, or some other equally great calamity.

Well, then, supposing the laws to be necessary to this extent, *what a situation* must Ireland be in ? What an out-work is it likely to form against the approaches of the enemy ? What sort of resistance to that enemy, if he should succeed in landing there, are we to expect from a people, to govern whom such laws are necessary ?

Let it be observed here, that this is not a mere *temporary measure* ; not a measure to meet a momentary effusion of discontent ; but that these laws have been in force now for upwards of *three years*. If, therefore, they are necessary, again I ask, what must be the situation of Ireland, and what the consequences of an invasion by France ?

If Ireland were invaded and in the hands of the enemy, there are, I should suppose, very few persons so infatuated as to imagine, that England could long escape the same fate. I should suspect, that there are few to be found, even amongst the MEAN, MERCENARY, and MALIGNANT men, who would pretend to say, that the consequences would not be fatal to England ; but, there is no doubt that *they* will never acknowledge the danger, till they see Ireland absolutely lost. Then they would begin to tremble ; but their trembling would come too late. It would be too late to tremble, when they saw two hundred thousand of the hardest men upon earth, ranged under the banners of France, and drawn up on the shore of St. George's Channel.

Is this an *exaggerated* view ? Is it a mere *frightful dream* ? Is it an invention to enforce an argument ? Oh, no ! Else why are we assured, that there are *French factions in Ireland*, and why are laws passed, bottomed upon that assurance ? These laws have no other justification than the existence of such factions ; that is to say, the existence, in Ireland, of a *French influence*, and that, too, to an extent dangerous to the state. Of course, then, we are to suppose, that such influence does actually exist, and we are to suppose also, that, if the French were, under the present circumstances, to land in the country, such landing would be attended with the consequences that I have anticipated.

Those, who, from whatever reason, wish not to look at or to think of Ireland, will say, that " the French are not there yet," and will turn off the subject, will evade any conclusion as to *consequences*, by affecting to believe, that the *cause* will never exist.

And what *foundation* have they for this belief? A French army *has* landed in Ireland; and very serious was the danger, before France was able to menace our own coast in the Channel at the same time, and long before it was declared, that French influence existed in that country. France will shortly have five times the maritime means that she had then; she is now organizing a regular system of maritime warfare. She will, in the course of two years, have more seamen than we have, or can have, supposing us to be able to go on increasing our marine to the utmost extent of which our means are capable. She has all the ports and seamen and military means in the north of Europe, except those of Russia, which she will have when she pleases. She will be able to lose fifty or sixty ships of war in an attempt upon Ireland; and, what reason is there, then, to suppose that she will not make that attempt, especially when we consider the powerful motives that urge her to such an enterprise?

"The French are not there yet." No. That is very true. Neither were the French in Holland in 1792; nor in Austria in 1804; nor in Prussia in 1805; nor in Spain in 1807; nor in Sweden in 1809. But, one year later than each of these years the French were in all these countries; and, we well know, that, in all these countries the French still are. It is the saying of a poor shuffler, or a coward, therefore, who dares not look reason or danger in the face, that, "the French are not there yet."

If, then, it be a fact, that these dangers do exist, *what can be done to obviate them?* This is the question, and, in discussing this question, we should proceed as we do in all other cases where our object is to prevent or avoid a danger; namely, to ascertain the *true cause*, and to remove it if possible.

If you find your shoe pinch you, it is folly to curse the shoe or even the maker, but it is little short of madness not to endeavour to make it easier to your foot, if it be an object of too much importance to be, at once, cast aside.

It is equally foolish to rail against the Irish or the French, in this case; for such railing will not diminish the evil, but it may very reasonably be supposed likely to add to it.

I have many times asked the question: "*Why* should the Irish be attached to the French?" A question which the venal shun as the bands of Satan are said to have shunned Ithuriel's spear. "There are *rebels* in Ireland." Aye, but *how* came they there? "Oh! why they are *wicked fellows*, that want to separate Ireland from England." Yes, but this is no *answer* to my question, for, then, again, I ask *why* this is? "Oh! there are very *few* of these *turbulent* men; the people, in general, "like the system very well." They do, do they? They *like* to live under cover, and within their houses, from sun-set to sun-rise? "Oh! no; we don't say that, but they would rather submit to these *little inconveniences* than have their country overturned by the turbulent, "and the French factions." Aye, this may be, but, if these turbulent men are *so few* in number, why do not *the people* put them down? Why not take these turbulent fellows and punish them, at once, and get rid of them?

There can be *no answer* given to this. It is impossible for the keenest sophister to get over the dilemma that here presents itself.

Well, then, the existence of *French influence* being the proximate

cause of the danger, what is the cause of that French influence? Why, the *discontents of the people*. Remove, therefore, the grounds of that discontent, and the French factions perish like the toad which has no longer poison to feed on.

What, then, are those grounds? This is a question, which, in these times, a prudent man will not answer. Nor, indeed, is it necessary to any one, who takes an impartial view of the state of Ireland, where, in as fine a climate and on as fertile a soil as any in the world, misery the most deplorable presents itself in every quarter. There, to use the words of DR. DRENNAN, in his beautiful poem on the emptiness of Pedigree, published in the last Volume of the POETICAL REGISTER, there, where

Green meadows spread—resplendent rivers run—
A healthy climate and a temp'rate sun.
There Misery sits and eats her lazy root,
There, man is proud to dog his brother brute;
In sloth the genius of the Isle decays,
Lost in his own, reverts to former days;
Yet still, like Lear, would in his hovel rule,
Mock'd by the madman, jeated by the fool.
There meet th' extremes of rank—there social art
Has levell'd mankind by their selfish heart.
There no contented middle rank we trace,
The sole ambition to be rich and base.

There is a license allowed to poets; but, is this picture far from the truth? Is it any thing more than a strong and lively representation of the sorrowful reality?

And, *why* should this be? Why should Ireland be in a state of semi-barbarism? Why should it be in a state to render *necessary* such laws as we have seen above described, and such treatment as we have, alas! all heard of? "Traitors!" Yes, poor Ireland has had traitors indeed; but these traitors are men who have calumniated her for the purpose of serving their own interested and base purposes; these are the true Irish Traitors.

Ireland took the lead of England in civilization; she has a better climate and a more fertile soil; she has harbours, rivers, all the natural advantages that England possesses, and in a greater proportion. Her people are naturally robust, brave, generous*, and full of genius and

* The following most striking instance of the kindness and generosity of the Irish peasants is worthy of notice and admiration. I quote the passage from a speech of Mr. O'CONNELL, at a late meeting of the Catholics in Dublin; and, when you have read it, say whether such a people are not capable of being gained by acts of kindness; say, whether nothing but an army can keep down French factions amongst such a people.

"This character of the noble feelings of the Irish peasantry did not rest on a single fact. What had occurred in the County of Cork was in the recollection of gentlemen from the South of Ireland.—When a detachment of the Brunswick Corps, quartered at Fermoy in August last, was ordered to embark at Cove, on the march from Fermoy some women, who accompanied the soldiers hither, for the purpose of keeping up with the battalion, or because they knew that incumbered with children, they would have less prospect of being received in the transports, began to abandon their children, leaving them in the potatoe gardens and behind the hedges. One or two of the children were found in much danger from the cattle and pigs. The Country People became alarmed; compassion shot, like electricity, through them; they crowded to the troops, and attended their march, receiving every child the women chose to leave

spirit. I observed before how conspicuously this was proved by their success and influence in the American States. There, where *all nations meet*, without any preference; where they all enter the lists of talents, industry, and enterprise; there, where all have "a clear stage and no favour," the Irish have obtained a decided predominance, notwithstanding the wretched plight in which they generally make their entry, notwithstanding the far greater part of them are, at first, bondmen and bondwomen, and thus have to work for years to pay off the debt which the misery of Ireland had imposed upon them. We see grants made annually out of the public money to make roads and bridges and canals in the *Highlands of Scotland*, for the avowed purpose of *creating*, in that most sterile of all countries, *labour* in order to *prevent the people from emigrating*. And, while we are doing this, we see, in every two or three years, as many people emigrate from Ireland as *the whole population* of the Highlands amounts to! Is this a mark of wisdom? Was there ever any thing so directly in the teeth of reason as this?

Why not do something to keep the Irish at home? It is *certain* that people will not voluntarily quit their native soil if they be happy, or only tolerably comfortable there. This is certain, and we, though very unwisely in my opinion, are taxing one part of the kingdom to *make work* for people in another part (the Highlands) in order to make the people comfortable. But, while this is done, shall we do nothing for the people of Ireland, who do not want our *money*; who want no work *made* for them; but, who have a climate and a soil ready to produce more than they can need?

Am I asked *what* can be done for them, and whether I believe, that granting the claims of the Catholics would do every thing? I answer, that this particular measure would not, in my opinion, do much; but, it would do *something*. It is *one* of the things that should be done, and, as it would not cost one single penny beyond the amount of the paper and print of the Act of Parliament, there can be no ground for delaying, other than those grounds which have been so often stated, and so often *proved* to be futile.

But, though this measure would be something; though it would please a great number of persons, and give rise to hope in a greater number, it must be followed by other measures, having a tendency to better the lot of the common people; and, though to effect this must be a work of time, let it be recollected, that *content* would commence with

"behind;—they even offered money to the mothers to give up the children without exposing them. Astonished at the eagerness of their humanity, some of the women availed themselves of it, and actually set up their children to auction. A child or two, between Middleton and ——, sold as high as six shillings. I was myself shown some of the children in about six weeks after, and the potatoe diet had agreed very well with them.—Can any man be found so callous to humanity as not to regret that the noble nature of the Irish Peasant is not better cultivated; but the fact I speak of passed almost as a thing of course, and nearly without notice: it was indeed mentioned in one or two of the Cork Newspapers, but there it rested.—In England, had a man of fortune, out of ostentation or vanity, taken up a single child of a foreign soldier, it would be blazoned forth trumpet-tongued—the newspapers would never cease extolling the bountiful benefactor—the fact would be sung in ballads, and recorded in lyric poetry; but in Ireland, it is a crime against the hirelings of the day, to praise Irish virtues; for which I trust that they will never forgive me."

the commencement of a better state of things. The patient dates his pleasure from the day when he feels that his cure has *begun*; and, perhaps, the day of his perfect re-establishment does not yield him pleasure so great.

If a people fall into a state like that in which the people of Ireland are, we are not bound to assign the cause. We have a right to assume, that the fault is in the manner of governing the country. Who that has read the observations of intelligent travellers, who that has travelled himself, has not ascribed the misery of a people, where he has found them miserable, to the government and not to the people themselves? Who that has looked over the stock of a farm and seen a parcel of poor, wretched-looking animals, ever thought of ascribing the condition of the stock to any one but the farmer; I do not compare men to beasts; but the cases are exactly similar. And, do not governments themselves recognise this principle in taking credit to themselves for the prosperity of the people, which they never fail to do when they can? Indeed, it is to the *laws* of a state, as well as to the *rules* in a family, that we are to look for the cause of prosperity or of misery.

Therefore, without entering into any detail, we may ask *why* the people of Ireland are in their present state; *why* they require a regular army to keep down the French factions; *why* they fill every hole and corner in every ship that goes to America; *why* they go to cultivate the lands and to add to population, the talents and the power of other countries? We have a right to ask of our rulers, *why* these things are, and to call upon them to put an end to their existence.

I have always thought, that the measure of Catholic emancipation, as it is called, should be followed by others of far more extensive effect; and, one of these is, the doing away of that ground of everlasting heart-burning, the *tithes*. The people of Scotland pay no tithes. They maintain their own clergy. And, why should *Catholics* not have the same exemption, in this respect, that *Presbyterians* have? Ireland is as much a Catholic country as Scotland is a Presbyterian country.

In the establishment of tithes, where the mass of the people profess the religion of the church to which the tithes are given, and *where the rector or vicar resides*, there is no injustice at all, and, in general, the cry, as injurious to industry, against tithes, is not well-founded, any more than a cry against rent would be; but, where three fourths of those who pay tithes are well known not to belong to the church to which they are obliged to render them, and especially when the mode of exaction is such as it is in Ireland, where the parties have to deal with a tithe-factor, and where the heats and animosities of a tithe-auction are annually revived in every parish, the hardship and mortification are intolerable.

This might be completely done away, and without any injury to the Protestant Church. To purchase up the whole of the livings in Ireland, including the sees, would not cost *half so much as the war in Portugal has already cost*; and, if the incumbents were paid the worth of their livings for their lives, what reason would they have to complain?

If any one should object, that the Church of England would suffer in its patronage, and, if, upon due consideration, that should be determined to be an evil, the livings in England might be augmented in value as the Irish incumbents dropped off, so as to preserve to the Protestant church the same amount of income and the same degree of weight that it now has in both islands, and, of course, the same degree of patronage to the Crown.

There would a question arise as to *private patronage*; but, it should be observed, that it is a monstrous abuse, a most outrageous insult to all true principle, to consider the advowsons as *private property*, when it is in the way of a *trust*, and in no other way, that they are looked upon by the law; and when the statute-book will tell any man that will take the pains to look into it, that it was the *abuse* of this trust, by the communities of monks, that produced the Reformation in this country, and the putting down of the Catholic religion. Nevertheless, in order to leave no ground for complaint upon this score, the additional patronage given to the patrons in England might be paid for, and thus the loss of private patronage in Ireland might receive a just compensation.

All the minor regulations for the allotment of churches, &c., would be easily managed. The whole would not be a work of three years; and, in those three years, no "regular army would be wanted to keep down French factions." In the course of seven years, I should suppose, that this army would cost much more than the whole of the expenses of this change. Does, not reason, nay does not necessity, point this measure out to us?

Of the effect of such a measure no man can judge, who has not very closely considered the workings of the tithe system in Ireland. This measure would, besides the real *relief* that it would afford the people, put an end to all religious animosities, because it would do away the great distinctive mark of different religions. Ireland would no longer exhibit the unnatural spectacle of a parish church (where there is one yet standing) where a Protestant curate performs his hasty service to half a dozen people, while a Catholic chapel, standing near to it, is crammed to the very mouth of the porch, and while, in many instances, the flock, for want of room within, are kneeling in the dirt round about the walls. While this is the case, things may possibly go on; Ireland may be held to England, and we may use the title of *United Kingdom*; but, I think, that every reasonable man must be convinced, that Ireland never will be tranquil, and that the Union will exist only in name.

That dissenting Protestants in Ireland (of whom the number is very considerable) would gladly see such a measure adopted, there can be no doubt; and, as to the Protestants of the Established Church, though they might regret the loss of predominance as a religious sect, they would feel an ample compensation in the relief, in which they too would share, from the burthen and vexations of a tithe system, such as that existing in Ireland, and of which an English cultivator cannot form any thing like an adequate idea.

The scruples of those Protestants, who would consider such a change as tending to foster the Catholic religion, and to prevent the chance of *converting* Catholics to the *true faith*, I wish to treat with all possible tenderness; but, when they consider, that we have been *two hundred years* at this work of conversion, and that we have made such trifling progress therein, they must, I should imagine, be disposed to think that we have been pursuing a *wrong plan*, and be ready to agree with me, that a change of plan, even with this object in view, is dictated by sound policy; and that at any rate, as far as relates to the work of conversion, no change of system can be for the worse.

Is there any one, who objects solely upon the ground that I propose an *innovation*? What have we seen but innovations for the last twenty years? And what have we heard in justification of them, but that "the

“*times* were such as rendered extraordinary measures necessary to the “safety of the state?” Are not the laws above mentioned, now existing in Ireland, *an innovation*? Are they the settled laws of the land! Was not the Union itself *an innovation*? And, is it a less thing to take away the legislature of Ireland, than to make a change in the disposition of the property of the church?

It is acknowledged, on all hands, that the reign of QUEEN ANNE was the most glorious that England ever saw; but, the Union with Scotland was by far the most glorious Act of that glorious reign; and if the Union with Ireland had been bottomed upon the same principles (with some few exceptions) the latter would have served, in some measure, to compensate for the numerous and weighty losses and calamities of the reign of George the Third. The people of Scotland had *their own Church* established; they were not compelled to contribute to the support of the Church of England. There was none of those odious and galling distinctions left remaining, which, in spite of names and forms, keep different parts of a kingdom effectually *divided*, divided in *heart*, separated by feeling, and, as is the case in all family disputes, strongly disposing the weaker party to throw himself into the hands of the enemy, be he who he may, of the stronger party. In short, such a state of things presents to the stronger party this sole alternative, either of putting the weaker party upon a fair footing with himself, or keeping him in subjection by force.

As to matters of *trade* and *commerce*, there ought to be, in no way whatever, any distinction. If Ireland possess any natural advantages superior to England, let her have the full benefit of them. Why should she not, seeing that her strength and wealth would belong to the whole kingdom? It would be as foolish to make any distinctions, in this respect, between Northumberland and Sussex, as between England and Ireland. If Ireland has a fine port, why not have one of our great dock-yards and arsenals there? Would the French hope to seduce Ireland, if she were placed upon such a footing? Ireland abounds with timber, why should not that timber be converted, upon the spot, into ships of war? And, how foolish as well as unjust would it be in us to grudge her a share in these advantages and honours? But, if we have any feelings of this sort; if *we* find it impossible to divest ourselves of such feelings, let us, for decency sake, not be guilty of the flagrant injustice of railing against the Irish for appearing to be impatient of our predominance.

In whatever light, therefore, that I view the matter, whether I consider what is in justice due to this part of the kingdom, or, taking a more narrow and selfish view, confine myself to the interests of England; whether I take justice or policy for my guide, I am led to the firm conviction of the wisdom of adopting the measures that I have here proposed, and of any other measures, which, to a person of greater knowledge and experience, may present themselves as likely to have the same tendency, namely, that of gaining the people of Ireland by kindness and conciliation, and thus enabling us to set at naught all the powers of seduction, now said to be exercised by the factions in the interests of France.

Thus have I stated, as fully as it appears to me necessary, at present, my opinion as to what ought to be done with regard to this important part of the kingdom; I have shown its consequence, its weight in the general scale of dominion; the causes of its being liable to the influence of our enemy; the danger to be apprehended from those causes, and the means that I think likely to remove the causes, and, of course, the danger.

I have shown, I think, that self-preservation as well as justice call for the measures I have recommended; and, I see no solid objection, of any sort to their adoption.

Whether his Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, with all the limitations upon his authority (if they should be persevered in) will be able to effect such measures, I know not; but, it will be in his power, and I am sure he will have the inclination, to convince the people of Ireland, that his wishes are to do every thing just and reasonable, to conciliate them and restore tranquillity and happiness to their country.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Friday,
January, 18, 1811.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, January, 1811.*)

BLACKSTONE AND LOCKE.

“As it is essential to the very being of Parliament that elections should be free, therefore, all undue influences upon the electors are illegal, and strongly prohibited; for Mr. Locke ranks it amongst those breaches of trust in the executive magistrate, which, according to his notions, amounts to a dissolution of government, if he employ the force, treasure, and offices of the society, to corrupt the representatives, or openly to pre-engage the electors, and prescribe what manner of persons shall be chosen; for, thus to regulate candidates and electors, and new model the ways of election, what is it but to cut up the government by the roots, and poison the very foundation of public security.”—BLACKSTONE'S COMMENTARIES ON THE LAWS OF ENGLAND: Book I. Chap. 2.

EARL MULGRAVE.

“But, my lords, there is another kind of incapacity worse than this, I mean that of parliament men's having such places in the Exchequer, as the very profit of them depends on the money given to the King in Parliament. Would any of your lordships entrust a man to make a bargain for you, whose very interest is to make you give as much as he possibly can? It puts me in mind of a farce where an actor holds a dialogue with himself, first speaking in one tone, and then answering himself in another.”—EARL MULGRAVE'S SPEECH, in the House of Lords, Dec. 22, 1692. *Cobbett's Parl. Hist. vol. 5. p. 749.*

THE GREAT LORD CHATHAM.

Mr. PITT, when contending for a reform in Parliament, in 1782, told the House, that he personally knew, that it was the opinion of his father, that, “without recurring to first principles in this respect, and establishing a more solid and equal representation of the people, by which the proper constitutional connection should be revived, this nation, with the best capacities for grandeur and happiness of any on the face of the earth, must be founded with the mass of those whose liberties were lost in the corruption of the people.”

MR. PITT.

“The defect of representation is the national disease; and, unless you apply a remedy directly to that disease, you must inevitably take the consequences

"with which it is pregnant. Without a Parliamentary Reform the nation will be plunged into new wars; without a Parliamentary Reform you cannot be safe against bad ministers, nor can even good ministers be of use to you. No honest man can, according to the present system, continue minister."—MR. PITT'S SPEECH, 1782.

MR. FOX.

"The whole of this system, as it is now carried on, is as outrageous to morality as it is pernicious to just government; it gives a scandal to our character, which not merely degrades the House of Commons in the eyes of the people, but it does more; it undermines the very principles of integrity in their hearts, and gives a fashion to dishonesty and imposture. They hear of a person giving or receiving four or five thousand pounds, as the purchase-money of a seat for a close borough; and they hear the very man who received, and put into his pocket the money, make a loud and vehement speech in this House against bribery; and they see him, perhaps, move for the commitment to prison of a poor unfortunate wretch at your bar, who has been convicted of taking a single guinea for his vote in the very borough, perhaps, where he had publicly and unblushingly sold his influence, though that miserable guinea was necessary to save a family from starving under the horrors of a war which he had contributed to bring upon the country. . . . These are the things that paralyze you to the heart; these are the things that vitiate the whole system, that spread degeneracy, hypocrisy, and sordid fraud over the country, and take from us the energies of virtue, and sap the foundations of patriotism and spirit."—MR. FOX'S SPEECH, 1797.

MR. GREY (NOW EARL GREY).

"Has the House of Commons shown either vigilance of inquiry, or independence of spirit? Have they investigated the origin of their misfortunes, or checked ministers in their ruinous career? Nay, the very reverse. In a war remarkable only for misfortune, and distinguished on our part solely by disgrace, they have suffered ministers to go on from failure to failure, adding misfortune to misfortune, and madness to folly, without either investigation or inquiry.—As a remedy for these evils, Mr. Grey recommended 'a Reform of Parliament; and to obviate the charge of making complaints without prescribing some specific mode of relief, he proposed, that instead of 92 county members there should be 113, and that the right of voting should be extended to copyholders and leaseholders who are bound to pay rent for a certain number of years. To prevent compromises, he proposed that every county should be divided into grand divisions, each of which should return a representative. He also proposed that the remaining 400 members should be returned by householders.'"—MR. GREY'S SPEECH IN 1797.

In my last I mentioned a *Reform of the Commons House of Parliament* as a measure, which the people would naturally look for at the hands of those, be they who they may, that may become the ministers of the Regent. It is now forty years since this measure was, by men in high situations in the country, declared to be absolutely necessary to the safety of the nation.

Twenty-eight years ago MR. PITT, MR. WILBERFORCE, and MR. HORNE TOOKER, were all co-operating most heartily for the attainment of this object; which was afterwards taken up by MR. FOX, MR. GREY, now EARL GREY, MR. SHERIDAN, MR. TIERNEY, MR. WHITBREAD, and others; and it is now called for by all that description of persons, taking an active part in public affairs, at the head of whom his talents and his well-tried devotion to public freedom have placed SIR FRANCIS BURDETT.

This is not, then, a trifling matter. It is not a matter that can be put aside easily. It is not a nine days wonder. A thing that rises up

and makes a hubbub, and then sinks down again. It is a great question, in which every man, who has any thing worth the name of property, feels that he has an interest. It is a question that has lived from father to son. It is, in short, a great *contest*, which, on the part of the people, will never be given up.

All the men, who have, at the different stages of the contest, stood on the side of reform, cannot have been *wrong*. This is not to be believed; and, therefore, to treat those who now call for reform as "*wild theorists*," is, to say the least of it, extremely impudent.

As to the *principles*, upon which the demand of reform is made, they have been so often discussed, and are so well understood, that it would be waste of time to say much about them; nevertheless, a short and plain view of them may not, upon this occasion, be altogether useless.

Ours is a government, consisting of three Branches. The KING, who is invested with certain prerogatives in order that he may be an efficient Executive Magistrate, and, that his power may be the more solid and durable, he possesses his office and prerogatives by heirship. The PEERS, who form a House by themselves, and who are the guardians of their own and their families' properties and freedom. The third Branch is that of the COMMONS, that is to say, all the nation, except the Peers and the Royal Family. The three Branches together form the *Legislature*, and the King is the executor of the laws.

The Commons House arose out of the maxim, that men ought not to be governed by, or subjected to, laws, to which they have not given *their assent*; and, indeed, it is this maxim which alone distinguishes *free* from *despotic* government, the former meaning a government exercised by the people's assent, and the latter a government by the ruler's will.

But, there is a maxim of more confined and familiar meaning, which we are accustomed to repeat, and which is taught by all the eminent writers on our constitution; namely, that *Englishmen* ought not to be TAXED *without their own consent*.

This, after all is said and done, is the point to which we must always come. This is the great principle of our government. This is the principle which distinguishes it from all others, except that of America, which is of English descent. This is the great principle contended for in the times of Magna Charta. It was for this principle that Hampden made his stand, and, rather than pay 20 shillings in a tax imposed on him without his consent, he ventured his whole fortune and his life in a contest, which finally cost him the latter in the field, but which brought his ill-advised sovereign to perish on a scaffold, and which brought the greater part of the advisers to a death still more ignominious. It is for this principle, that, at bottom, all the contests between the kings and the people of England have been; and so firmly is it rooted in the hearts of the people, that to tear it out you must take away their lives, and, if, by means of corruption, you succeed in deadening it there, the same cause will produce an apathy as to all public matters, an insensibility as to national honour, and consequently a disregard for national independence and defence.

He who laughs at these notions, and who, after what he has seen upon the Continent of Europe, still believes, that a people will voluntarily shed their blood for their country, let their treatment in it be what it may, will, of course, not think it worth his while to read any further;

but, those who are of a different opinion, will agree with me in the conclusion, that, at this time in particular, it is necessary that the hearts of the people should be kept alive to the interests and honour of their country, and not deadened by the workings of corruption.

To be able to say that you have the people's *consent* to the taxes which they have to pay, it is not necessary that the separate consent of *each man* should be obtained. This is not, and never was, the notion of any man in England. The thing is *impossible*, and that is quite enough. But, we all know, not only what is the maxim of the constitution, but what is practicable, and of extremely *easy* practice, and that is, that the people should give their consent *by their representatives*; and, as it is next to impossible that all the people in any given part of a country should be exactly of one mind as to the person, or persons, to represent them, the question, as in all cases of arbitration between man and man, must be decided by the majority of voices.

This is the way, in which those who call for a reform of the people's House of Parliament, say that the consent of the people to tax them *ought* to be obtained.

What *is* I need not say; and, I shall now proceed to make some observations upon the progress of this contest for the reform, which has been so long in existence.

The first movers for it were esteemed men of the greatest wisdom as well as patriotism, and their opponents discussed the matter with them with arguments built upon what they said were the principles of our constitution of government. At a still later period, when Mr. PITT and Mr. WILBERFORCE stood in the ranks, or rather, at the head, of the reformers, a little more of the spirit of party mixed itself in the discussions, but, still, wickedness of motive was not ascribed to those who called for reform. It was not till after the commencement of the French Revolution, that *Republican, Leveller, Jacobin, Traitor, and Parliamentary Reformer*, became synonymous terms in the mouths of those who took the side opposite to that of reform, amongst whom were many of the very men, who had themselves been amongst the most zealous reformers. That great event, which has already gone far, but which has, in my opinion, much farther yet to go, in changing the political state of the world, warmed into life the chilled and dormant seeds of reform in England, where the cause, though not openly disclaimed, had been effectually abandoned by all those men in power who had before espoused it.

The example of the French people exhibited a successful struggle for their rights; and, it was perfectly natural, that the people of England should feel an enthusiasm in their cause, and that they should, at the same time, endeavour to rival them in this way as well as in contests in arms.

This was the golden opportunity for the government of England; not to go to war; not to enter into a contest in arms with a people engaged in a struggle for their liberties; but to let them quite alone, and to make that reform at home, which had been so long called for, and the making of which, by giving satisfaction to every reasonable man, would have enabled the government to set at naught all the invitations to rebellion that any of the mad heads in France might have been disposed to give.

England was in a state of growing prosperity at that time. She was, contrary to the expectations of those who wished her best, recovering

from the effects of the then late war at an astonishing rate; and, indeed, though party contests agitated the higher political circles, there was, save the question of reform, nothing to agitate the great mass of the people. That question completely set at rest, what might the government not have contemned, on the part of France, in the way either of force or seduction?

The government unhappily chose a different course, a course precisely opposite; namely, a contest in arms against republican principles in France, and a resolution to keep down by force those who were struggling for reform in England, reform being now confounded with republicanism, and its advocates confounded with republicans, levellers, jacobins, and traitors.

In both objects the government of England finally *succeeded*. The *pecuniary* cost of that success we know and feel, in part, at least; but of the ultimate *political* cost no man can form any computation.

In his war against republican principles in France Mr. Pitt succeeded to admiration. But, what has he raised up in the stead of those republican principles? His wars and subsidies collected soldiers together to crush liberty in France, and to make the very name of liberty hateful even to the French themselves. But, has not something succeeded full as dangerous to England as French liberty and equality would have been?

And, as to his success at home against the reformers, under the names of republicans, levellers, jacobins, and traitors, what has followed it? Has the *success* been attended with any beneficial consequences? Lord DESART is, in the parliamentary reports, said to have produced this *success*, the other day, as a proof of Mr. Pitt's being "*a great statesman*." He is reported to have said, that "the great man crushed the *democrats*" in England. That is to say, the *reformers*, for none of them pretended to ask for any thing but a reform of Parliament. Well, "the great man" did succeed in crushing them for the time. By one means or another, by acts for which he afterwards obtained from the Parliament a bill of *indemnity* he kept them down. But, what of that? Has the *country* been rendered more secure by the keeping of them down? Has the keeping of them down prevented the Income-tax, the increase of the paupers, the Bank Restriction; and, has it prevented the growth of the power of France? It produced an *union* with Ireland, indeed; but did it produce *friendship* and *strength* and *safety* there?

Such men always seem to think that there are only *two* parties, the *government* and the *reformers*, and that if the former can but succeed against the latter, it may shout victory. But there is a third party to look to, that is, *Buonaparte*, and to beat him and the reformers too, is more than "*the great man now no more*" was able. Yet, until Buonaparte be beaten there is no good ground for shouting victory.

Yes, the reformers were kept down; but do those who lent their hands to that work, think they are *now safe* from without? In short, would they not gladly exchange their present situation for that of 1792? What, then, even upon their own ground, has been gained by keeping down the reformers?

There are men, who care not one straw for any thing but the quiet enjoyment of their wealth, and who would see any thing done to the people, no matter what, provided that that object were thereby secured. Such

men have no mercy upon any one whose principles tend to *disturb* them. They care not, in such a case, who it is that suffers. Their cry is, "*He is a troublesome fellow,*" and that cry they have long kept up. But, has this mended their state? Are they likely to enjoy much quiet? How are they to put down that "*troublesome fellow,*" Buonaparte? Their cry will not affect him. They *becall* him, indeed, without mercy; they decorate him with all the appellations suited to a fiend, and their mouth-piece, the Morning Post, asserts, that *he and his ministers* are men who boast of being guilty of *unnatural crimes*, like the *Vere-street gang*. But alas! this does not avail. There is no such thing as getting at him. His legions and his sergeants push on. His fleets are preparing, in spite of all the associations against republicans and levellers and jacobins and traitors. He gets into Sweden and the ports of the North in spite of all the *successes* against democrats. The transportations of Palmer and Gerald and Muir and Margarot tended, indeed, to stifle reform in England; but, upon *the whole*, what has it done for the *security* of England?

It is, I think, quite impossible to take this view of the matter, without coming, at once, to the conclusion, that what it would have been wise to do in 1793, it is, as far as possible, wise to do now. To reduce France to what she was then is impossible; to prevent the further increase of her enormous power is also impossible; but, it is possible to make England *secure* even against that enormous power by giving a new spirit to the people, by uniting them heart and hand, and all this would be done by a reform of Parliament, such as was called for by all those men, whose words I have taken as mottos to this Article, and to effect which reform would not cost one single sixpence.

A people *never die*; a people cannot perish if they would; and a great question, like that of reform, becomes, in time, part of the public soul. It may be smothered for awhile, but, it will always break out again. The want of reform is the great source of all complaint; every separate complaint flows from it, and, quick as thought, is traced to it.

It is nonsense to say, that the *people* do not wish for reform because they do not crowd up *petitions* calling for it. I have oftentimes shown *why* they do not crowd up petitions; and, after what every man has *seen* of late, what can any man want more to satisfy him of the futility of such an argument, to use which, indeed, is an insult so outrageous as never to be forgiven.

We are told that the "*quiet good sort of folks*" say nothing about reform. This is not true; for, in *private*, they do say a great deal about it, and are very anxious for its adoption. That they will not *stir*; that they will not expose themselves, in any way, I know very well. But, of what use would these "*quiet good sort of folks*" be, if Napoleon's Legions were to land in the country? Does any man imagine, that they would not retain this admired quality of *quietness*? Does any man suppose, that they would change their nature all at once; and that they who had not had the courage openly to express their sentiments, would, all of a sudden, find courage sufficient to meet the French bayonets?

Oh, no! This were a foolish supposition indeed; and whoever lives to see the day of trial, will find that these Quakers in politics will be something worse than Quakers in war.

Common sense says, that in the hour of real danger, the fate of the country must depend upon the disposition of the *active* and *zealous* part of the people, and these are *all* for reform. Leaving, therefore, the *justice* of the proposed

measure wholly aside, national safety calls loudly for it, unless we make our minds up to the notion that nations do not depend for their safety upon the activity and zeal and courage of the people. I hope, indeed, that nothing will ever prevent Englishmen from fighting in defence of their native land; but, is it to be supposed that if the necessity arose, they would be *able* to do it so effectually unless they were previously united by the measure of reform? Is it to be supposed that while those active and zealous men, who call for this measure, are, by their opponents, branded as *Jacobins* and *traitors*, the whole people can possibly be brought, upon any emergency, to act cordially together for any purpose whatever? And is there not good ground to fear, that a season of general danger would be also a season of mutual reproaches, and perhaps revenge?

These are the considerations that ought to weigh with statesmen, even supposing them to leave justice to the people entirely out of the question.

A passage in the leading venal print, the *COURIER*, of the 21st instant, furnishes a pretty good specimen of the means at present made use of to conciliate and unite the people and to stand by one another in an hour of danger. "The Ministry and the Public should be guarded against a clamour raising by persons *uniformly in the interest of France* against sending troops to Portugal. They cry out that Ireland is in danger of invasion, that England is in danger of an invasion. Now, there is less danger of invasion now, as they know, than at any former period of the war; but their wish is to let Massena get his reinforcements, and to prevent Lord Wellington from getting any, by which means *the victory for the enemy may be secure*, and the *English Jacobins* will have created a happy diversion in favour of *their allies, the French.*"

Thus are all those, who, after having seen Lord Talavera followed by Massena from the frontiers of Portugal to the vicinity of Lisbon; who, after having been, by these same prints, assured, that Lord Talavera intended to draw Massena to that point, where he had got him in a trap, saw him let the Frenchmen out of the trap; who, after having been over and over again told, that the French were starving, now find that they have plenty of provisions; who, after having been told, till the ear grew weary of the sound, that Massena possessed not an inch of ground but that on which his army stood, now find him to be the master of all Portugal, except the little nook in which our army is penned up; who, after being a hundred times told, by this same writer, that our army was superior in numbers to the French, and that the latter was daily and hourly wasting away by famine, sickness and desertion; all those, who, after having seen and heard these things, now think that *more troops ought not to be sent to Portugal*, and who are of opinion, that to send them out is only to incur a certain additional heavy expense, without the smallest chance of doing any good; all those persons are thus branded as *Jacobins*, are charged with *being in the interest of France*; and with *wishing to make the victory of the enemy secure.*

These are the means; these and the like of these, are the means now in use for *conciliating* and *uniting* the people, and for inclining them to spend their last shilling and shed the last drop of their blood in defence of the country, including, of course, these their calumniators.

The men who are thus depicted are *parliamentary reformers*. There is no other description of politicians that the venal have any serious ob-

jection to; and, the reason is plain: these latter know well, that *reform* strikes at the root of corruption. This is the reason, and the only reason, that they hate the reformers, for the purpose of destroying whom, they would annihilate the country. This object is always uppermost in their minds, and, in their endeavours to effect it, or merely for the purpose of venting their hatred, they think nothing of proclaiming to the enemy, that there are men in England, who are *uniformly in the interest of France*; who wish by all means to *secure the success of the French army over our own*; and who, in a word, regard the French as their *allies*. The number of these men, when he looks at the "*Burdettite Livery*," Napoleon will want nobody to tell him.

What would be said of *me*, if I were to state, in the Register, that a part of the people of England wish success to the arms of Napoleon against our army; that a part of the people of England are steadily in his interest; that a part of the people of England look upon him as *their ally*? What would be said of *me*, if I were to state this? Should I not be called a "seditious libeller?" Should I not be charged with "*inviting the French to our shores*," as I was, in the time of the Addingtons, because I urged the necessity of measures of defence that I thought were neglected? In short, what would not be said against me, or against any man of my sentiments, that were to state what is here, without any reserve or qualification, proclaimed to the world by this venal writer?

But this is all perfectly natural. It all proceeds from the same source. These venal men feel conscious of their weakness upon the real subject in dispute. They know that, if they speak of *reform*, they are beaten. They have so often been defeated and exposed in those discussions, that they turn from them as a perjurer does from the pillory. They use all possible endeavours to divert the public attention from the real cause of their hatred. To cry *reformer* would not do; but the cry of *Jacobins*, *French faction*, and the like, suits them to admiration, being, as they are, quite regardless of the consequences to the country, so that by these, or any other means, they secure to themselves the advantages of their venality and corruption.

I shall be told, perhaps, that I am teaching the public to expect *too much* from the Regency Ministry, and that the latter will not be able to carry a *parliamentary reform*. I do not teach the public to expect too much; for I do not say that the Regency Ministry will be able *immediately* to carry this great and vital measure; but, I am fully justified in pointing out what I think *ought to be done*. And, *something* they will certainly be able to do. They will be able to give the people a patient and respectful hearing; they will be able to abstain from ascribing their applications to jacobinism; they will be able to hear the statement of their grievances without calling out for "*a stand against popular encroachment*," and without designating them as a "*low, degraded crew*." All this they will have full power to do; and they will, besides have full power to show the people, to give them *convincing proof*, that they, at least, *wish* success to the cause of reform. Nothing can prevent them from being able to entertain the subject; to give it ample discussion; and to let it take its fair chance of the benefits to be derived from reason and truth.

Is this too much to expect from them? If it be, the safe way is for them to expect *nothing*; but, then, if the people expect nothing, if they are to have no hope of any benefit from the approaching change, it is not

reasonable to expect that they will either discover or feel any interest in it. In offering these observations, I am so far from having any wish to embarrass the government of the Regent, that my wish really is to prevent embarrassment by stating beforehand what are the expectations of the people. Every thing, I am well aware, cannot be done *all at once*; but, every thing may be done in time, and *something* may be done immediately, that is to give the people *proofs* of a wish to do more. But, in the end, I am thoroughly convinced, that this country can be saved by nothing but a constitutional Reform of the Commons House of Parliament.

In the meanwhile the venal men are hard at work to prepare, to muster up, and set in motion, all the prejudices that they can against the Prince and his government. The *COURIER* of the date above-mentioned, after some criticism upon His Royal Highness's Answer to the Deputation from the two Houses, in which the writer has discovered, what he calls *contradictions* and *insinuations*, he proceeds thus :

“ But if his Royal Highness's advisers are really anxious to manifest their reverential delicacy towards the King, they will find full as good opportunities of doing so in the exercise of those prerogatives which the Regent will have, as they could have done in the disuse of those which he has not; and I will suggest to them the delicacy of *not changing his Majesty's confidential servants*, and placing in their room those whom his Majesty lately dismissed from his service, and who have expressed their determined hostility to *the system which his Majesty has so successfully persevered in*, and which, there is every reason to hope, he is desirous of continuing. There is no comparison between the indelicacy of changing the King's servants and the making a few respectable individuals, to whom his Majesty is not known to have any violent personal objections, Peers. But we are even told, that Catholic Emancipation will delicately be assented to by these advisers. Thus, in his Majesty's name and for him, a measure will be assented to, to which during his whole reign, he is known to have felt the most conscientious and irrevocable objections: this is delicacy with a vengeance. I hope the rumour upon this subject will be contradicted. If there is no delicacy shown in the exercise of those powers which the Regent is to have, the country will not value much a delicacy which would have been shown in the exercise of those which he has not.”

Thus, then, are the people of Ireland told, that those claims, which they have so long been urging, have been refused solely from *the will of the King*. And thus have these vile hypocrites, these pretenders to exclusive “loyalty,” given the country another proof of their readiness to throw every thing upon the King, which is felt as a grievance by any part of the people.

But, what an outrageous principle is here? The Prince is not to listen to the people of Ireland, because *the King is known to have felt objections to the granting of their claims!* Why should not this argument be extended to any time beyond the *life* of the King? The Prince will hold his authority in *trust*, and so does the King. The whole, to use the Prince's own words, “ is held as a *trust*, for the benefit of the people.” But this writer would have us regard it as a thing of the nature of *personal property*; and that the happiness or misery of a whole people is to depend upon the mere *feelings* of one man; nay, that those feelings, even to such an extent as this, are to be consulted and submitted to, after the person having them is declared to be in a state of *mental derangement*; than which, perhaps, a more perfect specimen of *despotism* never was exhibited in this world; for, according to this venal writer, not only

is it proper to refuse to listen to the alleged grievances of the people upon the sole ground of the King's feelings, but they are still, upon that same ground, not to be listened to when the King is declared to be in a state not to be able to form any judgment on the matter, and to be utterly incapable of all business whatsoever.

This surpasses, if possible, in comprehensiveness, the argument of Mr. YORKE. It goes to *all measures* whatever that shall be disagreeable to the men now in place, who, if this reasoning be, for one moment admitted, have nothing to do but to say, "*the King felt objections to this measure, and we know it.*" And, as this writer has very consistently observed, it is well known that the King chose these present ministers, of course that he would feel objections to their being put out, and that, therefore, *they ought to remain in place*, and have all the power and profit that they now have.

This is complete in all its parts. It provides for everything. It insures us the perseverance in that same system, in which this most barefaced scribe tells us, "his Majesty has so *successfully* persevered." Where is the proof of success? Venal man, look *across the Channel*; and then tell us where the *success* has been. Look at the American States, formerly his Majesty's *Colonies*; look at *Ireland*; look at *the Bank*; look at *Sweden*; look at *Holland*; look up the *Scheldt*; look back at *Walcheren*; or, look now at *Portugal*; look *any where*, and produce us your marks of success.

Here, again, too, *the system*, which has led to all the evils that these names bring to our recollection; this fatal system is ascribed wholly to *the King*.

The day will, I trust, yet come, when the system and its measures will be ascribed to *others*, and that, too, in such a way as truth and justice demand.

The insult here offered to His Royal Highness is truly abominable. This writer, in addition to all his other insults, tells him, that he is bound in *delicacy* to adhere to a *system*, part of which, and no very trifling part, has been to *misrepresent, calumniate, and degrade himself!*

Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY, in the debate of the 21st instant, said, upon this subject, that he "neither accused, nor could he suppose Mr. Perceval "capable of offering any insult to the Prince of Wales. He wished he "could say the same of his political adherents. If so, they would not "have found those public prints, which he should not say were under the "protection of the administration of his right hon. friend, but which "were *certainly not prosecuted with the same severity and rigour as* "were manifested in other instances, pursuing a systematic course of "attack upon his Royal Highness, *calumniating every act, and misre-* "presenting every word of his Royal Highness, and holding up to scorn "and derision every member of the Royal family. Neither should they "have found them incessantly imputing the *basest motives to many* "members of that House for pursuing on this occasion what they con- "scientiously considered their duty."

It was well to point this out, though it could not have escaped the public attention. But, there is, in the present conduct of the venal prints towards the Prince of Wales, nothing *new*. They have been constantly at it, in a way more or less open, ever since I have been a reader of newspapers; but, now, they have thrown off all reserve, which, to say

the truth, is less objectionable than the base eavesdropping misrepresentations, the whispering and canting calumnies, in which they have so long dealt, but which they now perceive can no longer serve their MEAN, MERCENARY, and MALIGNANT purposes.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Tuesday,
22nd January, 1811.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register, January, 1811.*)

BEFORE I proceed to what I intended principally to make the subject of observation in this Article, I think it necessary to go back, for a little, to the subject of *Reform*, treated of in my last. I there spoke of the measure as necessary to produce that sort of spirit and union in the country, now so loudly called for by all the circumstances of the nation, both at home and abroad; but, I omitted to notice one possible emergency, in which the beneficial effect of this great conciliatory measure must be felt in a degree hardly to be calculated: I mean, the emergency attending *the total destruction of the Paper-money*, an emergency, which every one will allow to be *possible*, and which all those, who have much reflected upon the matter, will allow to be *probable*; and, one would think, that there could not be found a man, even amongst the most venal, to deny this position, after the Report of the Bullion Committee and the declarations of many of those men, who, if they possibly could have done it, would still have disguised from the people the real state of the Paper-money.

Mr. HUSKISSON has acknowledged, that the Bank-notes, in which the Dividends in the Funds are paid, have depreciated 15 per cent., and he has said, in express words, that the Fundholder now receives only 17 shillings in the pound, out of which he pays 2 shillings more in *Income Tax*, reducing his former pound to 15 shillings.

Mr. HORNE TOOKE long ago said that this would be the case. During the short time that he was in Parliament, he uttered more good sense, upon subjects of Political Economy, than I have ever heard of being uttered in that House for the last 30 years. He dealt not in fine-spun stuff that has no other effect than that of puzzling plain men, and that always has its rise in a want of clear notions in the speaker or writer. He saw the thing clearly himself; and he communicated his knowledge to others, in a way that no man of common sense could fail to understand.

He said it would be as the Bullion Committee have now declared it to be; he said that the pound of interest in the funds would go on sinking lower and lower in value, till at last (if the progress were not interrupted by some convulsion) the pound of interest would not purchase a *quartern loaf*.

Now, that this depreciation will *continue* is certain. All the powers upon earth cannot prevent it. And it must finally produce its natural

and inevitable consequences. These consequences *may* not be attended with any violent shock, though any violent shock that should accelerate or produce the catastrophe, would also make that catastrophe the more dangerous. The *time*, too, may be more or less distant; events from without or within may operate upon the paper system more or less rapidly; but, the death of you or me, reader, is not more certain, than the catastrophe now in contemplation.

This being the case, a wise government will look forward to it; it will be amongst the objects for which such a government will endeavour to provide. And, in the making of such provision, will a wise government leave the temper, the disposition, the wishes, of the people out of the question? Will not a wise government do all that it can to leave the people no solid ground of complaint in such a crisis, when, in spite of all that can be done, so much must depend upon the disposition of the people, and when, indeed, the very existence of the government and the maintenance of order and of law will rest upon that sole foundation?

At such a time there ought to be left in being no great and general grievance; for, is it not manifest, does not common sense, as well as the experience of the world, teach us, that, if such grievance were, at such a time, in being, that the people would not be likely to cease their complaints, and, indeed, that they would seize upon that very moment for urging them in all the ways in their power?

That the present state of the paper-money may be fairly ascribed to the want of a Reform of Parliament there can, I think, be no doubt; because, it was the want of that Reform that led to an expenditure, which produced the expulsion of gold and the inundation of paper. But, whether this be admitted or not, there can be no doubt, that, if the system produce any very great and general calamity, the calamity would be traced to that source, and that it would be no wonder if the popular accusations were even to exceed the bounds of the real truth.

Mr. PITT succeeded in keeping down the "democrats," that is to say, *the reformers*, in England; but, what was the *cost*? Six hundred millions added to the national debt, and the present fearful state of the Paper-money! Neither he nor his successors of the same school have *succeeded* in keeping down the Debt and the Taxes. He often declared, in express terms, that our National Debt was "*the best ally of France.*" What, then, did he gain by silencing, for awhile, his old co-operators for Reform, if, in doing that, he augmented, fourfold, the strength of "*France's best ally?*"

That the first war with France arose out of a *dread of democracy*, a dread of the *people* of England obtaining too much power, is certain. I do not say, that there were *no* men, at that time, in England, who wished to overturn the kingly government altogether; but their numbers must have been very small, and they would have been, at once, discovered and effectually put down by the granting of that Reform, for which many of the most eminent men in England had contended, and for which, therefore, it was perfectly reasonable, that the people should still contend.

But, supposing that the well-known moderation of the people of England was not to be trusted; even supposing, that, if not kept down by the means of a war with France and of Barracks and an army at home, the reformers would have gone the length of demanding too great a share for the people. Was it not better to have run that risk than to do what was done? Let us suppose ourselves now in the year 1792, and let me

put this question to the great Landholders in England. "You have now your choice: will you have *universal suffrage* and *annual parliaments* in England; or will you add six hundred millions to the national debt, pay ten per cent. upon your income, see France the absolute mistress of the Continent of Europe, and building navies in all her ports wherewith to attack you?"

That man of great estate must, I think, be very perverse indeed, who would not choose the former. What, then, has been gained in this eighteen years struggle against popular principles? What has been gained by this long "*stand against popular encroachment*?" What has been gained, I say, by the "*success*" of "*the great man now no more*" in keeping down democrats?

And, are we to be answered in the stale cant about "*the times*" and about the will of *Providence* to permit this or that? Providence,

" ——— The Universal Cause
" Acts not by *partial*, but by *general* laws."

And, amongst those laws, is this: that wisdom shall, in the end, triumph over folly, and that, in the end, every crime shall bring its own punishment. If the *result* of this long struggle shall be favourable to those who have pursued the present system in this country, then, indeed, they may boast of its wisdom; but, until that result be known, it will be too soon for them to boast.

In all the concerns of life, be they of what kind they may, the failure of a long series of trials points out the wisdom of *a change*. This is the wisdom of experience, which is of so very humble a sort that it is possessed even by the brutes. The ox that has found you corner of the pasture sour, will feed there no more; the horse that has felt the whip will not fail to flinch at its smack. What would be said, then, of the shepherd, who, having, year after year, found the dell to rot his sheep, were still to lead them to the same spot? And, yet, is this more unwise, more absurd, than the conduct of those statesmen, who, having, for many years, seen that their system has produced an annual increase of expense, difficulty, and danger, still adhere to that system?

The system of Anti-Jacobinism; the system of making two distinct classes of the people; the system of keeping down reformers; this system has had an eighteen years trial. The tree is known by its fruit, and the fruits of this system are seen at the Bank, in Ireland, in our Pauper List, across the Channel.

If this be *good fruit*; if it be such as is pleasant to the taste, and promises a healthful digestion, let the system continue, and let its author be an object of praise; but, if its taste be bitter and its consequences death, let it be changed as quickly as possible. And, as the keeping down of reformers has been the great and prominent feature of the system, let the effects of letting them up again be *tried*.

We have had *experiments* enough in other ways. We have had all sorts of commercial and military and naval and diplomatic experiments; we have had warlike and subsidizing experiments; we have had a *peace* experiment; and we have had an *Union* experiment. What have they all done? Have they led to happiness at home? Have they lessened the number of bankruptcies? Have they strengthened public credit? Have they made us *secure from without*? Well, then, as all these have failed, why not try a new course? Why not see what *reform* would do?

It would cost neither lives nor money. It would require neither army nor fleet. It would make no demands upon the War-office, the Admiralty, the Barrack Department, or the Ordnance. Why not *try* it, then? What else is there left to try? As to *diversions* abroad, they are over. The war in Spain and Portugal is the last of these experiments. What, then, is to be done? I ask any one of the abettors of the system to point out any thing that there is left, except the bare *defence* of the country; and any thing that he can *hope* for but that England should be able just to avoid being *conquered* and made a department of the French empire. Indeed, this is all that the "life-and-fortune" men now pretend to hope for; so that they have brought all their high boasting, to a pretty pass. They set out with projects of conquest, and they now *hope* not to be conquered. They set out with resolutions to subdue, with bullying threats against all the republicans in the world—"crush, stifle, strangle," were their words. Nothing short of a complete re-establishment of the old order of things would satisfy them. They looked as big and as bluff as giants amongst pigmies. How changed! Now they whine and cant and turn up their eyes, and, in a consumptive sort of voice, express their fervent hopes that they shall be able to *defend* themselves, or, rather, that they shall be defended by the people, whom they so long calumniated, and no small portion of whom they would gladly have seen hanged. They won the day. *They beat the democrats.* They *subscribed* and *toasted* and *addressed* and *huzzaed*; but, what has the victory availed them? What is their condition *now*? *They beat the reformers*; but, the reformers are still *alive*, and they are not to be killed by any thing. Time, which is hard at work *against* their persecutors, is as hard at work *for* them. There is not, in the whole chapter of events, one that can be favourable to the enemies of reform; and, if the country remains independent, reform will take place.

But, how much better would it be, that it should now originate with the government itself? How gracious this would appear; and what an excellent effect it would have! That this vital measure; this measure, without which all other measures must fail of producing any great good, it will not, perhaps, be in the power of the Regent's ministry to adopt *immediately*; but, as I said in my last (and I cannot repeat it too often), they may immediately give the subject *fair play*; they may evince their *wishes* for reform; for, unless they do this, they may be well assured, that they will have *no support from the people*.

They will take to the government in a fine plight. They will find an enormously expensive war in Spain and Portugal, for the *perseverance* in which they will find all those who profit, either directly or indirectly, *from the taxes*. Such men love war of any sort, if it be but *expensive*, and give rise to places and jobs. If they put an end to this war, they will have roused all this description of persons against them; and, if they continue it, they will thereby hasten the Paper-money crisis. Commerce and Manufactures they will find in a ticklish state. The war against the Republicans of France, which, it was boasted by Mr. Pitt and his set, had given us the trade of the whole world, has, at last, led to the destruction of no small part of that trade, with a fair prospect of a much greater destruction.

I, for my own part, do not hold, that *foreign* trade is at all necessary to the maintenance of the independence and the greatness of England. I am quite convinced, that it is not necessary. But, it makes part of the

present system ; and, at any rate, a great diminution of it must produce a shock ; it must, as to certain parts of the kingdom, produce very serious embarrassments ; and it must affect the revenue and the means of propping up the Paper-money.

It is quite useless to laugh at the idea of Napoleon's banishing all our trade from the Continent of Europe ; for, it is plain that he *will* do it. He has already reduced it to a mere *smuggling trade*. He has so loaded it with embarrassments and penalties, that it cannot be carried on but with a loss to us.

Manufacturing establishments will grow up on the Continent, whither English manufacturers will go, in swarms, as they are now going from Ireland to America. It is preposterous to suppose, that in the countries, whence we draw our raw materials, the same goods cannot be made as we make in England. Is it not absurd to believe, that, while all the wool that we make into superfine cloth, comes from Spain and Germany, superfine cloth cannot be made in those countries ?

See what has been, only by the short operation of the *Embargo* and *Non-intercourse* Acts, done in America. To such an extent have the cloth and cotton manufactories grown up there, that I have been credibly informed, that, during the last year, the *Cards* for carding wool and cotton, shipped for America from the Port of Liverpool, have exceeded in amount the cloths shipped at the same port, from the counties of Somerset and Gloucester.

I always thought, that the United States could not produce *wool* in sufficient quantity, on account of the long winters, which prevented the keeping of sheep. This was a wrong notion, grounded upon the universal mode in practice in England, of keeping sheep upon green food in winter. I now find, that, in Germany, whence comes the *finest wool in the world*, and where is (in Silesia) *the very finest flock of sheep in the whole world*, all the sheep are kept in yards during six months in the year, and, no small part of the time actually in houses. These are facts not to be doubted of. The feed of the sheep, during the long winter, consists of hay, straw, and roots, chiefly *potatoes* ; and this being the case, America may have sheep in as great abundance as they are in England.

Indeed, I understand, that very great progress has been already made in the increase of sheep in America, which has received much assistance from the breaking up of the Spanish flocks, of which America has had a share.

So great is the spirit of enterprise in this way, that a very intimate friend of mine, near Philadelphia, wrote to me, in July last, that the price of a *Spanish ram* there was, in some cases, *a thousand dollars* ; that is to say, 225*l.* of our Bank of England note money. But, there have been great numbers sent to America since that time, from Spain and Portugal ; and, which is not a little curious, many *thousands*, which I, at one time, notified that I expected to receive in *Hampshire*, are, I have every reason to suppose, and, for the sake of the worthy owner, I anxiously hope it, *now safely landed in the United States!* His wish, they being the finest flock in Spain, was to bring them to England, where his intention was to have made a most liberal and public-spirited distribution of them ; but, as I understand, *he was refused leave to send them home in empty transports*, and was, therefore, compelled either to

leave them for the French, or ship them off to the United States, and, of course, he chose the latter; and thus, perhaps, by this single act, the epoch of the final and complete independence of America upon England for *woollens* will be accelerated by several years; and, with regard to the *fineness* of wool, that country will be, at once, put upon an equal footing with this.

There would be no excuse for a detail like this, were I not thoroughly persuaded, that we have here before us the seeds of a great event; *nothing less than the complete and absolute independence of America upon English Manufactures*. Cotton she had to export; Iron she had to export; she had every thing but *wool*, and now she has that with an abundance of food for all sorts of manufacturers; so that, in a very short time, so far will she be from wanting *woollens* from England, that she will have them to export, and that the manufacturers will follow the manufactory there can be no doubt at all. She will be able to make cloths much cheaper than we can; and, of course, she will be able to *sell* them cheaper.

Now, observe, I draw from this, no conclusion unfavourable to the happiness or the security or the greatness of England, none of which are at all favoured by the country's being a *workshop for other nations*. I am satisfied that foreign trade is injurious to England; and that it has been one of the great causes of the dangers she now has to dread. But, as I said before, foreign trade is a *part of the present system of finance*, and its sudden decline must add to the difficulties that the government will have to encounter.

The Regent's ministry, therefore, will not, in this respect, be upon "*a bed of roses*," any more than as to matters connected with war and paper-money. They will, in short, be beset with difficulties. Look which way they will these difficulties face them, not in single rank, but in column. And, do they imagine, that they are destined to subdue all these without the *cordial co-operation of the people*? If they do, they will find themselves most egregiously deceived.

There is one other measure that I shall mention here, and which, if they have any regard for their reputation as ministers, or any desire of keeping their places for four months, they will, one would think, not fail to set about, the moment they get into office. I mean, the causing to be made a *full and clear statement of the situation of the nation*, in the several departments of *army, navy, church, poor, taxation, paper-money, colonies, foreign trade*, and, above all, the *liberty of the subject and the representation in parliament*.

When any man, in private life, takes a trust out of the hands of another, he never fails to have a clear statement made out of the situation of every part of the concern, unless he means to take upon him responsibility for the *past* as well as for the *future*. Common prudence points this out; and, at this time, I am sure, that every consideration that ought to have weight with men in power points it out to those who shall be ministers of the Regent. Some of them remember being twitted of coming in upon a *bed of roses*. It will be their *own fault*, if they be thus twitted again. They took to the concern before with the hope of *jogging on in the old way*. They were forewarned of the consequences. They were told, that the *Roses and Castlereaghs* would beat them at that. They despised the warning; but, at the end of fifteen months, they found

it verified; they found themselves where they will again find themselves, at the end of less than another fifteen months, unless they adopt a widely different course.

They seemed then to have adopted the opinion, that *place* would do every thing, and that *principle* was nothing; that, after representing the system of Mr. Pitt as the most unwise and wicked in the world, they might safely pursue it; and that, having got into place, they might, with impunity, extol the public virtues of Mr. Pitt, and even vote a reward, out of the people's pockets, to his *public services*, in the teeth of those amongst whom they had gained credit solely by their reprobation of his public character and public conduct. This was the most cutting affront that ever was offered to the understandings and feelings of a nation, and as such it made a deep and lasting impression; an impression that it will not be easy to wear away.

When they had once been prevailed upon to do this; when they had once identified themselves with the public character of the man, whose public character it had been the business of their whole political lives to reprobate, they were, in fact, from that moment bound hand and foot, and at the mercy of their enemies; for the *people* cared just as much for one party as they did for the other; and, of all the ministries that I ever knew, or heard of, the turning out of no one ever excited so little regret.

Let them *beware*, then; for the minds of the people are not changed, and never will and never can be changed, as to the system of the last 26 years.

But, the Regency ministers have another, and still higher, consideration to weigh with them. The late ministry acted under the same *head* which Mr. Pitt and his set had acted under. The Regency ministers will have a new head. If, therefore, they again take up the system; if they again take it under their protection; if they again identify themselves, by eulogies or otherwise, with the public character of Mr. Pitt, what shall we say of their conduct *towards the Regent himself*? He stands clear, in the eyes of the people, of any, even the smallest, participation in that system. He has had no art or part in any of the measures of the last 26 years. He has had no hand in adding six hundred millions to the national debt. He has had nothing to do with the Pitt wars against republican principles. He had nothing to do in the *successes* over democrats. He has had no hand in the measures which have augmented the taxes four-fold. He has never had any thing to do with that system which has augmented the poor-rates from 2 to 5 millions. In short, he stands *new, fresh, and fair* before the people, whom, in the course of nature, he is destined to govern. He is a sheet of unsoiled paper; and, ought not his advisers to take care, how they cause it to begin by writing upon it, "*the system of Pitt*"? Ought they not to be very careful how they pledge him to this, how they identify him with what has been so fatal to England, and the sound of which will, to the latest ages, be so hateful to English ears?

Thus have I stated, *in time*, what it appears to me the Regent's ministry ought to *think about*, at least, the moment they are in power, and even *before* they are there.

As to the Bill, now before the House of Lords for making the Prince Regent, there is nothing more to be said upon the subject. It is well understood. The *principles* have all been amply discussed, and whether *one-fourth or one-half* of the regal powers and prerogatives are withhold

from the Regent makes no difference at all. The *principles* are, and must remain, the same; and, whether they be violated little or much, the same objection must exist.

Our eyes must now be turned towards the *measures* that will be pursued; and, all that I shall say upon them now is, that, after having pointed out those which appear to me to be most essential, I have only to add, that I *wish* the whole of them may be good; and, that, be they what they may, I shall, in giving my opinion of them, divest myself of all prejudice and partiality.

In the meanwhile, as connected with this subject I cannot forbear making a few remarks upon one more passage that appeared in the *COURIER* (the leading venal print) of the 23rd instant.

The venal man is commenting upon a speech of Sir SAMUEL ROMILLY, upon the subject of the means used to excite *suspensions* against the PRINCES.

“ Review the doctrines contained in these extracts. The Regent should not be responsible, though his office is not supreme, but merely a delegated temporary trust. Who ever heard before of a deputy being irresponsible to his principal, or any other authority?—Mr. Fox, at the Shakspeare Tavern, in October 1801, publicly exulted in the example afforded by the French Revolution, of the right and power of the people to cashier Kings for misconduct; but the Foxites of the present day will not allow even a King’s deputy to be responsible. Was it candid to talk of proceeding against the Regent by information, as if so high an officer would be sued like a common culprit? Was it not invidious and inflammatory to represent him as degraded to the rank of an Exciseman because he was required to take an oath, though the King himself takes one? The Opposition would in reality exalt the office of Regent above that of King! It was humourously remarked that Mr. Burke’s brother thought himself a greater man than Burke, because he was his brother; and now the Opposition would have the Regent a greater man than the King, because he is his deputy! No law must be made to restrain the Prince. *Every thing must be trusted to his magnanimity: to control is to insult him.* Such language as this might lead a Prince of weak intellects, of an irritable, impatient, and arbitrary temper, to dissolve the Parliament for ever, as a body that did nothing but insult him, stigmatise him, degrade him to the rank of an Exciseman, and render him liable to prosecution like a petty offender. Yet this, according to the Newspaper reports, is the language of the Foxites, those friends of freedom! If they will trust *every thing to the Prince’s discretion, what is the use of a Parliament?* Why not reform it as a regiment is reformed, *by disbanding it altogether, substituting a military government in its stead?* We have already made too great a progress towards a military Government; and the Opposition, by piquing the Prince personally, by representing the conduct of Parliament as personally offensive to his Royal Highness, seem desirous of *preparing his mind to resort to one.* No arguments against the restrictions can be referred to the Prince personally without being in their nature highly unconstitutional, as making our safety depend upon his discretion, rather than upon the law; and those who can use them are fitter to become the Ministers of the Seraglio than of a free Country. Were the Prince a weak, imperious man, fond only of flatterers and sycophants, with such an abject fawning Ministry as the Opposition seem ready to become, and the *Burdett mob at his heels*, the Country would have cause to tremble. But his Royal Highness has too much good sense to be influenced by the crawling adulation of slaves, and too great a love of the liberties of his country, to encourage the anarchical tyranny of a mob.”

If the fact were not so notorious that this man is actuated solely by a love of *gain*, one would really suppose, that he had heated his brain into insanity. One is at a loss to decide between the *impudence* and the *nonsense* of this passage. This sentence insinuates that the Prince is disposed to call in the aid of *military force* wherewith to put down the

Parliament, and the next, that he wishes to have the "*Burdett mob*" at his heels, as if the two would so *cordially unite*!

But, the main drift of the thing is to inculcate the notion, that those who are opposed to the *restrictions* wish to introduce some *new powers* and give them to the Regent; that they want to "set him *above the King*;" that they are willing to "entrust every thing to his *magnanimity*;" that they are willing to leave all "to his *discretion*;" that "they are willing to depend upon his discretion *rather than upon the law*."

What an impudent, what an unprincipled, what a shameless man this must be! For my part, I cannot form an idea of any thing so base in human nature as those qualities that can enable a man to act thus. He knows that every man of sense and information will perceive the grossness, the foulness, of his misrepresentation; but, he also knows, that the uninformed will not, and that the whole of the corrupt tribe will be pleased with him; and thus, for the sake of deceiving the ignorant and obtaining the approbation of the corrupt, he knowingly and voluntarily incurs the contempt and detestation of those whom he is compelled to respect.

Where is the man who has, at any time, expressed a wish to invest the Prince with any *new powers*? Who has proposed to set him *above the King*? Who has ever thought of depending upon his magnanimity *rather than upon law*?

What we, who object to the restrictions and oaths and conditions say, is this: that, as the Prince is to fill the office of the King, he ought to possess *all the powers of the King*, during the time that he fills that office; and *no other powers*. We say, that he ought to take no oath *that the King did not take*. We say, that he ought to be *no more responsible than the King was*. We say, that it is an outrageous insult, not only to the PRINCE, but to common sense, *to suppose him less fit to be trusted with power than the King*; but, so far from saying, that we are willing to trust to his discretion *rather than to law*, we have said, over and over again, that he ought to have not an atom of power, *not awarded him by the constitution*, that is to say, the *settled laws of the land*.

This is what we have, all along, said, and this is what we continue to say. We say, that, if any one will bring forward a proposition for *diminishing the prerogatives of the Crown*, we shall cheerfully hear him, and discuss the matter with him. Such a measure may possibly be proper; but, we say, that no such proposition is offered to us; we say, that it is not a *diminution*, but a *division* that is proposed; and, we say, that, in a division, which would *separate a part of the prerogatives from the office of King*, we see a departure of the principles of our constitution, which holds, that "the prerogatives are vested in the Crown *for the benefit of the people*." We say, that this separating must consider the prerogatives in the light of *personal property*; and that we do not so consider them.

Plain as all this is; consonant as it is with all just notions of freedom; evident as are the truth and justice of it; yet, this venal writer finds his account in perversion, or, we may be assured that he would not take the pains to pervert. His readers consist, for the most part, of those bigotted and intolerant people throughout the country, who had their heads well crammed with Anti-Jacobinism about 12 or 15 years ago, and who are

busied much more about the means of "putting down Jacobins and Levellers," than about defending their country; those incorrigibly stupid animals, who even to this hour, tell you of the *glorious* prospect in Spain and Portugal, and who *laugh* at Massena and even at his master; who, when you remind them of the fleets preparing in all the ports of Europe, answer you by repeating the saying about the "*wooden walls of Old England*;" and who, were they to see, or hear of, the approach of a French army of only five thousand men, would, if they could, sink into the very bowels of the earth. These are the bigotted, intolerant, stupid, and cowardly people, to whom this writer addresses himself. Stupid as they are, however, they are more malignant than stupid, and though, at bottom, they despise him (and he knows it), their malice is fed by him, and thus he has a hold which he well knows they cannot shake off.

To these he adds the *elect* amongst the *corrupted* and *corrupters*. All those whose object it is to live unfairly, in one way or another, upon the people's earnings, to fatten upon their sweat: and who, rather than see the means of doing this put quite beyond their reach for ever, would cheerfully view the destruction of half the nation by fire and sword. The prevalence of justice is to such people, certain destruction. They cannot breathe the same air with truth and justice. Let delusion cease, and they perish without the assistance of either violence or law. This race is in *great alarm* at present, and all that I can say is, that I sincerely hope that their alarm *may not prove groundless*.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Friday,
January 25, 1811.

KING'S ILLNESS.—THE REGENCY.—*Continued.*

(*Political Register*, January, 1811.)

DURING the debate, in the House of Lords, which took place on *Friday* last, the 24th instant, there was something very curious transpired, relating to the *state of the King*, at former times, when he was exercising the *functions of royalty*.

This is the point towards which the people's attention ought now to be *steadily* directed. The subject of *Limitations* has been amply discussed. But, that of the *resumption of the kingly powers by the King* is of still greater importance; and it should now be considered well; for, very much indeed will depend upon the provisions made as to this resumption.

Before I enter upon the remarks that are suggested by the debate of *Friday*, I must notice a very curious passage in the *COURIER* newspaper of that day, manifestly intended to have an effect upon the discussion then coming on in the Peers' House.

The *COURIER*, it should be observed, is now become the only steady organ of the hypocritical enemies upon the Prince, those vile men, who under the garb of affected attachment to the King, are calumniating and insulting his son, by means of the basest insinuations. The *MORNING POST* has long been faltering and vacillating. It varies in its tone with

the variation in the *Windsor Bulletins*; and, one can see, that it is prepared to *go over*, the moment that it sees the Prince safely in possession of power, and other persons than the present in office. It discovered strong symptoms of rattling in a few days after it told us, that the King had a *slight cold*, and was attended by *three physicians*; and, when Dr. WILLIS was sent for, and came accompanied with *two gentlemen*, in a post-chaise and four, it actually began to discover, that there was a *great difference* between such *respectable* men as Lords Grenville and Grey, and Sir Francis Burdett and Horne Tooke. When the bulletins began to talk of *quiet nights* and *improvement*, the Morning Post began to talk of the *virtues of the King*, and the *fidelity* of Lord Eldon and Mr. Perceval; and when the *Terrace-tale* came out, it so far re-rattled as to resume its old talk about "*the talents*."

Now, it seems not to know what to do. It keeps a sort of middle tone. It is evidently waiting, as rats may well do, to see "which way the cat jumps." It leans to and from the ministry and the opposition by turns. It is precisely in that state which the country people describe by the phrase, "between *hawk* and *buzzard*;" and in this very state are its readers of "*the fashionable world*."

The COURIER is steady to its point. It has taken its ground, and there it must stand as long as it can. It has all the old blood-sucking Anti-Jacobin crew at its back, whose gall must be fed, and this the COURIER knows, and hopes to be without a rival in supplying the food; to possess a sort of monopoly of the trade. Its supporters are *decided*; but, it is only because hesitation and indecision would with *them*, be of *no avail*. Their *pretence* meet them where you will, is, *attachment to the King*; but, if you could look into their hearts, you would there find hatred of those who are opposed to their base and selfish views. This race *risk* nothing. They are quite sure, that tacking about would do them no good. It would be *useless* for them to *rat*, and, therefore, they will not attempt it; but will take the chance of opportunities to annoy those whom they hate, and to glut their revenge upon all those, be they who they may, that have contributed towards an exposure of them, and have thus done their best to blast their corrupt views.

Of this detestable race the COURIER is the organ, or, rather, the purveyor. They despise the COURIER; each man of them looks upon it as a vehicle of the most execrable hypocrisy; but, it keeps them in countenance; they are gratified to see in print what even they would be ashamed to utter: and, when they hand the paper about, they do it with views like those of murderers, when they drop poison into their neighbour's mess.

Such is the COURIER, and, if the reader wants *proof* of it, he shall have it in the article above spoken of.

The article is entitled, "DETHRONING OF THE KING;" and, after having insinuated in rather general terms, that this is the object of the *New Men* (by whom he must mean the men whom the Prince shall choose for his ministers), he proceeds thus:—

"Sir Francis Burdett leaves no doubt, with respect to his opinion upon the subject. The Morning Chronicle reports him to have said, 'that to have a person at the head of affairs, who had long been *incapable of signing his name to a document*, without some one to guide his hand; a person long incapable of receiving petitions, of even holding a levee, or discharging the most ordinary functions of his office, and now afflicted with this mental malady,—was a most

“ *mischievous example to the people of this country, while it had a tendency to expose the Government to the contempt of foreign powers.*”

“ This at least is candid; there is no hesitation, no mincing matters here. We have it avowed, that the King ought to be set aside. The new men, therefore, thinking that he never can be fit to reign again, must be expected to act upon that opinion,—and we are justified in believing, that they would never let him exercise the royal functions again. Of this it is necessary the people should be warned, they must not be misled by the pretended eagerness of the new men to afford every facility to the King to resume his authority. They tell us he is unfit to resume it, and *if they accede to power, they will never let him resume it.* And one of the means which they will use, will be irritating and goading the royal mind. This is very candidly avowed in an article, in which they remind us of a case in Chancery some years ago. ‘It may be useful to know,’ says the Morning Chronicle of to-day, ‘that the same Lord Chancellor Eldon, when applied to, to supersede a Commission of Lunacy some years ago, declared that *he should use extreme caution in complying with the prayer of the petition*; for he well remembered a case where a lunatic had been brought into Court, whose case did not seem to warrant the continuance of the Commission; that the lunatic was rational, conversed well on every subject which was proposed, and appeared perfectly capable of the management of his own affairs; the Commission was about to be ordered to be superseded, when, at the moment the Committee of the lunatic desired that he might be asked a certain question (Catholic Emancipation for instance), which was no sooner done, than ample grounds were evinced for the continuance of the restraint.’

“ Here is the secret of their policy disclosed at once. How open, how simple the confession! Let the King pray to be put in possession of the regal functions, and they will immediately use ‘their extreme caution.’ Let the King show symptoms of recovery; let them see him making advances to a perfect re-establishment; they have a recipe that shall throw him back; press him upon the subject of Catholic Emancipation, which may agitate and hurry him, and they have said before ‘that a man subject to hurries is not fit to wield the executive power.’ Grievous indeed would it be to the whole country to see the King *thrown aside*; he has ‘borne his faculties so meekly,’ been ‘so clear in his great office.’ *But he has the guilt of age upon him; he has the guilt of want of sight. Throw him into a corner; tell him this is the lot reserved for a King who has reigned so long; wrench the sceptre from his hand, pluck the crown from his head, and bind it with thorns. These are the doctrines that are now inculcated, and no doubt will be acted upon by the new men. They have passed sentence of dethronement, and we must expect it to be carried into execution.*”

What a disgrace it is to the English nation, that its character should be such as to embolden any one to put forth such hypocritical cant! What a shame it is for us, that any one, living amongst us, and pretty well able to ascertain the nature of the public mind, should think it his interest (for that is his guide) to publish a passage like this! What a disgrace to our national understanding, what a proof of gross national cullibility, and, indeed, what a symptom of degeneracy and baseness of spirit, that any man, after long experience at the press, should not only think it safe, but should deem it his interest, to address the public in this manner; to put forward in their teeth sentiments and assertions like these! It is true, that all men of sense will see them in their proper light; but, the publisher of them knows well, that there are enough who will not; and, upon the supposition that there are only *one thousand* persons out of *fifteen millions*, capable of being thus imposed upon, the fact is highly disgraceful to the country.

Let us examine, now, the close, particularly, of this gull-catching article; and see how it squares with *truth*; let us see how it will stand that test.

As to the King’s having “borne his faculties *meekly*,” as to his having

been "so clear in his great office;" these are points that I shall not attempt to discuss; but, whether true or not, it is, for several reasons, base in the extreme, in such a case, to make use of the assertion; first, because if any one dissented from it, the writer well knows that no one would dare to express that dissent, especially accompanied with the proofs, if any existed, of the falsehood of the assertion. This is always the case, when praises are bestowed upon those whom no man dares attack. If, for instance, any one were to publish assertions of the wisdom and honesty and sincerity of Mr. Perceval and his colleagues Lords Liverpool and Eldon: the assertion, whether true or false, would not, I warrant you, be controverted in print; that there is no man now in England, who would say, "that is not true;" much less would he think of producing any proofs in support of his denial.

It is, therefore, always very base to introduce, in support of an argument, praises of the King, or, under the present state of the press, praises of any man in power; for, if it be a libel to pain a man's feelings, it is pretty evident, that if you assert, that the praise has been unjustly bestowed, you must necessarily pain the feelings of the praised party, and this you must do in a double degree, if you produce proofs of the falsehood of the praise. To bestow praises upon men, whom nobody must attack, is, therefore, at all times very suspicious, at best, and when made use of in an argument, excessively base. What would this same venal writer say, if a French writer were to publish in France: "Napoleon is a most excellently good man; and, therefore, the people ought to do so and so for him?" What would this venal man say thereon? Would he not say, that the assertion was very base, seeing that no one would dare to contradict it? "Napoleon is a good sovereign; let any one deny it if he can." What would he say of a challenge of this sort? There needs nothing more to show how base it is in any one to deal forth praises of those, whom it is well known no one dares attack; to put forth, in support of an argument, facts which no one dares controvert, and especially if he prove the facts to be false. The facts of the King's having "borne his faculties meekly, and his having been so clear, in his great office," I shall, as I said before, not attempt to discuss, being quite willing to leave them to the judgment of the reader; but, I cannot refrain from remarking how these pretended King's friends are here, indirectly, again throwing all the responsibility upon the Prince's "poor Father," as this same writer calls him, in his paper of Saturday last, in an article, which, for hypocritical malice, exceeds even that, upon which I am now commenting. There is no one that talks about any thing that the King has done wrong; we hold that he can do no wrong. Aye, but this does not suit the venal. It suits them much better to hoist him up and thrust him forward, upon all occasions between the ministry and the people. "Here," say they, "here is your mark: do not blame the ministers: cast your stone here, if you have any fault to find." This has been their constant practice. Never was their such a series of hypocritical tricks played off upon a people!

But, after all, what have the King's virtues to do with the great question now before the people? What have these virtues to do with the question, which this man has agitated, namely, whether the King ought, without great caution, to be called upon to resume the regal state and functions? What have the King's meekness and uprightness and single-

ness of heart to do with this question? It is not of meekness and upright-ness and singleness of heart that he has been declared *incapable*; it is of exercising the functions of royalty; it is of executing the ordinary duties of his office; it is of understanding any thing; it is in this respect that he has been declared to be in a state of incapacity; in short, that he is in a state of *mental derangement*, to which is added the circumstance of corporeal blindness.

Suppose, in bar of an application to the Chancellor to issue a commission, or whatever else it is, of *lunacy* against any one, it was pleaded, that he had been a very good and mild master and a very honest man during the last fifty years. Would the Chancellor hear such an argument? Nay, could any advocate be found to make use of it? Would not any man of reputation be ashamed to urge it? Yes, and upon the whole earth, there is not another people to be found to whom such an argument would be addressed. This venal man, however, knows, that, in this nation, he shall find gulls to swallow his bait; especially in these *dark days*, when lowness of spirits amongst so many of the weak and the aged create a sort of selfish sympathy in the case of the King.

The words, used as the title of the article: "DETHRONING OF THE KING," taken in connection with the quotation from SHAKESPEARE, convey a most malignant meaning. MACBETH, when he is about to murder King DUNCAN, reasons with himself, and, during the soliloquy, he says, that Duncan, "has borne his faculties *so meekly*, has been *so clear* in his "great office, that his virtues, like angels trumpet-tongued, will cry out "against the deep damnation of his taking off." These are the words, as nearly as I can recollect them. Why did not the venal man go on with the quotation? Why did he not quote the *latter part* of the sentence as well as the former, and leave the whole, as he has done a part, to be applied to the King's son, who is to succeed him in the royal authority, as Macbeth did Duncan? But, though he took not the words, the context is in every man's mind, and the inference is full as clear as those inferences upon which many a man has been convicted of libel.

Let us now take the closing gull-catching parts of this article, and expose the falsehood, the fraud, the imposture of them.

"But, he has the *guilt* of age upon him; *guilt* of want of sight. "Throw him into a *corner*; and tell him that is the *lot reserved* for a "King who has reigned so long; *wrench* the sceptre from his hand, "pluck the crown from his head; bind it with *thorns*. These are the "doctrines that are now *inculcated*; they have *passed sentence* of *de-thronement*, and we must expect it to be carried into execution."

No, impostor, there is nobody that talks of the *guilt* of age and of blindness. It is not a crime to be aged and blind. Nobody says that it is a crime. Nobody ever has said so. Every one expresses regret that the King, or that any other human being, should be afflicted with blindness. But, old age is old age, and blindness is blindness, in a king as well as in other men, and when blindness is unhappily added to old age, and to both are added *mental derangement*, is it unreasonable that people whose happiness or misery must, in a great degree, depend upon their government, should be solicitous, that *great caution* should be used in the resumption of the royal authority by a person thus afflicted; and is it not quite right, that members of parliament as well as public writers should express their opinions upon the subject? Old age and blindness combined are very serious things where the weight of affairs is

great and where the business actually to be performed is of a laborious nature and such as may well demand the most vigorous faculties of all sorts; but when, in such a situation, in a person having so momentous an office to discharge; to these two, when to old age and blindness, in such a person, *mental derangement* is added, is it not very impudent indeed to reproach any part of the people with want of feeling or of loyalty, because they express their wishes, that *great caution* should be used in the resumption of such an office by such a person, even leaving compassion towards himself out of the question, and most assuredly that alone is quite sufficient to call for extreme caution in this respect?

“*Throw him into a corner*, and tell him that is the *lot reserved* for a king who has *reigned so long*.”

These are words, like the context, put into the mouths of those, who have contended against restrictions upon the Prince, and who wish for great caution to be used in the resumption of the royal authority by the King. But this, like the context, is basely and impudently *false*. We do not say, “*throw him into a corner*.” We say, take the best of care of him; cherish him; give him all the means you possibly can invent to divert his mind from distressing and embarrassing objects. He is, unhappily, in a corner; and we wish to see him out of it, if his state will permit it. We wish to see him have a succession of amusing and pleasing ideas presented to his mind; to see him cheered, if possible, by change of place, by agreeable variety, to live in the best air, to have, in short, every thing that the art of man can devise to console and comfort him; and all this we have said over and over again. To represent us, therefore, as wishing to throw him in a corner is a falsehood, invented by hypocrisy for the basest of purposes.

No: we do not say, that it is “the *lot reserved* for a king who has *reigned so long*.” We have had nothing to do with the *lot*; we have had no hand in making the King either old or blind or mentally deranged. The *lot* has fallen upon him. The first is the *lot* of every man, and is generally esteemed a very fortunate lot; the second is nothing very rare, it is by no means an unfrequent companion of old age; and the third, and all three, are the work of *nature*, and not of any of us. We have not *reserved* the lot. We did not even discover that nature had thus afflicted the King. It was *his own servants* that proclaimed the fact to us, and *his physicians* confirmed it upon their oaths. What, then, have we had to do with *reserving* the lot? And as to the King’s having “*reigned so long*,” there is neither merit nor demerit in that, either in him or his people. If George the Second had reigned longer than he did, George the Third would not have reigned so long as he has. This, therefore, is a poor, miserable device to extort sighs from the weak-nerved valetudinarian, and must be quite thrown away upon any person who is in possession of a sound mind. It is like those tricks that we read of by which cunning priests, of all religions, contrive to rob a man’s heirs.

“*Wrench* the sceptre from his hand, *pluck* the crown from his head, and bind it with *thorns*.”

This again is false. We do not say any such thing. Nobody went to the ministers to *ask* for the kingly office. They made an *offer* of it. They *told* us, that the King was incapable of executing the duties of his office. What did they do this for, if this venal man was afterwards to say, that we, the people, wished to *wrench* the sceptre from his hand? If any body *wrenched* it, it was his own servants. But, nobody did it.

It *fell* from his hand. He was incapable of holding it any longer, and then it was *offered* to his son, in a way that his son did not, indeed, approve of; but, still it was *offered* without being *asked* for.

And the same of the *Crown*. The King could not wear it. Nobody *asked* for it, much less *plucked* it from the King's head. And nobody says, "bind it with *thorns*;" but put safely by for the Prince. Do not *disfigure* it; do not *mar* it; do not *divide* it; do not *chip* it away; take nothing from it, either of the solid or ornamental.

This is what we say; this is what the people say. They say, in the words of the Prince, this crown exists for *our benefit*; therefore, do not lay the foundation for its total destruction, by dividing and hammering it about and new-shaping it; for, if you do, it will be no longer the same thing. No, no! We do not say "bind it with *thorns*." The assertion is impudently *false*; it is a barefaced trick to gull the weak and the foolish. We say, *let it be as it was*. Let us have no *thorns*, either for King or *Regent*. We want to see all the powers and prerogatives accompany the office of King. If you will, indeed, propose to us a scheme for *diminishing* in perpetuity these powers and prerogatives, we will say, that you *may* be right; though, if the people be fully and fairly represented in *their* House of Parliament, we do not think that any diminution of the Royal powers and prerogatives is at all necessary. If however, you make such a proposition we will *discuss* it with you; but, we deny, that you have proposed any *diminution*. All the powers, all the prerogatives, all the patronage, all the expenses of Civil List and Privy Purse are still to exist; but a very considerable part of them are to be *separated from the kingly office*, to which office they were attached for *the people's benefit*. A part is to be possessed by the Prince Regent; a part by the Queen and a Council; and another part is to be kept *in reserve* to be used by the King, who, if he shall be again declared to have recovered from his mental derangement, will have to possess them in *retrospect*.

Thus *all* the assertions of this venal man are *false*. They are falsehoods, contrived by some *arch-hypocrite* for the purposes of delusion; for the fraudulent purpose of enlisting compassion and arraying it against the Prince, kidnapping the feelings of the weak and the ignorant and making them subservient to the purposes of *interested hypocrisy*.

These expressions of "his *poor Father*;" the "*poor old King*;" the "*poor dear King*;" all these expressions, all the reverential cant, all the professions of personal attachment, all the hiccupping and the blubbering that we hear from these venal men, can be ascribed to base self-interest and to nothing else. One of the great characteristics of the thorough-bred *harlot*, is, that she has always a flood of tears at command. It is generally her *last resource*. When all her other tricks, when disguise, when wheedling and coaxing, blustering and threatening, shuffling and lying (Oh! how she'll LIE!); when all have failed, out comes her handkerchief and her flood of tears; and at the moment that they pour down her cheeks, a glance through the flood ascertains the relenting disposition of her cull, and, then, even then, she coolly plans fresh dilapidations upon his purse. Crocodiles, those most voracious *Robbers* both by land and water, when they want to inveigle their prey within reach of their insatiable jaws, set up a most lamentable *cry*, which to the dogs, more sagacious than other animals, is always a signal to *keep at a distance*. Englishmen, avoid the example of the cull, and follow that of the dogs of the Nile. Shun these canting and hiccupping

and blubbing men; read all their verbose columns with a suspicious eye; and when they sigh out, "poor dear King," be assured that they have their eye upon your purse.

Having now, and I should hope effectually, exposed these consummate hypocrites, who calumniate the Prince by the means of canting and crying, we will now return to the subject, of which, at the outset of this article, I proposed to treat, namely, the circumstances under which, at certain times passed, the King had exercised the Royal Authority, and see what was said thereon by LORD GREY and the LORD CHANCELLOR, in the Debate of Friday last, the 25th instant. I shall not, indeed, have much to say upon it myself. The speeches contain in themselves quite enough to suggest observations and conclusions to the reader. I take the extract from the TIMES newspaper, just as I find it there. LORD GREY said:—

"With respect to that part of the Bill, which provided for the *resumption of the Royal Authority* upon his Majesty's recovery, he would say that no one, not even any of the Noble Lords on the other side of the House, would more sincerely rejoice at the arrival of that period: but before he could approve of that resumption, he must be convinced, that the recovery was *full and perfect*; he must have other authority for that important fact than the mere putting of the *Great Seal to a commission in his Majesty's name*. He could not receive such a document as a decisive proof of his Majesty's recovery, when he considered *what had taken place on two former occasions, when it was notorious the Great Seal had been employed, as if by his Majesty's command, at a time that he was under the care of a physician for a malady similar to that by which he was now afflicted*. The Noble and Learned Lord must excuse him when he said, he must have better authority than his declaration for his Majesty's recovery. That important fact required to be substantiated in the most solemn manner; and nothing short of an examination of the physicians by their lordships could afford that proof of it which would satisfy his mind."

This was *coming to the point*. It was, as far as I recollect, what nobody had said before; and it was, too, said in the presence of the LORD CHANCELLOR.

Here, then, we have a statement from LORD GREY, that, upon two former occasions, when it was notorious THE GREAT SEAL HAD BEEN EMPLOYED, AS IF BY HIS MAJESTY'S COMMAND, AT THAT TIME HE WAS UNDER THE CARE OF A PHYSICIAN FOR A MALADY SIMILAR TO THAT BY WHICH HE WAS NOW AFFLICTED.

Now, then, what said the Lord Chancellor in ANSWER to this? Here it is. I beg the reader not to miss a word of it.

"The Lord Chancellor, rising under extreme agitation, said, That the Committee would excuse him for troubling them at that period of the debate; but he could not suffer the observations with which the Noble Earl concluded his speech to pass without taking the earliest opportunity of replying to them. In answer to what had fallen from the Noble Earl, he would now repeat what he had said upon another consideration of the subject before them; that he not only would not decline, but that he challenged the strictest inquiry into his conduct. The noble Earl might well have spared the observations that had fallen from him: but since he chose to allude to acts which he (Lord Eldon) had done in a conscientious discharge of his duty, he would tell that noble Lord, that he would rather have perished on a scaffold, than have withheld himself from any act of public duty he had performed. In what he had done upon the occasion alluded to, he acted under the solemnity of an oath, which prescribed that he was to act conscientiously, and to the best of his judgment. He felt himself superior to the uncalled-for imputation of the noble Lord

“ Until his country told him he had done wrong, he should feel satisfied with himself for his conduct on that occasion. No man had a right to charge him with criminality. He had long served a gracious master most faithfully : he had done so in conjunction with some noble Lords over the way, at the most critical moment that this country ever experienced. It was at a time when some of those noble Lords were supporting him in the measures which he thought necessary for putting down those societies which aimed at the subversion of the Government ; and which measures other noble Lords, who were now sitting side by side with them, were obstructing by every means in their power, and ridiculing under the name of the ‘ gagging bills.’ Strong as those measures were, they could not have effectually counteracted the pernicious and unconstitutional proceedings of those clubs and societies—from his conscience he believed that nothing could have saved the country at that momentous period, but the almost universal love and reverence of the people for the individual who filled the Throne. With respect to the transactions of 1802 and 1804, he would again say, that he challenged the strictest inquiry into them. The opinions of physicians, though entitled to great attention, were not to absolutely bind him. He was bound to act upon his oath, and to the best of his judgment. He had always done so, and he was ready to abide the consequences. There were no terrors for him in any inquiry that might be instituted into his official conduct. *Impavidum feriant.* As to the daily scandal that was poured out against him, and which connected him with measures in which he had no concern, he would not condescend to reply to it. He would not ask the noble Earl to trust him. He would discharge his duty to his Sovereign conscientiously ; and satisfied that he had done so, he should feel indifferent as to what might be said of him. It had been put to him, whether he would supersede a commission of lunacy against the opinion of physicians. He had often done so, and perhaps he might have been wrong in so doing ; but he had acted upon his conscience, as he should always do in such cases.”

I do not know what “ *Impavidum feriant,*” mean ; but, I suppose, that the ANSWER to Lord Grey was contained in those words ; for as to the history of the “ *gagging bills,*” it is not easy to see what that had to do with the matter, though a subject of very great importance, and one that I, for my part, like to see revived ; and I feel grateful to the Lord Chancellor for reviving it at this time. But, it is certainly difficult to see how it was connected with what passed in 1804 respecting the putting of the *Great Seal* to things at that time.

Just as I arrived at the close of the last sentence, the newspapers, containing the report of the last night (Monday, 28th January) was put into my hands. Here, I see, the subject was revived ; the charge of Lord Grey was first noticed by the LORD CHANCELLOR. Lord Grey replied, and so far from *retracting* any thing, went into a *detail* of what was done in 1804.

Now came forth Lords SIDMOUTH and LIVERPOOL, who said they were *equally responsible* with the Lord Chancellor for what was done in 1804.

The LORD CHANCELLOR replied to Lord GREY ; and Lord Grey rejoined ; and, at last, Lord KING grounded a motion for excluding the Lord Chancellor from the QUEEN'S COUNCIL upon the facts relating to his conduct in 1804.

Here is some very curious and interesting matter ; and though it may be supposed to be widely circulated in the newspapers, yet, the extreme importance of it induces me to insert these speeches here, as far as they relate to this subject, which it is quite impossible should rest where it is.

This affair of 1804 is all quite new to the people. Not a word of it did they know, or dream of.

I begin with the Lord Chancellor's speech, which, as the reader will bear in mind, grew out of what passed on Friday, and which we have seen above.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that he understood the noble Earl (Grey) to have accused him of having performed certain acts, connected with the office he held, in his Majesty's name, while his Sovereign was in an incapable state. He would again repeat, that he challenged the most minute inquiry into those transactions. What he did on those occasions he did in concurrence and with the approbation of all his colleagues; and he would have acted as he did, though he had even differed from every man among them. He would even go farther; and he would say, that acting conscientiously, so help him God, he could not have acted otherwise than he did. What was the nature of the crime imputed to him? Why this, that he had acted in obedience to his Majesty's commands. He would ask the noble Earl (Grey) what he would have thought of him, if he had refused to do so: and what kind of crime he would impute to those who disobeyed his Majesty's commands? With respect to the accusation which had been made over and over again, as to the certain prospect of his Majesty's speedy recovery, he would now repeat, what he had stated as often as the charge was preferred, that he never held out any such hopes to the House. He stated from himself, as from a person ignorant of the medical profession, his confident expectations of his Majesty's recovery within a reasonable time. This was a species of disorder as to which he had little confidence in the opinions of physicians. If all the physicians on earth were to tell him that his Majesty's recovery would be speedy, he would not believe them. Upon the same grounds, were they to declare that his Majesty's recovery would *not* be speedy, he would be equally incredulous. The restoration of the Sovereign to the full exercise of his mental powers depended upon other causes than mere medical aid. In the language of the Scriptures, if it was the pleasure of God that "*there should be light*" in the Royal mind, "*let there be light.*" He would, however, undertake to assert, "that there was a most material amendment in his Majesty;" and having said this, he would say no more.

Earl GREY said: The noble Baron having specifically applied to him at the commencement of his speech, in consequence of what had fallen from him in a former debate, it became necessary for him to repeat what he had then said. It was not his disposition to prefer charges upon light grounds, or to retract them when made. In pursuing what he conceived to be his duty to his country, he would arraign the noble and learned Lord of a crime little short of treason. As the noble Lord had put a question to him, he would answer it by another; and he would ask the noble and learned Lord, what ought to be the punishment of that man, who, when his Sovereign was in a state of proved incapacity, notoriously under medical care, and the necessary restraint which his particular malady required, should come down to that House, and declare there was no suspension of the Royal authority? What would he think of the person who, under these circumstances, should put the Great Seal to acts in the name, and as if by the express command, of the Sovereign? Let the noble and learned Lord answer these questions if he could. The noble Baron had endeavoured to explain his assertion on a former occasion, that, looking to his Majesty's speedy recovery it was immaterial to what period the duration of the restrictions was limited. The noble Baron now found it convenient to qualify that declaration. He wished to deal as severe as he could with the learned Lord, but at the same time, with a strict regard to justice. Whatever, therefore, the noble Lord's practice might be in another court, and whatever indifference he might there show as to the judgment of medical persons, he would ask, whether he had not held out expectations to that House of his Majesty's speedy recovery, and stated, that those expectations were founded on the opinions of persons who were best qualified to judge?

The LORD CHANCELLOR rose to order. The noble Lord, he trusted, would excuse him for the interruption he was giving him; but in justice to himself he must declare, that he never had held out expectations of his Majesty's early or speedy recovery; but that, on the contrary, he avoided pledging himself to any specific declaration on that point.

Earl GREY resumed. He would again repeat and re-assert what he had stated. He would maintain that the noble Lord had held out expectations of his Majesty's speedy recovery. He was in the judgment of the House, whether he had not. The noble Lord even went so far as to state that those expectations were founded upon the opinions of those very physicians, whom he said this night he would not believe; and the result was, that the House adjourned.

for a fortnight upon the faith of that declaration. (*Hear, hear!*) He came next to a part of the noble and learned Lord's speech, to which he should beg the particular attention of their Lordships; he meant that in which he had stated, that, to his own knowledge, a very considerable amendment had taken place in his Majesty's health. Upon this point he would take the liberty to ask the noble Lord, whether in the course of a short conversation, he could have had an opportunity or the means to form any opinion as to the state of his Majesty's malady, which could be either satisfactory to his own mind, or ought to have any weight with their Lordships? He would ask him, whether he had founded his opinion in any degree upon the representations of the physicians, or was borne out by their authority in the statement their Lordships had just heard? Had the noble lord, in the course of his interview with his Majesty, touched upon any of those subjects upon which particularly the delusion to which he was subject was said to prevail? He was fully aware of the delicacy of touching upon this topic; but it was a duty he owed their Lordships to endeavour to prevent them from being led to entertain false hopes respecting the state of his Majesty's health by partial or unfounded representations. There was nobody who had ever visited any of those places appropriated for the reception of persons labouring under mental infirmity, who did not well know, that in various instances the unhappy individuals preserved every appearance of intellectual sanity, until questioned respecting, or reminded of, some topic, upon which the derangement of their faculties particularly prevailed. Several cases of that description had even lately been published, and some of them upon high authority, in which no trace of the latent disease could be discovered, until the topic upon which the malady turned happened to be touched on. His object in adverting to these circumstances was to show to their Lordships the necessity of receiving such accounts as had been given by the noble Lord with distrust, and of withholding credit from them till they should be presented to them supported by complete and satisfactory evidence. It was the duty of their Lordships to take care that the sceptre of the Sovereign, which was to be committed to a Regent, to be used in his name and on his behalf, should not be withdrawn until his Majesty's happy recovery should enable him to wield it himself, for the good of his people, and keep it from falling into other hands, by which it had, in other instances, been assumed and exercised. He trusted, therefore, that when they should come to that part of the Bill which was to provide for the resumption of the royal authority, their Lordships would take particular care upon this point, as they must feel it to be their indubitable duty to do. He hoped they would consider it right not to suffer any person to be included in the Council which would have to report upon his Majesty's recovery, who had in former instances suffered his Majesty's name to be used in public acts, at a time when, according to what had lately transpired, his Majesty was incapable of expressing his pleasure respecting them. At the same time that they must feel it their duty to provide for the full and perfect resumption of his authority by his Majesty, they were no less bound to take care that his recovery must be complete before such resumption. With respect to the conduct of the noble and learned Lord on those former occasions to which he had alluded, that noble Lord had asserted his ability to defend himself; and though he should not invite the investigation, was yet not inclined to shrink from it. But this assertion was nothing but a vain boast on the part of the noble Lord; for, unquestionably, if the matter were brought forward, the noble Lord would not be able to shrink from it. Notwithstanding what had fallen from the noble and learned Lord, he adhered to his former statement; and felt it his duty here more explicitly to put their Lordships in possession of the cases to which he had before alluded. It was now in evidence before their Lordships, that, as well in 1801 as 1804, the King's name had been used to public acts, and the Royal authority exercised at a time when, according to the evidence, his Majesty was incapable of exercising his Royal functions. His Majesty's malady began about the 12th of February, 1801, and continued without remission till the beginning of March. Their Lordships would recollect, that councils had been held and members sworn during that interval. The foreign relations of the country, too, had undergone a material change in that period: Sweden, which had been our ally, acceded to the northern confederacy; and even considerable expeditions had been sent out. Subsequent to that date, too, about the 17th of March, another council was held and members sworn of it. Here he must beg the attention of their Lordships to the circumstance, that about the

14th or 15th of June following, his Majesty had a relapse, which, though it did not last long, required the aid of medical attendance. This had taken place in 1801. In 1804 he had been a member of the other House, and from the anxiety felt by the public upon the subject, considered it his duty to put a question to the noble Viscount on the cross bench (Sidmouth), then a member of the other House, respecting the state of his Majesty's health; and though his noble Friend had at first endeavoured to evade the question, upon being pressed, he ended with saying, that there was no necessary suspension of the royal functions. To a similar question put in that House, the noble Lord upon the Woolsack had returned a similar declaration. (No! no!) Certainly the noble Earl opposite (Lord Liverpool) had made such a declaration, and that had afterwards been confirmed by the noble Lord on the Woolsack, in that House. Now, by referring to the evidence of Dr. Heberden, their Lordships would find, that at that very period his Majesty had been ill, and continued in that state from the 12th of Feb. 1804, to the 23rd of April following, at which time it was considered, that his Majesty was well enough to resume his royal authority. Within that interval, viz. on the 9th of March, a commission had been issued under his Majesty's Great Seal, for giving the Royal assent to fifteen different bills which had passed the two Houses. But still more, the noble and learned Lord had on the 5th of March an interview with his Majesty, in consequence of which he felt himself warranted in declaring that his Majesty's intellects were unimpaired. But would the House consider such an interview, which may have taken place at a lucid interval, to outweigh the evidence upon oath of the physicians in attendance? Would they not be convinced that it would be a direct breach of the Constitution for the highest officer in his Majesty's service to venture under such circumstances, even during a lucid interval, to take his Majesty's pleasure upon high matters of State? He would put it even to the noble Lord himself, whether, in the case of a private individual who continued from the 12th of February to the 23rd of April in a state of lunacy, and might within that period have been induced by an attorney to make a will, that noble Lord would consider such will valid? If the transaction should be submitted to the Court of Chancery, what would be the feelings of the Court, what its reprobation of the conduct of the attorney? No court in Westminster-hall, he would venture to say, would give countenance to such a proceeding: and yet their Lordships had in evidence before them, that whilst his Majesty was thus incapable, his royal name had been abused and his sovereign authority exercised; and that at a time when the noble Lord opposite had ventured to assert, and the noble Lord upon the Woolsack to back the assertion, that there was no necessary suspension of the Royal functions. The charge he made upon the noble Lords before their Lordships, and in the face of the country; and with such a transaction in their view, he would ask the House, whether they would suffer this Bill to pass without making effectual provision to prevent the recurrence of similar circumstances; whether, if they should omit to make such provision, they would perform their duty to the public, whose interests they were bound solemnly to secure and to protect. In the evidence of Dr. Reynolds, it appeared that when the King removed to Kew in 1804, he had ceased to attend him, and for this reason, that it would have a better appearance to the public. It also was apparent, from the evidence, that his Majesty was then in such a state as to require medical attendance till October; and he should also assert, and challenge the noble Lord to deny the fact, that Dr. Simmons and his attendants had the control of his Majesty until the 10th of June. For his own part, he would never consent to suffer a Lord Chancellor, a Lord Keeper, or any man, or set of men, however great or distinguished, to possess themselves of the Royal authority, under such circumstances, and exercise the functions of the sovereign: neither should he take the statement of any man, however exalted, as to the competence of his Majesty to the personal exercise of his functions, without other satisfactory proof of his perfect re-establishment. He was sorry to trouble their Lordships at this length upon this delicate subject, but he was anxious to state his sentiments upon it as soon after the noble and learned Lord as possible. The conduct of that Lord on the occasions to which he had called their Lordship's attention, seemed to him extraordinary and inexplicable, and to require some provision to prevent a repetition of it, and particularly when they should come to the clause for securing the resumption of his Royal power by his Majesty.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that he could not avoid stating his opinion, that it was very unfair for noble Lords to select him individually from the whole of the persons who composed the Government in 1801 and 1804, and make him the constant object of their attacks. He thought those noble Lords should, at the same time, have done him the justice of stating, that the course then adopted was from the opinion of the administration generally, and not from his individual opinion. He felt pride in stating that his opinion at that time was supported and strengthened by the unanimous opinion of many great and honourable men, with whom he then acted. He thought that he could satisfy any honourable man of the propriety of his conduct in 1801 and 1804. At all events he thought that it must be allowed that he had no private objects in view at the time, that his using the Great Seal would produce the immediate effect of depriving him of that place which had been the greatest object of his ambition both to get and to retain. There were many illustrious persons present, who perfectly recollected the circumstances of the case in 1804. There was a noble Lord then present (Earl St. Vincent) who, no doubt, recollected how often the subject of his Majesty's state of health was then brought before the consideration of the Cabinet. It was not at that time resolved to bring forward the Royal Commission until the evidence of all the physicians had been given that his Majesty was completely competent to exercise his Royal Authority. If what he had then done was supported by the opinions of all the physicians, it did not follow that he was now guilty of any inconsistency in saying that whatever the report of physicians might be, he would not consent to dethrone his Majesty upon their report merely, if in his judgment and conscience he believed that the King was adequate to the discharge of his Royal functions. He must be permitted to state, that the great man who was then at the head of the administration (Mr. Pitt) had afterwards expressed some surprise, when he found that it had been his fixed resolution never to see his Majesty, at any time when he could be considered under the control of others, or before any persons who might be considered as exercising any control over him. (*Hear, hear!*) His interviews with his Majesty at that time were always in the absence of such persons, and it was his firm conviction, that he was warranted in the course that was then adopted. When he came down to that House, on the 9th of March, 1804 a noble Earl called upon him to consider seriously the consequences of the proceedings going to be adopted. He then replied, that he was perfectly convinced of their propriety; and, however strange it might appear, he could take upon himself to say, that his Majesty on that very day, the 9th of March, 1804, knew and understood the duty that he (the Lord Chancellor) had to exercise, better than he did himself. (*Hear, hear!*) Under such circumstances, it was impossible for him to have pursued any course which would have the effect of dethroning his Majesty.

Earl GREY, in explanation, said, that he had felt it his duty to state his reasons for thinking the provisions in the clause for the resumption of the Royal authority did not afford to the country a sufficient assurance of the restoration of his Majesty's health and capability of discharging his Royal functions. It became his bounden duty when he felt that the assurance was not sufficient, to state to the House why he thought so. If he had distinctly charged the noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor) with the transactions of 1804, if he had selected him from among his colleagues, the reason was that the Constitution of this country always selects for responsibility the individual minister who does any particular act. For any act, then, which was directly within the province of the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chancellor alone was responsible; and it was upon this ground that he had singled him out from the rest of his colleagues upon a question of affixing the Great Seal. If ever the time should come when it might be thought necessary to call the serious attention of the House to the conduct of the noble and learned Lord, the House must determine simply on the propriety of his conduct, and not upon the purity of his intentions, or the coincidence of other people with his opinions. As to the statement of the noble and learned Lord about his never visiting his Majesty in the presence of persons under whose control he might be supposed to be, he would reply, that it appeared from the evidence, that from the 12th of February to the 23rd of April, and even so late as the 10th of June in that year, his Majesty had been attended by Dr. Simmons and his servant, who did exercise a control over the mind of his Majesty. He did not mean to say that this control was constantly exerted, or that

those persons were present when the Sovereign was visited by the noble and learned Lord, but there was a knowledge in the King's mind that those persons were in attendance, and could be brought forward to control him whenever it might be judged necessary. If such were the circumstances of a former case, he would now call upon the Peers of England to say whether the Royal authority should be so usurped on the present or any future occasion. The noble and learned Lord seemed well aware of the efficiency of appealing to the shade of Mr. Pitt; but the circumstances of the present times were totally different from those of 1788. Whatever might be his original opinions of the principle of the present Bill, his wish was now to render it as unobjectionable as it was possible to do.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that if the noble Lord (Lord Grey) thought that he was responsible in a peculiar degree for what had taken place in 1804, he certainly was right to say that such was his opinion. But if any noble Lord would say directly and expressly that he was responsible in a peculiar degree, he would, in as strong language as could be used in a company of gentlemen, assert that it was not true that he was responsible more than the other Members of the Administration.

Lord KING next rose, and after charging the Lord Chancellor with having come down to that House, and affixed the Great Seal to 15 Acts in his Majesty's name, in the month of March, 1804, when it appeared upon the solemn testimony of Dr. Heberden, that his Majesty was insane, moved to expunge from the list of the Queen's Council, the name of John Lord Eldon.

This was opposed by Lord BUCKINGHAMSHIRE and Lord WESTMORELAND, and on a division the numbers were,

Non-Contents	139	} Proxies included.
Contents	54	

Majority 85 against erasing Lord Eldon's name.

Thus stands the matter *at present*. Think of it well, reader, for *this* is the most material point of all. There is nothing belonging to the whole subject a thousandth part so important as this. We now get a sight of what was going on in 1801 and 1804.

I beseech the reader to think well of it.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Tuesday,
January 29, 1811.

London: Printed by Mills and Son,
Gough-square, Fleet-street.
