

THE  
**Black Book ;**  
OR,  
**CORRUPTION UNMASKED !**

BEING AN ACCOUNT OF  
PLACES, PENSIONS, AND SINECURES,  
THE REVENUES OF THE CLERGY AND LANDED ARISTOCRACY ;  
*The Salaries and Emoluments in Courts of Justice and the Police Department ;*  
THE EXPENDITURE OF  
THE CIVIL LIST ;  
THE AMOUNT AND APPLICATION OF THE DROITS OF THE CROWN AND  
ADMIRALTY ;  
*The Robbery of Charitable Foundations ;*  
The Profits of the Bank of England, arising from the Issue of its Notes,  
Balances of Public Money, Management of the Borough Debt,  
and other Sources of Emolument ;  
THE DEBT, REVENUE, AND INFLUENCE OF THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY ;  
THE STATE OF THE FINANCES, DEBT, AND SINKING-FUND.


TO WHICH IS ADDED,  
Correct Lists of both Houses of Parliament ; showing their Family Connections,  
Parliamentary Influence, the Places and Pensions held by themselves  
or Relations ; distinguishing also those who voted against  
Catholic Emancipation, and for the *Seditious Meeting*  
and *Press-Restriction Bills* : the whole forming  
a complete Exposition of the  
COST, INFLUENCE, PATRONAGE, AND CORRUPTION  
OF THE  
BOROUGH GOVERNMENT.

---

London :

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY JOHN FAIRBURN,  
2, BROADWAY, LUDGATE-HILL.

1820.



JUN 21 1955  
W 2  
V. 1

48397

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

*OWING to the demise of the late King, the hereditary revenues revert to the Crown; and, on the assembling of a new Parliament, an entire new arrangement will probably be made in respect of the Civil List Expenditure: this arrangement, and other changes under the new reign, may render it necessary to publish a Supplementary Part, and, if so, public notice will be given previous to publication.*

*February 14, 1820.*

---

\*.\* It is suggested to purchasers, for the sake of uniformity, and as being most appropriate to its name and contents, that the **BLACK BOOK** be *bound in black*.





# DEDICATION

AND

## INTRODUCTION

TO

*The Working, the Agricultural, the Commercial, and  
Manufacturing Classes of the Community.*

---

TO these classes the subject of this work peculiarly belongs: it is an exposition of the chief causes of their poverty and embarrassment; it will show why a powerful nation, meriting happiness and greatness by its physical resources and intellectual power, by its high moral character—its skill—its capital—its enterprise, and, above all, by its unwearied industry, it will show why such a nation is the most wretched, its population the most degraded, its government the most corrupt, its clergy the most rapacious and hypocritical, and its laws the most expensive and absurd which can be found on the face of the earth.

The object of government is to promote the happiness of society—affording equal security to the property and persons of every individual,—protecting the weak against the strong—the poor against the rich,—in short, by guarding against the extremes of indigence and crime, luxury and vice, and spreading an equilibrium of comfort and enjoyment through all ranks, by good laws, wisely conceived and impartially administered.

It is a cheap, simple, and admirable contrivance, when supported by the respect and confidence of the public. There is then no need of standing armies in a time of peace. There is no need of expending 16 millions a year in support of naval and military establishments. There is no need of a Sinking Fund as a resource for future war. Government is strong in the hearts of the people. It is prepared for every exigence, and must always be invincible against domestic foes and foreign aggressors. But if government has not this support, if it is looked upon only as an instrument of rapacity and extortion; if it is looked upon as a legalized system of pillage,

fraud, and delusion; if it is looked upon only as an artful cabal of tyrants, united for plunder and oppression; then must such a government, instead of being a cheap and simple institution, be a complex and expensive establishment—strong, not in the people, but in its means of corruption, delusion, and intimidation.

The English government seems in the latter predicament. It has long ceased to possess the respect and confidence of the people, and it has governed by over-awing the weak, deluding the ignorant, and corrupting the baser part of the community. The latter—its power of corruption—its means of rewarding its adherents by the spoil of the people, is the great lever by which it operates. This power, its connexion and influence, as exhibited in our church-establishment, the administration of justice, and what more particularly belongs to government, it is the object of this work to develope.

Many persons still seem to expect retrenchment under such a system. A fallacious hope! To retrench is to weaken; its policy is to spend, not to save. There are, no doubt, scores, nay thousands, of offices, useless indeed to the people, but invaluable to their rulers. The greater the sinecure, the greater its importance; and the very reason urged by the people for its abolition, is the strongest argument for its continuance by their oppressors. Could government only reward its servants in proportion to their deserts, what inducement would there be to enter into its service? Who would incur the odium of such employment? How could it obtain adherents? How could it have zealous supporters in every part of the empire, and carry on an execrable system, which has trampled on the rights, and is incompatible with the happiness of the people?

Ministers, weak and contemptible, are yet too wise to depend on their wisdom and justice; they depend on *force* and *corruption*; on the bayonets of the military, and the expenditure of 60 millions of money. These form the right and left hand, the master principles of the system. The support they cannot bribe they will intimidate. Their principles have been clearly manifested during the present Session of Parliament. Let us for a moment look at their efforts to maintain a large military establishment, and to avoid any reduction in the public expenditure.

The cheap, natural, and most effective defence of this country is certainly the navy; but ministers think otherwise. With them the *army*, and not the *navy*, is a primary object.

Of 16 millions, the estimated expense of the army and navy, upwards of 10 millions is for the army alone. In the third Report of the Finance Committee, a saving of £14,000 is recommended by the reduction of the *Naval Asylum*, where 1000 orphan children are fed, clothed, and educated: but the *Military Asylum*, which costs the public £36,000 a year is to be kept up! Again, the *Military College*, at Sandhurst, costs more than £25,000 a year, and for what? why, there are 30 masters to teach 320 scholars, and this establishment has given to the public service about 20 cadets a year, which is an expense of more than £1000 each!

Now, why this lavish expenditure on the army?—why its preference to the navy? Plainly this,—ministers are not apprehensive of foreign aggression, but of domestic resistance; their black and iron system is not endangered from without, but within; it is the PEOPLE, not France or America, of whom they are afraid, and whom they are preparing to resist. Let us pass on to the subject of retrenchment.

The Finance-Committee could suggest no practicable saving in the *army-estimates*. A Correspondent, in "*The Times*," May 10, shows clearly, in a statement which has not been contradicted, that £250,000 might be saved to the public in that department alone, principally in the Commander-in-Chief's office, and the military establishments which have been mentioned. The Ordnance department swallows nearly £1,200,000 of the public money, £34,000 of which sum is expended in pensions, &c. Can any one believe there could be no reduction in this branch? Mr. Tierney, no niggardly politician, asserted that *one million* might be saved by economy in the public expenditure. But why not reduce the salaries of the persons employed in the public offices? There are betwixt 3 and 4000 persons of this description; their incomes have increased from 20 to 30 per cent. within the last twenty years; why not reduce them to their former amount? The Board of Excise has offered to collect the customs at an expense of 5 instead of 13 per cent. which they now cost, and thus save the public half a million a year. Will this proposition be acceded to? No! Why? because it would lessen the patronage of ministers; it would abolish a whole host of placemen, of comptrollers, of commissioners and of collectors almost innumerable. Then, again, there are 64 commissioners appointed to collect the revenue; there are commissioners to audit the public accounts; there are receivers of taxes, receivers of assessed taxes, and distributors of stamps. Many of these have incomes of £5000, and none

less than £700 a year. The duties of some are wholly discharged by deputy; and of others, they have merely to affix their signature for the monies they receive. All these are either wholly or nearly useless to the public; under a good government they would either be entirely abolished or greatly reduced; but then they are necessary under a system like ours, which has only such things to depend on for support.

It would be easy to point out other branches of lavish expenditure, were it possible to believe that retrenchment was either the policy or wish of ministers. After the appointment of the two *lay lords* of the Admiralty, their most bigoted admirers must be convinced that they will not make the smallest sacrifice to the necessities of the country, that they will not give up a single office which they have the power to retain. The grant to the Duke of York is another measure of the same character. Language does not afford terms sufficiently strong to do justice to that transaction. From his different appointments, probably, the Duke does not receive less than £100,000 per annum;—and when we reflect on the unparalleled sufferings of the people, to wring from them £10,000 more, for an office for which a brute would blush to receive a reward, we say language cannot describe the atrocious transaction.

Instead of lightening the burdens of the people by retrenchment, THREE MILLIONS of additional taxes are to be imposed to supply the waste of government; and upon whom are they to be levied? Not upon the clergy, the fundholders, nor the landholders;—no! upon none of these, but upon the useful classes, upon those classes we are now addressing. But it is upon the working classes that the fresh burdens fall with the most merciless weight. Instead of relieving them from the salt-tax, the duties on leather, soap, and candles; they are loaded with new imposts still more oppressive, and pursued through the whole circle of their enjoyments—beer—clothing—tea—tobacco—nothing has escaped the rapacity of their oppressors.

This is the only answer the people have to their petitions and sufferings. The resources of a system, that breathes nothing but inhumanity, injustice, and extravagance, and which exists in opposition to the wishes and interests of the people, it is the object of this work to expose.

THE

# Black Book;

OR,

## CORRUPTION UNMASKED.

ON

### PLACES, SINECURES, PENSIONS,

AND

### REVERSIONS.

“That no person who has an office or place of profit under the King, or receives a pension from the Crown, shall be capable of serving as a Member of the House of Commons.”—*Act of Settlement, 12 and 13 William III.*

“It should always be remembered, that every eighteen pounds a year, paid to any Placeman or Pensioner, withdraws from the public the means of giving active employment to one individual, as the head of a family, thus depriving five persons of sustenance from the fruits of honest industry and active labour, and rendering them paupers.”—*Richard Preston, Esq. M.P. and a supporter of the Pitt-System.*

LOOK at the motto! Look at the motto! It is no matter that the clause in the Act which placed the present family on the throne is repealed, the invaluable, constitutional, and fundamental principle still remains. In framing that enactment our forefathers wisely foresaw that no man could serve two masters; that a servant of the

crown could not at the same time be a faithful servant of the people; and that a Member of Parliament ought not to be allowed to spend the money which he is expressly deputed to save. It belongs to a subsequent part of this work to treat of the salaries and pensions of Members of the present Parliament; but there is a fact connected with this subject, for which the public is indebted to a motion of the gallant Cochrane, to which we cannot forbear adverting, and which will show the extent of the violation of the principle on which we are commenting. The fact to which we allude is in the Supplementary Report of the Committee of Expenditure, in May, 1809, where it is shown that seventy-six Members of the then Parliament, received in salaries and pensions, free from all deduction, £164,003.

Having adverted to this great constitutional principle, we shall now, conformably to our plan, give an introductory essay on Places and Pensions.

From changes in the mode of managing the revenue, and in the administration of justice, and partly from the union of the three kingdoms, there is a considerable number of offices to which no duties whatever are attached, and of which the holders, without either employment or responsibility, have only to receive the salaries and emoluments. Of this description is the Chief-Justiceship in Eyre, north of Trent, held by Mr. Villiers, with a salary of £2250; the Keeper of the Signet in Ireland, held by Lord Colchester, with a salary of £1500; the office of Lord Justice-General in Scotland, held for many years by persons not brought up even to the profession of law.

Next to offices of this cast, are those of which the salaries are vastly disproportioned to the employment, and of which the duties are discharged wholly by deputy. This forms a very numerous class. As specimens of Sinécures of this character we may mention the Auditorship of the Exchequer, held by Lord Grenville, with a salary of £4000; the Registrarship of the Admiralty, held by Lord Arden, with a salary of £10,000; the Clerkship of the Pells, held by a son of Lord Sidmouth, with a salary of £3000; and the Tellerships of the Exchequer. Many offices in the Courts of Justice belong to this head, and we may also add a host of Commissioners for the collection

*On Places, Sinecures, Pensions, and Reversions.*

of the Revenue, the Receivers of Taxes, and Distributers of Stamps. But the chief *nidus* is in the colonies. The duties of nearly all offices in the West Indies are discharged by deputy, while the principal resides in England. They form an immense branch of patronage to the crown. It is impossible to estimate correctly their total value, the incomes being paid in fees, received by the deputy, who stipulates to pay a fixed annual sum to the principal. The total value of colonial sinecures, exclusive of those at the Cape of Good Hope, the Isle of France, and Malta, has been estimated at £76,546.

The following Statement, taken from the Supplementary Report of the Committee of Public Expenditure in 1809, shows the *net* value of the principal sinecures in the gift of the Crown, and otherwise :—

In the English Law Courts, not generally in the gift of the Crown,	£ 62,462
Sinecures in England, not in Law Courts.....	115,589
<b>Ditto in Scotland .....</b>	<b>25,523</b>
<b>Ditto in Ireland .....</b>	<b>76,435</b>
<b>To which add Colonial Sinecures .....</b>	<b>76,546</b>
	<u>£356,555</u>

Having spoken of *Sinecures*, we come next to their natural offspring—*Reversions*. It was very natural that the holders of situations, to which large emoluments and no duties were attached, should not only wish to preserve them during their lives, but also, if possible, transmit them to their relatives and friends after their death: hence originated grants in reversion. Another reason, however, may be assigned.—Ministers not having situations in sufficient abundance to satisfy all their adherents, endeavoured to satisfy them by anticipation. Those for whom they could not immediately provide, they satisfied by obtaining grants from the king, making them the heirs of places at the death of the present possessors. Sometimes these reversions were granted to two or three persons at once; first to one, and if *he* or *she* should die, to *another*; and if *he* or *she* should die, to another: in this way have been granted most of the places on the Irish establishment for sixty or seventy years to come.

The absurdity of this practice is sufficiently obvious. Nothing

could be more ridiculous than to appoint persons to offices who were, perhaps, yet in the nursery; and of whose future capabilities it was impossible to have any knowledge. To be sure, many of these reversionary situations had no duties attached to them; and, of course, it could not be of much importance by whom they were discharged.

From the large emoluments of Sinecures, and the granting them in reversion, have originated many ludicrous incongruities. "Many *Noble Lords* and their sons, Rt. Hon. and Hon. Gentlemen, fill the offices of Clerks, Tide-Waiters, Harbour-Masters, Searchers, Guagers, Packers, Craners, Wharfingers, Prothonotaries, and other degrading situations. Some of these officers are filled by women—by fine ladies too; some by children, but then these children are of *high blood*, and, of course, they have extraordinary faculties. There is one fine lady, a *Baroness*, who is Sweeper of the Mall in the Park, for £340 a year; Lady Arabella Heneage is *Chief Usher* in the Court of Exchequer; and the *Honourable* Louisa Browning and Lady B. Martyn are *Custos Brevium* in the Court of Common Pleas. Then, again, of Noble Lords, the Duke of Grafton is *Sealer* in the King's Bench, at £2886 a year; Lord Walsingham is in the petty office of Comptroller of First-fruits in the Court of Exchequer; and Lord W. Bentinck is Clerk of the Pipe, part of whose office it is to attend the man who holds up the Lord Chancellor's robe.

We could enumerate a great many more, but they will be noticed in our List; we shall now pass on to Pensions.

Of Pensions and Grants there are, in the official accounts, *eleven hundred and nine names*, receiving in the whole £642,621 a year.\* No inconsiderable part of this sum has been granted to "*late Foreign Ministers*;" men who have been sent abroad two or three years, and then return home and receive a swinging pension for life. Forty-seven of these persons receive £51,589 a year out of the

\* Since these accounts were published, there has been a very considerable addition to the Pension-List. In the Ordnance department alone we have already noticed an addition of more than £6000 per annum.



earnings of the people, who are in the deepest misery for food and clothing. This, however, is not the most objectionable class; the wives of such men as Mr. Huskisson and Lord Grenville are to receive enormous pensions at their death, while they are already saddled on the public for prodigious sums. Then there are swarms of misses, of mistresses, and of honourable ladies;—of the Herries, the Pagets, the Selwyns, the Piersons, the Napiers, and scores more, of whom we know nothing, and of whom the public know nothing, except their pensions. Foreigners too,—aye, foreigners are on the Pension-List; men have been brought from all parts of the earth, from America, from Germany, from France,—and myriads from Scotland, to eat our bread, and devour the wages of labour and the profits of trade.

The salaries of public servants ought to be their only remuneration, and the granting of Pensions is altogether unjustifiable, unless for casualties in the service of the country; but when they are squandered on persons of whom the public know nothing, nor for what, they are an intolerable grievance. At the close of the American war, when the country was very much straightened, an Act was passed to restrain the lavish expenditure of the public money in this department. This Act ordains “That no pension, exceeding the sum of £300 a year, should be granted for the use of any person, and that the whole of the pensions granted in *any one year should not exceed £600*, a list of which, together with the names of the persons to whom they were granted, should be laid before Parliament within *twenty days after the beginning of each session*, until the whole Pension-List should be reduced to £90,000, which sum it should not be lawful to *exceed by more than £5000 in the whole of all the grants.*” How rigorously this enactment has been observed, will be seen from the following pages:—like every other fundamental law made for the protection of the persons or property of the people, it has either been evaded or abrogated.

It only now remains to give an estimate of the whole of the public money wasted on the subjects we have been describing. We shall digest our statement from the parliamentary papers to which we have

---

*On Places, Sinecures, Pensions, and Reversions.*


---

already referred. The sums we have put down are the net amount, the gross sums would be nearly one-fourth more.

A Summary Statement of Sinecure Offices, Pensions, and Reversions, exclusive of Allowances to Naval and Military Officers and their Relatives, on account of Naval or Military Service:—

Royal Family . . . . .	£365,000
Pensions granted by Parliament as Compensation for eminent Public Services . . . . .	93,990
Pensions limited by law to £95,000 . . . . .	63,000
Pensions paid out of the Scotch Civil List . . . . .	85,588
Pensions, Ireland . . . . .	92,042
Sundry other Pensions, paid out of 4½ per cent. Duties, &c. . . . .	58,248
Pensions of the nature of Compensation for the Loss of Offices in England . . . . .	12,020
Ditto in Ireland . . . . .	89,245
Pensions in the nature of Superannuations for Services in the Public Offices . . . . .	97,271
Total Value of Sinecure Offices . . . . .	356,556*
Total Amount of Offices granted in Reversion, and of Pensions on the Irish Pension-List for more than one life . . . . .	140,524
Grand Total . . . . .	£1,373,490

When the reader has reflected on this enormous sum, which excludes all salaries, properly so called, and allowances for naval and military services, let him turn to the extract from Mr. Preston, where it is asserted, that every *eighteen pounds* abstracted in this manner from the people, deprives *5 persons of sustenance*; whence it follows, that *381,525 persons are deprived of sustenance by Pensioners and Sinecurists alone!!!*

Since concluding the above article, we have seen a paper by Mr. Knight, intituled, "*An Analysis of the Red Book*," from which we are tempted to make a curious extract.

\* See page 7.

*On Places, Sinecures, Pensions, and Reversions.*A CLASSIFICATION of Placemen, Pensioners, &c. with their  
Yearly Allowances.

Number of Persons.	Yearly Sum.		Total.
	£	£	£
251 have	50 to	60 ..	18,938
68 ..	60 ..	70 ..	4,242
58 ..	70 ..	80 ..	4,246
15 ..	80 ..	90 ..	1,213
32 ..	90 ..	100 ..	2,962
540 ..	100 ..	200 ..	63,826
266 ..	200 ..	300 ..	57,598
194 ..	300 ..	400 ..	61,568
110 ..	400 ..	500 ..	45,507
181 ..	500 ..	600 ..	77,068
76 ..	600 ..	700 ..	46,563
35 ..	700 ..	800 ..	25,819
41 ..	800 ..	900 ..	33,013
20 ..	900 ..	1,000 ..	18,688
234 ..	1,000 ..	2,000 ..	304,857
97 ..	2,000 ..	3,000 ..	217,118
49 ..	3,000 ..	4,000 ..	156,778
33 ..	4,000 ..	5,000 ..	140,263
17 ..	5,000 ..	6,000 ..	89,066
12 ..	6,000 ..	7,000 ..	82,817
11 ..	7,000 ..	8,000 ..	61,128
7 ..	8,000 ..	9,000 ..	58,254
6 ..	9,000 ..	10,000 ..	54,756
25 ..	10,000 ..	20,000 ..	349,581
7 ..	20,000 ..	30,000 ..	181,686
6 ..	30,000 ..	40,000 ..	197,479
2 ..	50,000 ..	and upwards	100,631

2,344 Persons receive yearly

£2,474,806

# LIST

## PLACES, PENSIONS, &c.\*

Names marked *p* are patent pensions; *s. m.* pensions by sign manual; *c* contingent pensions; *pl* during pleasure; *l* for life; *w* pensions paid by warrant; *i* Irish, and *s* Scotch pensions.

ABBOT, sir Charles, lord chief justice, court of King's Bench.....	£ 4000	0	0
—— John Henry, esq. marshal and associate to the chief justice .....	990	0	0
—— Thomas, deputy ditto .....			

The two latter are the sons of the chief justice. The patronage and emoluments of the chief justiceship are enormous. In a *Report on Saleable Offices in the Courts of Law*, made in 1810, fifteen offices are enumerated as saleable in the King's Bench, and the disposal of which is vested either in the chief justice, or in persons appointed by him. The duties of seven of these offices, of which the fees and emoluments, on an average of three years, amounted to £15,022 : 19 : 3, were discharged wholly by deputies; to whom were paid £1356 : 13 : 0, or one-eleventh part of the total receipt. The duties of the remaining eight saleable offices; of which the average annual value, during the same period, was £6941 : 1 : 1, were executed in person. Thus we see, that the lord chief justice has offices to sell of the annual value of £21,964 : 1 : 10, and that for two-thirds of that sum, no duties whatever are to perform by the purchasers. After this statement, it will not appear surprising, that 70,000 guineas have been offered for situations in the gift of the chief justices, and refused. The statute of the 5th and 6th of Edward VI. prohibits the sale of any office, which in anywise concerns the administration of justice; but this law, we suppose, like many others, inconvenient in practice, has been suffered to grow obsolete by those by whom it ought to have been administered. We have not yet stated the whole of the good things

\* Our intention at first was to give separate alphabetical lists of persons in the church, government, and law; but it afterwards occurred to us that the reader, according to that plan, would frequently be at a loss with a particular name under what head to look for it, therefore we determined to give a general list of all places, and treat of each subject separately afterwards.

Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

appertaining to this situation. The place of marshal to the King's-Bench prison, from the enormous profits on the sale of ale and porter to the prisoners, and the granting of the rules, cannot be estimated at much less than £8000 per annum; and among the *cheese-parings* of office, the chief justice receives annually at Christmas, four yards of broad cloth from Blackwell-hall, and thirty-six loaves of sugar, presented to him by particular officers on the plea side of the court. Perhaps the annual emoluments of the chief justice are nearly equal to those of the lord chancellor, and may be estimated at £25,000 a year.

Abercrombie, sir George, bart. sheriff-depute for Elgin and Nairn .....	£ 500	0	0
Abercrombie, sir George, bart. clerk to the admission of notaries in court of sessions, paid by fees .....	(s) 473	0	0
Abercrombie, general sir Robert, governor of Edinburgh-castle .....	300	0	0
Abercrombie, hon. James, M.P. for Calne, commissioner of bankrupts .....	350	0	0
Abercrombie, baroness, for her life, and afterwards to the two next succeeding male heirs of sir Ralph Abercrombie .....	2000	0	0
Widow of the gallant sir Ralph Abercrombie, and mother of Lieut. general sir John Abercrombie.			
Aberdeen, Earl of .....	600	0	0
Acheson, hon. Edward, customer and collector, Dublin .....	(i) 1500	0	0
Acklom, capt. George, adj. Chelsea hospital .....	100	0	0
Adam, William, right hon. baron of the exchequer .....	(s) £2000	}	4000
_____ lord chief commissioner of the jury court in Scotland ....	2000		
Adams, W. Esq. gen. com. lott. office .....	200	0	0
There are no fewer than 20 general commissioners of the lottery office, besides 5 certificate commissioners, comptrollers, &c. Notwithstanding the vicious principle of these establishments, the profit and patronage resulting from them still continue more than a match for the morality and piety of the chancellor of the exchequer			
Adderly, George, provost-marshal at Trinidad .....	211	0	0
Addington, Henry Unwin, secretary of legation at Switzerland .....	590	0	0
_____ hon. Henry, clerk of the pells .....	3000	0	0
_____ right hon. John Hiley Addington, high steward of Harwich, under secretary of state for the home department .....	2135	0	0
Henry Unwin is a nephew, the hon. Henry a son, and John Hiley a brother, of the pibits and humane secretary of state, viscount Sidmouth.			
Agge, hon. C. clerk of the paper office .....	500	0	0

*Pacts, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Ainge, Edward, gentleman pensioner .....	£ 100	0	0
Ainslie, sir Robt. September 8, 1716..... (p)	100	0	0
Ainslie, C. governor of Dominica .....	1800	0	0
Alban's, St. duke of, grand falconer, hereditary) .....	£1372	}	2012 10 0
— registrar of the court			
of chancery (hereditary) .....	640		
This duke is one of the many illegitimate descendants of Charles II. and is the fruit of that amorous monarch's connexion with <i>Nell Gwynn</i> , the celebrated actress. There are three more noble Dukes in the English Peerage—Grafton, Richmond, and Queensberry, who can boast a similar origin, and in whose veins flows the glorious blood of prostitutes and kings!			
Aldbrough, lord, agent to the forces on the Irish establishment, serving abroad .....	(i)	981	3 0
Alexander, Henry, chairman of the committee of supply and ways and means .....	(i)	500	0 0
Allen, Richard, esq. consul at Gallicia .....		400	0 0
Allen, Thomas, superan. lieut. in the navy .....		109	0 0
Allen, John, Esq. clerk of the cheque, king's yeoman guard .....		150	0 0
Alton, countess d', May 29, 1795 .....		500	0 0
Alt, Christiana Henrietta, and Maria .....		150	0 0
Alves, Henry Scot, master of the mint in Scotland (sinecure) .....	(s)	200	0 0
Amherst, William Pitt, baron Amherst ..	£3000	}	4000 0 0
— lord			
of the chamber .....	1000		
Amitand, lady d', formerly <i>Lady Augusta Murray</i> .....		2578	0 0
This lady is the daughter of the earl of Dunmore. She was married to the Duke of Sussex at Rome; but the marriage being contrary to the 12 Geo. III. it was declared null and void; and, we suppose, as a compensation for her disappointment, for we know no other pretext, the public has been burdened with this enormous pension.			
Amyot, Thomas, secretary and register of records in Lower Canada .....		454	0 0
Anderson, Francis, esq. ....	(s)	100	0 0
Anderson, Janet, (probably his wife) .....	(s)	100	0 0
Andrews, John, clerk in navy office .....		150	0 0
Anguish, rev. George, prebendary of Norwich .....		300	0 0
Annesley, hon. Robert, consul at Antwerp .....		600	0 0
Anningson, Joseph .....		109	0 0
Anstey, John, esq. commissioner for auditing the public accounts .....		1200	0 0
Anstruther, John, sheriff-depute for Fife .....	(s)	500	0 0
Anstruther, right hon. sir John, receiver-general of bishops' rents in Scotland .....		400	0 0

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Athlone, earl of.....(i)	£ 2000	0	0
Atkinson, Joseph, secretary to the board of ordnance.....(i)	520	3	6
Apsley, lord, M.P. commissioner for the affairs of India.....	1500	0	0
Arbuthnot, right hon. Charles, ambassador to Constantinople, April 5, 1804, pension commenced July 5, 1807.....	£2000	5000	0 0
joint secretary of the treasury.....	£3000		
Arden, Charles George, lord, (brother of the late Mr. Perceval,) register of the high court of admiralty, appeals for prizes and delegates	38,574	0	0
This is the gross amount of his lordship's income;—deductions have been given in to the amount of £26,012, making his net income £12,562.—In a list of payments out of the droits of the crown and admiralty, we observe his lordship received two sums, one of £6000, and another of £16,000 for poundage, as the perquisites of his office. The disinterested loyalty of this nobleman was marvellously exemplified in an animated speech he once made in the upper house, in defence of reversionary grants; asserting that an attempt to abolish them was an “ <i>indecent attack upon the king's LAWFUL prerogative.</i> ”			
Arden, Samuel, superan. capt. in the royal navy..	219	0	0
Arnold, Edward Shippen, James Robertson, George and Sophia Matilda.....	500	0	0
These are the children of the notorious American, General Arnold; famous for having first taken up arms in favour of American independence, and then deserting the glorious cause.			
Ashington, Henry, superan. lieut. in the navy.....	109	10	0
Ashurst, sir William Henry,—(by act of parliament)	2000	0	0
Astell, William, East India director.....	300	0	0
Brother-in-law to earl Poulett, proprietor of the borough of Bridgewater.			
Astle, Thomas, late commissioner for the care of state papers.....	200	0	0
Athol, duke of, pension.....	4059	9	6½
— in trust for Charlotte, Louisa, and Emily Murray, as long as they shall remain unmarried.....(s)			
Atkinson, James Muncaster, gentleman pensioner..	100	0	0
Auckland, lady.....	1296	0	0
The late lord Auckland, husband of this lady, who is usually inserted in the pension-list as a foreign minister, died in 1814. He had pensions and other appointments to the amount of £4000. The present lord is auditor and director of Greenwich hospital, £100.			
Audley, lord.....	500	0	0
Augusta, princess, (civil list).....	9000	0	0
Aust, George, commissary-general.....	2755	6	6

<b>Ayscough, Ann, admiral's daughter, determinable on her marriage</b> .....	£ 100	0	0
The equity with which pensions are squandered is evident from this—here is a poor admiral's daughter, with a solitary £100, determinable on her marriage, while, further on, we shall find <i>Eleanor Madelina Wickham</i> with a pension of £675 during the life of her husband, who is loaded with pensions besides.			
<b>Avonmore, right hon. lord, searcher, packer, and guager, port of Cork</b> .....	(i)	901	0 0
Only think of this;—a <i>right honourable</i> lord searcher and packer at a sea port!			
<b>Aylmer, lord baron</b> .....		600	0 0
<b>Sundry pensions under £100</b> .....		1355	10 5

## B

<b>BABINGTON, D.</b> } -----W.C. }	chirographers, partly by deputy	£ 628	0	0
<b>Badcock, T. G.</b>	distributor of stamps for Buckinghamshire .....	414	0	0
<b>Bagot, hon. C.</b>	envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary in America .....	6500	0	0
<b>Bagwell, right hon. William,</b>	governor of the county of Tipperary.....			
-----	joint muster-master-general for Ireland .....	2374	0	0
<b>Bailey, —</b>	gentleman pensioner .....	100	0	0
<b>Baillie, Alex. F.</b>	superan. capt. in navy .....	109	0	0
<b>Baillie, Helen Douglas</b> .....	(s)	100	0	0
<b>Baillie, William, esq. of Polkemet</b> .....		1500	0	0
<b>Baillie, William, of Dumfries</b> .....	(s)	240	0	0
<b>Baird, John, superan. capt. navy</b> .....		109	0	0
<b>Baker, Anthony A. John,</b>	consul-general North America.....	1672	0	0
-----	Robert, esq. police magistrate Marlborough-street-office .....	600	0	0
<b>Balcarras, earl of</b> .....		300	0	0
<b>Baldwin, John,</b>	receiver of the seven police offices..	16,843	17	10
<b>Bamley, Samuel,</b>	superan. capt. ....	109	10	0
<b>Banks, sir Joseph,</b>	recorder of Boston .....	300	0	0
<b>Banatyne, John, Lanerk</b> .....	(s)	150	0	0
<b>Banatyne, William M'Leod, esq. of Banatyne,</b>	lord of session.....	2000	0	0
-----	(s)			
<b>Barclay, John, Tain</b> .....	(s)	150	0	0

It is impossible to help remarking the crowd of Scotch



*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

names which throng upon us here. The Scotch seem to take as much out of the Public Treasury in pensions and salaries, as they put into it in taxes and imposts. Scotland is certainly greatly indebted to the establishment of banks and parochial schools, but she is not less indebted for her prosperity to lord Bute, who first opened the way to the "RED BOOK." In the *Third Report of the Committee on the Public Expenditure*, in 1808, it is remarked, that Scotch pensions, which at the commencement of the present reign amounted only to 19, in 1797 had swelled to 185, and in 1808 to 331;—two thirds of these pensions had been granted to females!

Barkie, Hugh, superan. capt. in navy.....	£219	0	0
Barne, Barne, commissioner of taxes.....	500	0	0
Barne, Snow, lord treasurer's remembrancer, (exchequer,) .....	340	0	0
Barnes, col. Edw. lieut.-gov. of Leeward Islands..	300	0	0
Barlow, R. P. esq. inspector of East India ship-letters .....	400	0	0
Barlow, Sophia.....	100	0	0
Barow, James, superan. capt. navy .....	109	10	0
Barrington, rev. George, B.D. prebend of Durham	1300	0	0
hön. Shute, bishop of Durham .....	19,000	0	0
<p>The holder of this rich bishopric is an uncle of viscount Barrington. Three of the most valuable bishoprics,—Canterbury, Winchester, and Durham, and more than one-half of the remainder, are in the hands of the relatives of Borough-mongers. We shall have occasion to say more on this subject hereafter.</p>			
Barrow, John, secretary to admiralty .....	2000	0	0
<p>This gentleman is a principal contributor to the <i>Quarterly Review</i>. On retiring from his sinecure situation, Mr. Barrow's pension of £1000 a year commences, so that the public will still continue burdered with one half his salary.</p>			
Barry, right hon. John M. a lord of the treasury..	1600	0	0
<p>Brother-in-law of the earl of Mountnorris, and first cousin to the earl of Cavan; trustee of the linen manufacture, and col. of Cavan militia.</p>			
Bartholomew, John, old inspector of wheel-carriages .....	100	0	0
(s)			
Barton, Newton, inspector-general of inland duties	500	0	0
Bates, Edw. assistant clerk in the treasury, private sec. to Mr. Arbuthnot, comptroller of the 4½ plantation duties in the customs (sinecure) ..	1200	0	0
Bates, Sarah, July 20, 1793.....	500	0	0
(L)			

What services we wonder has Sarah Bates rendered to the community, to entitle her to £7000 of the public money? Probably she is indebted for her good fortune solely to being the wife of sister of Edward Bates. The introduction of one person on the pension-list, generally prepares the way for the family; and the reader must have remarked, that the names seldom come single, but generally in clusters, including the wife and sister of the principal.

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinicures, and Emoluments.*

Bathurst, right hon. Charles, M.P. chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster .....	£4525	0	0
Brother-in-law of lord Sidmouth, and barrister at law.			
Bathurst, earl, } clerks of the crown court			
— hon. } of chancery* .....	£1610		
— Apsley, } secretary at war .....	6000		
— earl, } commissioner of the affairs of			
— India .....	1500		
— teller of the exchequer, (deputy and clerks paid out of it).....	23117		
— clerk of dispensations and faculties .....	473		
	<b>32,700</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

These form a sort of *lay pluralists*, with incomes, which would maintain about 80,000 working families, at the present rate of wages in Lancashire. There are two more of the Bathursts, namely,

Bathurst, lieut.-col. James, lieut.-gov. of Virginia Islands .....	200	0	0
— lieut.-gov. of Tortola .....	200	0	0
— Henry, bishop of Norwich (value of see) ..	6000	0	0
Balliscomb, R. esq. apothecary royal household ..	100	0	0
Batt, John Thomas, July 24, 1806.....( <i>s.m.</i> )	770	0	0
Bayley, sir Daniel, consul-gen. at St. Petersburg ..	1000	0	0
Bayley, sir John, senior puisne judge King's Bench	4000	0	0
This salary, payable out of the treasury, was fixed by 39 Geo. III. cap. 110, in lieu of fees, and other pecuniary emoluments, formerly paid to the judges. In addition however to the above sum, the senior puisne judge receives £10 in every term, out of the monies payable into court, in consideration of his trouble in giving the charge to the grand jury, and pronouncing judgment on malefactors. In common with the other puisne judges, he also receives annually, according to ancient usage, a small silver plate and 18 loaves of sugar, presented by officers on the plea side of the court.			
Baynham, Thos. assistant fire-master in laboratory( <i>i</i> )	130	0	0
Baxter, J. F. esq. gen. com. lottery office.....	200	0	0
Beadon, Rich. bishop of Bath and Wells .....	3300	0	0
Dr. Beadon was tutor to the duke of Gloucester.			
Bearcroft, Clare St. John, May 9, 1800 ....( <i>s.m.</i> )	200	0	0
Beauclerk, John, commissioner of bankrupts .....	250	0	0
— Henrietta Martha Charlotte .....	300	0	0
Beckett, John, (late under secretary of state,) judge advocate .....	2552	12	6
Son-in-law of lord Lowther, and son of sir John Beckett, banker, Leeds. Sir John was formerly a cotton-spinner, at			

\* The reversion of this office is granted to the hon. William Henry John Scott for life, after the demise of its present possessors.

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Barnsly; he then became a banker; and, lastly, a knight! A foolish story is told at Leeds, that sir John formerly ruled that *loyal* and *stupid* borough like a *king*; and that the borough ruled the county of York; and the county of York ruled *Billy Pitt*; so that, in fact, sir John ruled the British empire. This seems something like the story of the bung-hole, in Hamlet, and wants connexion. However, knowing sir John, we may say, supposing that such a man had any influence in the councils of *Pitt*, it would sufficiently account for the calamities of that and a subsequent period. The Judge-Advocate lately attempted to *speechify* in the House of Commons, but, from the specimen he gave of his *humanity* and *talents*, we presume, he concluded that the wisest course in future would be to hold his tongue, and we are happy to say we have not since heard him attempt an oration.

Bedford, J. esq. chief justice of admiralty, Barbadoes .....	£893	12	4	
Belcher, John, tipstaff to King's Bench prison....	130	0	0	
The tipstuffs have no salary, but are paid in fees, which probably amount to considerably more than is here put down.				
Bell, Archibald, sheriff-depute for Ayr..... (s)	500	0	0	
Bellingham, sir William, principal officer and commissioner of the navy, Aug. 6, 1803 .....	£500	}	1050 0 0	
_____ wife of ..... (pl) 330				
_____ pension .....	220			
Bellyse, J. E. W. prothonotary in the Caernarvon and Anglesey circuit.....	250	0	0	
Benton, Richard, gentleman pensioner .....	100	0	0	
Bentinck, W. H. E. naval officer in Barbadoes £200	}	509	0 0	
_____ clerk of the signet.....				369
_____ lord W. C. C. treasurer of the household				1200
_____ William, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Sicilies .....	£6500	}	7468 0 0	
_____ clerk of the pipe in the court of chancery.....	968			
Well done the Bentincks! but only think of lord William, the son of a duke, lieutenant-general in the army, minister plenipotentiary, &c. filling the office of <i>clerk of the pipe</i> ; part of whose duty is to attend the man who <i>holds up the tail of the lord chancellor's robe</i> , when he enters and leaves the court!				
Berkeley, C. corrector and supervisor of his majesty's printing press, ( <i>sinecure</i> ) .....	(i)	209	0 0	
Bernard, Andrew, clerk of the quit rents, customs (i)	(i)	500	0 0	
Beresford, lord George Thomas, comptroller to the king's household .....		2000	0 0	
_____ John, jun. } <i>wine tasters</i> .....	(i)	1000	0 0	
_____ James, jun. }				
_____ John, <i>purse-bearer</i> to secretary to the lord chancellor....	(i)	91	1 3	
Berkeley, lord, constable of Dean Forest.....		210	0 0	

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Berkeley, Frederick Augustus, earl of, keeper of St. Briaval's castle.....	£ 210	0	0
Bernard, Thomas and John Hosier, Sept. 2, 1796.	600	0	0
——— rev. Robert, prebendary of Winchester....	400	0	0
Best, William Draper, esq. judge of the court of King's Bench .....	4000	0	0
Beston, Thomas, superan. rear-admiral .....	400	12	6
Binning, lord, M.P. commissioner for the affairs of India Son of the earl of Haddington, and son-in-law of the earl of Macclesfield.	1500	0	0
Birnie, Richard, esq. police magistrate, Bow-street	600	0	0
Bissett, Catharine Mary, Dec. 4, 1806 .....	130	0	0
Blackie, Alexander, macer of session .....	120	0	0
Blackney, Theophilus.....	674	0	0
Blackwood, hon. Mrs. Sept. 15, 1801 .....	206	0	0
Blagg, William, gentleman pensioner.....	100	0	0
Blair, Dr. Robert, com. for sick and wounded seamen, July 21, 1804 .....	300	0	0
——— Gilbert, ditto, June 3, 1805 .....	400	0	0
Blockley, Charles, formerly employed in the perfumery department;—duty repealed but salary continued....	£100	}	600 0 0
——— formerly employed in the hair powder and armorial-bearing certificate duty, transferred to another .....	500		
Bloomfield, right hon. sir Benjamin, keeper of the Prince Regent's privy purse and privy seal, private secretary, &c. ....	1500	0	0
Bond, Mary, Feb. 18, 1808.....	130	0	0
Boringdon, lord, and others, in trust for lord Amherst and his heirs.....	3000	0	0
Borthwick, lady .....	100	0	0
Boscawen, W. Augustus, com. of salt duties ..	428	0	0
——— William, commissioner of bankrupts....	300	0	0
Boston, lord, lord of the bed-chamber.....	1000	0	0
Boswell, Claud. lord of session.....	2000	0	0
——— W. esq. sheriff-depute for Berwick ..	500	0	0
——— James, commissioner of bankrupts ....	350	0	0
Bouchier, Capt. John, for a severe wound, continued to his family .....	200	0	0
Boughton, sir C. W. R. bart. com. for auditing the public accounts.....	1200	0	0
Boulger, William, first clerk to clerk of ordnance (i)	250	0	0
Bourchier, Thomas, deputy clerk of the crown and hanaper .....	108	19	6
Bourne, W. S. M.P. commissioner for the affairs of India .....	1500	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Bouverie, hon. W. H. commissioner of stamp office	£ 1000	0	0
—— hon Edward, commissioner of navy . . . .	1000	0	0
Boyd, Robert, late a justice of the King's Bench, Ireland . . . . . (i)	1600	0	0
—— Ann . . . . . (s)	100	0	0
Boydell, John, com. of lottery office . . . . .	200	0	0
Boyle, right hon. David, lord justice clerk . . . (s)	2000	0	0
—— John, esq. principal clerk justiciary court..	200	0	0
Boyle, Henry, lord viscount, clerk of the pells.. (i)	3500	0	0
Bowlby, lady Mary . . . . .	485	0	0
Bradley, James, superan. rear-admiral . . . . .	410	0	0
Bradshaw, A. H. esq. surveyor-gen. of the revenues in America . . . . .	250	0	0
—— hon. Augustus Cavendish, <i>groom of the bed-chamber</i> . . . . .	500	0	0
Second brother of lord Waterpark.			
Bradyll col. Wilson, ditto . . . . .	500	0	0
These offices, as well as the lords of the bed-chamber, not performing any duties about the king's person, their salaries were discontinued by the late regulations for the Windsor establishment, and they only hold their situations as mere honorary appointments. Four lords and four grooms of the bed-chamber were appointed in 1811; they have cost the public about £50,000, and this session of parliament it was discovered, that they were useless situations, and ought not to have been created!			
Brande, Ev. Aug. apothecary to the queen . . . . .	320	0	0
The salaries of the late queen's servants will be continued during their lives.			
Braybrook, lord, provost-marshal in Jamaica . . . .	2100	0	0
Another statement makes the value of this sinecure £5960. <i>Extraordinary Red Book.</i>			
Bridport, right hon. Samuel, lord, general of ma- rines . . . . .	1825	0	0
Second son of viscount Hood, and son-in-law of earl Nelson.			
Brietzoke, Catherine, widow of a late clerk in the foreign office . . . . .	227	10	0
Bringloe, Hugh Say, clerk of jury court rolls (s)	300	0	0
Brisbane, sir Charles, governor of St. Vincents ..	1300	0	0
Broderick, hon. William . . . . .	600	0	0
Brother of viscount Middleton, and the archbishop of Cashel.			
Brogden, James, M.P. chairman of committees . . . .	1500	0	0
Brooksbank, T. C. esq. gen. com. lottery office . . . .	200	0	0
—— Ann, March 4, 1789 . . . . .	200	0	0
Brougham, Henry, esq. M.P. sergeant at arms, <i>salary unknown.</i> . . . .			
Broughton, Bryan, register of seizures port of London, ( <i>sinecure.</i> ) . . . . . £279	} 1079	0	0
—— ditto . . . . . 600			
—— agent for Canada . . . . . 200			
Brown, John Osborne, clerk of the jury court (s)	500	0	0

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Brown, Robert, deputy teller of the exchequer, one of the gentlemen ushers quarterly waiters to his Majesty, captain of the royal Bucks militia, suppressed deputy commissary in south Britain .....	£ 150	8	9
Considering the multifarious duties of Mr. Brown, it must be admitted, he is not over-paid.			
— Henrietta, Helen Agnes, Ann and Eliza Dalzell .....	200	0	0
(s)			
A needy Scotch family : their pensions to commence on the death of their mother, lady Dalzell.			
Browne, Richard, late a deputy commissary-general	266	18	0
Brown, John, deputy naval officer at Demarara ..	150	0	0
Browne, William, distributor of votes .....	130	0	0
Browning, <i>hon. Louisa</i> , sir F. Eden, <i>lady</i> Mortyn, and Joseph Hankin, <i>custos brevium</i> in common pleas .....	929	0	0
Only think of two <i>ladies</i> , one an <i>honourable</i> , clerks of the treasury, and keepers of the records in a court of law. The <i>custos brevium</i> has the nomination to several saleable offices in the common pleas.			
Bruce, Thomas, esq. com. of customs in Scotland	800	0	0
— Ann .....	100	0	0
(s)			
— Mary .....	100	0	0
(s)			
— John, keeper of state papers .....	£500	}	780 0 0
— latin secretary .....	280		
— Stewart, gentleman usher attending the lord lieutenant .....	237	0	0
Brudnell, Robert .....	131	0	0
— Augusta .....	131	0	0
Brudenell, Thomas Bruce, earl of Aylesbury ....	500	0	0
— James, earl of Cardigan, governor of Windsor-castle .....	1118	0	0
— Augusta, maid of honour to the queen ..	300	0	0
— Robert, equerry to ditto .....	220	0	0
Brunnell, B. esq. gen. com. lottery office .....	200	0	0
Brunton, Nathaniel, deputy paymaster at New Brunswick .....	547	0	0
Brydone, Pat. comptroller in the stamp office .....	400	0	0
Bryson, John, sheriff-depute for Hamilton .... (s)	500	0	0
Buchan, solicitor to the exchequer, and for expense of prosecutions .....	1140	1	4
Buckner, John, bishop of Clichester, value of see	3600	0	0
Bude, major D. ....	500	0	0
Bulkeley, Ann .....	100	0	0
Bull, John, gentleman pensioner .....	100	0	0
Buller, James, commissioner of bankrupts .....	350	0	0
— John, commissioner of the custom-house ..	1400	0	0
Brother of James Buller, proprietor of the borough of Saltash.			

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Bulmer, William, gentleman pensioner . . . . .	£ 100	0	0
—— Fenwick, ditto . . . . .	100	0	0
Bunbury, Henry, July 9, 1795 . . . . .	500	0	0
Burdett, dame Sarah, May 9, 1804 . . . . .	100	0	0
Burgess, Charles Montolieu, knight-marshal lord steward's office . . . . .	200	0	0
—— Thomas, bishop of St. David's, value of see . . . . . £2800	} 4800	0	0
—— prebendary of Durham 2000			
—— sir James Bland, knight-marshal of the king's household, July 1, 1796 . . . . .	1200	0	0
Burghersh, lord, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at Tuscany . . . . .	4300	0	0
Burghell, George, March 13, 1793 . . . . .	300	0	0
Burgoyne, Charlotte, April 19, 1787 . . . . .	500	0	0
—— Montague, chamberlain . . . . .	1660	0	0
Burgh, Ann, wife of Thomas Burgh, esq. . . . . (i)	200	0	0
—— Thomas, measurer and paymas- ter to the ordnance . . . . . £500 0	} 1612	16	0
—— agent to the royal artil- lery regiment . . . . . 1112 16			
Burke Edmund, executors of the late, Oct. 24, 1795 . . . . .	2500	0	0
—— Mrs. widow of the late Edmund Burke, September 20, 1794 . . . . .	1200	0	0

When it is remembered that Mr. Burke, during his life, had a pension of £3000 a year; when we observe here that his executors had a grant of £2500, and his wife a pension of £1200 a year; and when it is known that but for the premature death of his son, he would have been elevated to the peerage, to form a part of that "*Corinthian column*," whose privileges he had so zealously defended; when all these things are taken into consideration, it must be admitted, that his zeal against the French revolution was not so *insane*, as one might have inferred from the outrageous tenor of his writings. Burke was a highly favoured pensioner. In the Longs, the Grenvilles, and the Huskissons, we have instances of pensions being granted to their wives after their death; but a pension to the executor, after the death of the *grantee*, was a thing quite unprecedented. Such a new and singular mode of squandering the public money induces us to transcribe the original grant:— "Grant to the executors of the late Edmund Burke, annual amount, £2500. By authority of two patents dated 24th October, 1795, that is to say, £1160 during the life of Lord Royston, and the Hon. and Rev. Archibald Grey; and £1340 during the life of the Princess Amelia, Lord Althorpe, and William Cavendish, Esq."

Burnet, John, sheriff-depute for Haddington . . . (s)	500	0	0
Burney, James . . . . .	219	0	0
Burney, Charles, June 11, 1806 . . . . . (s.m.)	258	0	0
Burn, Thomas . . . . . (s)	100	0	0
Burrard, Harry, esq. riding forester of New Forest	500	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Burrell, Mrs. E. widow of the late Peter Burrell, cashier of half pay .....	(l)	£ 175	0	0
Burroughs, sir James, judge common pleas .....		3000	0	0
Burton, John, Peebles .....	(s)	200	0	0
Burton, rev. James, canon of Christ Church .....		400	0	0
Burton, Richard, gentleman pensioner .....		100	0	0
Burstall, William, ditto .....		109	10	0
Bush, sir Wadsworth, late attorney-general Isle of Man .....	(w)	200	0	0
Butler, col. James, lieut.-gov. royal military col- lege, Berks .....		1098	0	0
Butts, Thomas, assistant commissary of musters and chief clerk .....		373	1	7
Butt, William .....		500	0	0
Byng, hon. Bridget .....		131	0	0
Byron, J.M.C. in trust for the children of captain Byron		100	0	0
Byron, Catharine Gordon, 2d October, 1799 (s.m.)		300	0	0

## C

Cabell, Mary Turner, Ann Eliza, Thomas Scutt, and Robert Davies, 22d January, 1802 (s.m.)		200	0	0
Cadge, William, clerk in ordnance-office .....		125	2	0
Caithness, Jean, countess of .....	£ 200 }	300	0	0
additional .....	100 }			
Cambridge, duke of, out of consolidated fund ....		24,000	0	0

His royal highness is viceroy of Hanover, which also yields a considerable revenue; and like the rest of his royal brothers, he has had £20,000 out of the Droits of the Admiralty. In 1806, his income, as well as the incomes of four other of the royal dukes, was only £12,000; but in that year it was raised to £18,000 by the courtly, economical, and retrenching Whigs. On his marriage with the Princess of Hesse, £6000 more was added. All the royal dukes have gardens, lodges, parks, and palaces, not only rent-free, but tax-free, and, in general, they are exempt from every kind of impost.

Camden, marquis, teller of the exchequer .....		23,093	0	0
--	--	--------	---	---

The great sinecures being about to be attacked in 1817, the marquis suddenly resigned all the fees and emoluments of his office, retaining only the regulated salary of £2500. An expectation was entertained, which is not yet realized, that this example would have been followed by the Grenvilles, the Erskines, the Ardens, the Bathursts, the Huskissons, and other great sinecurists.]

Cameron, Charles, esq. governor of the Bahama Islands		600	0	0
Cameron, Alicia .....	(w)	100	0	0
Calvert, John, M.P. for Huntingdon, secretary to the lord chamberlain .....		1332	0	0

Cousin to lieutenant-general sir Harry Calvert, adjutant-general of the forces; and brother to Charles Calvert member for Southwark.



## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Campbell, Dugall, esq. and Catherine, his wife and survivor .....	(i)	£ 500	0	0
Campbell, Dugald, accountant to board of general officers for life .....	(i)	150	0	0
Campbell, William, joint clerk in admiralty, reversion to his son .....		705	0	0
Campbell, sir Henry, comptroller of the late queen's household .....		500	0	0
Campbell, T. esq. deputy accountant-general (post office) .....		450	0	0
Campbell, Mrs. Christian .....	(s)	200	0	0
_____ Mrs. Jean .....	(s)	200	0	0
_____ Miss Mary .....	(s)	100	0	0
_____ Duncan, Inyerary .....	(s)	200	0	0
_____ Cambelton .....	(s)	150	0	0
_____ lord Frederick, lord clerk register, £1200 } _____ for the support of } the register-office ..... 1000 }		2200	0	0
Campbell, Archibald, esq. lord of session .....	(s)	2600	0	0
_____ commissary of Edinburgh, .....	(s)	250	0	0
_____ Ann .....		100	0	0
_____ Mary, Agnes, Jean, and Grace, and survivors .....	(s)	200	0	0
_____ Janet, Mary, John, and Amelia, and survivors .....	(s)	200	0	0
_____ Thomas .....	(s)	200	0	0
_____ Eliza Maria, September 16, 1805 (s.m.)		500	0	0
No fewer than twenty-two Campbells, and there are three or four more down for pensions under £50, which we have not inserted. They are all Scotch, of course.				
Canning, Stratford Canning, minister plenipotentiary at Switzerland .....		4276	0	0
Canning, right hon. George, president of the board of trade and controul .....		6000	0	0
_____ receiver-general of the Alien-Office .....		446	7	0
This is the notorious George Canning; famous for his brilliant oration over the bowels of Ogden, which set St. Stephen's in a roar. His character is so well known, that, to say any thing in its illustration, would be burning candles in day-light. His eloquence is never so animated, his wit so trenchant, his jokes so numerous and happy, as in his attacks upon misfortune, infirmity, and old age. The mission of this right hon. gentleman to Lisbon, where he held the sinecure situation of ambassador, cost the country £18,000. For birth and parentage, see <i>Hum.</i>				
Capel, hon. J. J. secretary, register, and receiver of Berbice .....		1000	0	0



Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Chamberlain, Henry, consul-general at the Brazils	£1672	0	0
Chambers, William, superannuated rear-admiral	410	12	6
Chambre, sir Alan	2600	0	0
Chapman, James, secretary, register, and clerk of council at Trinidad (sinecure)	300	7	0
F. deputy naval officer in Tobago	162	0	0
James, commissioner for auditing West-India accounts	1000	0	0
Chatham, John, earl of, and his heirs male	4000	0	0
_____ governor of Jersey	1800	0	0
_____ countess of, to commence on the earl's death	3000	0	0
_____ earl of, in trust for lady Lucy Bachel Taylor and lady Griselda Tekell	1200	0	0
Cheyton, H. esq, general commissioner lottery office	200	0	0
Cheney, George, commissioner for victualling the navy	800	0	0
Chester, Robert, assistant-master of ceremonies	£124	13	4
_____ marshal of ditto	100	0	0
Chester, Robert, esq. gentleman usher of the privy chamber	200	0	0
Chester, bishop of	1100	0	0
Brother of the late Lord Ellenborough.			
Chetwynd, viscount, first clerk of council	250	0	0
_____ sir George, second ditto	100	0	0
Chichester, earl of, joint post-master-general	2500	0	0
Brother to the bishop of Exeter, and brother-in-law to the Earl of Rothes.			
Cholmondeley, Hugh, dean of Chester	800	0	0
_____ R. C. receiver-general of excise	3000	0	0
_____ marquis, lord steward	1540	0	0
The receiver-general is cousin to the marquis.			
Christer, Alexander, superannuated rear-admiral	410	12	6
Clare, dowager lady, March 10, 1803	1000	0	0
R. H. Fitzgibbon, a relation, is usher in the court of chancery in Ireland, £2940.			
Clarence, duke of, out of the consolidated fund	£24,000	0	0
_____ as admiral of the fleet	1095	0	0
_____ as ranger of Bushy Park	187	9	8
Clark, rev. George, chaplain military asylum, Chelsea	350	0	0
Clifton, Rachael, Jane, Ann, and Hugh	300	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Clements, William, captain of marines, for a severe wound	£ 100	0	0
Clements, Henry John, lord of the Irish Treasury	1200	0	0
Clements, hon. R. C. <i>searcher, packer, &amp;c.</i> (i)	987	0	0
We have before remarked to what low offices the higher orders descend: here is an honourable gentleman performing the functions of packer and searcher for the small sum of £987!			
Clements, Jane Catharine	600	0	0
Clephorn, Alexander, esq. sheriff-depute for Peebles	500	0	0
Clerk, James, esq. baron of exchequer	2000	0	0
Clerk, William, clerk of jury court	800	0	0
Clinton, Andrew, late a clerk of the war-office	200	0	0
Coast, W. S. distributor of stamps for Kent	1342	0	0
Coburg, Prince Leopold de Saxe	50,000	0	0
Cockburn, Archibald, baron of exchequer	1500	0	0
Mrs. Jane	200	0	0
Mary	100	0	0
Fanny	100	0	0
Harriet	100	0	0
Elizabeth	50	0	0
Matilda	50	0	0
Margaret	50	0	0
Ann	50	0	0
What a pretty family party! These pensions are to take place on the death of their mother, Mrs. Jane Cockburn, and to continue till their marriage; unless his majesty, which is not probable, should signify his gracious pleasure to the contrary.			
Clipden Henry Viscount, clerk of the council (i)	2161	13	4
Cockayne, hon. W. constable of Limerick-castle (i)	365	0	0
This is a perfect sinecure, no duties either for deputy or principal.			
Cockburne, dame Augusta Anne	600	0	0
Coddington, Henry, deputy sergeant at arms	350	0	0
Goffin, Nathaniel, provost-marshal at Granada	273	5	0
Colchester, lord Charles Abbot, late speaker of the house of commons, pension on being raised to the peerage	£ 4000		
keeper of the signet, and privy counsellor in Ireland	1500		
} 5500 0 0			
Lord Colchester is nearly related by marriage to the celebrated <i>Jeremy Bentham</i> , Esq. author of the <i>Traité de Legislation</i> , the <i>Parliamentary Reform Catechism</i> , and many other valuable works.			
Colebrooke, dame Mary	400	0	0
Colebrooke, George, James, Edward, and Henry Thomas, chirographer court of exchequer	1555	0	0

## Pensions, Grants, Stipends, and Emoluments

Coleman, Thomas, master caulker in Woolwich-yard	£ 200	0	0	
Coleman, Miss Seymour, maid of honour	300	0	0	
— J. C. deputy naval officer at Barbadoes	400	0	0	
— right hon. land register, Scotland	1800	0	0	
Collingwood, lady, pension	1000	0	0	
— hon. Sarah, ditto	500	0	0	
— Mary Patience, ditto	500	0	0	
Colpoys, admiral sir John, governor of Greenwich-hospital	1825	0	0	
Colquhoun, John C. sheriff-depute, Dumbarton	500	0	0	
— Frederick, retired clerk	300	0	0	
— Patrick, LL.D. receiver of the Thames police	6834	19	1	
Mr. Colquhoun, in his "Treatise on Indigence," page 7, observes, that "poverty is a most necessary ingredient in society, without which nations and communities could not exist in a state of civilization." Perhaps it would be easy to show that there is a much nearer connexion betwixt poverty and crime, which is the reverse of refinement, than poverty and civilization. Mr. C. is the author of the "Thames Police," and several other works, which have recommended him to his present lucrative situation.				
Colville, Miss Ann	(s)	100	0	0
— Catherine	(s)	100	0	0
Colville, Alexander, sheriff-depute for Dumferline	(s)	300	0	0
Combermere, lord, pension, governor of Leeward Islands	£2000	3200	0	0
— governor of Barbadoes	1200			
Brother-in-law to the Duke of Newcastle.				
Compton, John Woodfield, pension		1000	0	0
— James, preacher Dutch chapel		160	0	0
Congreve, sir William, pension		1200	0	0
This extravagant sum was granted by the WHIGS, in 1806, for throwing a few burning rockets into Boulogne.				
Connel, John, esq. judge admiral, court of admiralty, Scotland		800	0	0
Conant, sir Nathaniel, chief magistrate, Bow-street office		1200	0	0
One half of this salary is for attending at the secretary of state's office. We shall hereafter treat distinctly of the patronage and expense attendant on the police establishments of the metropolis.				
Cook, Edward, clerk in alienation-office, by deputy customer and collector of port of Kinsale	(i)	150	0	0
— Louisa, captain's widow		513	0	0
— Louisa Sophia, captain's daughter		200	0	0
— first master king's kitchen		66	0	0
— second ditto, ditto		287	0	0
		217	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments*

Cooke, Samuel, gentleman pensioner .....	£100	0	0
— Benjamin J. ditto .....	100	0	0
— Ranelope Ann, July 30, 1793 .....	150	0	0
Cooke, Edward, retired under secretary of state, pension .....	£1500		
— Compensation for a reversion .....	500	(i)	4000 0 0
— Ex-revenue officer .....	400		
— Keeper of the Irish records .....	1000		
— His wife, keeper of Dublin-castle .....	600		
This Cooke may be termed a <i>lay sinecurist</i> . He has another batch of minor relations quartered upon the public.			
Cook, Eliza .....	(s.m.)	175	0 0
— Maria .....	(s.m.)	175	0 0
— Edward .....		250	0 0
— George, late agent at Tripoli .....	(pl)	248	0 0
Cooper, William, searcher, packer, and gauger, Belfast .....	(i)	328	0 0
— Caroline Mary .....	(s)	200	0 0
— Elizabeth Ann .....	(s)	200	0 0
— sir William Henry, and Francis Grey, au- ditors of the land revenue .....		3421	0 0
Copley, sergeant John Singleton, chief justice, Chester .....		1230	0 0
Cornwallis, James, dean of Durham .....		4000	0 0
— Charles, marquis, master of the king's stag-hounds .....		2000	0 0
— hon. sir W. vice-admiral of Great Britain .....		461	0 0
— James, bishop of Lichfield and Coventry The uncle of the marquis.		3300	0 0
— bishop of Worcester .....		4900	0 0
Corry, right hon. Isaac, surveyor-general of lands (i)		600	0 0
— James, clerk of the journals and records (i)		660	0 0
Cottrel, sir Stephen, master of the cere- monies .....	£ 300	(i)	3157 0 0
— keeper of the council records .....	500		
— a pension, 29th Jan. 1816 .....	(c) 1200		
— dame Mary, wife of the aforesaid			
— sir Stephen .....	371		
— (c) 786			
Another grant, not yet fixed, to commence on the death of her husband.			
Court, William A. envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Naples .....		3550	0 0
Courtney, Miss Elizabeth, maid of honour .....		300	0 0

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emblements.

Courtney, William, subpoena office, chancery.....	£ 850	0	0
— Eliza, Catharine Ann, and Frances Charlotte .....	400	0	0
— Thomas Peregrine, M.P. brother to the above, principal register to the land-tax, and secretary to the commissioners for the affairs of India—(salary unknown)			
— William, commissioner of bankrupts.....	£350		
— subpœna office, court of chancery .....	855		
Next male heir to viscountess Courtney, brother-in-law to earl of Rothers, and brother to J. P. Courtney.			
Couttown, earl of, capt. of band of gentlemen pensioners .....	1800	0	0
Relations—the hon. Henry Stopford, general officer and equerry to the late queen, £220; the hon. R. B. Stopford, captain of Windsor, chaplain to his majesty, prebendary of Hereford, &c.			
Cowper, Maria Judith, after the decease of her husband, Henry Cowper .....	513	0	0
— earl, pension .....	(s) 2000	0	0
— Jane .....	230	0	0
— Elizabeth..... Nov. 12, 1800. (p)	500	0	0
— Henry .....	Nov. 21, 1797. (p) 1026	0	0
Craigie, Lawrence, esq. master of the mint, Scotland	150	0	0
Craig, William, esq. lord of session and justiciary .....	(s) 1800	0	0
Craigie, Robert, esq. lord of session .....	(s) 3000	0	0
Cranbourne, viscount, commissioner for affairs of India .....	1500	0	0
The commissioners for the affairs of India are eleven in number, besides the president, and form very snug and profitable places.			
Cranley, viscount, out-ranger of Windsor forest ..	600	0	0
Cranston, lord .....	March 6, 1790. (s.m.) 300	0	0
— George, sheriff-dep. for Sutherland .. (s)	500	0	0
Crauford, Mrs. Jane, widow of P. C. Crauford; late accountant .....	400	0	0
— general..... Nov. 27, 1810. (p)	1200	0	0
Crawford, James .....	815	0	0
— sir James, late envoy and minister plenipotentiary at Copenhagen—dead—continued to his family .....	1000	0	0
— Charles Payne, solicitor to the wine-licence-office .....	£350		
— deputy paymaster .....	400	0	0
— of widows' pensions.....	130		

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinécures, and Emoluments.

Creighton, hon. John, governor of Hurst-castle...	£ 182 10 0
Abraham, register of forfeitures, Ireland..... (i)	300 0 0
Crewe, R. H. secretary to the Board of Ordnance A near relation to lord John C. Crewe.	2500 0 0
Creyke, Richard, ditto.....	219 0 0
Croft, James, secretary of embassy and <i>charge d'affaires</i> at Lisbon.....	804 15 0
Croker, right hon. John Wilson, first se- cretary to the admiralty..... £3000	} 3250 0 0
to the widows' charity..... 250	
Croke, Alexander, chief justice of Admiralty Court, Nova Scotia.....	2000 0 0
Cullen, Robina, Elizabeth, and Margaret, during their joint lives, unless his majesty should graciously signify his pleasure to the con- trary..... (s)	200 0 0
Cullen, Robert..... (s)	500 0 0
Cumberland, duke of..... £18,000 0 0	} 19,008 10 10
as colonel of 15th regiment of hussars.. 1008 10 10	
An abortive attempt was made, at the time of the duke's marriage with the princess of Salm, to increase his annuity £6000 per annum; a provision, however, of £6000 a year was made for the duchess, on the decease of his royal high- ness.	
Harriet, Eliza Margaret, July 1, 1794..... (s.m)	100 0 0
Albenia..... ditto (s.m)	100 0 0
lady Albenia.....	400 0 0
<p>These are the daughters of Mr. Richard Cumberland, the dramatist. It is difficult to ascertain what were the peculiar merits of the father to entitle his daughters to pension; unless it were his foolish adoration of Pitt, whom he compared to Cicero, and termed "the wonder of Britannia's isle!" As a monster, but not as a man, truly wonderful! But perhaps another reason may be assigned for the introduction of the Misses Cumberland on the pension list; namely, one of them having married a member of the Bentinck family, which see.</p>	
Cunningham, Andrew, late clerk in navy pay office..... (pl)	100 0 0
Cunninghame, Margery and Lavinia, and survivor (s)	251 0 0
Canyingham, lieut.-col. Francis.. Dec. 8, 1802. (s.m)	300 0 0
Curtis, Griffin, secretary and register of council at Demerara.....	150 0 0
Curts, Louis de, three children..... Oct. 29, 1805	300 0 0
Cutbelli, William and Henry Scott Alvis, for the children, or surviving child of Ann Wilson (s)	300 0 0



*Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Dallas, sir Robert, chief justice common pleas . . . . .	£ 3500	0	0
Dalrymple, sir John, bart. . . . . (s)	800	0	0
<del>0 0 000</del> Mrs. Elizabeth, dame Helen, Margaret, Helen, and Elizabeth . . . . . (s)	450	0	0
Daniel, John, compt. of the salt duties . . . . . (t)	241	0	0
— Williams, first clerk in receiver-general's department . . . . . (i)	200	0	0
Dantze, I. N. suppressed deputy commissary S. Britain . . . . . (s)	159	3	6
D'Arcy, sir William, capt. of marines . . . . . (pl.)	210	0	0
Davidson, David, macer of Exchequer . . . . . (s)	100	0	0
— Harvey, Edinburgh . . . . . (s)	200	0	0
Davis, John Henry, esq. lieutenant king's yeoman- guard . . . . .	500	0	0
Davison, Nath. late consul-general at Algiers . . (pl.)	360	0	0
Dawkins, Richard, commissioner for auditing public accounts . . . . .	1200	0	0
Dawson, Edward, standard-bearer to gentlemen pensioners . . . . .	310	0	0
Deare, Philip, pension . . . . . £800	1500	0	0
— commissioner for auditing public accounts . . . . . 1200			
There are six commissioners for auditing the public accounts, with innumerable clerks, examiners, messengers, &c.			
De Blaquere, John, baron, K. B. . . . . (i)	1000	0	0
De Goutant, Josepha, Elizabeth Byron, and Char- lotte Sabina Byron . . . . .	194	0	0
De Grey, hon. and rev. Thomas, archdeacon of Winchester . . . . . £400	1000	0	0
— of ditto . . . . . prebendary 600			
— G. and T. . . . . July 27, 1794. (s.m)	1200	0	0
Delamain, Eliza, widow . . . . . Feb. 20, 1805. (s.m)	100	0	0
Delaval, Edward Hussey . . . . .	300	0	0
Delane, Solomon, <i>Cork Herald</i> . . . . . (i)	265	0	0
Dent, sir Digby, superann. rear-admiral . . . . .	410	12	6
— Sophia and Colton . . . . .	100	0	0
Derring, Charles, late commissioner of tax-office . .	400	0	0
Dick, Miss Ann and Janet, and survivor . . . . . (s)	100	0	0
Dickie, Andrew, to pay pensions to late servants of the younger princess . . . . . (w)	1385	18	0
Digby, hon. and rev. Charles, canon of Wells . . . . . £ 400	900	9	0
— ditto of Windsor . . . . . 500			

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Dilkes, Juliana Maria, and Ann, Jan. 11, 1808 . . . . .	£ 260	0	0
Pretty names, but what have they done to entitle them to more than £3000 of the public money?			
Disbrowe, Edward C. secretary of legation in Denmark . . . . .	600	0	0
D'Ivernois, sir Francis Knight, Oct. 7, 1800 . . . . .	200	0	0
A native of Switzerland, and author of several works against Buonaparte and the Revolution, and a pensioner contrary to law.			
Dixon, Mary, captain's widow . . . . .	100	0	0
Dodd, John . . . . .	150	0	0
Dods, William, late clerk in the war office . . . . . (l)	500	0	0
Doefield, John Lewis, late charge d'affaires . . . . . (pl)	250	0	0
Donnellan, Matthew, customer and collector, Waterford . . . . . (i)	618	0	0
Donoughmore, lord, sec. remembrancer £ 550	} (i) 3127	0	0
searcher of Strangford 1071			
packer and gauger, Port of Dohaghadee . . . . . 1506			
Lord Hutchinson, the earl's brother, pension of £2000, by act of parliament; John Hely Hutchinson, governor of Stirling castle, £300; F. H. Hutchinson, collector of the port of Dublin, £305.			
Downshire, marquis of, constable of Fort Hillsborough . . . . . (i)	243	0	0
This office is hereditary. The marquis is brother-in-law to the earl of Plymouth.			
Dorchester, lady Guy Carleton, and Thomas Carleton, by act of Parliament . . . . .	1000	0	0
Douglas, David, esq. lord of session, and one of the commissioners of the court of justiciary (s)	2000	0	0
Douglas, George Shelto, secretary of legation at Berlin . . . . .	800	0	0
Douglass, John, deputy provost-marshal in Granada	273	0	0
Douglas, lieut.-col. sir H. military college, Sandhurst . . . . .	540	0	0
John, esq. commissioner of excise, Scotland . . . . .	800	0	0
Douglass, sir John, col. of royal marines . . . . . (pl)	433	0	0
Douglas, Mary and Anne Irvine . . . . .	200	0	0
Dowdeswell, rev. E. C. canon of Christ Church . . . . .	400	0	0
D'Oyley, Ann . . . . . (w)	200	0	0
Drake, Francis, late envoy and minister plenipotent.	1500	0	0
Drogheda, marquis of, and Mr. Bagwell, muster-master-general . . . . . (i)	4107	0	0
Stephen Moore, esq. comptroller of the customs in Ireland, £1040, is a relation to the marquis.			
Drouillet, St. Raimond, dep. sec. and register at St. Lucia . . . . .	250	0	0

Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Drummond, Andrew, for Charlotte, countess of Dunmore .....	(s)	£ 200	0	0
— Dr. Edward, prebendary of York, Southwell .....	£600	}	1500	0
— Rector of Hadleigh, Suffolk .....	900			
— Maurice .....	(s)	50	0	0
— William .....	(pl)	1700	0	0
Duckett, sir George, deputy secretary to lords commissioners of the admiralty .....		400	0	0
Duff, Sophia, captain's widow .....		200	0	0
— Norwich, Georgiana, and Ann Margaret, captain's daughters .....		150	0	0
Duff, Adam, sheriff-depute for Forfarshire .....	(s)	500	0	0
— R. Marton, comptroller to Excise in Scotland .....		600	0	0
Duddington, William, superannuated rear-admiral .....		410	0	0
Dumfries, countess dowager of .....	(s)	300	0	0
Duncan, Robert Duncan, viscount by act of parliament, pension of £2000, to continue to the next male heir, and from the Irish compensation list £1083 .....		3083	0	0
Dundas, lady Elizabeth Eleanora .....	(s)	300	0	0
Dundas, Robert, for Jemima, countess dowager of Errol .....	(s)	300	0	0
Dundas, right hon. William, register of seisins, reversion vested in him by commission .....	£2269	}	2769	0
— governor of Chelsea Hospital .....	500			
Dundas, George, commissioner of the navy at Bombay .....		2000	0	0
— David, January 11, 1805 .....	(s.m)	300	0	0
— David's five children, Aug. 23, 1805 .....	(s.m)	300	0	0
— Robert, esq. depute lord privy seal, Scotland .....		400	0	0
— Robert, lord chief baron of the exchequer .....	£4000	}	6200	0
— keeper of register of seisins .....	200			
— signet-keeper in Scotland .....	2000			
The lord chief baron died suddenly on the 17th June, and has been succeeded by sir Sam. Shepherd, late attorney-general.				
— right hon. Charles Hope, lord president of court of session .....		4300	0	0
Total Dundases £16,939. The principal, if not the whole of these, are relations of viscount Melville, first lord of the admiralty, lord privy seal, register of seisins, &c. whose in-				

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Exemptions.

come from the public is £10,209, besides a very handsome pension from the East-India Company; so that the total income from the public of the Dundas family is £27,208; and yet this was not enough, without saddling the community with David's five children for £300 more!			
Dunlop, Robert, sheriff-depute for Renfrew . . . . .	£500	0	0
Dunmore, countess of . . . . .	400	0	0
— earl of . . . . .	764	7	8
<i>Ci-devant</i> father and mother in law of the Duke of Sussex. It is a rare thing, in England as well as Turkey, for parents to have captivating daughters; but the royal duke's unfortunate passion has been a little expensive to the community. <i>Vide Amiland.</i>			
Dunsey, Catherine . . . . .	100	0	0
Durell, Mrs. . . . . .	500	0	0
Pray who are Mrs. Durell and Kate Dunsey?			
Durham, James, surveyor-general of taxes, Scotland	300	0	0
Durnford, S. esq. certificate com. lott. office . . . . .	350	0	0
Dutens, Louis, late <i>charge d'affaires</i> at Turin ( <i>pl</i> )	300	0	0
Dutton, Patiéntia . . . . .	131	0	0
Duval, Philip . . . . .	450	0	0
Dyer, F. T. clerk in dock-yards . . . . .	100	0	0
Dyer, Maria Letitia . . . . . ( <i>s</i> )	100	0	0
— Henry Moreton, chief justice admiralty court, Bahamas . . . . .	2000	0	0
— pension . . . . .	100	0	0
Dyson, Jeremiah, deputy clerk of house of commons . . . . .	3000	0	0
Dwyer, John, secretary to the lord chancellor, Ireland . . . . .	659	18	11
<b>E</b>			
Earl, Edward, esq. chairman board of customs . . ( <i>s</i> )	£1200	0	0
— P. H. general com. lottery office . . . . .	200	0	0
Edgar, Alexander, superann. rear-admiral . . . . .	410	12	9
Edgecombe, Pegg, March 29, 1797 . . . . . ( <i>s.m</i> )	178	0	0
Edgell, Henry, clerk of error court of exchequer . .	1030	0	0
Edmonstone, J. G. sheriff-dep. for Bute . . . . . ( <i>s</i> )	500	0	0
Edsell, William, esq. gen. com. lottery-office . . . . .	200	0	0
Edwards, Sarah, captain's widow . . . . .	100	0	0
Egerton, hon. Francis Henry, prebendary of Durham	2500	0	0
— Mrs. A. M. woman of the bed-chamber to the late queen . . . . .	300	0	0
— Mary and Uriana Margaret . . . . .	410	0	0
Eldon, John Scott, lord, speaker of the house of peers . . . . . £3000	} 18,000	0	0
— lord high chan-			
cellor . . . . . 15,000			
— a lord of trade and plan-			

tations; visitor of Oriel college, Oxford, and of Pembroke and Catherine halls, Cambridge; an official trustee of the British and Hunterian Museums; high-steward of Oxford university, and a governor of the Charter-house; D.C.L. F.R.S. and F.S.A. &c. &c. &c.

This is a huge monster! the noble lord is the atlas of the borough system. We hardly know how to treat his lordship according to his various functions; but we will attempt a dissection; beginning with the trunk, and afterwards the branches—speaking of his lordship first, and then of his relations.

The sum put down is lord Eldon's fixed income as speaker and lord chancellor. The legal, school, and ecclesiastical patronage of his lordship is immense; the salaries of offices in the gift of the lord chancellor in the legal department alone, amount to £42,600 per annum. He was appointed lord chancellor in 1801; a situation he has continued to hold from that time to this, with the exception of the short interval in 1806, during the Whig Ministry. Taking the official emoluments of the chancellorship at £33,000 a year—certainly not too much, his lordship must have drawn from that source alone more than £600,000 principal money. A prodigious sum, when contrasted with the indigence of millions reduced to beggary and pauperism during the same period! But the enormous wealth, either in expectation or possession of his relations, is nearly as great. His eldest brother, sir William Scott, father-in-law of the marquis of Sligo, is judge of the admiralty court, which, with other appointments, has yielded for many years £6704 per annum. His lordship's son, W. H. J. Scott, has the reversion of clerk of the crown after the death of the earl and hon. A. Bathurst, £1610; also reversion of office for execution of laws, after the death of Edward and Thomas Thurlow, £3720; William Villiers Surtees, esq. is commissioner of bankrupts, £300, and a reversion of register of affidavits, after the death of H. Wilmot, esq. £400; and M. Surtees is prebendary of Canterbury, £500.

The almost incredible wealth of this family fills the mind with amazement; and when it is contrasted with the extreme poverty of other classes of the community, it cannot be denied, that there has been something radically bad in that system, which has suffered to grow up such monstrous disproportions. The lord chancellor is the son of a coal-merchant, at Newcastle; and how he has groped his way through the mazes of the law to his present glittering eminence—where he has fastened on the highest honours and emoluments of the state, and under a government which affords such few facilities to *mêre* talent and virtue, he best can inform the public. After what has been said, the reader need not be told that lord Eldon is the zealous defender of the present system in every part: that there is no absurdity in law; no intolerance in church government; no arbitrary state measure, of which he is not the surly, furious, and bigoted advocate: neither political reformer, nor religious dissenter, Catholic or Protestant, would he admit to participate, in the smallest degree, of the emoluments of which he and his family monopolize such an inordinate share. His lordship and sir William invariably attend the Pitt club, which annually

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

assembles to mock the sufferings of the people, and where they join the barbarous and intolerant howl, for "protestant ascendancy," and "the immortal memory."

The lord chancellor is keeper of the king's conscience; and, as a parting observation, we would respectfully ask him, how he can reconcile the keeping of his own conscience, with clinging, with his last grasp, to the emoluments of offices, which, from age and infirmities, it is notorious he cannot discharge the duties. An occasional joke, with an affectation of frankness and sincerity, will, we fear, be but a poor atonement for such mercenary and unprincipled devotion to Mammon. When his lordship retires from office, his pension of £4000 a year commences.

Elgin, earl of, late ambassador and minister plenipotentiary to the Ottoman court . . . . . (pl)	£ 2000	0	0
—— lady . . . . . (s)	300	0	0
Elibank, Alexander, baron . . . . . (s)	300	0	0
Elliot, hon. George, governor of the mint, Scotland, sinecure . . . . . (s)	300	0	0
—— F. Percival, commissioner for auditing the public accounts . . . . .	1200	0	0
Elphinstone, Eliza M'Kenzie, -and Keith, 25th June, 1790 . . . . . (s.m)	300	0	0
Elphinston, John, baron . . . . . (s)	300	0	0
—— Clementina and Ann . . . . . (s)	300	0	0
Elsington, Capt. J. H. fort major of the tower . . . .	173	7	6
Errol, earl of, lord high commissioner of the general assembly of the church of Scotland . . . .	2000	0	0
—— Elizabeth Jemima, countess of . . . . . (s)	300	0	0
—— Isabella, countess dowager of . . . . . (s)	300	0	0
Erskine, lady Louisa, sister of the marquis of Anglesey, on the English and Scotch list . . . .	600	0	0
—— Mary Henrietta, sister to the earl of Rosslyn . . . .	800	0	0
—— W. esq. sheriff-depute for Orkney and Shetland . . . . . (s)	500	0	0
—— Thomas Erskine, lord, brother of the earl of Buchan, counsellor of state in Cornwall, and a governor of the charter-house, pension . . . . .	4000	0	0
Estcourt, Edmund, late solicitor to the stamp-office . . . . .	1200	0	0
This gentleman retired before 1809 on this extravagant pension. He is brother to T. G. Estcourt, proprietor of the borough of Devizes, who voted for the continuance of the income-tax in the last parliament.			
Este, Charles, secretary in Ireland . . . . .	350	0	0
Etwall, Richard, esq. certificate com. lott. office . .	350	0	0
Eustace, Henry, aid-de-camp to the master-general of the ordnance . . . . . (i)	332	18	0
Ewart, Elizabeth, widow, 10th Nov. 1794 . . (s.m)	645	0	0
—— John, Eliza, and Mary, ditto . . . . . (s.m)	363	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Exmouth, Edward Pellew, viscount, admiral of the  
blue, pension . . . . . £ 2000 0 0

## F

Fagan, Robert, consul at Sicily and Malta . . . . .	600	0	0
Fagell, Henry, 21st June, 1798 . . . . . (w)	1026	0	0
Falcon, John, late consul at Algiers . . . . . (pl)	500	0	0
Falconer, John, consul at Leghorn . . . . .	600	0	0
Robert, Nairn . . . . . (s)	150	0	0
Falkiner, Ann, wife of Frederick Falkiner, esq. (i)	400	0	0
Falkland, Charles John, viscount . . . . . (s)	200	0	0
Farr, Dr. William, physician of Plymouth hospital	225	0	0
Farrell, Miss, <i>privy-woman</i> to the king . . . . .	200	0	0
Farwell, George, esq. gen. com. lott. office . . . . .	200	0	0
Fauconberg, viscount, 10th March, 1803 . . (s.m)	200	0	0
Faucett, Susannah, representative of, during lives of her two daughters . . . . .	400	0	0
Fauquier, Thomas, secretary to the comptrollers of the barrack-office . . . . .	700	0	0
Fearne, Thomas, clerk to the secretaries to the admiralty . . . . .	100	0	0
Fergusson, Geo. esq. lord of session and justiciary (s)	280	0	0
J. esq. commissary of Edinburgh . . . . (s)	600	0	0
Margaret, Isabella, and Mary, and sur- vivors . . . . . (s)	200	0	0
Ferne, Henry Bent, gentleman-pensioner . . . . .	100	0	0
Ferrier, Archibald, treas. to the king's remembrancer . . . . . (s) £192 : 19	617	19	0
lord treas. and re- memb. court of exchequer . . (s) 415 : 0			
Fetherstone, George and John, in trust for six daughters of sir Thomas Fetherstone, who voted for the income-tax . . . . .	300	0	0
Fedge, John, surgeon, Portsmouth-yard, 15 Jan. 1816	273	15	0
Finch, hon. lieut.-gen. Edward, gov. of the bed- chamber . . . . .	500	0	0
Daniel, prebend. of Gloucester . . . . .	500	0	0
Finucane, Mathias, justice of the common-pleas, Ireland . . . . .	2000	0	0
Fisher, John, bishop of Salisbury, value of see . . . . . £4200 : 0	4770	5	0
chancellor of the order of the garter . . . . . 570 : 5			

The right reverend bishop is also provincial preceptor of  
Canterbury, and was tutor to the Princess Charlotte of Wales.

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Fisher, Jonathan Parker, prebendary and sub-dean of Exeter .....	£500	0	0
— J. esq. gen. com. lottery office .....	200	0	0
Fishly, Hugh, master-shipwright, Jamaica yard, 4th June, 1804 .....	200	0	0
Fite, de la, M.A. preacher Dutch chapel .....	150	0	0
Fitzgerald, Thomas, late a clerk in the navy pay office .....	(pl)	150	0
— Keane, clerk of the warrants and enrolments, common pleas .....	500	0	0
— lord Robert, 12th March, 1808 .....	(s.m)	800	0
— right hon. Vesey, eldest son of the right hon. James Fitzgerald, lord of trade and plantations in Great Britain .....			
— lord of the treasury .....	1600	0	0
Fitzharris, lord viscount, pension to commence at the death of his father .....	1200	0	0
— governor of the Isle of Wight .....	1379	0	0
What a prudent youth is this! He is already in possession of a sinecure of more than £1300 a year, and he has stuck himself on the pension-list for £1200 more! But this is not all: his father, the earl of Malmesbury, has a pension of £2300 a year, as late foreign minister, and his old aunt Gertrude, sister of the earl, was down as early as 1798 for £600 more!			
Fitzroy, lord Henry, bother of the duke of Grafton, prebend of Westminster .....	400	0	0
Fitzgibbon, R.H. usher in the court of chancery (i) .....	2940	0	0
Fleming, Elizabeth, Catherine, and Jean .... (s) .....	150	0	0
— alderman, resident justice Ireland .....	206	0	0
Follett, John, clerk of assize, western circuit ....	1200	0	0
Forbes, Alexander, macer of jury court .....	(s)	100	0
— John, H. M. sheriff-dep. for Perth .... (s) .....	500	0	0
— George Banff .....	(s)	200	0
Forestie, Sheridan, resident at the Seven Islands ..	672	0	0
Forrester, Ann Mary, baroness .....	(s)	600	0
Forster, Mary, housekeeper of the parliament-house .....	(i)	352	18
Fortescue, sir Chichester, superann. rear-admiral .....	£410		
— from Irish compensation-list .....	1122		
— John F. superann. rear-admiral .....	410	0	0
— John, ditto captain in the navy ..	219	0	0
— M. ditto ditto ..	219	0	0
— William Faithful, and Jane his wife, Irish civil-list, Feb. 1804 .....	(i)	800	0



*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Fortescue, H. deputy post-master at Cork, ( <i>sinecure</i> ) .....	(i)	£ 690	0	0
— Sir Chichester, Ulster king at arms .....	(i)	£691	5	1
— for loss of his apartment at the late parliament-house .....	(i)	140	0	0
Relations of earl Fortescue, lord lieutenant, <i>custos rotularum</i> , and vice-admiral of the county of Devon, high steward of Barnstaple and South Malton, uncle-in-law to the marquis of Buckingham, and father-in-law to lord King.				
Forward, hon. William, treasurer of the post office .....	(i)	500	0	0
Foster, right hon. John, speaker of the Irish house of commons, ( <i>pension</i> ) .....		5038	0	0
— Augustus John, son of the above, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary in Denmark .....		5300	0	0
— Ralph, suppressed dep. commissary in Portugal .....		100	0	0
— Charles, clerk in navy office, Nov. 17, 1802		150	0	0
Fotherington, Fred. esq. com. of excise, Scotland ..		800	0	0
Foveaux, J. office-keeper, war-office, ( <i>sinecure</i> ) .....		433	0	0
Fowls, lady .....	(s)	100	0	0
Fox, William, superan. rear-admiral .....		410	12	6
— hon. Edward, receiver of issues in Glamorgan, &c. during the lives of C. J. Fox, and D. Fox .....		350	0	0
— Elizabeth Bridget, widow of the late Charles James Fox, of <i>immortal memory</i> , Dec. 4, 1806 .....	(s.m)	1200	0	0

Mr. Fox was a *sinecure placeman*, and a *pensioner*, from his infancy to the day of his death. On April 8, 1794, he delivered the following argument in defence of sinecures and pensions:—"You should never suffer yourself to trench on *private property* in any degree. If a pension or sinecure was unworthily bestowed by a minister, he would make complaint against that minister. But if it was bestowed *legally*, it became a part of the *person's property* on whom it was conferred, and like *all other property was sacred*. All that he wished to ask about property was, whether it was *legally granted*, by a person competent to grant it, and whether it had been received by a person competent to receive it. He should therefore be for holding sacred from the proposed measure, all sinecures and pensions held for a term of years, or for life."—This is very superficial. It is a mere assumption, placing grants of the public money for life, or during pleasure, on a level with *real property*; but even admitting this, still, how many transfers of *real property* have been set aside, by a court of equity, when made without a *valuable consideration*; and would not the great mass of *sinecures* and *pensions* fall under a similar denomination; and might not they

## Placés, Pensions, Grants, Salaries, and Emoluments.

be set aside, for having been granted without an equivalent to the public?		
Foy, George, consul-general at Stockholm	£ 1000	0 0
— Louis, suppressed deputy commissary, Canada	100	0 0
Francis, Frances and Eliza, Oct. 9, 1793 . . . . . (s.m)	120	0 0
Franks, Matthew, deputy guardian and keeper of the rolls, Ireland . . . . . (i)	725	0 0
Fraser, capt. Percy, March 10, 1803 . . . . . (s.m)	300	0 0
— Charlotte Mary Ann, Mr. John Theodore, Charles Henry, and Jane Wilhelmina, children of Charles Fraser, late resident in the Hanse Towns, April 4, 1799 . . . . . (c)	500	0 0
— ditto, ditto . . . . . (s.m)	900	0 0
— Hugh, deputy provost-marshal, Jamaica . .	1544	13 10
Frazer, Robert Murray, register of seizures . . . . . (i)	388	0 0
Frazer, Mary and Henrietta, and survivor . . . . . (s)	200	0 0
Frederic, Thomas, esq. comptroller lott. office . . . .	500	0 0
Freemantle, W. H. joint resident secretary in London, to the lord lieutenant of Ireland . . . . . (i)	£636	2
— joint solicitor in Great Britain . . . . . (i)	391	0
— Mrs. keeper of house of commons, Ireland . . . . . (i)	722	0 0
— rear-admiral sir Thomas, for severe wounds, December 1797 . . . . .	200	0 0
Frere, Bartholomew, secretary of embassy at Constantinople . . . . .	1200	0 0
— right hon. John Hookham, late ambassador at Madrid, April 1803 . . . . . (pl)	1700	0 0
These are the celebrated "young friends," the Castor and Pollux, of George Canning.		
Frune, four children of the rev. Thomas, Nov. 1805 . . . . . (w)	120	0 0
Fry, Joseph, late <i>charge d'affaires</i> at Brussels . . . .	200	0 0
Fyne, Charles, prebend of Westminster . . . . .	400	0 0

## G

Gage, John, clerk of signet . . . . .	£ 364	0 2
Galbraith, J. clerk to attorney-general, Ireland (i)	446	12 0
Gambier, Sarah, admiral's widow . . . . .	100	0 0
— sir James, consul-general, Netherlands . .	1672	0 0
Gardner, Hyde Allen, baron . . . . .	2000	0 0
— Edwd., deputy naval-officer, Trinidad . .	282	0 0
Garnier, William, chancellor and prebendary of Winchester . . . . . £ 800	} 1800	0 0
— rector of Droxford, Hants. 1000		

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Garnier, George, apothecary general to the army	£12,158	5	4
We have put down the emoluments of this office; but truth requires we should inform the reader, that Mr. Garnier surrendered the patent of his situation many years ago, in consideration of an annuity of £2500 a year for life.— <i>Vide First Report on Sinecure Offices</i> , 1810.			
Garrow, sir William, knt. counsellor of state for the duchy of Cornwall			
baron of the court of exchequer	3000	0	0
Geoghegan, John, accountant-general	300	0	0
George, Margaret, to commence on the death of her husband, Rupert George	300	0	0
Gibbons, sir William, bart. commissioner for sick and wounded seamen, Feb. 1806	500	0	0
Gibbs, Crawford Antrobus, esq. secretary of legation to America	600	0	0
right hon. sir Vicary, late C. J. of common pleas	2000	0	0
Giese, rev. Hemand, German Chapel	243	0	0
Gifford, William, esq. comptroller of the lottery-office	600	0	0
paymaster of gentlemen pensioners	300	0	0

Mr. Gifford is the son of a shoemaker, and the editor of the *Quarterly Review*; and we understand in private life a very amiable and worthy man. But it seems a little difficult to reconcile these qualities with the conduct of a journal prostituted to government, and which, with the exception perhaps of *Blackwood's Magazine*, is more exclusively devoted to scurrility, falsehood, and misrepresentation, than any other periodical publication. For the truth of this observation the reader has only to turn to some late articles on Morris Birkbeck, Sir Robert Wilson, the Reports of the Education Committee, and Mr. Fearon; which have been proved to contain the most atrocious falsehoods, and even wilful misrepresentations.

While we are upon this subject, it may be as well to subjoin a few facts of the subservency of pensions and sinecures to literary prostitution. The *Antijacobin Review* was begun by one *Crump*, who afterwards changed his name to Gifford, and became a police justice. JOHN BOWLES, the celebrated JOHN BOWLES, began his career by writing a pamphlet against Paine; that pamphlet did not preclude the necessity of a publication against Paine's works, but it procured BOWLES a commissionership of bankrupts. BOWLES was next the agent in setting up the *Antijacobin Newspaper*, and the conductor of the *Antijacobin Review*; which procured him a commissionership in the management of Dutch property; this office yielded more than one thousand a year; but it was not enough to satisfy his rapacity; and it is well known that JOHN was brought up to the bar, as the saying is, for misapplying the public money. The *True Briton*, *Sun*, and *Pilot* newspapers, were originally set up with the public money; and Mr. *Heriot*, many years the editor of the two former journals, and whose

sole and settled business was to eulogize Pitt and his measures, had five or six hundred pounds a year settled on him for life, in what is called a double commissionership of the lottery. And Mr. Walter, too, father of the present proprietor of *The Times*, we are informed, received a pension of £600 out of the public purse for many years, for devoting his paper exclusively to the Pitt ministry. Many of the magazines and reviews are not more independent. The proprietor of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Mr. Nichols, has great profits as a printer to government. The *British Critic* is conducted by two clergymen, Nares and Beloe; the former is an archdeacon, and had two large livings bestowed upon him by the lord chancellor, Eldon; Mr. Beloe has a living in the city of London, and lately was a prebendary of Lincoln, and held an appointment in the British Museum. It would be easy to enumerate others; but these will suffice till we meet with the next literary prostitute on our list.

Gifford, sir Robert, attorney-general .....	£ 6000	0	0
— William, clerk of the foreign estreats, exchequer .....	329	0	0
Gilbert, Joseph, master attendant at Deptford-yard, April, 1803 .....	300	0	0
— William, storekeeper at Portsmouth .....	300	0	0
— W. L. esq. gen. com. lottery-office .....	200	0	0
— John, D.C.L. historiographer, Scotland.....	200	0	0
Gillies, Adam, lord of session and justiceary .....	(s) £ 2600	3200	0
— commissioner, civil jury-court .....	600		
Gillow, Catharine and Elizabeth .....	(s) 200	0	0
Gilman, Webster, formerly employed in the hair-powder-duty .....	300	0	0
Gilzean, Thomas, sub-sheriff, Inverness .....	(s) 300	0	0
Kimber, William, clerk to secretaries of the admiralty .....	337	10	0
Glandore, John, earl of, commissioner for the custody of rolls.....	(i) 1037	6	9
Glentworth, lord E. H. clerk of the crown in chancery .....	£ 379	10	(i) 510 18 0
— clerk of the hanaper .....	138	8	
Glenberrie, lord, surveyor-general of the king's woods and forests .....	£ 3000	3600	
— contingents .....	600		
His lordship's son, the hon. F. S. Douglas, nephew of the earl of Guildford, holds part of these offices in reversion.			
Glencairn, Isabella, countess of.....	(s) 300	0	0
Glyn, Thomas, commissioner of bankrupts .....	350	0	0
Gloster, John, deputy register in Trinidad, and secretary of council in St. Vincent.....	711	7	6

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinécures, and Emoluments.*

Gloucester, duchess dowager of	£ 480	0	0
Prince William, duke of, a general, colonel of the 3d foot guards, chancellor of the university of Cambridge, and ranger of Bagshot-park and walk: by act of parliament	14,000	0	0
duchess of, pension	9000	0	0
Goddard, Charles, pension <i>(pl)</i> £850 collector and transmitter of state-papers in secretary of state's office	1350	0	0
The pension to be wholly or proportionably suspended to an amount equal to the value of any employment he may hereafter hold under government; other than as collector of state-papers. A singular condition, which renders public service or not, equally profitable to the individual.			
Goddard, Charles, April, 1799 <i>(s.m)</i>	850	0	0
Golding, Jackson, compt. of sorting office, post-office <i>(i)</i>	250	0	0
Goldie, Magdalen <i>(s)</i>	100	0	0
Sophia <i>(s)</i>	100	0	0
Goddenough, George Trenchard, late secretary .. Samuel, bishop of Carlisle, value of see	150	0	0
Tutor to the duke of Portland; the lady of the bishop's brother was sister to viscount Sidmouth.			
Gordon, Alexander Gordon, duke of, keeper of the great seal, Scotland	3000	0	0
Father to the marquis of Huntly, and father-in-law to the dukes of Richmond, Bedford, and Manchester; lady Madelina Palmer, a daughter of the duke, has a pension of £200, and his brother is deputy ranger of St. James's and Hyde parks.			
lord W. receiver-general of the duchy of Cornwall	1040	0	0
deputy ranger of St. James's and Hyde parks	700	0	0
sir Alexander, knight, sheriff-depute for Kirkcudbright <i>(s)</i>	500	0	0
lady Ann <i>(s)</i>	150	0	0
Mrs. Margaret Stewart <i>(s)</i>	50	0	0
Goodrich Ann <i>(s)</i>	100	0	0
James, commissary of Edinburgh <i>(s)</i>	500	0	0
George, dean of Exeter	1000	0	0
George Hamilton, July, 1793 <i>(s.m)</i>	200	0	0
E. esq. sergeant at arms	100	0	0
Charles Frederick, assistant surgeon at Haslar hospital	55	0	0
hon. Robert, secretary of embassy to Vienna	1900	0	0
Adam, naval officer at Trinidad, (sinécure)	450	0	0

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinécures, and Emoluments.

Gordon, Patience, Oct. 1797.....	£ 200	0	0
Gore, dame Annabella, to commence on the death of her husband, Jan. 1806..... (s.m.)	386	0	0
May not this mode of granting pensions weaken the conjugal tie, and even give rise to petty treasons?			
Goulburn, Henry, nephew of viscount Chetwynd, under sec. of state for the war department	2000	0	0
Gould, A. commissioner of stamp duties, Jamaica	806	0	0
— Ann, and Ann Pacton Gee, Oct. 1782 (w)	200	0	0
— William, clerk of assize, home circuit....	800	0	0
Græme, admiral Alexander, for severe wounds, December, 1781 .....	300	0	0
— Mary..... (s.m.)	100	0	0
Grafton, duke of, for his life, and the heirs male of his great grandfather .... £6870	9756	0	0
— seal officer of king's bench and common pleas .....			
An illegitimate descendant of Charles II. by Barbara Villiers. The annuity of £6870 was granted in lieu of a butlerage and prisage on wines. His grace's parliamentary influence is in Thetford and Bury St. Edmund's, returning one member for each. His grace's motto— <i>Et decus et pretium recti</i> —the ornament and recompence of virtue, certainly cannot allude to his illustrious descent.			
Graham, sir Robert, baron of the court of exchequer	3000	0	0
— Aaron, inspector of places for the confinement of felons previous to transportation ..	350	0	0
— Grace .....	100	0	0
— general, for Jane Hay .....	100	0	0
Grant, Charles, director of the Sierra Leone company, chief secretary to the lord-lieut. in Ireland			
— East-India director .....	300	0	0
— Charles, son of the above, lord of the treasury .....	1000	0	0
— Joseph, counter warden in mint, Scotland..	60	0	0
— Sophia, Jane, Charlotte, Margaret, Catharine Ann Harriet, and Caroline, and survivors or survivor .....	200	0	0
— Robert, clerk of the works at the ordnance, Ireland .....	85	3	0
Grattan, Lucy Carey, Caroline, and Frances, March, 1803 .....	120	0	0
Surely these are not relatives of Henry Grattan, who had £50,000 given to him by his countrymen, for defending the constitutional liberties of Ireland!			
Gray, lord William .....	200	0	0
— Marion.....	150	0	0



## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Griffith, Richard, forage-master in the ordnance department.....(i)	£ 547	0	0
Grierson, George, his majesty's printer, Ireland (i)	900	0	0
Groves, David, John, and Richard, superannuated rear admirals.....	1231	12	6
——— John and Richard, superannuated captains	438	0	0
Grudell, vice-admiral sir Richard, for severe wounds, February, 1796.....	250	0	0
Gunning, sir Robert, late envoy to Russia....(pl)	1000	0	0
Gurnell, John, late a messenger, May, 1804.....	150	0	0
Gurney, Richard, Esq. vice-warden of the stannaries	400	0	0
Gwydir, Peter Burrell, great chamberlain of England.....	3000	0	0
Brother-in-law to the duchess of Northumberland, marchioness of Exeter, countess of Beverly, and the earl of Cholmondeley.			
Gwyn, Mrs. Mary, woman of the late queen's bed-chamber.....	300	0	0

## H

Haffield, Thomas, clerk in the auditor-general's office.....(i)	£ 294	}	£ 304	0	0
——— on the treasury establishment.....(i)	100				
Hailes, Daniel, late envoy at Stockholm, (pension).....(pl)	1127	0	0	0	0
Hale, John, gentleman usher, privy chamber.....	300	0	0	0	0
Halford, sir H. physician in ordinary to the king ..	300	0	0	0	0
Hales, William, clerk, Oct. 1802.....	168	0	0	0	0
Halket, John, commissioner for auditing West India accounts, chairman.....	1500	0	0	0	0
Hallam, George, vendue master, Berbice.....	1000	0	0	0	0
Hall, Samuel, deputy secretary and register and clerk of the council in Tobago.....	550	0	0	0	0
——— major, barrack-master, Jamaica.....	365	0	0	0	0
Hallifax, Gertrude, Charlotte, Marianne, Caroline, Catharine, and Elizabeth, £60 each, 1793 ..	360	0	0	0	0
Hamilton, Archibald, duke of, keeper of Holyrood-house, premier peer of Scotland, (no return)					
——— sir Charles, gov. and commander in chief, Newfoundland, (ditto)					
——— William, under secretary of state for foreign affairs, (ditto)					
——— Sarah.....(i)	700	0	0	0	0



## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Hamilton, Edward, customer, port of Newry	£407	0	0
Robert, esq. sheriff-depute for Lanark (s)	500	0	0
C. secretary of legation at Wirtemburgh	584	0	0
Charles Powel, secretary and clerk of council, Granada	900	0	0
There are fourteen more <i>Hamiltons</i> , principally females, with pensions and incomes from the public, amounting to £1398.			
Hammond, William Andrew, Edward, George, and Margaret, £194 each, Feb. 26, 1806..(s.m)	776	0	0
George, late under secretary of state (pl)	1200	0	0
Margaret, wife of the above, to commence on his death	615	0	0
Hamon, Jerome, pilot, for meritorious conduct	50	0	0
Contrast this paltry sum, the reward perhaps of the pilot risking his own life, in saving the lives of his fellow creatures, with the immense sums swallowed by an <i>ex-under secretary</i> of state and family.			
Hamond, sir A. S. late comptroller of the navy	1500	0	0
Hanner, J. W. clerk to <i>nisi prius</i>	358	0	0
Harbourne, suppressed dep. commissary, South Britain	159	0	0
Harcourt, Wm. Harcourt, earl of, general, col. of the 16th dragoons, governor of Portsmouth	£4500	8100	0
deputy ranger of Windsor-park			
governor of the royal military college			
master of the robes to the king			
of horse to the queen			
countess, lady of the queen's bed-chamber	500		
The earl is brother to lord Vernon and the archbishop of York			
Harding sir Richard, surveyor-gen. of the ports (i)	2400	0	0
Hargrove, Louis, consul at the Balearic Isles	352	0	0
Harris, T. G. esq. commissioner of stamp duties, Jamaica	800	0	0
Harrison, Richardson, remembrancer of first-fruits, settled on his heirs and assigns for ever, whether they be <i>fools</i> or <i>knaves</i>	660	0	0
Harrington, Charles Stanhope, earl of, general in the army, col. of 1st regiment of life guards; governor of Windsor castle	182	0	0

The countess of Harrington was lady of the late queen's bed-chamber, £500; the hon. B. Stanhope is page of honour to the king, £250; and viscount Petersham is a lord of the king's bed-chamber, £1000.

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinécures, and Emoluments.

Harrowby, Dudley Ryder, earl of, trustee of the British Museum, high steward of Tiverton; lord president of the council .....	£4000	0	0
<i>Relations.</i> —The right hon. R. Ryder, judge advocate gen. &c. £5060; Thomas Ryder, commissioner of excise, £554, and accomptant-general of salt duties, £148; and the hon. H. Ryder bishop of Gloucester, are all brothers to the earl.			
Hartwell, George, clerk in the navy office, Feb. 1801 .....	400	0	0
Harrison, Jones, port-surveyor of Cork .....	200	0	0
———— in right of his wife .....	50	0	0
Harwood, Harry, principal officer and commissioner of the navy, June, 1806 .....	750	0	0
Hase, Henry, chief cashier Bank of England, for fees at public offices .....	925	17	0
Hasler, John, searcher, packer, and guager, port of Waterford .....	433	0	0
Hastings, Francis Rawdon, marquis of, general in the army, col. of the 27th regiment, lord lieut. of the Tower-hamlets, and one of the governors of the Charter-house; constable and chief governor of the Tower of London .....	£1000	}	26,000 0 0
———— governor-gen. of India, (salary) .....	25,000		
<i>The patronage and emoluments of this office, it is impossible to estimate. The court of directors lately voted £50,000 to the marquis for his services in India. The marchioness is a peeress in Scotland, in her own right, by the title of countess and baroness of Loudon.</i>			
Hatsell, John, late clerk of the house of commons .....	8010	0	0
Hatton, George, examiner of excise .....	850	0	0
———— Edward Finch, com. of stamp office .....	1000	0	0
———— George F. gentleman usher privy chamber .....	200	0	0
Haye, Thomas Robert, earl of Kinnoul, Lyon king of arms .....	£578	}	1578 0 0
———— pension .....	1000		
<i>Relations.</i> —Dr. Edward Haye Drummond, prebendary of York and Southwell, £600; and the rector of Hadleigh in Suffolk, £900, and chaplain to the king.			
Hay, Isabella .....	(s)	150	0 0
———— Barbara .....	(s)	600	0 0
———— Mrs. Helen, Elizabeth, Lewis, Maria, Dorothea Judith, Arthur Whittam, and Agnes Clark, £100 each; to take effect on the death of their mother and continue till they are married .....	(s)	700	0 0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Hay, Charles, of Newton.....(s)	£1200	0	0
Hayman, John, esq. lieut.-gov. of St. Kitts .....	200	0	0
Heathecote, Antoinette, Nov. 1802 .....	300	0	0
Heathfield, lord, for his life, and afterwards to his son .....	1503	0	0
Heberden, W. physician in ordinary to the king ..	300	0	0
Hecht, F. W. suppressed dep. commissary, Annapolis Royal .....	159	3	9
Helen's, lord St. late foreign minister, continued to his family .....	2300	0	0
Henderson, William, lieut. of the band of gentlemen pensioners .....	500	0	0
Henry, F. Dublin.....(i)	276	0	0
Heneage, Arabella Walker, widow, chief proclanator, common pleas .....	£100	}	237 0 0
chief usher .....	137		
Henley, lord, late envoy and minister plenipot. at Vienna, Jan. 1800.....(pl)	2000	0	0
Henslow, sir John, senior surveyor of the navy, 1806	750	0	0
Hepburn, George Buchan, baron of exchequer (s)	1200	0	0
Elizabeth .....	100	0	0
Hereford, Henry Devereux, viscount, premier viscount of England, pension, 1806 .....	£600	}	1200 0 0
pension, in conjunction with his wife 1810(s.m) : 600	600		
Hermard, G. Fergusson, lord of session .....	2000	0	0
lord, one of the commiss. of the judiciary court, Scotland .....	600	0	0
Herries, John Charles, esq. late commissary in chief appointed on the abolition of his office of auditor of the civil list ..	1350	0	0
Herries, Mary Ann, April, 1799 .....	1500	0	0
Catherine, Isabella Maria, and Julia Mary, £150 each, April, 1799 .....	300	0	0
Hertford, Francis Ingram Conway Seymour, marquis of, lord chamberlain of the household	450	0	0
The patronage of this office is considerable. Lords Robert and Henry Seymour, brothers to the marquis, fill the office of prothonotary, in the court of king's bench, Ireland, average salary £6849, and lord George Seymour, another brother, is commissioner of excise, £1250.	3000	0	0
Hervey, Lionel, secretary of legation, Munich ..	227	5	2
Heste, L. esq. secretary lottery office.....	500	0	0
Hewgill, Elizabeth, March 14, 1801 .....	300	0	0
Hewitt, James P. clerk of the warrants, common pleas .....	852	0	0

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Hibbert, George, esq. for Jamaica agency .....	£1500	0	0
Hicks, George, esq: police magistrate, Bow-street	600	0	0
— William, esq. superintendant of returned letters, post office.....	320	0	0
Hill, J. A. clerk Portsmouth-yard .....	400	0	0
Hill, sir G. F. clerk of the house .....	2265	13	9
— lord, pension .....	£2000	}	2180 0 0
— governor of Hull.....	180		
Hill, hon. Ann, <i>widow</i> , June, 1803 .....	(s.m)	130	0 0
— hon. William, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipot. at Sardinia .....		5300	0 0
Brother to Thomas Noel Hill, lord Berwick, a peer.			
Hill, James, esq. gen. com. lottery office .....	200	0	0
Hinchcliffe, H. J. chief justice admiralty-court, Jamaica .....	2000	0	0
Hobart, Jane, executors of the late, June, 1803..	200	0	0
— hon. Henry Lewis, prebendary of Canterbury .....	800	0	0
Hobert, George, the late five children of.....(w)	400	0	0
Hobson, Webbe, joint dep. sec. and receiver at Berbice .....	1688	6	8
Holdsworth, Elizabeth, June, 1789 .....	(w)	300	0 0
Holdship, James, } <i>chaff office</i> .....	793	0	0
— John, }			
Holland, lord, recorder of Nottingham, receiver-general of the issues, Glamorgan, Monmouth, &c. ....	350	0	0
His lordship is in trust for the pension of the widow of his uncle, the late C. J. Fox.			
Holmes, Peter, secretary, stamp office .....	(i)	200	0 0
Holroyd, sir George Sowly, knt. judge of the court of king's bench.....	4000	0	0
Each <i>puisse</i> judge transmits to the commissioner of the treasury, every half-year, a statement of his fees and emoluments, when such a sum is issued out of the consolidated fund as will make them up two thousand pounds for each half year.			
Home, sir E. surgeon, royal household .....	396	13	4
— William Home, earl of, son-in-law to the duke of Buccleugh, pension .....	800	0	0
Honeyman, sir William, bart. of Arma-dale, lord of session .....	(s) £1200	}	1800 0 0
— lord of justiciary .....	(s) 600		
Hope, lieut.-gen. sir Alexander, half-brother to the earl of Hopetoun, K. B.; gov. of the royal military college, Berks.....	1500	0	0
— sir George Johnstone, real-admiral of the red; a lord of the admiralty .....	1000	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Hope, Charles, right hon. lord president of the court of session .....	(s)	£ 4300	0	0
— Charles and David Williamson, for Isabella viscountess Arbuthnot .....	(s)	300	0	0
— ditto, Catharine, and James Arbuthnot, to take effect on the death of their mother, viscountess Arbuthnot .....	(s)	300	0	0
Hopner, Richard Belgrave, consul at Venice ....		1000	0	0
Horne, William, sheriff-dep. for Haddington ....		500	0	0
Hort, sir John, Sept. 1796 .....	(s.m)	1000	0	0
Hotham, Diana, widow of general Hotham .....		400	0	0
— sir Beaumont .....	(l)	2000	0	0
Houston, Ann .....	(s)	100	0	0
Howard, Richard, earl of Effingham, treasurer to the late queen .....		500	0	0
— lady Elizabeth .....		150	0	0
— lady Mary .....		150	0	0
Howley, right hon. William, bishop of London, value of see .....		£8500		
— dean of the chapel royal .....		200		
		8700	0	0
Hughes, John, first clerk to store-keeper of the ordnance .....	(i)	299	0	0
Hulse, gen. S. lieut. gov. royal hospital of Chelsea .....		400	0	0
Hume, sir Abraham, in trust for Henry, St. Vincent Frederic, and Richard Thomas Morton, £100 each, until they reach the age of 21, or be otherwise provided for, to an equal amount .....	(s.m)	300	0	0
Hunn, Mary and Maria, May, 1799 .....		500	0	0
<p>Mother and sister of Mr. Canning, the celebrated defender of all that is vicious in the <i>higher orders</i>, and the reviler of all that is virtuous in the <i>lower orders</i>. It is a little singular that the most able and zealous defenders of the patrician classes, Messrs. Perry, Canning, Gifford and Stuart, should all be of plebeian origin. Mrs. Hunn was originally a celebrated actress, and her first lover was the father of Mr. Canning. Her second lover was Mr. Reddish, likewise upon the stage; and her third lover, who married her, was Mr. HUNN, who kept a shop at Plymouth; and from whom probably, the right hon. gentleman has ever since felt such a strange aversion for every thing connected with the <i>lower classes</i>. Mr. Hunn became a bankrupt; since then the family has been supported by the people, for whose goodness the son never lets slip an opportunity to express his gratitude by ridicule and abuse.</p>				
Hunter, sir John, consul-general at Madrid .....		1692	0	0
Husbands, J. D. dep. secretary and clerk of council, Barbadoes .....		400	0	0

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Huskisson, right hon. William, a director of the Sun Fire-office; commission- er of woods, forests, and land reve- nues .....	£500	} £2400 0 0
colonial agent for Ceylon .....	700	
pension from May, 1801, of .....	1200	
Mrs. Huskisson's pension, of £615 a year, commences at the death of her husband. According to a statement made by Mr. Calcraft in the House of Commons, Mr. Huskisson could not obtain his <i>marriage settlements</i> till he had secured the above comfortable provision for himself and spouse.		
Hutchinson, hon. F. H. collector, port of Dublin ..	305 5 9	
John Heley, governor of Stirling-cas- tle £300, and a pension of £2000 .....	2300 0 0	
The pension continues to the two next male heirs in succes- sion. For <i>relations</i> , see Donoughmore.		
Hyatt, Philip, clerk in the navy-office, April, 1802	200 0 0	

## I &amp; J

Inglis, sir Peter, for the children of sir Charles Primrose, deceased .....	(s) 200 0 0
Innes, John, Kincardine .....	(s) 200 0 0
Johnson, Robert, judge of the common pleas, Ire- land .....	(i) 1200 0 0
Jones, Edward, clerk of the debentures .....	(i) 163 0 0
Irby, Methuen, page of honour .....	280 0 0
Iremonger, rev. L. prebendary of Winchester .....	500 0 0
Irving, Marian, Oct. 1800 .....	
Iveson, W. esq. certificate com. lottery office .....	350 0 0
Jackson, Francis James, late foreign minister, Ber- lin, Oct. 1806 .....	1700 0 0
Thomas, late minister plenipotentiary to Sardinia .....	800 0 0
W. and Wm. jun. distributors of stamps .....	1272 0 0
James, esq. commissioner of excise ..(s) ..	800 0 0
James, John, late secretary of embassy, Amsterdam	1100 0 0
Jameson, Andrew Cupor .....	(s) 240 0 0
Jeanes, rev. Thomas .....	200 0 0
Jeffery, John, consul-general at Lisbon .....	1672 0 0
Jenkins, Lewis, commissioner for auditing public accounts .....	1200 0 0
Mrs. formerly Augusta Evelyn .....	250 0 0
Jenkinson, Elizabeth, now Cornwell .....	250 0 0
rev. John Banks, prebendary of Worcester Cousin to the earl of Liverpool.	400 0 0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Salaries, and Emoluments.*

Jennings, Ann and Robert John, July, 1804..(s.m)	£ 450	0	0
Jephson, sir Richard, judge of the admiralty-court, Gibraltar .....	172	17	0
Jocelyn, viscount, vice chamberlain .....	1159	0	0
Johnes, Thomas, auditor for the land revenue, Wales	1505	0	0
Johnstone, lady H. C. ....(w)	250	0	0
Jones, William, esq. marshal of the King's-Bench- prison .....	5000	0	0

It is the duty of this officer to attend the lord chief justice, and the other judges at Westminster, on the first day of term, and also on all other occasions when his attendance is required. It is his duty to take charge of and secure all prisoners committed to his custody; and he is answerable in case any of them should escape. He has the care and management of the King's-Bench-prison; he hears and determines all complaints made by the prisoners against the officers, or against each other; and regulates all matters connected with the security, health, and good order of the prison. He has no salary; his income is derived from fees, the granting of the rules, and the sale of ale and porter to the prisoners. The following is a list of some of the marshal's fees, as fixed in 1760, by act of Parliament, and confirmed by a rule made in the King's Bench, 1806:—

For every prisoner com. on any civil action, 4s. 8d.

For the discharge of ditto, 7s. 4d.

For the use of chamber, bed, bedding, and sheets, after the first night, (on the common side) 1½d.

For the use of ditto, (on the master's side,) 3d.

On the common side, if two lie in a bed, the charge is only 1d. each; and on the master's side, if two lie in a bed, the charge is 2d. each; and if the prisoner finds his own bed, bedding, and sheets, which the marshal has no right to prevent, he then pays for chamber rent 1s. For granting the rules, for the first £100 debt, 5s. 5d; and for every £100 after the first, 4s. 4d. Fees are also paid to the deputy-marshal and other officers of the prison. The dismissal fee of a prisoner committed on any crown prosecution is £1: 11: 8.

## K.

Keate, Thomas, esq. surgeon to Chelsea Hospital	£1000	0	0	
Kelly, right hon. Thomas .....	2000	0	0	
Kemmis, Thomas, crown solicitor, Ireland ....(i)	314	14	6	
Kennedy, John, door-keeper .....	168	4	9	
Kent, duke of, out of the consolidated fund .....	£24,000	0	0	
as governor of Gibraltar .....	6517	8	4	
as col. of the royal Scotch regt. of foot .....	613	2	6	
as keeper and paler of Hampton-court park ..	74	3	4	
		31,205	4	2

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

The annual allowance of his royal highness, previous to his marriage with the princess of *Leinengen*, sister to prince *Coburg*, was £18,000; on that occasion it was increased £6000; and ministers would have augmented his income to £40,000, but that was found rather too much even for the *country gentlemen*. The duke seems as little endowed with economy and prudence as his royal brothers; for we observe, from a statement of the chancellor of the Exchequer, that he is making preparations to dispose of part of his property by a lottery, to enable him to pay his debts!

Kent, Edward, itinerant deputy-surveyor general of woods and forests .....	£ 500	0	0
Kenyon, lord, joint <i>custos brevium</i> in the King's-Bench .....	930	0	0
—— hon. R. S. filazer and exigenter, appointed by the lord chief justice .....	4986	0	0
Kerr, William, for Mary Hart and Margaret Rose, and survivor .....	100	0	0
—— ladies Louisa, Sidney, and Elizabeth, £200 each .....	600	0	0
Kevern, Charles, first assistant to master shipwright, Plymouth-yard .....	225	0	0
Kilwarden, viscount John .....	866	13	0
King, John, comptroller of the private office ....	1000	0	0
The wife of this gentleman has a contingent pension of more than £500, granted so long ago as 1792, and to take place whenever Mr. King does not hold any situation under government of the clear annual value of £400.			
King, Walter, bishop of Rochester, value of see .....	£2000	}	5400 0 0
—— canon of Wells .....	500		
—— prebendary of Durham ..	2000		
Secretary to the duke of Portland, and provincial chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury.			
King, John, naval-officer in Jamaica, as long as he discharges the <i>duty in person</i> , and behaves well therein—all which he does by <i>deputy</i> ..	1500	0	0
Kingdom, John, clerk in the navy-office, July, 1804	350	0	0
Kingston, John, esq. commissioner of stamps ....	1000	0	0
—— Robert, dep. vendue-master at Demarara	1700	0	0
Kinnoul, George, earl of, pension .....	£1000	}	1600 0 0
—— Lion king of arms in Scotland .....	600		
Kirkcudbright, lord .....	300	0	0
—— for Mrs. Ferguson .....	100	0	0
Kirkpatrick, Isabella .....	500	0	0
—— sir Thomas, sheriff-dep. for Dumfries ..	350	0	0
Kirwan, Wilhelmina, widow of Dr. Kirwan, late dean of Killala, reversion to her daughters	300	0	0



*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Kneper, rev. J. German chapel .....	£425	0	0
Knipe, Mrs. Alicia .....	(i)	300	0 0
Knockey, Mr. Jacob, late messenger .....		130	0 0
Knollis, Samuel .....	(i)	250	0 0
Knox, Letitia, <i>pension</i> .....		600	0 0
— William, ditto, Dec. 1790 .....	(pl)	600	0 0
— Mary Ann, ditto, Nov. 1801 .....	(i)	200	0 0
— John, esq. ditto, Dec. 1802 .....	(i)	200	0 0
— Francis, assistant barrister for Sligo .....	(i)	300	0 0
— right hon. George .....	(i)	400	0 0
— hon. Thomas and hon. John Vesey, joint pro- thonotary of common pleas, Ireland, July, 1794 .....	(i)	10,023	0 0
— ditto <i>weigher</i> at Cork .....		352	0 0
— hon. William, bishop of Derry .....		9000	0 0
<i>Relations of Thomas Knox, viscount Northland, governor and custos rotularum of the county of Tyrone, and one of the peers of Ireland.</i>			
Kutzlebon, Gertrude Philippine de, May, 1800 ( <i>s.m.</i> ) .....		150	0 0
Kyte, Loretta Maria, April, 1790 .....	( <i>s.m.</i> )	150	0 0

## L

Lake, Francis Gérard, viscount, major-general, two pensions by act of parliament, in con- sideration of his father's services in India .....		12,649	0 0
— William, commissioner of stamp-office .....		800	0 0
Lamb, Thomas, macer of exchequer .....	(s)	100	0 0
— Thomas Davis, law-clerk in the home-office, sinecure .....	£300	800	0 0
— commissioner of taxes .....	500		
Lambe, hon. F. envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at Bavaria .....		5300	0 0
Lant, John, consul at Fiume .....		400	0 0
Lant, Gavin, crier of the court of chancery .....		144	8 5
Langford, William Wiss, consul-general at Tripoli .....		930	0 0
Larant, John, jun. <i>examiner of new plays</i> .....		400	0 0
Law, John, archdeacon and prebend of Rochester .....		600	0 0
— George Henry, lord bishop of Ches- ter, value of see .....	£3400	3900	0 0
— prebend of Carlisle .....	500		
<i>Relations of the late lord Ellenborough.</i>			
Law, John, D.D. bishop of Elphin .....		5500	0 0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Law, William .....	(s)	£200	0	0
Lawrenzie, Ernestine .....		200	0	0
Le Blanc, lieut. col. Henry, hospital major, Chelsea .....		300	0	0
Lee, sir John, bart. compt. port of Cork £896 } — searcher, packer, and	(i)	1459	0	0
guager, Wexford .....	563			
Legge, major Richard, chief fire-master at the laboratory in the ordnance .....	(i)	150	0	0
— hon. Edward, dean of Windsor .....		1000	0	0
— hon. Henry, commissioner of the navy .....		800	0	0
Leigh, hon. Mrs. Augusta, woman of the queen's bed-chamber .....		300	0	0
Leitrim, earl of, and Robert Clotworthy Clements, searcher of the port of Dublin .....		1359	0	0
Lempriere, Elizabeth Brudenell, Oct. 1798 ..(s.m)		200	0	0
— John, consul at Pernambuco .....		788	0	0
Leslie, lord, 14th Aug. 1799 .....	(s.m)	500	0	0
— lady Charlotte .....	(s)	100	0	0
— Eugenia .....	(s)	60	0	0
Leven, Alexander, earl of .....	(s)	£300		
— compensation as				
retired officer .....		400		
— compt. gen. of				
customs, Scotland .....		405		
Lewis, Elizabeth .....	(w)	150	0	0
Ley, John Henry, clerk assistant to the house of commons .....		2500	0	0
Limerick, earl of, privy counsellor; clerk of the crown and hanaper .....	(i)	405	0	0
Lincoln, George Tomline, bishop of, value of see .....		£4300		
— dean of				
St. Paul's .....		300		
Lind, Dr. John, physician of Haslar hospital, Aug. 1804 .....		300	0	0
— Letitia, Mary, Letitia, £50 each .....		150	0	0
Lindsay, Thomas, gentleman usher of the black rod, Ireland .....	(i)	608	18	3
Lindsey, lady Ann .....	(s)	300	0	0
Lister, Elizabeth .....	(w)	200	0	0
Liston, right hon. R. ambassador and plenipotentiary at Constantinople .....		8603	0	0
— Robert, late envoy and plenipotentiary to United States, pension, 1804 .....		2000	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinicures, and Emoluments.*

Liverpool, earl of, first lord of the treasury	£4000	}	£13,100	0	0
constable of Dover-castle	4100				
commissioner for the af-					
fairs of India.....	1500				
clerk of the rolls in Ire-					
land .....	3500				

His lordship is also a lord of trade and plantations; master of the Trinity House; high steward of Kingston-upon-Thames; a governor of the Charter-house; an official trustee of the British Museum; and warden, keeper, and admiral, of the Cinque Ports. The bishop of Worcester, and John Banks Jenkinson, prebend of Worcester, are relations. The office of clerk of the pells, the earl's father bought, in 1775, of the late C. J. Fox; and, by patent, is granted in reversion to the earl of Shannon, peer of Ireland, and *custos rotulorum* of the county of Cork.

Livingstone, Edmund, Oct. 1800 .....	(s.m)	500	0	0	
lady.....	(s)	100	0	0	
Elizabeth, Ann, and survivor.....	(s)	100	0	0	
Lloyd, Ann, <i>spinster</i> .....		100	0	0	
John, May 1801 .....	(s.m)	500	0	0	
rev. Wm. Seales, (court of chan.) .....		293	0	0	
John, first clerk to the compt. and accountant					
general .....		100	0	0	
John and Nath. Leitch in trust for Isabella (s)		225	0	0	
Lock, Georgiana Cecilia .....		200	0	0	
lady Frances .....		200	0	0	
Emily Frederica.....		200	0	0	
Margaret, Jean, and Frances, £55 each (s)		165	0	0	
Locke, Cecilia, June 1799 .....		411	0	0	
Loftus, general, William, lieut. gov. of the Tower..		963	1	0	
Uncle in law of the marquis of Townsend, and colonel of the 24th regiment of dragoons.					
Long, rev. Wm. canon of Windsor .....		603	0	0	
rt. hon. Charles, pension, Feb. 1801	£1500	}	3500	0	0
joint paymaster of					
the forces .....	2000				
Mr. Long is an official lord of trade and plantations, a trustee of the British and Huntrean museums, commissioner for the erection of <i>national monuments</i> , a director of Greenwich hospital, R.S. and S.A. The borough of <i>Haslemere</i> , which he represents, is said to have been bought by an apothecary and chandler on speculation, for £18,000; and sold again to the late sir James Lowther, for £24,000. A pension to Mrs. Long of £750 commences on his death.					
Longfield, John, customer, port of Cork .....		500	0	0	
Low, George Henry, prebend of Carlisle .....		500	0	0	
Lowe, sir Hudson, <i>jailer</i> of Buonaparte at St.					
Helena .....		12,000	0	0	
Lowndes, Richard, clerk of assize, midland circuit		650	0	0	

Lowther, Wm. viscount, commissioner for affairs of India .....	£1500	}	£3100 0 0
----- lord of the trea- sury .....	1600		
Son of the earl of Lonsdale, who returns <i>eight</i> members to parliament, and who has nearly as many church livings in his gift. The earl is a governor of the charity of St. Bees school; a very rich endowment, the value of the tenements alone being above £8000 a year, which have been let out at leases for 1000 years, at the low fixed rent of £100. The earl's ancestor, sir James Lowther, while he was governor, in 1742, obtained, or rather granted to himself, a lease of the <i>coal</i> and other valuable minerals for 867 years, for the trifling sum of £3:14s. <i>per annum</i> . The Lowthers, for obvious reasons, oppose <i>Parliamentary Reform</i> ; and the noble earl, during the last sham election at Appleby, said, the constitution was " <i>the most GLORIOUS which could be devised!</i> "			
Lugard, John, assistant and secretary military asy- lum, Chelsea .....	182 10 0		
Luken, Robt. first clerk in the war-office .....	2000 0 0		
Lumley, major-general, groom of the bed-chamber ----- sir William, governor of Bermuda .....	500 0 0 750 0 0		
Lushington, S. R. son-in-law of lord Harris, joint secretary to the treasury .....	3000 0 0		
----- sir Henry, consul at Naples .....	623 0 0		
Luttrell, F. commissioner of customs .....	1250 0 0		
----- Henry, clerk of the pipe in Ireland .....	360 0 0		
J. F. Luttrell is a relation of the earl of Carhampton, and proprietor of the botough of Minehead.			
Luxmore, John, bishop of St. Asaph, tutor to the duke of Beaufort, value of see £1900	}	2700 0 0	
----- rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn .....			
Lynch, John, deputy clerk of the crown and peace, Jamaica .....	300 0 0		
Lynedoch, Thomas Graham, lord, brother-in-law to earl Cathcart, pension .....	2000 0 0		
Lysons, Samuel, keeper of the records in the Tower .....	£500 0	}	1435 16 0
----- to pay fees .....	169 4		
----- to pay three clerks ..	766 12		

## M

Macclesfield, George Parker, earl of, captain of the  
yeomen of the guard .....

1000 0 0

In 1486, when this commission was instituted by Henry VII. there were only 50 yeomen, afterward 100, eight of whom are called ushers, who have each £10 more than the others. The earl is president of the board of agriculture, high steward of

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Henley, lord lieutenant of Oxfordshire, and father-in-law to lord Binning, M. P. The countess of Macclesfield was lady of the queen's bed-chamber, £500.		
M'Clutock, W. F. and John, serjeants at arms . . . (i)	£1500	0 0
M'Donald, Thomas, February, 1804 . . . . . (s.m)	770	0 0
Macdonald, sir Archibald, pension . . . . . (s)	3800	0 0
—— James, M. R. son of the above; clerk of privy seal for life . . . . .	350	0 0
—— Henry, consul-general at Algiers . . . . .	500	0 0
—— Ronald, esq. sheriff-depute for Stirling . . . . .	500	0 0
M'Donough, November 1815 . . . . . (s.m)	130	0 0
M'Dougall, Allen, esq. in trust for the children of John Hay, of Newhall . . . . . (s)	400	0 0
M'Dowall, James, cashier of police office, Scotland (s)	100	0 0
—— auditor of excise . . . . . (s)	368	0 0
M'Gra, Emily, Elizabeth, and Harriet . . . . . (c)	500	0 0
To commence on the death of their father, Perkins M'Gra.		
M'Gregor, Peter, surgeon military asylum, Chelsea	273	0 0
Macintosh, sir James, M. P. for the rotten borough of Knaresborough, late recorder of Bombay— (salary unknown)		
M'Kay, James, for loss of revenue permits . . . . .	153	0 0
Mackay, John . . . . . (w)	150	0 0
—— Erie, baron Kevy . . . . . (s)	200	0 0
—— Louisa and Marian, £100 each . . . . . (s)	200	0 0
M'Kenna, T. sen. and Theobald, jun. and survivor	300	0 0
Mackenzie, Catharine, admiral's daughter . . . . .	50	0 0
—— John H. sheriff-depute for Linlithgow . . . . .	500	0 0
—— Henry, attorney to the exchequer . . . . . (s)	350	0 0
M'Laine, rev. Archibald . . . . . Nov. 1790 (s.m)	100	0 0
—— Harriet Ann . . . . . Feb. 1798 (s.m)	200	0 0
—— Charles Anthony . . . . . June 1800 (s.m)	130	0 0
—— Maria, on the decease of her aunt, 1807 (c)	200	0 0
M'Lean, Alexander, receiver-general of land rents, Scotland . . . . .	600	0 0
—— Jane and Jane, £150 each . . . . .	300	0 0
Macleod, Donald, sheriff-depute for Ross and Cromarty . . . . . (s)	500	0 0
Maclachan, Donald, sheriff-depute Argyleshire . . . . .	500	0 0
Macnaghton, Edmund Alexander, lord of the treasury, Ireland . . . . .	1200	0 0
Maconachie, Alexander, <i>vide</i> Meadowbank.		
—— Allan, esq. of Meadowbank . . . . . (s)	2600	0 0
Macqueen, Robert Dundas, clerk of justiciary . . . . . (s)	200	0 0

Thirty-six *Macs* we have put down, and there are twenty-seven more upon the list, twenty of whom are females, with incomes not exceeding, £100 each.

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Madan, Mercer, treasurer and canon of Litchfield .....	£500	} £ 750 0 0
———— canon of Peterborough ..	250	
Maddock, Wm. clerk, Portsmouth-yard .....		200 0 0
Magra, Perkins, late consul, Tunis .....	(pl)	500 0 0
Mahon, viscount, surveyor of green wax ..	£260	} 741 0 0
———— keeper of the records ....	481	
Maitland, hon. F. lieut.-gen. and governor of Granada		400 0 0
<p>Uncle to the earl of Lauderdale; the hon. Alexander Maitland, general in the army, colonel of the 49th foot, is also an uncle to the earl; and the right hon. Thomas Maitland, colonel of the 10th foot, governor of Malta; and the hon. Wm. Mordaunt Maitland, lieut. general, are brothers to the earl. The earl receives in trust for the six <i>Hayes</i> £600. Clementina, Janet, Eleanora, Primrose, Charlotte Ann Wheatley, and Elizabeth Grey Dundas, Maitland, on the death of their mother, receive £300, with the benefit of survivorship. Helen Maitland is dowry for £50.</p>		
Majendie, H. Wm. bishop of Bangor, value of see		5000 0 0
<p>Son of the queen's English master, archdeacon of Anglesea and Bangor, and rector of Llandaff, Llandynnoc, and Denbigh.</p>		
Majoribanks, Edward .....	October 1802 (s.m)	250 0 0
Malmsbury, James Harris, earl of, pension as late foreign minister. [ <i>Vide Fitzharris</i> ]....	(pl)	2300 0 0
Mallet, du Pan, foreigner, and pensioned writer for Pitt .....	October 1800 (s.m)	200 0 0
Maningham, Henry, precis writer in the home office		300 0 0
Manchester, Wm. Montague, duke of, governor of Jamaica .....		14,000 0 0
<p>Lord Frederick Montague, brother to his grace, is collector outwards of the customs in the port of London, £2780.</p>		
Manners, Robt. M.P. relative of the duke of Rutland, first equerry to the king .....		736 0 0
Mansell, William, lord bishop of Bristol, value of see .....	£1000	} 2200 0 0
———— master of Trinity college, Cambridge .....	1200	
———— rector of Berwick, Yorkshire ( <i>unknown</i> )		
<p>Tutor to the late Spencer Perceval.</p>		
Mansfield, Mrs. Margaret .....	(s)	250 0 0
———— sir James, pension .....		3300 0 0
———— countess of, <i>deputy ranger</i> of Richmond Park .....		1600 0 0
<p>Mother to the earl of Mansfield, whose second son has the reversion of auditor of exchequer in Scotland, £1200.</p>		
March, Charles, late principal clerk of the war office .....	(l)	1000 0 0

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Marchant, Nat. seal engraver .....	£ 50	0	0
Marchall, S. G. consul-general, Embden .....	500	0	0
Markham, Osborn, and F. le Blanc, clerks of the King's Bench .....	£7591	}	8391 0 0
Osborn, chancellor of the pro- vince of York .....	800		
George, dean of York .....	1000	0	0
Robert, archdeacon of York, £500, and prebendary of Carlisle, £400 .....	900	0	0
John, late M. P. for Portsmouth, vice- admiral of the red .....			
Marlborough, George Spencer, duke of, pension ..	5000	0	0
Lord Charles Spencer, uncle to the duke; pension £1207; a lord of the bed-chamber, £1000. John Spencer, esq. a rela- tion, is accountant general of the post-office, £700. Rev. R. Nares, another relative, is archdeacon of Stafford, and canon of Lichfield, £600.			
Marsden, Alexander, Irish pension list ....	£700	}	1086 0 0
English ditto .....	386		
Elizabeth, his wife we suppose, by the <i>Whigs</i> , 1806 .....	300	0	0
Marsh, Herbert, bishop of Llandaff, value of see ..	1400	0	0
This right reverend person published a pamphlet in favour of the <i>Pitt system</i> , in 1797, and has continued to thrive ever since; in 1804, he obtained a pension of £514. Another divine, the Rev. John Brand, wrote a pamphlet in praise of Pitt, and he was rewarded with the great living of St. George, in the borough of Southwark. For more particulars on this subject, see <i>Gifford</i> .			
Lucy, on the death of her husband .....	300	0	0
Marsham, rev. T. C. master of mechanics .....	150	0	0
hon. Jacob, canon of Windsor .. £600 } prebend of Rochester 400 }	1000	0	0
Marten, sir Byam, compr. of the navy .....			
lady Mary .....	200	0	0
Mary, Sarah, and Alice, £50 each .....	150	0	0
Maseres, Francis, cursitor baron of the exchequer			
Mash, Thomas, sergeant at arms .....	100	0	0
Mason, right hon. J. M. .... (i)	1200	0	0
Catharine, his wife .....	200	0	0
Thomas, gent. pensioner .....	100	0	0
There are forty gentlemen pensioners. They purchase their places.			
Massereene, right hon. earl of, customer of Belfast	408	0	0
Master, W. C. gen. usher, privy chamber .....	200	0	0
Mary .....	50	0	0
Isabella F. ....	200	0	0
Mathias, H. prothonotary, Carmarthen circuit ....	1138	0	0

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Stipends, and Emoluments.

Matthews, James, R. consul at Cadiz.....	£528	0	0
Maurice, Thomas, clerk; Oct. 1806 .....	300	0	0
The <i>Whigs</i> being in office at this time, the pensions granted about this period, a very considerable number, ought to be placed to their account.			
Maxton, Marian .....	100	0	0
Maxwell, dame Magdalen .....	100	0	0
—— Mrs. Mary and Elizabeth, £100 each, and Agnes, £50 .....	250	0	0
—— George Dumfries .....	98	15	0
Maxwell, sir Murray, the " <i>gallant captain</i> ," harbour-master, Surinam .....	400	0	0
Mayor, John .....	650	0	0
—— Mary, on the death of her husband, John Mayor, Aug. 1798 .....	400	0	0
Mein, John .....	200	0	0
Meade, hon. Robert, customer, port of Yougall ..	431	0	0
Meadowbank, lord, (late lord advocate,) lord of session and justiciary .....	2600	0	0
Mecklenburgh Strelitz, prince of .....	2000	0	0
Meeke, W. secretary to the board of general officers .....	315	0	0
—— clerk of the parliament in the upper house.....	2208	0	0
—— master of the revels .....	300	0	0
Mr. Meeke seems to be the old <i>George Rose</i> of Ireland.			
Melbourne, Peniston Lamb, viscount, pension.....	£1500		
—— lord of the king's bed-chamber .....	1000		
Father of Mr. Lamb, M.P. for Westminster.			
Melville, Robert, viscount, first lord of the admiralty .....	5000	0	0
—— viscountess, lady of the queen's bed-chamber .....	500	0	0
Vide Dundas.			
Mellish, C. consul at Hamburgh .....	480	0	0
Merry, Anthony, late envoy and minister plenipotent. to America, 1807 .....	1700	0	0
Metge, Peter, late a baron of the exchequer, Ireland .....	2000	0	0
Meuron, Susan de .....	393	0	0

The *Act of Settlement*, in virtue of which the present family sits on the throne, says, that no person, "although he be naturalised, or made a *denizen*, except such as are born of *English parents*, shall be capable to be of the privy council, or a member of either House of parliament, or to enjoy *any office or place of trust either CIVIL or MILITARY*; or have any grant of lands, tenements, or hereditaments, from the crown to himself, or any other or others, in trust for him." In plain violation of the spirit of this law, innumerable pensions have been granted to



*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

foreigners: to the *D'Ivernois*, the *Mallet du Pans*, the *D'Attens*,  
*Wettensteins*, *Laurensis*, and a great many more:

Middleton, Elizabeth .....	£195	0	0
Miles, William Augustus, July, 1793 .....	(s.m)	300	0 0
Miller, Ann, widow, March, 1801 .....	(s.m)	130	0 0
——— sir William, bart. of Glenlee .....	(s)	2000	0 0
Milliquet, John, late charge d'affaires, Dresden (pl)		250	0 0
Milman, sir F. physician in ordinary to the king ..		300	0 0
Milward, James, jun. compt. gen. of accounts, by dep. ....		700	0 0
Mins, William, esq. ....	(s)	500	0 0
Minto, Gilbert Elliot, earl of, pension, 1809 ..(p)		1200	0 0
Reversion to his son.			
Mitford, Robert, agent for the Scotch exchequer (s)		2000	0 0
Mitchell, E. daughter of Hugh Mitchell, esq. ....(i)		100	0 0
Molesworth, Mrs. K. widow of a late accountant (l)		400	0 0
Molleson, Eleanor, July, 1793 .....	(s.m)	300	0 0
Moncrief, James, sheriff dep. for Clackmannan ..		500	0 0
——— Douglas, and Margaret, and survivor (s)		200	0 0
Moncks, William, assist. clerk of the ordnance (i)		1530	0 0
Monypenny, David, lord of session, and commiss. of jury court .....	(s)	2600	0 0
Montague, lord F. A. collector outwards of the customs, London .....		2788	0 0
Brother to the duke of Manchester, governor of Jamaica, £14,000.			
Montfort, lord .....	(s.m)	800	0 0
Montgomery, sir James, M. P. presenter of signa- ture .....	(s)	200	0 0
Montrose, James Graham, duke of, master of the horse .....	£1266	3266	0 0
——— lord justice general of Scotland, sinecure ....	2000		
Moodie, James .....	(s)	1000	0 0
Moir, sheriff, dep. Aberdeenshire .....		500	0 0
Moore, rev. George Charles, and rev. Robert, re- gistrars prerogative court .....		3670	0 0
——— rev. George, prebend of Canterbury .....		600	0 0
——— Charles, registrar of the faculties £440		1640	0 0
——— commiss. for auditing public accounts .....	1200		
——— Stephen, compt. of the customs, Ireland ..		1040	0 0
——— hon. Peter, commiss. of barracks .....		400	0 0
——— John, late inspector .....		120	0 0
For relations, see <i>Maryuis of Drogheda</i> .			
Mordaunt, lady Mary .....		600	0 0
Morier, James, sec. of embassy in Saxony .....		1073	0 0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Morier D. H. consul general at Paris .....	£1672	0	0
Morland, William, for the life of Harriet Bernard, } 1793 .....	554	0	0
Morris, Edward, master in chancery .....	1500	0	0
Morrison, Thomas, receiver of fees in the mint .....	2753	0	0
——— Mary .....	300	0	0
——— Georgiana.....( <i>w</i> )	200	0	0
Mortlock, John, C. receiver gen. post office .....	800	0	0
——— John, commiss. of salt duties .....	428	10	0
Morton, George Douglas, earl of, chamberlain to the queen .....	1200	0	0
——— lady Catharine .....	200	0	0
Mosely, Dr. physician to Chelsea hospital .....	365	0	0
Mosse, Ann Grace, captain's widow .....	200	0	0
Mottier, William, June 1803.....( <i>s. m</i> )	200	0	0
Mount Edgecomb, earl of, captain of the band of } gentlemen pensioners .....	1000	0	0
Moyes, Dr. Henry .....	200	0	0
Moyle, Isabella and Mary, Aug. 1789 .....	150	0	0
Mudge, Thomas, Jan. 1798 .....	130	0	0
Muir, Catharine .....	200	0	0
Muirson, Harriet, Maria, Mary Ann, and Clara, } daughters of capt. Muirson, 1805.....( <i>s. m</i> )	200	0	0
Mulgrave, Henry Phipps, earl of, master general } of the ordnance.....	3160	0	0
The hon. E. Phipps, M.P. commissioner of excise, £1400, and the hon. Aug. Phipps; deputy pay-master at Gibraltar, £547, are brothers to the earl. Robert Ward, barrister at law and clerk of the ordnance, £1950, is brother in law to the earl.			
Muller, Christopher.....( <i>sm</i> )	254	0	0
Murray, lord James, lord of the bed-chamber .....	1000	0	0
——— sir Patrick, his majesty's remembrancer ..	500	0	0
——— J. Wolfe, lord of session .....	2000	0	0
——— A. esq. clerk of the pipe exchequer, Scot- } land.....( <i>s</i> )	200	0	0
——— Alexander, agent for Turks island .....	100	0	0
——— Charles, <i>gentleman porter</i> of the Tower ..	79	7	9
Besides these six Murrays there are eight more <i>ladies</i> and <i>misses</i> : miss Louisa, maid of honour, £300; Maria Frances, £200; Elizabeth, £200; Betty, £50; Catharine Stewart, £100; lady Virginia, £200; lady Elizabeth, £100; and Charlotte, £50.			

## N

Nagle, suppressed dep. commissary .....	100	0	0
Nairne, sir Wm. bart. of Dunsinane .....	1200	0	0
——— lord of justiciary .....	500	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinécures, and Emoluments.*

Naish, Edward, esq. late assistant secretary.....	£400	0	0
Napier, Francis Napier, lord, brother in law to sir J. B. Warren; lord high commissioner of the church of Scotland.....	1000	0	0
<p>Lady Napier has a pension, dated May 1789, of £ 200. Lord Cathcart and others, in trust for lady Napier's children, a pension, dated 1775, of £ 300. The hon. C. Napier, superann. captain in the navy, £ 710; and of the misses and ladies, there are Caroline, Henrietta, and Cecilia Mary, a pension, dated 1803, of £ 324; lady Sarah, a pension of the same date, of £ 386; Louisa Maria and Emily Louisa a pension, of the same date, of £ 162.</p>			
Nares, rev. Robert, archdeacon of Stafford, and canon of Litchfield.....	600	0	0
Nassau, Thomas, master of the robes.....	800	0	0
Nayler, sir George, genealogist of the order of the Bath.....	500	0	0
Neal, Geo. esq. chairman of the commissioners of stamps.....	1400	0	0
Nelson, earl of, brother to the late lord Nelson, prebendary of Canterbury..... £ 700	7700	0	0
———— pensions by act of parliament, £ 7000			
<p>Dowager, viscountess Nelson, by act of parliament, £ 2000; and the two sisters of the late lord Nelson, £ 5000 each.</p>			
Nepean, right hon. sir Evan, clerk of the crown and peace, and chief clerk of the supreme court in Jamaica.....	2620	0	0
<p>The salaries of these offices are on condition of discharging the duties in person, but in both cases the duties are discharged by deputy; and sir Evan is exercising the functions of governor of Bombay. His wife, lady Margaret Nepean, has a pension of £ 643, dated so early as 1792.</p>			
Neville, Henry, earl of Abergavenny, patent inspec- tor of prosecutions at the custom-house....	2000	0	0
———— Richard, teller of the exchequer, Ireland, gross amount,.....	2195	0	0
———— Catharine.....	372	0	0
Newberry, John, esq. inspector of East-india ship letters.....	400	0	0
Newbiggin, James, collector of clerk duties, court of session..... (s)	100	0	0
Newcastle, duchess dowager of, March 1803. (s.m)	1000	0	0
Newcome, G. W. general commissioner of the Lott. Office.....	200	0	0
Newman, Sylvester, dep. provost marshal, Trinidad	211	0	0
———— J. general commiss. Lott. Office.....	200	0	0
Newmarket, schoolmaster..... (pl)	50	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Nicholl, right hon. sir John, M.P. principal of the court of arches .....	£5000	0	0
Nicholai, Christopher .....	372	0	0
North, Frederick, lord, chamberlain in till-office, } £1755			
———— comptroller inward and } outward of the customs, in trust for } the daughter of the earl of Guildford 2391	4146	0	0
———— hon. Brownlow, uncle to Francis North, } earl of Guildford, bishop of Winchester....	12000	0	0
———— hon. Francis, prebendary of Winchester ..	500	0	0
Northey, canon of Windsor... ..	600	0	0
Northington, sisters of the earl of, <i>clerk of hanaper</i>	2070	0	0
Northumberland, duchess dowager, as a general } officer's widow .....	120	0	0
Norton, Fletcher, baron of exchequer..... (s)	2865	0	0
Nott, Charlotte Georgiana Augusta and Augusta } £150 each. Oct. 1799..... (s.m)	300	0	0
Nugent, sir George, gov. of St. Mawes' castle ....	109	10	0

O

Odell, right. hon. William, lord of the treasury ..	1600	0	0
Oglander, Richard, consul-general, Tunis .....	930	0	0
O'Hara, Robt. pursuivant, exchequer, Ireland ....	1619	0	0
———— Jemima .....	100	0	0
Ogle, right hon. G. register of deeds..... (i)	1300	0	0
Oliver, Wm. sheriff dep. for Roxburgh .....	500	0	0
Onslow, George, earl of, lord of the king's bed- } chamber .....	1000	0	0
———— Arthur, dean of Worcester..... £800 } ———— in trust for Paley, Geo. } Walker, and Arthur Onslow .....	3800	0	0
———— sir R. admiral of the red, and lieut.-general } of marines.....			
Osborne, John, esq. one of the lords of } the admiralty..... £1500 } ———— pension .....	2300	0	0
———— (pl) 800 } Mr. Osborne is a relation of the duke of Leeds, and was envoy } to the court of Dresden, from 1771 to 1775; so that from that } time to this he has received more than £40,000 of the public } money, for four years service.			
Oswald, James Townshend, auditor of } exchequer..... £1157 10 8 } ———— do. Scotch } exchequer.....	1200	0	0
	2357	10	8

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Ousely, sir Gore, ambassador in Persia .....	£5102	0	0
Oxford, university of .....	703	0	0

The items of this sum are, a preacher £10, a professor of divinity, £13 6s. 8d.—of law, £40—of physic, £40—of history, £400—botany, £200.—*An Account of the Civil List, March 1812.*

## P

Paget, lady Louisa (now lady Erskine) .....	600	0	0
——— sir Arthur, late min. plenipotent. Vienna....	1700	0	0
——— hon. Berkeley, M.P. lord of the treasury....	1500	0	0
Relatives of Henry Wm. Paget, marquis of Anglesea, lieutenant and col. of the 7th reg. of dragoons.			
Pakenham, hon. Thomas, master-general of the ordi- nance .....	(i)	1200	0 0
——— Thomas, secretary to ditto .....	(i)	100	0 0
——— William, clerk to ditto .....	(i)	50	0 0
Palmer, Wm. principal commiss. of the navy, 1805	750	0	0
——— Felix, dep. naval officer at Granada .....	158	10	0
——— lady Madelina .....	(s)	200	0 0
Palmerstone, viscount, M.P. secretary at war ....	2480	0	0
Parish, Woodbine, chairman of board of excise....	1200	0	0
Parker, John, consul at Iceland .....	300	0	0
——— sir Harry, chief clerk to the secretaries to the lords commiss. of the admiralty....	1795	400	0 0
Parkhurst, Charles, clerk of the quit rent office (i)	500	0	0
Parkin, Anthony, solicitor-gen. post-office .....	300	0	0
Parkinson, John, consul, Koningsberg and Memel	700	0	0
Parsons, John, master of Baliol-college, Oxford; bishop of Peterborough, value of see....	2300	0	0
Patrickson, John, dep. clerk of the council, and soli- citor of the turnpike-bills .....	(i)	427	0 0
Patrie, Patience .....	(w)	250	0 0
Pearce, Charles, librarian and clerk of the papers (l)	300	0	0
——— Wm. gen. commiss. Lott.-office .....	200	0	0
Pearson, Margaret, widow of sir Richard Pearson, lieut.-gov. of Greenwich-hospital.....	1500	0	0
Pelham. See earl of Chichester.....			
Pellew, Susanna, wife of lord Exmouth, who has a pension of £2000 .....	(pl)	150	0 0
Pembroke, countess of, lady of the queen's bed- chamber .....	500	0	0
Penn, Granville, late assistant-clerk, war depart- ment .....	(pl)	550	0 0
——— John and Richard; and their heirs.....	4000	0	0

To the disgrace of the Penn family these pensions were granted in consideration of their services in the liberticide war in America.

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Pennefather, William, of Clonmel.....	£ 400	0	0
Penrice, G. B. gen. commiss. of lottery office.....	200	0	0
Penrose, J. surgeon to the housenold .....	280	0	0
Peplar, Geo. inspector of tontine certificates, 1789	750	0	0
Pepys, sir Lucas, physician in ordinary to the king	300	0	0
Perceval, hon. Jane, now Carr, pension .....	2000	0	0
——— Spencer, teller of the exchequer .....	2700	0	0
Of Mr. Perceval, it is enough to say, that his maiden speech, on the appointment of six equeries to the king, was rapturously applauded by the <i>immaculate Castlereagh</i> .			
Percy, hon. A. secretary of legation, Sardinia.....	584	0	0
Peterkin, Alexander, Orkney.....(s)	180	0	0
Petersham, viscount, lord of the bed-chamber ....	1000	0	0
Peyton, sir Yelverton .....	250	0	0
——— William, clerk in the navy-office, 1801 ....	250	0	0
Phipps, hon. Aug. deputy paymaster,	} £ 547	1797	0
——— Gibraltar .....			
——— commiss. of excise.. 1250 }			
——— hon. Edmund, M. P. clerk of deliveries in the ordnance office .....	1015	9	8
Brothers to earl Mulgrave, master-general of the ordnance, £3160.			
Pierpoint, hon. H. envoy extraordinary, Stockholm	1200	0	0
Pierson, rev. Thomas, March 1801 .....	130	0	0
——— Sarah, Francis, Mary, and Diana, each £29, 1786 .....	108	0	0
Pitmilly, lord, commiss. civil jury court, Scotland..	600	0	0
Pitt, dame Mary, wife of the right hon. sir W. A. Pitt .....	750	0	0
Plat, Samuel and Joseph, clerks of the papers ....	2675	0	0
Playfair, John.....(s)	100	0	0
Plumer, sir Thomas, master of the rolls.....	4000	0	0
Pole, right hon. W. W. master and worker of the Mint, £10,350; joint remembrancer court of Exchequer in Ireland, £2100 .....	12450	0	0
Brother to the marquis Wellesley, and the duke of Wellington. Another brother, the hon. G. V. Wellesley, is rector of Chelsea, and vicar of West Ham, £1300.			
Pollock, Wm. clerk of the crown, Lower Canada, <i>sinecure</i> .....	300	0	0
——— John, clerk of the report office.....(i)	114	0	0
——— A. H. and John, clerks of the peace, Dublin .....	284	0	0
Pond, John, astronomer royal, Greenwich.....	250	0	0
Popham, sir Home .....	500	0	0
——— Catharine .....	200	0	0
——— Elizabeth, on the death of her husband..	500	0	0
Porteus, John, macer of session.....	120	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Poulett, earl of, lord of the bed-chamber .....	£ 1000	0	0
Pownal, sir George, provost-marshal Leeward Islands .....	500	0	0
——— Mary .....	600	0	0
Powys, Thomas, dean of Canterbury .....	1000	0	0
Praed, W. M. chairman of the commiss. for auditing the public accounts .....	1500	0	0
[Auditing of the public accounts cost last year more than £ 58,000.]			
Prettyman, John, archdeacon of Lincoln, and prebendary of Norwich.....	1200	0	0
Price, N. compiler of the Dublin Gazette .....	300	0	0
Probyn, Thos. gov. of the Virgin Islands, and lieut. gov. of Nevis.....	2100	0	0
Provost, Thomas, keeper of records, Whitehall....	160	0	0
Prowse, Rich. master attendant of Woolwich-yard..	300	0	0
Pucky, A. certificate commiss. lottery office .....	350	0	0
Pye, Walter, in trust for Anthony Buller, chaff office .....	792	0	0

## Q

Quarme, R. George, usher of the black rod, house of peers.....	200	0	0
——— Robert, gent. usher of the green rod to the order of the thistle.....	100	0	0

## R

Radstock, lady, bed-chamber woman to the queen	300	0	0
Rae, Jos. macer of session.....(s)	120	0	0
——— Wm. sheriff dep. for shire of Edinburgh ..(s)	600	0	0
——— sir William, bart. lord advocate for Scotland .	300	0	0
Rafferty, Wm. clerk of the fees and the minutes (i)	470	0	0
Ralfe, rev. William, Sep. 1784.....(w)	182	10	0
Ramsay, major gen. governor of Antigua and Montserrat.....	2000	0	0
——— W. deputy register in chancery, Jamaica ..	4694	10	0
Ramus, George.....	200	0	0
Rankin, Peter, Forfar .....	220	0	0
Real, major-general, governor of Granada.....	1361	0	0
Redesdale, John Freeman Mitford, lord, pension (i)	4000	0	0

Brother-in-law of the earl of Egremont, a lord of trade and plantations, and a privy counsellor in Ireland. His lordship was lord chancellor in Ireland, from 1802 to 1806; and since then received a pension. The late Mr. Ponsonby, the *whig leader*, was only lord chancellor for *fifteen months*, when he received a similar pension till his death.

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Reid, Andrew and Joseph, clerks of the juries court, common pleas, with reversion to Andrew's son .....	(r)	£ 211	0	0
Reilly, James, for <i>diminution of salary</i> .....		58	0	0
This is excellent! reduce his salary and then make him amends with a pension.				
Reily, Michael, dep. sec. and clerk of council, St. Vincent .....		310	18	8
Renard, Lewis Peter .....		200	0	0
Rennie, Archibald Hill, Clackmannan .....	(s)	150	0	0
Reynoldson, Jacob, clerk of privy seal .....		366	0	0
Rice, hon. Edw. canon and precentor residentiary, York .....		800	0	0
Richards, right hon. sir Richard, lord chief baron ..		8500	0	0
Richmond, Chas. Lennox, duke of .....		19,000	0	0
This enormous sum was granted by act of parliament in lieu of the duty on coals. His grace is also governor-general and commander in chief of Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, the emoluments of which offices amount to more than £10,000 per annum: He is son-in-law to the duke of Grafton, and an illegitimate descendant of Charles II. by Louisa de Querouelle; and returns three members to parliament.				
Richardson, Townley, assistant engrossing clerk, (i)		150	0	0
Ricketts, Sophia, June 1800 .....		411	0	0
——— Isabella, ditto .....		103	10	0
Rickman, John, second clerk assist. house of commons		1500	0	0
Ridley, rev. Henry, prebendary of Gloucester .....		500	0	0
Rits, George .....		150	0	0
——— Louisa, June 1787 .....	(s. m)	250	0	0
Rivers, James, clerk of the signet .....		369	0	0
——— pension, April 1794 .....	(s. m)	440	0	0
——— George Pitt, baron, lord of the bed-chamber.		1000	0	0
Dame Mary Pitt has a pension, dated March 1805, of £600, and another, granted August 1806, of £150. His lordship returns two members for Dorsetshire.				
Roberts, Edw. yearly sum, formerly paid to the auditors of the exchequer .....		650	0	0
Robertson, Robt. dep. sec. and clerk of enrolments, Jamaica .....		2000	0	0
——— James, chief justice of Tortola .....		200	0	0
——— for the widow of capt. Geo. Robertson .....	(s)	100	0	0
——— for the children of ditto .....	(s)	100	0	0
——— William, esq. lord of session .....	(s)	2000	0	0
——— Rachael .....	(s)	100	0	0
——— Mrs. John .....	(s)	100	0	0
Robinson, sir F. P. governor of Tobago .....		1800	0	0



Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Robinson, George, director of the East India Company .....	£300	0	0			
————— lord treasurer's remem. .... (s)	200	0	0			
————— Robert, clerk to the secretaries of admiralty .....	375	0	0			
————— Catherine Gertrude Robinson, 1793 (s.m)	600	0	0			
————— right hon. F. J. brother of lord Grantham, joint paymaster of the forces .....	2000	0	0			
Roche, dame Mary .....	300	0	0			
Rochford, Richard, and hon. Henry Forbes, pratique-masters, Dublin .....	1047	0	0			
Rochford, earl of, a pension of £200, and another of £1000 .....	1200	0	0			
Rocheed, James, for Ann and Mary Mac Kay .. (s)	400	0	0			
These pensions to take place on the death of their mother, and to continue while they remain unmarried, or during his majesty's pleasure.						
Roden, Robert Jocelyn, earl of; joint auditor-general in the Irish treasury £1784	} 2389	0	0			
————— search-er, port of Galway .....				605		
His son, viscount Jocelyn, is another auditor of the treasury, and vice-chamberlain to the king, £2940,						
Rodney, George, lord, two pensions .....	2923	1	6			
Rogers, James, late clerk in the treasury .....	500	0	0			
————— George, late com. in the navy—trustees (pl)	300	0	0			
Rolleston, S. gazette writer .....	300	0	0			
Rollo, Barbara and Isabella, and survivor .... (s)	150	0	0			
Romer, Mary Ann .....	100	0	0			
Rooke, Charles, serjeant king's band .....	100	0	0			
Rose, Samuel, commissary of excise, Scotland ....	800	0	0			
————— John Tongue .....	180	0	0			
————— Elizabeth .....	100	0	0			
————— Theodora, Feb. 1785 .....	300	0	0			
————— William Stuart, clerk of the exchequer pleas	2137	0	0			
————— George Henry, ambassador at Berlin .....	} £3017	9	7			
————— chargé d'affaires				362	0	0
————— clerk of parliament .....				3300	0	0

The two last are the sons of "old George Rose", who in his life-time held situations worth more than £10,000 per annum, and whose family, it has been calculated, received, in principal and interest, nearly two millions of the public moneys. The two sinecures, of clerk of parliament and clerk of exchequer pleas, were conveyed by letters patent, in reversion, from old Rose to his sons, and is one of the most impudent and selfish jobs record-

Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

ed in the history of these scandalous transactions. Old George originally was a purser in the navy. He was one of Pitt's warmest admirers; a strenuous supporter of *Saving-Banks*; and a striking example of that disgusting mockery, which plunders the people of the just rewards of industry and toil, and then hypocritically laments the privations created by its rapacity.

Ross, George, esq. commissary of Edinburgh . . . . £600 0 0

There are three more commissaries with the same salary. They are appointed by patent under the great seal, and hold their situations as other judges, *ad vitam aut culpam*. The jurisdiction of the *commissary-court* extends to questions of the constitution of marriage, of divorce, and legitimacy; and has an exclusive power in the confirmation of testaments of persons dying abroad, who have personal estates in Scotland. Actions may also be maintained in this court, under certain forms, for the recovery of ordinary civil debts to the amount of £40. The principal clerk of the court formerly purchased his commission; the duties of his office are performed by deputy, who purchases his office of the principal. The emolument of depute-clerk for three years, ended July 1, 1816, amounted to £1873:15.—*Third Report on Courts of Justice in Scotland.*

Ross, James Tyrrell, *pension* . . . . .(s.m) 643 0 0

— Hugh . . . . .(s) 200 0 0

— T. superintend. of letter-bill-clerks, post-office 280 0 0

— Jane . . . . . 100 0 0

Rosslyn, James St. Clair Erskine, earl of, a general, and colonel of 9th dragoons; director of the court of chancery, Scotland . . . . . 1712 0 0

The earl's children are clerks to the court, £925. His sister, Mary Henrietta Erskine, has two pensions amounting to £800.

Rewley, Onseley, clerk of council, Granada . . . . . 666 0 0

Russel, John, clerk of the civil jury-court . . . . .(s) 500 0 0

The chief clerk of this court has £800 per annum, and the first and second clerk £500 each.

Ruthvin, lady . . . . .(s) 100 0 0

Rycroft, Henry Knight, harbinger . . . . . 195 0 0

Ryder, hon. Henry, bishop of Gloucester . . . . . 2800 0 0

— Thomas, accomptant-gen. of salt duties . . . . . £148 } 702 0 0

— register to the commis } sioners of excise . . . . . 554 }

Brothers to the earl of Harrowby, lord president of the council, £4000.

S

St. Vincent, John Jervis, earl of, an admiral of the red, general of marines

— pension by act of parliament . . £2000 } 3083 0 0

— from the Irish compensation list 1083 }

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Mrs. S. Ricketts, pension £410, and Miss J. Ricketts, pension £100, are relations. <i>Thomas Jervis</i> , esq. is a king's counsel, and a counsel to the admiralty and navy.		
St. Paul, Horace .....	(s.m)	£600 0 0
Salisbury, James Cecil, marquis of, joint postmaster-general .....		2500 0 0
Salt, Henry, esq. consul-general, Egypt .....		1672 0 0
Sargent, John, auditor of public accounts .....		1200 0 0
— Mrs. Charlotte, May, 1804 .....		616 0 0
Saumarez, sir James .....	(l)	1200 0 0
Saurin, right hon. W. attorney-general, Ireland .....		2000 0 0
Saxton, sir Charles, late com. of the navy, 1806 ..		750 0 0
Sayers, James, king's remembrancer .....		170 0 0
Sayer, James, clerk in the victualling-office, 1800		350 0 0
Schank, John, late com. transport board .....		1081 0 0
Schawb's (sir Luke,) daughter .....		200 0 0
Scott, sir William, M.P. for Oxford University, vicar-general to the archbishop of Canterbury, master of the faculties, chancellor of London, official commissary of the diocese of Canterbury and London, and a trustee of the British Museum.		
— judge of the admiralty-court ..		6524 0 0
— judge of the consistory-court ..		180 0 0
For the wealth, influence, and connexions of the Scott family, see <i>lord Eldon</i> .		
— Agnes .....	(s)	100 0 0
— Henry, earl of Deloraine .....	(s)	300 0 0
— Charlotte, widow of the late lord Nelson's secretary .....		100 0 0
— Walter, sheriff-depute for Selkirk ..	£500 }	3500 0 0
— clerk of court of session ..	3000 }	
— lady Harriet, of Ancram .....	(s)	200 0 0
Searle, Ambrose, commissioner, transport-office ..		1000 0 0
— allowance for relinquishing an office ..		100 0 0
Sedgwick, James, commissioner of stamps .....		1000 0 0
Selwyn, William, July, 1798 .....	(w)	410 0 0
— Henry Charles .....		400 0 0
Sellon, Mr. sergeant, police-magistrate, Hatton-gard.		600 0 0
Sempill, Jeanetta .....	(s)	100 0 0
Sewell, John, pension .....		401 0 0
— chief-justice, admiralty-court, Malta		2000 0 0
Seymour, right hon. lord Henry, and right hon. lord Robert, prothonotary in court of King's Bench, Ireland ..	£12,511	14,043 0 9
— crown-office, ditto .....	427	
— keeper of declarations, ditto ..	1105	

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

Seymour, right hon. lord Robert, <i>craner and wharfinger</i> , port of Dublin.....	£1930	0	0
— lord George, commissioner of excise.....	1500	0	0

*Uncles* of lord Castlereagh. Lord Henry and lord Robert Seymour have held their offices ever since 1766, and including compound interest must have drawn from the public more than *two millions* of money. Lord George Seymour, besides his commissionership of excise, till lately held the situations of naval officer and harbour master at Frederickstedt and St. Croix, worth £3100 per annum. Another member of the same family, John Ormsby Vandeleur, first cousin of lord Castlereagh, is commissioner of excise in Ireland, £1200. Lord Henry Seymour Moore, another first cousin of lord Castlereagh, is joint muster-master-general, £2394. And, Messrs John and Henry Staples, first cousins of lord Castlereagh, are examiners of the customs, Ireland, £918. Lord Stewart, ambassador to the court of Vienna, brother to lord Castlereagh, £15,000. Lord Castlereagh himself has £7500 per annum, exclusive of the enormous emoluments derived from his foreign missions. The total sum paid by the public to lord Castlereagh and his eight relations is £43,427 per annum.

Shanley, Michael, paymaster of corn-premiums ( <i>i</i> )	286	14	4
Shaw, Alexander, late governor Isle of Man ..( <i>i</i> )	300	0	0
— Barnard, collector of Cork ( <i>i</i> ) £2579 19 7 } — pension for life ..... ( <i>i</i> ) 709 0 0 }	3288	19	9
Shree, sir George, bart. receiver-general ..... ( <i>i</i> )	150	0	0
— dame Elizabeth Maria, 1803 ..... ( <i>s.m.</i> )	430	0	0
Shepherd, sir Samuel, (late attorney-general,) lord chief baron of exchequer, Scotland .....	4000	0	0
— Richard, late chargé d'affaires at Munich, <i>pension</i> ..... £250 } — receiver-general duchy of Cornwall..... 1400 }	1650	0	0
Son of sir Samuel Shepherd. Mr. Shepherd has received his pension for about twenty years; he must, therefore, have drawn a pretty round sum from the public purse for <i>two years service</i> at Munich.			
— Thomas, port-surveyor, Londonderry ..... £1008 } — pension..... 45 }	1053	0	0
Sheridan, Thomas, esq. colonial paymaster, Cape of Good Hope.....	1000	0	0
Sidmouth, Henry Addington, viscount, ranger of Richmond park, recorder of Devises, and high steward of Westminster. — secretary of state for the home department ..... £6000 } — commissioner for the affairs of India ..... 1500 }	7500	0	0

His lordship's character for *piety, humanity*, and respect for the *constitution*, has been so frequently celebrated that it is beyond

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Stipends, and Emoluments.

our ability to add any thing further in his *praise*. The office of secretary of state is more valuable on account of the extensive patronage annexed to it than the salary. For relations, see *Addington*.

Selphie, Maria Claudine, duchess Fltz-James, 1806	£200	0	0
Pension granted by the <i>immortal</i> and <i>consistent</i> WHIGS, to a French woman, the wife of a Frenchman, and a descendant of <i>James the Second</i> , of that family which it is their chief boast to have expelled from the throne of England.			
Simeon, sir John, master in chancery	2149	0	0
Simpson, J. S. assay-master Scotch mint	100	0	0
Charlotte	100	0	0
(s)			
Sims, William, captain of marines, for meritorious conduct	50	0	0
Sinclair, lady Madelina	200	0	0
(s)			
lady Isabella	150	0	0
(s)			
Charles, esq.	200	0	0
(s)			
lady of Longformacus	100	0	0
(s)			
Mrs. Elizabeth	150	0	0
(s)			
Singleton, Mark, storekeeper, ordnance	1863	5	0
Brother-in-law to Marquis Cornwallis.			
Sitherow, F. rear-admiral, severe wounds	200	0	0
Skeffington, hon. W. J. constable Dublin-castle	365	0	0
Smith, Thomas, deputy-clerk, Jamaica	1382	0	0
John Spencer, late foreign minister	1200	0	0
John, esq. paymaster of the navy	800	0	0
Thomas, deputy clerk justiciary	144	14	0
(s)			
George, M.P. East-India director	300	0	0
Sir W. Sydney	2000	0	0
(pl)			
John, clerk, victualling-office, 1800	250	0	0
James, master-attendant, Plymouth-yard	300	0	0
John, deputy clerk, justiciary	150	0	0
John, commissary alienation office, by deputy	162	0	0
Thomas, clerk of bill chamber, court of session, paid by fees	503	0	0
George, suppressed dep. commissary	159	0	0
Robert, clerk in secretary's office	200	0	0
(i)			
Henry, dep. paymaster corn premiums	670	0	0
(i)			
John, assist. clerk, journals and records	230	0	0
(i)			
Endo, under clerk, council-office	160	12	0
There are about half a score more <i>Smiths</i> for smaller sums, but the above it is thought will be sufficient by way of specimen.			
Smuts, J. L. receiver of land revenue, Cape of Good Hope	2700	0	0

The value of offices at the Cape is very great. We have before us a return made to the House of Commons in 1816, of the annual value of the civil offices in the preceding year. From this document we have selected a few as examples. The

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

appointments with numerals affixed are made by the king ; the rest by the governor.—

I. Governor	£ 10,000	0	0
II. Lieut.-Governor	3000	0	0
III. Colonial Secretary	3500	0	0
Assistant ditto	3000	0	0
The Fiscal	10,000	0	0
Deputy ditto	3000	0	0
Chief Justice	6000	0	0
Thirteen constables	3900	0	0
President ( <i>orphan-chamber</i> )	4000	0	0
Secretary, (ditto)	5500	0	0
Book-keeper (ditto)	3000	0	0
Messenger	1500	0	0
Collector of tithes	2000	0	0
Director of the printing department	1200	0	0
Printer	1200	0	0
Compositor	840	0	0
Superannuated Clergyman	1353	0	0

There are many other appointments in the same colony nearly as valuable as those we have selected. Scarcely any of our colonial establishments bring any thing into the public treasury ; but many of them (as Ceylon and the Isle of France), annually take immense sums out of it. They are of little importance to the country, but they are of great importance to ministers, from the patronage and lucrative situations they afford to their relations and friends.

Sneyd, Elizabeth, Sept. 1803 ..... (s.m) £ 336 0 0

Ann, wife of Nathaniel Sneyd, Esq. .... 400 0 0

Mr. Nathaniel Sneyd is a member of the honourable house for the county of Cavan. He has a relation with a pension of £1612, and whose wife has a pension of £200.

Somerset, lord Fitzroy, secretary of embassy, Paris 530 10 0

lord Granville Charles Henry, joint paymaster of the forces ..... 2000 0 0

lord Robert Edward Henry, joint deputy paymaster ..... 500 0 0

Brothers of the duke of Beaufort. Lord Charles Henry Somerset was lately governor and commander in chief, Cape of Good Hope, £10,000.

Southey, Robert, *poet-laureat* ..... £ 100 }  
pension, 1807, ..(s.m) 200 }

Author of *Wat Tyler*, and many other works—*crazy, loyal, and jacobinical*. Poor apostate Southey ! what a miserable termination of his career ! when he could barter principle, consistency, and independence for a paltry £300. But the present generation of bards appear strangely inspired with a love of pensions and places. Walter Scott, we have seen, holds places worth £3500 a year ; Gifford, the editor of the *Quarterly Review*, to which the *laureate* is a liberal contributor, holds appointments worth £900 ; Wordsworth, the *lake-poet*, is distributor of stamps, worth £300 a year ; and Mr. Thomas Moore, the Irish bard, is registrar, by deputy, at Bermuda. How much Coleridge is paid out of the public purse we don't

\* Earl Dalhousie, whose name we omitted to insert in its proper place.

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

know; but Fitzgerald, "the small beer poet," who wrote more verses in abuse of Bonaparte than are contained in the *Iliad* and *Eneid* put together, had a pension of £150.

Sparks, Mary .....	(w)	£ 100	0	0
Sparke, Bowyer Edward, bishop of Ely .....		1200	0	0
Speigle, Van de Digna Johanne, 1801 .....	(s.m)	500	0	0
Spencer, W. R. commiss. stamp-office .....		1000	0	0
———— John, gentleman pensioner .....		100	0	0
———— John, accountant-general, post-office ....		700	0	0
———— R. vaccinating-surgeon, Cape of Good Hope .....		1200	0	0
———— lord Charles, lord of the bed-chamber .....		£ 1000		
———— pension, March 1807 .....	1200	2200	0	0
Spurrell, B. clerk navy office, 1803 .....		200	0	0
Stafford, marchioness of .....		300	0	0

The avarice of this woman is only exceeded by her cruelty. She is possessed of immense landed property in Scotland; and we observe from the public papers, that she has lately been forcing from their paternal homes nearly the whole of her tenantry, almost without notice, and without making any provision to shelter them from the inclemency of the weather,—merely to turn her farms into sheep-walks.

Stainforth, G. messenger of the great seal .....		994	0	0
Stanhope, hon. Blanc, page of honour .....		260	0	0
———— hon col. groom of the bed-chamber ...		500	0	0
———— hon. J. F. commissary alienation-office ..		102	0	0
———— Caroline, January, 1805 .....	(s.m)	500	0	0
———— Charles Banks, ditto, 1806 .....	(s.m)	600	0	0
———— James Hamilton, ditto, 1806 .....	(s.m)	600	0	0
———— lady Hester Lucy, ditto, 1806 .....	(s)	1200	0	0

How liberally these *whigs* squandered the public money while in office; and how forgiving too! *Hester Stanhope*, if we remember right, was housekeeper to the *heaven-born minister*. But this was not quite so charitable, as when they made the well-known *Davison* treasurer of the ordnance, after he had been confined in the King's Bench prison, indicted, tried, and convicted, of *BRIBERY*. The Stanhopes are relations of the late earl Stanhope, who died in 1816, and who was surveyor of green wax, &c.

Stanley, James, master in chancery .....		1500	0	0
Stanwix, general, groom of the bedchamber, .....		500	0	0
Staples, right hon. J. and Thomas Staples, cousins of Lord Castlereagh, examiners of customs(i)		918	0	0
Stark, Henry S. ....		200	0	0
Stedman, Charles, comptroller stamp-office .....		400	0	0
Steel, right hon. Thomas, king's remembrancer, ( <i>sinecure</i> ) .....		1833	0	0

This is the notorious "*Tommy Steel*," the friend of Pitt, who, it was proved, had misapplied, to say no worse of it, £19,000 of the public money for his own private emolument. Mr.

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.

*Joseph Hunt, a similar defaulter, was obliged to abscond in consequence of misapplying the public money, and he now receives pensions amounting to £1037 a year, as a reward for public services!*

Stephens, sir Philip, bart. late lord commissioner of the admiralty, pension .....	£2000	0	0
—— Francis, late commiss. for victualling the navy .....	617	0	0
—— general Edward, groom of the bed-chamb.	500	0	0
—— William .....	200	0	0
—— Mary .....	100	0	0
Stephenson, hon. Jane, June, 1803 .....	130	0	0
Stepney, sir John .....	800	3	6
Stewart, sir John, late attorney-general .....	2036	5	9
—— Henry, accountant-general .....	369	0	0
—— Joseph, sec. to commissioners for wounded seamen, 1806 .....	500	0	0
—— S. P. lieut.-governor of Montserrat .....	200	0	0
—— lord, ambassador, Vienna .....	£12,000		
of the bed-chamber and col.			
of 25th dragoons .....	3,700		
—— Dugald, gazette-writer, Scotland .....	300	0	0
—— Mr. John .....	100	0	0
—— sir John, baron of exchequer .....	1200	0	0
pension .....	1000	0	0
—— Daniel, macer in the exchequer .....	79	1	3
—— Robert, Tobermory .....	59	0	0
—— John, superannuated pater .....	75	0	0
Of ladies, misses and mistresses Stewarts, there are, Jane, £50; Grace, £50; lady Lucy, £300; Ann, £50; lady Louisa, £100; Jane and Lelias, £25 each; Elizabeth, £50; and Catharine, £100; all Scotch except the last, who is Irish.			
Stone, Martin, tipstaff to King's Bench prison .....	130	0	0
Stonehewer, Richard .....	600	0	0
auditor .....	531	0	0
Stopford, sir Edward, brother to the earl of Courtown; equerry to the Queen .....	220	0	0
Stow, D. in trust for children of capt. Roberts ( <i>pl</i> ) .....	200	0	0
Stracey, W. Messenger .....	307	0	0
Strachan, sir Richard .....	1000	0	0
Strachey, sir Henry, July, 1796 .....	657	0	0
Strahan, rev. George, prebend. Rochester .....	400	0	0
Andrew, M.P. King's printer for 30 years, no salary, but paid for work done			
Strangford, lord viscount, late foreign minister .....	2600	0	0
viscountess dowager; 1804 .....	300	0	0
Stratton, Alexander, late foreign minister, 1809 ..	1500	0	0
Strickland, N. certificate com. lott. office .....	350	0	0



## On Places, Sinecures, Pensions, and Reversions.

Sturges, J. gen. com. lott. office .....	£200	0	0
Succouth, A. C. lord of session and judiciary .....	2600	0	0
Suffolk, earl of, gov. of Culmore forts .....	365	0	0
Sullivan, J. A. receiver, Demerara .....	1800	0	0
—— right hon. John, com. for affairs of India	1500	0	0
Surtees, W. V. com. of bankrupts.....£300	} 700	0	0
——reversion of register of affidavits 400			
—— Matthew, prebend of Canterbury .....	500	0	0
Sussex, duke of .....	1800	0	0
Sutherland, lieutenant, and Elizabeth, £100 each	200	0	0
—— Mrs. Mary and Miss Louisa £100 each	200	0	0
Sutton, right hon. Charles Manners, archbishop of Canterbury, primate of England; lord of trade and plantations; and a governor of the charter-house;			
value of see ..	28,000	0	0

There is some doubt as to the *origin* of this great personage: report says, that a *stone-mason's wife*, in East Cheap, had the honour of his birth; and that his *father or cousin*, the duke of Rutland, had another son by the same woman, lately one of the Welsh judges, but now dead. However this may be, this seems certain, that his grace was created archbishop younger than any of his predecessors; that the right hon. Charles Manners, speaker of the house of commons, salary £6000, is his son; that Thomas, lord Manners, lord chancellor of Ireland, is his brother; and that Lord Charles Manners Sutton is aide-de-camp to the Prince Regent, with the rank of colonel in the army.

Swan, John.....(i)	300	0	0
Swanton, Emma .....	300	0	0
Swinton, Margaret .....	300	0	0

Her daughters, Ann, Margaret, Mary, Isabel, and Harriet, have a pension of £300, to take effect on her death, and continue during his majesty's pleasure.

Swinton, John sheriff- <i>depute</i> for Berwick.....(s)	300	0	0
--	-----	---	---

The sheriff-*depute* in Scotland is not, as the name implies, the *deputy* of the principal, but an entirely independent officer, appointed by the crown, and performing functions which cannot be exercised by the high sheriff. He has an extensive civil and criminal jurisdiction in actions for debt, and the trial of certain species of robbery. The duties of this office are usually discharged by a substitute. The sheriff of Edinburgh has £800 per annum; of Lanark, £500; and the remaining twenty-seven sheriffships have incomes from £300 to £400 a year.

Sydney, lord, ranger of Hyde and St. James's Parks	1732	0	0
—— John T. Townsend, viscount, lord of the king's bed-chamber .....	1000	0	0
—— in trust for Charlotte Albinia, Frances, Maria Louisa, and Hen- rietta Elizabeth Selwin.....	400	0	0
—— viscountess, lady of the queen's bed-chamber	500	0	0

## T

Talbot, Charles Chetwynd, earl, lord lieutenant of Ireland .....	£30,000	0	0
<i>Relations</i> —Charles Talbot, D.D. dean of Salisbury, £700; George Talbot paymaster of the king's household, £500; James Talbot, esq. as late secretary to the embassy to the French republic, £600; ditto, examiner of hearth-money, Ireland, £250.			
Tarleton, general Bonastre, governor of Berwick ..	600	0	0
Taylor, R. late examiner of army-accounts .... (l)	1100	0	0
Thomas, compt.-general of the customs ..	1000	0	0
major-gen. H. treasurer to the queen ....	500	0	0
major, chief commissioner of paving, and inspector of roads, Ireland .....	1168	15	0
John, keeper of records, exchequer .....	98	0	0
J. dep. sec. and register, Lower Canada ..	270	0	0
Brook, clerk of signet .....	364	0	0
envoy-ex. and min. plenipotentiary, Wirtemberg .....	4276	0	0
B. assistant to the astronomer-royal .....	170	0	0
lady Lucy Rachel .....	600	0	0
Mrs. Alba, keeper of parliament-house ..	155	13	0
Teignmouth, lord, com. for affairs of India .....	1500	0	0
Tekell, lady Griselda .....	600	0	0
John, deputy commissary-general .....	354	11	4
Tekytl, John, foreign apposer, exchequer .....	301	0	0
comptroller of the mint .....	312	0	0
comptroller of the pipe (Chancery)	206	0	0
Telfers, Jane and Cecilia, and survivor .....	100	0	0
(s)			
Temple, hon. W. sec. of legation, Stockholm ....	504	0	0
Tenter, J. A. chief-justice, Cape of Good Hope .....	£4000	}	8000
president of the orphan chamber, ditto .....	4000		
P. J. collector, Simon's Town, ditto .....	700		
political commissioner .....	1500		
Mr. searsker, Cape of Good Hope .....		2200	0
		300	0

The *Tenters* appear to hold very comfortable situations at the Cape. For a more particular detail of the enormous emoluments attached to civil offices in this colony, the reader is referred to our remarks on Mr. *Smut's* office. *En passant*, we cannot help suggesting to our pious and virtuous chancellor of the exchequer, as he has thrown out some hints about affording facilities to emigrants to the Cape, the propriety of applying a portion of emoluments of offices in the colony to the assistance of the new settlers, rather than imposing upon the already over-burdened parishes of this country, the necessity of raising a subscription for that purpose.

## Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments

Theseger, A. in lieu of an abolished clerkship in the customs .....	£511	0	0
Thomas, Nassau, master of the robes .....	800	0	0
— groom of the bed-chamber .....	500	0	0
— Charles Nassau .....	181	0	0
Thompson, vice-admiral sir Thomas Boulden, for severe wounds, 1799 .....	£200	}	2500 0 0
— for loss of left leg, 1801 .....	300		
— pension .....	2000		
— lady .....	300	0	0
Thornton, Edw. amb. and min. plenipotent. at Brazil	5300	0	0
Thurlow, Edward Hovell, lord, clerk of presentations, petty bag-office .....	£190	}	6713 0 0
— patentee for executing bankrupt-laws* .....	5720		
— clerk of custody of idiots and lunatics .....	608		
— reversion of clerk of the hanaper	105		
<i>Relations</i> —Edward Smith Thurlow, rector of Houghton-le-Spring, Durham, £800, and prebendary of Norwich £400. Thomas Thurlow, prothonotary, court of chancery £1056.			
Thynne, lord George, comptroller of the king's household .....	1200	0	0
— lord John, vice-chancellor to the king .....	1200	0	0
Brother to the marquis of Bath, and nephew to lord Carteret.			
Tighe, George W. comptroller of the pipe ....(i)	453	0	0
— Robert, comptroller, Ireland .....	800	0	0
Tisdall, E. first clerk in jerquer's office .....	326	5	9
Tod, James, commissary-court, Scotland .....	600	0	0
Tomkins, B. physician of the tower .....	173	7	6
Tomline, George, (formerly Prettyman,) bishop of Lincoln, value of see .....	£4300	}	5100 0 0
— dean and canon residentiary of St. Paul's .....	800		

This right reverend person has been accused of misapplying the funds of the charity of Mere and Sital, of which he is patron and visitor. The charity of Mere consists of 650 acres, situate within five miles of Lincoln; it was left to maintain six poor men and a warden. The whole estate is let for £32, out of which £24 is distributed to the poor brethren; the only benefit they derive from their estate of 650 acres. It would be absurd to imagine that an estate of this extent, which pays neither tythes nor poor-rate, and where land in the neighbourhood lets from 20s. to 40s. an acre, yields no more than £32 a year. The truth seems to be that, a heavy fine is paid at every renewal of the lease; that this fine is pocketed by the warden; that the warden is a nephew, or,

\* The reversion of this office is granted to W. H. Scott, son of the lord chancellor after the death of Edward and Thomas Thurlow, July, 1815. *Vide* Lord Eldon.

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Snecures, and Emoluments.*

according to the *Quarterly Reviewers*, a son of the right reverend bishop; and that the right reverend bishop made way for this lucrative appointment for his son or his nephew, by promoting Mr. Cumming, the former warden, to a living in his gift. The son of the same prelate is master of Spital Hospital, another ancient endowment for the poor; the income of this charity is £6 or 700 a year, and all that is paid to the poor is £27 : 4 : 0 to four or five pensioners!

Torpichan, lord James .....	(s)	£300	0	0
Torrington, lord, late foreign minister, 1799, (pl)		1084	0	0
Tothill-fields hospital .....	(pl)	50	0	0
This solitary £50 to an hospital seems like "a paradise blooming in the wild," or more correctly in the waste.				
Tovey, Old, inspector of carriages .....	(s)	100	0	0
Townshend, hon. Miss Georgiana, housekeeper, Windsor-castle .....		320	0	0
— right hon. lord John, M. P. uncle to marquis Townshend; in trust for Sophia Johnson, Emma Campbell, and Elizabeth Courtney .....				
		324	0	0
Towry, G. P. commissioner, victualling-office .....		1000	0	0
Father-in-law to the late lord Ellenborough.				
Towson, James, chief cashier, South Sea company, for fees at public offices .....		280	0	0
Tottenham, Henry, clerk of the ordnance .....		487	2	6
Trail, J. sheriff-depute Caithness .....		500	0	0
Trenchard, J. late commissioner of tax-office ....		500	0	0
Trevor, Thomas Trevor, prebend of Chester .....		300	0	0
— John, late foreign minister, 1797 .....	(pl)	1200	0	0
Trefusis, hon. C. R. compt. stamp-office .....		400	0	0
Brother to lord Clinton, patron of the borough of Callington.				
Tresham, Edward, assist. clerk ordnance .....	(i)	594	0	0
Trimbleston, baroness dowager, 1803 .....	(s.m)	200	0	0
Trotter, Messrs. and Coutts, for Mrs. Maria Coch- rane and Elizabeth Cicioperce and daughter, (s)		400	0	0
— Thomas, physician of the fleet .....		182	10	0
Tucker, Benjamin, deputy secretary to the lords of the admiralty .....		1082	0	0
Tupper, C. consul, Barcelona .....		600	0	0
Turner, major-gen. groom of the bed-chamber ....		500	0	0
— Wm. clerk to the treasurer of the ordnance .....	£224	} (i)	540	0
— paymaster, artillery regiment	316			
Turton, sen. T. clerk of the juries .....		96	0	0
Tyler, vice-admiral sir Charles, for wounds .....		250	0	0
Tytler, W. F. sheriff-depute Inverness-shire .....		500	0	0
Tyrrwhitt, sir J. gentleman-usher of the black-rod ..		200	0	0
Pyther, Alexander F. of Woodhouselee .....		1100	0	0

## V

Vansittart, right hon. Nicholas, M. P. for Harwich ; brother-in-law to lord Auckland ; a barrister at law ; a privy counsellor in Ireland and England ; vice-president of the British and Foreign Bible Society, &c. &c.		
_____	chancellor of the exchequer ..	£2600
_____	lord of the treasury .....	1600
_____	commis. for the affairs of India	1500
_____	under-treasurer of the excheq.	1800
		£7500 0 0
Every body knows that <i>Nicholas Vansittart</i> , late clerk of quarter session, is the paragon of piety, humanity, wit, elo- quence, and financial genius.		
Vaughan, Charles, sec. of embassy, Madrid .....		1136 10 0
_____ J. attorney-gen. to the queen .....		250 0 0
Veitch, H. commiss. of customs, Scotland .....		800 0 0
_____ William, macer of exchequer, and door- keeper, Scotland .....		109 1 3
_____ Henry, consul-general, Madeira .....		700 0 0
Vere, W. H. suppressed dep. commissary .....		159 0 0
Verney, hon. H. groom of the bed-chamber .....		500 0 0
Vernon, Charles .....		300 0 0
_____ general Charles .....		679 0 0
_____ Levison, gentleman pensioner.....		100 0 0
_____ Caroline, maid of honour.....		300 0 0
_____ sir C. and C. Fleetwood, usher of the ex- chequer .....	(i)	544 0 0
Villiers, right hon. John Charles, chief justice in Eyre, north of Trent, <i>sinecure</i> .....		2250 0 0
_____ hon. Geo. pay-master of marines £2800	}	3300 0 0
_____ groom of the bed-cham. 500		
Brothers to earl Clarendon, peer, who returns a member for Wootton Bassett.		
Vivian, and T. W. Carr, barristers at law, solicitors of excise .....		15,913 0 0
Vyse, William, archdeacon of Coventry .. £ 700	}	1700 0 0
_____ rector of Lambeth.....		

## W

Waddington, rev. Thomas, prebend of Ely.....		400 0 0
Wales, princess of.....		35,000 0 0
Walker, S. assist. examiner customs .....	(i)	600 0 0
_____ C. assist. prize office .....		300 0 0
_____ James and Archibald Murray, clerks of the pipe exchequer, Scotland.....	(s)	200 0 0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinécures, and Emoluments.*

Walker, James .....	£ 200	0	0
——— for abolished office .....	95	0	0
——— sir G. T. lieut.-gov. Granada.....	3000	0	0
Wall, Francis .....	100	0	0
Wallace, right hon. Thomas, commiss. for affairs of India .....	1500	0	0
Waller, Robert, Oct. 1801 .....	500	0	0
——— Richard, solicitor for the revenue in the port department, Ireland .....	716	14	0
Walpole, lord, commiss. for the affairs of India .....	1500	0	0
——— Thomas, late foreign minister, 1797 ( <i>pl</i> ) .....	800	0	0
Walrond, Robert, ditto, 1805.....	250	0	0
Walsh, T. T. chief dep. to compt. of customs .....	762	0	0
Walsingham, lord, compt. of first fruits.....£ 150 } ——— pension .....	2000 }	2150	0 0
Walton, John, late consul at Venice .....	300	0	0
——— J. dep. provost-marshal Barbadoes.....	249	0	0
Ward, M. late secretary of legation Lisbon.....	200	0	0
——— E. M. secretary of legation at Tuscany .....	584	0	0
——— Robert, M. P. for <i>lord Lonsdale</i> , clerk of the ordnance .....	1914	9	4
A barrister at law, and brother-in-law to lord Mulgrave. His wife has a pension of £1000, dated 1806, and to commence whenever her husband ceased to be one of the under secretaries of state, or to hold any other employment under government of equal value.			
Wardlow, Elizabeth, for her four children.....	100	0	0
Warren, sir John Borlase, late foreign minister .....	2000	0	0
Warrender, sir G. lord of the admiralty .....	1000	0	0
The first lord of the admiralty has a salary of £3000 per annum, and the other six lords £1600 each; all of them, except the youngest, has a house in the admiralty. During the war, the number of men in the service of the navy was 120,000, and the number of ships in commission about 1200; the number of men now in the service is 19,000, and the number of ships in commission, including frigates, about 137. Owing to this great decrease in the business of the navy, it was thought this session, that the services of two or three or half a dozen of the lords might be spared, and an attempt was made to reduce the number, but in vain. Ministers would as soon grant the elective franchise to the people, as surrender any important part of their patronage: they know well, that the continuance of their system depends as much on keeping up the latter, as in withholding the former.			
Warrender, H. dep. keeper of the signet .....	100	0	0
Watkins, John .....	150	0	0
Watson, Mrs. ....	557	0	0
Wife of the celebrated sir Brook Watson, lord mayor in 1797, chairman of the famous <i>humbug</i> meeting at the Mansion House, previous to the Bank stoppage.			

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Wedderburne, James, esq. solicitor-general, judiciary court .....	£1600	0	0
The principal officers of the court of judiciary are, the lord justice-general, £2000; lord justice-clerk, £2000; five lord commissioners, £600 each.			
Wellesley, right hon. sir Henry, ambassador, Madrid marquis, joint remembrancer of the court of exchequer, Ireland, with his nephew, W. W. Pole .....	10,603	0	0
hon. Gerard Valencian, nephew of marquis Wellesley, rector of Chelsea, and vicar of West Ham .....	4252	0	0
Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, duke of, marquis of Douro; prince of Waterloo; a field marshal; colonel of the royal regiment of horse-guards and 33d regiment of foot; master-general of the ordnance; K.G.-GCB. KGF. KSTF. KMT. KCR. DCL. &c. &c. &c.	1300	0	0
It is impossible to give a correct estimate of the income of the duke of Wellington; before he was appointed master-general of the ordnance, it was calculated at £30,000. Independent of this income, by two parliamentary grants, £400,000 have been appropriated to the purchase of a mansion and estate for his grace; and the foreign gifts are supposed to be of an equal amount. The duke is brother to the marquis Wellesley, and uncle to the other Wellesleys we have mentioned.			
In no country in Europe as in England, nor perhaps in history, are such extraordinary instances to be found of the sudden acquisition of prodigious wealth by particular families. Within the last thirty years the Grenville, the Scott, the Wellesley, the Arden, the Dundas, the Manners, and the Seymour families, must have absorbed each at least one million and a half, or two millions of the public money. The wealth accumulated by these families forms some set-off against two millions of paupers and 800 millions of debt. Public services ought to be amply and freely rewarded; but the warmest admirer of the duke of Wellington can hardly deny, that if his military achievements have been great, his rewards have been still greater. Comparisons, it is said, are odious; but will it be contended, that the victories of Wellington so far transcend those of Nelson, as to entitle him to such a far greater reward? Sir Philip Francis opposed the grant of £5000 to the heirs of the hero of Trafalgar, on the ground of <i>public poverty</i> , and he was applauded by every considerate man in the kingdom. The victories of Talavera, Salamanca, and Waterloo, are not more brilliant than those of Blenheim, Ramillies, and Malplaquet; yet the house of commons of that day refused a grant of £5000, at the request of queen Anne, to the duke of Marlborough; but the house of commons of this day only refuses <i>reform and retrenchment</i> —never to vote away the properties and liberties of the people.			
West, Benjamin, esq. surveyor of pictures .....	200	0	0

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinécures, and Emoluments.*

Westerans, H. seneschal of his majesty's manors, (i)	£800	0	0
Westmeath, earl and countess of, auditor of imprest accounts .....	£2500		
_____ earl, clerk of the hanaper .....	960		
_____ earl, and his countess, annuity out of the consolidated fund, to the survivor .....	1000		
Westrop, Palms, captain of marines, for <i>meritorious conduct</i> .....	100	0	0
The reader must have remarked how few instances occur of rewards for <i>meritorious conduct</i> , and, when they do occur, how trifling the reward!			
Wharton, Thomas, commiss. of excise, Scotland....	800	0	0
Whinwright, John, superannuated captain of the navy .....	219	0	0
Whishaw, commiss. for auditing public accounts..	1200	0	0
White, Joseph, late solicitor.....	1200	0	0
Whitford, Caleb, pension .....	400	0	0
Whitworth, Charles Whitword, earl of, late lord lieutenant of Ireland; pension as ambassador to the French Republic .....	2300	0	0
Wickham, William, esq. late chargé d' affaires at Berne, Feb. 1804 .....	1200	0	0
_____ Eleanor Madelina, wife of the above, June, 1803 .....	675	0	0
Wiggott, W. clerk, navy-office, 1806 .....	150	0	0
Wilkes, William, attorney in exchequer .....	241	0	0
Williams, William, prothonotary, and clerk of the crown, in the counties of Glamorgan, Brecknock, and Radnor, 1805 .....	689	0	0
After his death, reversion to Thomas Maybury.			
_____ John, clerk in the victualling office.....	250	0	0
_____ Mary, pension .....	150	0	0
_____ D. keeper, alienation of office.....	108	16	4
Williamson, David, lord of session .....	2000	0	0
_____ Mrs. Susan.....	100	0	0
_____ lieut.-col. James, commandant royal military asylum, Chelsea .....	365	0	0
_____ Kirkpatrick, for Elizabeth and Helen(s)	100	0	0
_____ - David, Stirling.....	357	13	4
Willis, John, M.D. Jan. 1791 .....	707	0	0
_____ rev. Francis, Jan. 1791 .....	1000	0	0
_____ Thomas, clerk, 1790.....	400	0	0
Willoughby, Harriet, 10th Oct. 1806.....	500	0	0

To take effect on the death of Elizabeth Bridget Fox, widow of Charles James Fox, and to continue during his majesty's pleasure.



CORRUPTION UNMASKED.

89

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Wills, James .....	£150	0	0
Wilmort, W. H. clerk of the patents, court of chancery .....	900	0	0
—— Sarah Anne, to commence on the death of her husband, Sept. 1797.....(c)	400	0	0
Wilson, John, commissioner for auditing West India accounts .....	1000	0	0
—— Thomas, July, 1787 .....	300	0	0
—— James, M.D. Dec. 1798.....(s,m)	250	0	0
—— F. E. gen. commiss. lott. office .....	200	0	0
Winchester, Charles Paulet, marquis of, groom of the stole.....	2000	0	0
The groom of the stole has the care of the King's bed-chamber.			
Windsor, New, church and poor .....	50	0	0
Winstanley, T. N. Dublin, herald at arms.....(i)	185	16	1
Wirttemberg, princess of .....	5416	13	4
Wise, Frederick, consul-general at Sweden.....	1000	0	0
Wishart, Ann .....	60	0	0
Wodehouse, Philip, prebendary of Norwich .....	300	0	0
Wolfe, hon. Mary Ann.....(i)	433	6	6
Wood, sir George, baron of the exchequer.....	3000	0	0
—— R. R. naval officer, Granada.....	158	10	0
—— Samuel, gentleman pensioner.....	100	0	0
Woodcock, Henry, and others, in trust for Margaret Fordyce .....	150	0	0
—— Charles, naval officer, Tobago .....	174	0	0
Woodford, sir Ralph, late for. minister.....(pl)	800	0	0
—— E. J. A. late inspector of foreign corps (l)	144	2	6
Woodward, sir Ralph, 1798 .....	200	0	0
Wordsworth, Wm. distributor of stamps.....	400	0	0
Worth, James, superann. rear admiral.....	410	12	6
Worgan, J. D. esq. sergeant at arms .....	100	0	0
Wraxall, Jane, July 1793 .....	400	0	0
Wrottesley, Miss Louisa, maid of honour .....	300	0	0
Wynard, Sarah .....	200	0	0
Wyndham, Percy Chas. register of chancery in Jamaica .....	£1470	}	2170 0 0
—— secretary and clerk of enrolments, Barbadoes .....	700		
—— hon. C. W. secretary and clerk of the enrolments, Jamaica.....	2500		

Brothers to the earl of Egremont. The patent of these offices is dated 4th May, 1763. They are supposed to be worth £20,000; but taking them only at the sum put down, £4670, the Wyndhams must have drawn from these three offices, of which

the duties, if there be any, are discharged by deputy, £285,520 principal money. Lord Braybrooke, brother-in-law of lord Grenville, has been provost-marshal of Jamaica since 1762: the value of his office, one account makes, £2100; another account, £5960; but, taking only the former sum, he must have derived from his sinecure, £119,700.—We are particular in mentioning these facts, to show, that, though our colonial possessions bring little or nothing to the public treasury, under the present profligate system, yet under a wise, economical, and honest government, they would form an almost exhaustless resource for relieving the burdens of the people.

Wyne, Robert, clerk of the deliveries, store-keeper's office.....(i)	£400	0	0
Wynn, Robert, esq.....(i)	300	0	0
Wynn, Henry Watkin William, late envoy extraordinary at the court of Dresden, April 1807 ..	1200	0	0
This is not " <i>Squeaking Wynn</i> ," nephew of lord Grenville, who is so tenacious of the <i>privileges</i> of the <i>honourable house</i> , and who excites such laughter among the people, by attempting to bolster up its <i>respectability</i> , when its profligacy and prostitution have become as notorious as if a " <i>lantern were hung at the door</i> ." The Wynn mentioned here is brother to the honourable member, and son of sir Watkin Wynn, famous for his <i>loyalty</i> . He was envoy at Dresden, from 1803 to 1807; since he has received his pension, which, with the <i>service of plate</i> , and an enormous salary while he was there, forms a tolerable remuneration for the <i>loyalty</i> of the family, and the <i>four years</i> , PUBLIC SERVICE of Mr. Wynn.			
Wymis, governor of Teignmouth-castle .....	182	0	0

## Y

Yates, lady .....	250	0	0
— heir of Nicholas .....	100	0	0
Yelverton, hon. W. C. and J. Barry, <i>searchers</i> , port of Cork.....(i)	901	0	0
Yonge, right hon. sir George, 1803 .....	1000	0	0
York, col. John, dep. lieutenant, governor of the Tower .....	865	16	0
— right hon. Edward Venables Vernon, archbishop of, lord high almoner to the king, brother to lord Vernon and Harecourt, value of see .....	14,000	0	0
— duchess of.....	4000	0	0
— duke of, earl of Ulster, in Ireland; bishop of Osnaburgh; a field-marshal; commander-in-chief of all the land forces; colonel of the 1st foot guards, of the 60th regt. and of the royal			

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Dublin regt. of infantry; grand master of the order of the Bath, K.G. F.R.S. &c.				
— by act of parliament.....	£14,000	0	0	} £38,631 16 7
— by letters of privy-seal .....	12,000	0	0	
— for holding swainmote courts at Windsor ..	40	0	0	
— keeper of the king's warrens, Windsor.....	591	10	7	
— keeper of the king's person, do. ....	10,000	0	0	

What we have stated gives as poor an idea of the Duke's enormous income as his numerous titles. His emoluments as commander-in-chief—an office kept up with all its appendages in a time of peace, it is impossible to estimate. Mr. Hume stated in the House of Commons, that his income, from various sources, could not be much less than £100,000 per annum. The acceptance of the infamous grant of £10,000, has lost the Duke's character beyond redemption. Considering the circumstances of the country, his already enormous income, and the office for which the grant was accepted, history hardly records an action more atrocious, odious, and detestable.—Like the last of the Stuarts, James II. the character of his royal highness exhibits a strange compound of bigotry, avarice, and profligacy.

Yorke, rev. Philip. prebend of Ely .....	400	0	0
— right hon. C. P. teller of the exchequer....	2700	0	0
Relations of lord Hardwicke. Sir Joseph Yorke is vice-admiral of the blue, and late lord of the admiralty.			
Young, sir Wm. rear admiral, 15s. a day and 12s. a month, for twelve servants.....	364	0	0
— Jean .....	100	0	0
— Mrs. Ann .....	500	0	0

After her decease to be paid as follows: Olivia Maria Young, £200; Ann Maria Young, £150; Julia Mary Young, £150; during their lives.

## Z

Zeerogel, Mr. store-keeper, Cape of Good Hope....	1500	0	0
---	------	---	---

END OF PLACES AND PENSIONS.

## FURTHER REMARKS

ON

## PLACES, PENSIONS, &amp;c

We have now finished our list of *splendid paupers*. It has extended further than we either wished or intended ; but it occupies too large a space in the catalogue of national grievances to be slightly noticed. To borrow a phrase from the inimitable Curran, it is a *muscum of curiosities*, embracing every link in the human chain, every description of men, women, and children. Like the ark of Noah, there is nothing too great nor too mean in nature to find admission. It exhibits all the vice, the caprice, and injustice, of kingly government : the highest services to the state almost without notice, and the greatest gifts of the crown lavished on profligacy, servility, and intrigue. It exhibits indolence and vice devouring the bread for which poverty and industry have toiled, and for which they are now starving. It exhibits the strength, arcana, and machinery of the English government. It is a real picture of our boasted *constitution*—if not by law, as by practice established ; and is a source whence a foreigner may draw far more correct notions of the checks, balances, and supports of our system, than from the visionary descriptions of Blackstone and De Lolme.

While preparing this monument of national apathy and forbearance, various observations occurred on the different classes of placemen and pensioners, which we thought would be best thrown together at the conclusion. That we may be as brief and intelligible as possible, we shall range them under distinct heads, as follow :—

**COMPENSATIONS.**—A great number of persons are paid under this head, as compensations for offices abolished. By referring to page 10, it will be seen, that more than £100,000 is paid to persons in England and Ireland, for the loss of office in consequence of the Union and other causes. Now, is there any principle on which the granting of these compensations can be justified ? Let us suppose two parallel cases : first, that by the discovery of some new machine, a certain manufacture can be carried on at a cheaper rate, and of course the public would be benefited by its substitution for manual labour, owing to the less price at which they would obtain the manufactured article. Again ; suppose that by some new mode of managing the

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinécures, and Emoluments.*

the business of government, a number of offices might be abolished, and of course their salaries saved to the community. Here then are two cases exactly similar; in one, a number of working people are thrown out of employment; and in the other, a number of the officers of government. The public is benefited alike in both cases: in one, by a saving of salaries; and in the other, by the less price at which it purchases manufactures. But how differently these two classes of sufferers have been treated: One receives a pension, perhaps to the amount of his salary; and the other is suffered to perish for want of employment, and his privations aggravated by contributing to the maintenance of a person whose claim at all events is not greater than his own.

The *Sinécures' Office-Bill*, in 1812, was founded on a similar principle: no *existing interest* was to be touched; and it was only at the death of the possessors of sinécures that they were to be abolished. A most erroneous principle; because public offices being instituted for the benefit of the public, it is right they should be abolished, without compensation, whenever they cease to be of public utility.

TITLES AND PENSIONS.—They are generally conferred together: a person at once receives a title of honour and a badge of disgrace, and at the same moment is made a pauper and a nobleman. A little incongruous; but it passes in a country demoralized by stock-jobbing and trade; where honour is considered synonymous with money; where, in her courts of justice, offices are publicly sold, and the *honour* of a man's wife is rated at so many thousand pounds. But it is a base principle: among the Romans the *civic crown* was considered a glorious testimony of public gratitude; but then it was bestowed for real services to the common-wealth; it was stamped with the approbation of the people, and did not require a pension of £5000 to add to its lustre, and secure respect and dignity to the wearer. The disgrace of coupling pensions and titles was noticed by *Curran*. "The pension-list," says he, "has been degraded by a new species of prostitution unknown before; the granting of honours and titles to lay the foundation for the granting of a pension. The suffering any man to steal a dignity for the purpose a barren beggar steals a child."—*State Trials*, p. 107.

FAMILY CONNEXIONS.—It is curious to see how the great families are dovetailed into each other. Who could trace all the ramifications of the Castlereagh family through the Moores, the Vandeleurs, the Staples, the Stewarts, the Seymours, and the Ellenboroughs? Or who could trace the family of George Canning through all its branches; the Hunns, the Redishes, the

*Places, Pensions, Grants, Sinecures, and Emoluments.*

Cadwalladers, and a great many more illustrious names, *only known behind the scenes?* But to be serious; the aristocracy may be considered only one family, plundering, deluding, and fattening on the people; and by its connexions possessing more power and influence in society than the ancient barons, with all their feudal immunities. When a new family, like the Scotts', for instance, forces its way into the compact, through the church or the bar, it is amusing to observe how rapidly it spreads through every department of the state. Its members may be compared to the roots of a tree; spreading in all directions, destroying the verdure, and consuming the nutriment of every thing in its neighbourhood. Or it may be compared more aptly to a *polypus*, continually shooting out new branches; these branches again becoming the centre of new constellations; thus spreading through the system, *ad infinitum*, and exhausting the blood and nutriment of the community.

**COMMISSIONERS.**—A numerous class of pensioners burden the list under this head. They are a sort of servants of servants; they are appointed by those who ought to be the servants of the people, to do the work which they themselves were deputed to perform. The professed object of some is to audit the public accounts; or to inquire into some branch of the public expenditure; but the real object of all is generally to lay the foundation for some new job, to extort more plunder from the people. In fact, the appointment of these commissions has been the great source of pensioners and placemen: it is the favourite whig and tory mode of inoculating new members into the borough system.

**SUPERANNUATIONS.**—Superannuated admirals, captains, shipwrights, schoolmasters, and men in the medical profession. These are generally rather under than over paid. It is the curse of the *borough system*, that its rewards are bestowed without either justice or wisdom; they are lavished on intrigue, indolence, and vice; while virtue, talents, and real services are left to pine in want and obscurity.

# POLICE ESTABLISHMENTS

OF THE

## METROPOLIS.

---

OUR intention at first was to bring also under this head an account of salaries in courts of justice, and the number and emoluments of persons connected with the administration of law; but, on reflecting upon the immense swarm of attorneys, conveyancers, notaries, lawyers, judges, and chancellors, with which the country is impoverished and distracted, we determined to treat of these classes separately;—besides, the subjects themselves do naturally suggest this division: the object of police is the prevention and detection of crime, and the object of the administration of law is its punishment.

In treating this and every other subject, the reader must bear in mind that our chief object is to expose the numbers and emoluments of persons whose interests are, more or less, identified with the continuance of the borough-system.

For greater perspicuity in this article, we shall give an account of the Police in the following order:—*First*, a general account of these establishments. *Secondly*, their emoluments. *Thirdly*, a statement of their total expense to the public. *Fourthly*, their patronage. *Lastly*, their abuses.

**POLICE-OFFICES.**—In the metropolis there are nine different police-establishments, namely, Bow-street, Marlborough-street, Hatton-garden, Worship-street, Whitechapel, Shadwell, Queen-square, Union-Hall, and the Thames-police. These offices have no communication or connexion with each other; each acting independently in its own jurisdiction, unless particular circumstances require a general co-operation. Three justices preside in each office, with a suitable establishment of clerks, constables, office-keepers, door-keepers, messengers, gaolers, &c. The magistrates attend the office in rotation, one each day; the hours they ought to attend are from ten in the morning to three in the afternoon, and then again at seven in the evening: some part of the establishment, however, is always in attendance both night and day, to be ready in case of emergency. The general object of the

*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

establishments is the preservation of the peace—the prevention of crimes—the apprehension of offenders—and their examination and committal to prison.

The office in Bow-street is considered the principal, both in magnitude, the experience and ability of its magistrates, and the activity and address of its officers. This establishment consists at present of the three magistrates, three clerks, eight police-officers, 100 patrols, one office-keeper, messenger, and house-keeper, two door-keepers, two gaolers, an assistant-messenger and the editor of the Hue and Cry Gazette.

EMOLUMENTS.—The following is a statement of the salaries of the principal officers on the Bow-street establishment :—

Chief Magistrate, (Sir N. Conant) .....	£600	} £ 1350 0 0
For attending the home-office .....	600	
For superintending the horse-patrole ..	100	
The two other magistrates, £ 600 each .....		1200 0 0
Chief clerk .....		240 0 0
Second ditto .....		200 0 0
Third ditto .....		149 0 0
Police officers, per week .....		1 1 0
Patrole, per night .....		0 2 6
Conductor of the patrole, ditto .....		0 5 0
Editor of the Hue and Cry Gazette .....		60 0 0
Surgeon .....		140 0 0

In the police, as in almost every other establishment under government, the salaries of the different officers form a very small portion of their total emoluments. Many of the clerks are solicitors; their duties, perhaps, are discharged by an assistant, or distributed among the other clerks, while they are discharging the functions of some other situation. Some of the clerks practise as solicitors, on their own account, in the office; and, in some instances, act as solicitors both for plaintiff and defendant. Mr. Stafford, chief clerk at Bow-street, is clerk of indictments on the home-circuit, and of the Middlesex Sessions, and is generally absent eight weeks in the year. In the exaction of fees the public appear to be left, in a great measure, at their mercy. At Hatton-Garden, extra fees are charged in some cases for informations, and for the drawing of affidavits; and if a landlord applies for the restoration of his house, he is charged *four guineas*, two of which are pocketed by the clerk.\*

\* Third Report of the Police of the Metropolis, p. 149. Nearly the whole of this account is taken from the evidence of the parties themselves, as published in the Police-Reports.



*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

The guinea a week paid to the officers is only their retaining fee; their chief emoluments are derived from other sources. Three of them, Townsend, Sayer, and Vickery, have £200 each for attending the Regent while in town and at Brighton. Any of them have a guinea a day when they attend at the Bank, the Custom-house, and Excise and Stamp offices; and the same allowance per night, for attending the Opera or the Theatres. They receive considerable sums from private individuals employing them in town or country; and not unfrequently a handsome gratuity from the libertine sons of the *higher orders* for shielding them from the consequence of their brawls in gaming-houses, brothels, and other licentious places. On the apprehension of a burglar, they receive what is technically termed a "*Tyburn Ticket*;" it exempts the holder from parochial duties; it is assignable, and is generally sold for about £30 to some person who wishes to be exempt from the laborious and unpleasant duties of constable. The last source of emolument we shall mention is the parliamentary rewards, or *blood money*, on the conviction of criminals. The sums derived from this source, as is well known, are not only in proportion to the turpitude of offenders, but also to the turpitude of the officer.

The horse-patrol receive 28s. a week, and their conductor, Mr. Day, keeper of the *criminal registers*, in the home-office, £100 per annum.

**TOTAL EXPENSE OF THE POLICE OFFICES.**—Of the nine police offices, seven were established, in 1792, by act of parliament. They were all brought under the view of the House, in the 28th Report of Finance, which was ordered to be printed in 1798. From that Report it appears—

That the annual average of the total expense, of the seven police offices, taken from the time of their institution in August 1792, to the end of 1797, a period of nearly 5½ years, amounted to..... £18,281 16 6

The total expenses of the same offices, (which do not include the office in Bow-street, nor the Thames-police,) amounted,—

In the year 1814, to .....	£ 24,377	1	1½
1815, to .....	23,938	9	10
1816, to .....	23,786	15	1
1817, to .....	24,196	7	5½*

By the 9th section of the 54th Geo. III. it is enacted, That the whole charges of the *seven offices* shall not exceed the annual sum of £24,000, over and above the necessary disbursements, for hiring and repairing the

\* *Third Report of the Police of the Metropolis*, p. 20.

houses and building wherein the said seven offices shall be held. But what is most remarkable, is the enormous increase, in a few years, in the annual expenditure, namely, from £18,000 to £24,000 per annum, being one-fourth of the total expense.

The cost of each of the different establishments was, according to the return in 1814, 1815, 1816, and 1817, as follows:—

	1814.			1815.			1816.			1817.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Bow-street . . . .	13,029	0	6	12,300	6	1	12,123	19	9	12,270	13	1
Thames-police. . .	6167	16	3	6775	12	6	7708	19	5	8308	13	3
Marlborough-street	4359	4	8½	3463	11	1½	3660	9	1	3625	17	7
Hatton-garden . .	3783	1	7	3528	17	8	3529	17	0	3538	2	11
Worship-street . .	32.1	12	9	3223	16	10½	3296	0	1	3643	18	8½
Whitechapel . . .	3146	12	0	3119	19	1	3185	13	7	3300	19	7
Shadwell . . . . .	3206	19	11	4018	16	1	5166	18	1	3213	18	4
Queen-square . . .	3017	18	9	3035	5	7	3194	14	1	3334	4	8
Union-hall . . . .	3602	1	5	3548	5	5	3752	3	2	3539	18	8
Horse-patrole . . .	5367	6	0	6699	16	0	7556	6	9	7740	15	6
	48,941	9	4½	49,714	6	5	50,647	19	10	51,796	6	2½

From these sums must be subtracted the receipt of money arising from fees appropriated to the public service, and which, in the different police-offices, not including Bow-street, amounted,—

In 1814, to . . . . .	£ 5272 11 11½
1815, to . . . . .	5559 19 11
1816, to . . . . .	4968 6 2
1817, to . . . . .	4432 5 3

Hence we have the net sum paid out of the public treasury—

In 1814 . . . . .	£ 43,668 17 5
1815 . . . . .	44,154 6 6
1816 . . . . .	45,679 13 8
1817 . . . . .	47,364 0 8½

The most remarkable item in this statement is the prodigious expense of the Bow-street establishment, which has nearly doubled in the space of twenty years. From the 28th report of the Finance Committee, already mentioned, it appears

That the expense of this office, in the year 1797, including remuneration to magistrates, in lieu of fees, and perquisites for special services, as well as for the patrole, amounted only to . . . . . £ 7901 7 9

The items of expenditure at Bow-street, in the year ending 5th January, 1818, were as follow :—

*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

	£	s.	d.
Salaries* . . . . .	9910	13	11
Extra Charges . . . . .	1444	17	5
Incidentals . . . . .	751	1	8
Disbursements . . . . .	164	0	1
	<u>12,270</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>

After this full exposition of police expenditure, we shall only make one remark, namely, that the expenditure in this department, as in almost every other under government, has been gradually increasing, while the ability of the people to support it has been gradually decreasing.

**PATRONAGE.**—The act of 1792 made a very considerable addition to the patronage of the crown. The appointment to nearly all offices in the police is vested in the secretary of state for the home department. He appoints the magistrates and chief clerk; and the other officers appointed by the magistrates, with the exception of the two door-keepers, two gaolers, and an assistant messenger, are subject to his approbation. So eager is lord Sidmouth to thrust a portion of his creatures into the police—many of whom perhaps have occupied situations in the *espionage corps*—that he lately nominated to some of the subaltern offices contrary to law. According to the 54 Geo. III. cap. 37, constables and other officers are to be appointed by the magistrates, subject to the approbation of the secretary of state. Notwithstanding this law, the *pious* secretary, in 1815, without waiting for the nomination of the magistrates, appointed four constables in the public office, Worship-street. Of the four persons thus nominated by him, one declined his appointment; another, an abandoned character, who hired himself out as a fraudulent bail, and who was imprisoned in the King's Bench, and not being able to perform his duty, he was turned out of the office; the remaining two were confirmed in their situations, in defiance of the remonstrance of the magistrates.

**POLICE ABUSES.**—The nature and general organization of the police of the metropolis is very little known; there are very few works which treat on the subject. With the exception of Mr. Colquhoun's two works, and the parliamentary reports, there is no source whence information can be obtained on this subject. The jurisdiction of the offices we have been describing is confined principally to the suburbs, and does not extend into the city of London, properly so called. Both in London and the city of Westminster there are separate establishments for the maintenance of the peace, and of which establishments it will be necessary to give a short account, before we

\* *Third Report of Police, p. 22.*

*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

can discuss with advantage the abuses, defects, and influence of the present system of police. And, first, of the—

**CITY OF LONDON.**—According to the evidence of the late city marshal, Mr. Holdsworth, thieves, pickpockets, and depredators of every description, have been nearly expelled from the City by the vigilance of the magistrates and police. Whenever any of the light-fingered gentry venture into the City, it is with great fear and trembling; and if ever they attempt any thing professionally, it is a great chance, unless they use great despatch, but they will be discovered by some member of the police. “Soames (says Mr. Holdsworth) just came through Temple-bar to take a peep in the City, and just beyond the Temple-gate he picked a pocket, and was returning with the pocket-book he had taken, when he was seized; one of our patrol saw him do it, and immediately took him by the collar, and found the gentleman whose pocket he saw picked; the case was as plain and clear as possible.”

The establishment by which these great things here boasted of have been accomplished, consists of the lord mayor; the 25 aldermen, who preside in their respective wards; the two marshals, constables, patrols, beadles, &c. The salaries and emoluments of some of the stipendiary offices, as far as they can be obtained, are as follow:

Upper marshal . . . . . £600 0 0

Of this sum, £100 is received as a gratuity from the court of aldermen, and £40 from the commissioners of the lottery, for taking care of the wheel.

Under marshal . . . . . 550 0 0

Eight marshal-men, each £140 . . . . . 1120 0 0

Patroles, each, per week . . . . . 1 10 6

Besides this sum, the patrols receive extra pay for any particular service, or when they are employed by private individuals.

In the *City of Westminster* the police is the least effective of any part of the capital. The lord high steward, who appoints the court of burgesses, is the principal officer. Next to the lord high steward and his deputy is the high bailiff and his deputy. These, with the high constable, who has under his control 80 constables, appointed by the court of burgesses, constitute the whole civil power of Westminster; a place which contains 14,000 householders, and 200,000 inhabitants. No emolument is attached to the office of lord high steward, nor to the court of burgesses, who are chosen from among the principal house-holders. The dean and chapter have the disposal of all offices. The regular sum given for the office of high bailiff, to which considerable emoluments are attached, is £2000.

*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

We have now given a short account of the three great branches of Police; namely, the nine public offices, the police establishments of the city of London and the city of Westminster. In the first of these branches, the appointment to all offices of consequence is in the crown; in the second, in the corporation of the city of London; and in the third, in the dean and chapter of Westminster. We have also given a statement of the salaries and emoluments of the stipendiary officers, as far as they can be obtained. To complete this part of our subject, we shall insert a statement of the total number of persons regularly attached to the Police.

1st. <i>City of London</i> .—City marshals . . . . .	2	
Marshals' men . . . . .	8	
Beadles . . . . .	36	
Parochial constables, including principals, substitutes, and 32 extra officers . . . . .	275	
		321
2d. <i>City of Westminster</i> .—Lord high steward and his deputy . . . . .	2	
High bailiff and his deputy . . . . .	2	
High constable and 80 parochial constables . . . . .	81	
		85
3d. <i>Middlesex Parishes</i> .—Holborn division, high constable and petty constables . . . . .	79	
Finsbury, ditto ~ ditto . . . . .	69	
Tower Hamlets division, ditto . . . . .	218	
		366
4th. <i>Tower Liberty</i> .—High constable and constables . . . . .		17
5th. <i>Kensington Division</i> .—High constable and constables . . . . .		22
6th. <i>Borough of Southwark</i> .—High constable and constables . . . . .		88
7th. <i>Nine Police Offices</i> .—Police justices, salaries, £600 each . . . . .	27	
Clerks . . . . .	27	
Police officers, at Hatton Garden 10, at the other offices 8 each . . . . .	74	
Patrole, 87 men, and 13 conductors . . . . .	100	
Office-keepers, messengers, gaolers, house-keepers, assistants, &c. . . . .	63	
		291
To which add beadles, watchmen, and patroles . . . . .		2044
Add also justices of the peace in Westminster, who have taken out their <i>dedimus potestatem</i> , and who reside near the spot . . . . .		150*
Total civil force in the metropolis . . . . .		3384

\* In that part of the metropolis situate in the county of Middlesex, there are about 800 justices, including the princes of the royal family, many of the nobility, great officers of state, and members of parliament.

Of this number about 2422 are *stipendiary* situations, the rest are parochial offices, the duties of which are discharged without any ostensible emolument.

## ABUSES, DEFECTS, AND INFLUENCE,

OF THE

## POLICE SYSTEM OF THE METROPOLIS.

COLQUHOUN says, that foreigners who visit the metropolis and contemplate the nature and organization of our police establishments, concur in one general remark, namely, "*That we have some shadow of police for apprehending delinquents after crimes are actually committed, but none for the purpose of preventing them.*"—This is exactly the case. The public is put to an enormous expense; an immense number of individuals are employed; and the object of both is merely to apprehend offenders—neither to remove nor investigate the cause of their delinquency. That such a system is defective is undeniable. Besides crimes which originate in natural depravity, there are a far greater number which proceed from the want of education, from indigence, and other unavoidable causes. Now the object of an enlightened and liberal system of police would be not so much to punish such crimes, but to root out the causes of their perpetration.

Punishment, in one point of view, is injurious rather than beneficial to the community: it degrades the individual; his character, which formed perhaps his most valuable inheritance, and the chief means of obtaining a livelihood, is impaired: deprived of that, and having less to lose, he is rendered careless about the commission of future depredations. Thousands of offenders have been necessitated to continue a course of guilt, from being thus deprived of any other means of subsistence. Judges, in passing sentence, generally expatiate on the advantages of an honest and virtuous course of life, but they generally forget that the sentence they are pronouncing is one great obstacle to the culprit following their advice: the criminal, at first a voluntary offender, is subsequently rendered so from necessity.

The evidence of Townsend, the police-officer, in the case of the celebrated Barrington, is strikingly illustrative of this point:

*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

“ I agree (says he) with George Barrington, whom I brought from Newcastle ; and however great Lord Chief Baron Eyre's speech was to him, after he had answered him, it came to this climax : ‘ Now,’ says he, ‘ Townsend, you heard what the Chief Baron said to me ; a fine flowery speech, was it not? But he did not answer the question I put to him.’ Now, how could he? Now all the Chief Baron said to him, after he was acquitted, giving him advice, this word was every thing ; says he, ‘ My lord, I have paid great attention to what you have been stating to me after my acquittal ; I return my sincere thanks to the jury for their goodness. But your lordship says, you lament very much that a man of my abilities does not turn my abilities to a better use. Now, my lord, I have only this reply to make, I am ready to go into any service to work for my living, if your lordship will but find me a master.’ Why, what was the reply to that? ‘ Gaoler, take the prisoner away.’ Why, who would employ him? that was the point. It is really farcical with me, sometimes, when I have heard magistrates say, ‘ Young man, really, I am very sorry for you ; you are much to be pitied ; you should turn your talents to a better account, and you should really leave off this bad course of life.’ Yes, that is better said than done ; for where is there any body to take these wretches? I will take upon myself to say, that I have known this to be a clear case, which they have said to me—‘ Sir, we do not thieve from disposition, but we thieve because we cannot get employment ; our character is damned, and nobody will hire us.’ And so it is, there is no question about it. Then again, upon the other hand, there are cases where men might do and will not.”—*Police Report, July 1816. p. 143.*

It is considered a great hardship to be ironed or imprisoned before trial, but the injustice is infinitely greater, when the penalty of the law has been suffered, and an offender is starving from the infamy it has attached to his character. Both cases are unjust, but in the former the punishment only lasts for a few months, at the most ; but, perhaps, in the latter, it sticks to the unfortunate individual through life. This is the case with thousands every year, who return from transportation, whose term of imprisonment is expired, or perhaps who have only been confined under the bare suspicion of criminality. This, then, is one defect in our police ; it affords to an offender no opportunity to regain his station in society, after the law, in attempting to reform him, has rendered reformation impossible. The other defect noticed under this head, is, the police not preventing crimes originating in indigence and other unavoidable causes.

Notwithstanding the cumbersome and expensive nature of the present system, it is vastly inadequate to the protection of the inhabitants, and they are exposed to the most shameless imposition and depredations. We have seen that the number of peace-officers is 3384 ; and that the cost of the police-offices is more than £50,000 per annum ; yet notwithstanding, if the statements of Mr. Colquhoun, the chief magistrate of Queen-square, be any where near the truth, immorality and crime prevail to an incredible extent. He estimates the annual value of the depredations committed in the metropolis and its vicinity, in ONE YEAR, at £2,000,000. The particular heads of this immense sum, which he says are drawn from the best information, are as follow :

*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

Small thefts . . . . .	£ 710,000
Thefts upon the rivers and quays . . . . .	250,000
Thefts in the dock-yards on the Thames . . . . .	200,000
Burglaries, highway robberies, &c. . . . .	280,000
Coining base money . . . . .	310,000
Forging bills, swindling, &c. . . . .	250,000
Total . . . . .	£2,000,000*

The fields near London are dreadfully plundered, especially on a Sunday. On that day, few gardens within five miles escape a visit from the marauders; and the farmers' fields are plundered every day of fruit, roots, cabbages, pulse, and corn to an immense amount. The ears of wheat are cut from the sheaves and carried off in the most daring manner, in open day, in various ways, but mostly in bags containing about half a bushel each. It has been estimated that 20,000 bushels of all the various sorts are thus carried away every Sunday morning; and 10,000 more during the other six days of the week; or one million and a half bushels a year, which, if valued at so small a sum as sixpence each, would amount to £37,000. The occupiers of land around London, lose annually in this manner to the amount of more than 20s. an acre.†

The frauds and felonies committed in the course of a year in respect to horses are still more incredible. Of thirty thousand of these useful animals, said to be flayed and boiled annually in the metropolis, at the seventeen licensed houses, about one-fourth are brought there alive, supposed chiefly to be stolen horses.

When one reads this history of pillage and robbery, by a *police magistrate*, supposing it only tolerably correct, one would imagine there is no police in existence; or rather that it were instituted more for the protection of thieves and vagabonds than the honest and industrious part of the community.

But the frauds and impositions practised on the public in respect of provisions, and connived at by a venal or inefficient police, are still more abominable. Without mentioning coffee, tea, bread, and other commodities, notoriously adulterated, let us take the single article of *milk*, which forms a necessary and wholesome beverage for all ages and conditions. The number of milch cows kept for supplying the metropolis with this

\* *Treatise on the Police of London*, p. 613.

† It is calculated that the depredations committed on the landed interest probably amounts to 4s. an acre per annum, on all the cultivated lands in England; or to eight millions of pounds sterling per annum; and including the injuries done by game and vermin, it is supposed that the farmer's property suffers to the amount of 10s. an acre, or nearly twenty millions annually.



article, is stated by Mr. Middleton, in his report on the county of Middlesex, at 8,500; and each cow is supposed on an average to afford nine quarts of milk per day. Five or six men only are employed in attending near three hundred cows. As one woman cannot milk above eight or nine cows, twice a day, that part of the business would necessarily be attended with considerable expense to the cow-keeper, were it not that the retailer agrees for the produce of a certain number of cows, and takes the labour and expense of milking on himself.

The milk is always given in its *genuine* state to the retailer, and is sold to them at such a rate, that their profit, considering the difference of measures, amounts to more than 100 per cent. This, however, is far from being the whole of their gains. The retailers first carry the milk to their own houses, where it is set up for half a day, when the cream is taken from it, at least all that comes up in that time, and it is then sold for *new* milk. Hence the milk delivered in the morning is no other than the milk of the preceeding afternoon, greatly reduced in strength and quality, by being deprived of the cream it has thrown up during that time. The cream, such as it is, they again mix with flour, chalk, and other more baneful ingredients; yet the whole finds a ready market in the metropolis, and the poor *Cockneys* gulp it down as genuine from the cow!

There is, however, another far more important source of emolument to these scoundrel retailers. "Every cow-house," says Mr. Middleton, "is provided with a milk-room, where the milk is measured and served out by the cow-keeper; and this room is mostly furnished with a *PUMP*, to which the retail dealers apply in rotation; not secretly, but openly before any person that may be standing by, from which they pump water into their milk vessels at their discretion. The pump is placed there expressly for that purpose, and, indeed, is very seldom used for any other. A considerable cow-keeper, in Surrey, has a pump of this kind, which goes by the name of the *famous black cow*, from the circumstance of its being painted black; and it is said to *yield more than all the rest put together*.

"Where such a pump is not provided for them, things are much worse; for in that case the *retailers* are not even careful to use *clean water*. Some of them have been seen to dip their pails in a common horse-trough. And what is still more disgusting, though equally true, one cow-house happens to stand close to the edge of a stream, into which runs much of the dung, and most of the urine of the cows; and even in this stream, so foully impregnated, they have been observed to dip their milk pails."

The same writer further states, that, for the most part the retailers are

*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

composed of the refuse of all other employments, possessing neither character, decency, nor cleanliness; and that it would be utterly impossible for any person to drink the milk, were he acquainted with the filthy manœuvres of the imposing brutes who deal in it.

Now we ask of what importance is the apprehension of a score of pick-pockets and swindlers, compared with the toleration of these miscreants. There are a million of persons in London; their health is injured; their pockets are picked twice every day in paying for a commodity which is not what it purports to be; and all this from the *police* not enforcing the laws against those who sell unwholesome and adulterated provisions. Let us pass on to another abuse.

About thirty years ago the number of *gaming-houses*, exclusive of those established by subscription, did not exceed four or five. In the year 1797, they had increased to thirty; and according to an affidavit made in one of the superior courts of justice, there were, lately, not less than six in one street near the Haymarket; where persons stood at the door to invite passengers to play. These houses are principally *partnership concerns*, carried on by practising attorneys; some of whom have acquired fortunes of from fifty to one hundred thousand pounds. On stated days, Sunday being the chief day, they have luxurious dinners, to which they contrive to get invited merchants and bankers' clerks, and others whom they think are entrusted with money. The expense of entertainments alone, of one house of the highest class, has been stated to amount, in eight months, to *six thousand guineas*, and the total expense of such houses in one year to amount to £150,000. To enable the proprietors to support such a prodigious expense, the profits they derive from their infatuated visitors must be enormous.

Mr. Colquhoun, who reduces every thing to figures, has calculated the amount of sums annually lost and won in forty-three gaming-houses in the metropolis. We will insert his estimate and classification.

## SUMS WON AND LOST IN GAMING IN ONE YEAR.

	Persons attached.	Money played for nightly.	Aggregate lost and won.
1. Seven subscription houses open one-third of the year, or one hundred nights . .	1000	£ 2000	£ 1,400,000
2. Fifteen houses of a superior class, one-third of the year, or one hundred nights . . . . .	3000	2000	3,000,000
3. Fifteen houses of an inferior class, one-half the year, or one hundred and fifty nights . . . . .	3000	1000	3,925,000
4. Six inferior gaming-houses, fifty nights . .	1000	2000	600,000
			<hr/> £ 7,925,000 <hr/>

*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

This exhibits a pretty commerce among the *higher orders!* among noble lords, right honourable gentlemen, and honourable ladies! Talk of the profligacy of the Reformers,—why, what can be found equal to this? These gambling gentlemen and ladies are nearly all pensioners, placemen, and sinecurists, we dare say. With the exception of Charles Fox we do not remember any other gambling reformer. Whatever may be the vices of the Reformers, they do not spend their nights, and Sundays too, over dice and cards. Here, one would imagine, is a fit subject for the *Society for the Suppression of Vice*. Here Mr. Prichard ought to launch his hottest bolt. What is the use of pursuing such ignoble sport, as deistical writings, of bullock huntings, two-penny hops, and cock and hen clubs? Here is noble game, surely; but, alas! they are the *higher orders*, and their pleasures must not be interrupted.

In defence of the *Police*, it is said, that many of the gaming-houses are so barricaded, and not unfrequently guarded by bludgeon men, and prize-fighters, that it is perilous attempting to force an entrance. This may be true; but this is the very reason why they ought to be put down. Were the people to attempt to oppose the legal authorities by force, their resistance, it would be urged by their enemies, would be the very reason why they ought to be suppressed. But there is one law at Pekin, and another at Japan; the reasoning which is very good on one side of Temple-bar, does not hold on the other.

There is, however, one instance mentioned by Mr. *Nares*, (*Police Report*, 1816, p. 297.) of a gaming-house being penetrated, where considerable plunder was obtained, and which has never yet been accounted for. The case is curious, and as our intention is to render *The Black Book* the depository of every well-authenticated abuse, we shall relate the transaction.

Mr. Capper, of the alien-office, and a foreigner who gave the information, obtained a warrant to search a gaming-house in Pall Mall. Adkins, the officer, accompanied them with the warrant to the spot. The foreigner and Mr. Capper, who was in uniform, and with a drawn sword, first forced their way in. These two gentlemen immediately cleared the table, and made the parties empty their pockets, Mr. Capper taking memoranda of the contents. Adkins on this occasion appears to have been left in the lurch; for, coming in last, he only obtained about £20. The foreigner, who also belonged to the alien-office, instead of appearing before a magistrate to give an account of his booty, made off, and has not since been heard of. Mr. Capper, brother to a clerk of that name in the secretary of

state's office, still we believe keeps possession of his share of the plunder, as well as Adkins of the £20.

On Mr. Nares applying to Mr. Becket, respecting the interference of the *alien-office* in the business of the police, and also relative to the foreigner who had absconded, he could obtain no explanation. The truth is, it was a bare-faced robbery of the parties; and the matter has ever since been hushed up. However little sympathy we may feel towards gamblers, we should not like to see them put down illegally; neither by an under secretary of state, or his agents.

Next to *gaming-houses* the police appears the most defective in respect to *female prostitution*. When an evil cannot be subdued, the next object ought to be to render it as little noxious as possible. It is admitted on all hands, that prostitution can never altogether be prevented: it has prevailed in all ages and countries: we read of it both in sacred and profane history: and this circumstance of its universality, seems no inconsiderable argument of its necessity. It may indeed be considered a disease truly, but a disease it would be dangerous to suppress, and of which the continuance seems necessary to the community as a preventive of greater evils.

What then ought to be done? Why, since prevention is hopeless; since all law and legislation is only a preference of less evils to greater, let such places be an object of municipal regulation, tolerated by the law; not punishable, because they are such, but only when, from the improper conduct of the owners, they are sources of disorder and contagious disease.

There is not a more disgusting nuisance in society than prostitution, as now carried on; but, then, much of the evil originates partly from the law and partly from public opinion. There is nothing so effectually renders any class infamous and degraded, as the law or the public considering it infamous and degraded. There is nothing hardly so intrinsically and stubbornly good, but what might be rendered the reverse under such a proscription. There is no class so tenacious of preserving its reputation, as that which imagines it has a reputation to lose. The unfortunate females, many of them are truly so, of whom we are speaking, they are considered vile and abandoned wretches; they are proscribed from all society but their own; and thus a character and manners are formed, which are not only the consequences of their profession, but of their treatment by the public.

To complete our remarks on this subject, we shall lay before the reader some details to show the extent of prostitution in the metropolis. Mr. Colquhoun classes and enumerates them as follows:

*Police Establishments of the Metropolis.*

Of the class of well-educated women . . . . .	2,000
Of persons above the rank of menial servants . . . . .	3,000
Of persons who have been employed as menial servants, and seduced in early life . . . . .	20,000
Of those in different ranks in society, who live partly by prostitution, including the multitude of females, who cohabit with labourers without matrimony . . . . .	25,000
	50,000

In the *Third Report of the Police*, p. 30, it is stated that out of three parishes examined by the "The Guardian Society," consisting of 9924 houses, and 59,050 inhabitants, there are 360 brothels, and 2000 prostitutes. Prostitution prevailing to such an extent, in spite of all the odium and wretchedness attached to it, proves that to prevent it, if politic, is impossible; therefore, the wisest course would be to bring it under such regulations as would render it the least detrimental to the health and peace of the community.

We shall now conclude our article on the police of the metropolis. We have laid before the reader a mass of details and observations, which we will venture to say are not to be found in any other publication. We shall conclude with a brief enumeration of the abuses and defects which appear in our police establishment.

1. The police being divided into three great branches of Westminster, the City of London, and the nine public offices, differently organized, and independent of each other, it is not adapted for any general and effective co-operation, in case of emergency.

2. The establishment of the police offices has thrown a dangerous mass of patronage into the hands of the crown; and we should beg to suggest, that instead of the magistrates being appointed by the secretary of state, they ought to be appointed by the householders in their respective districts.

3. The object of the present system appears confined entirely to the punishment of delinquents, not to remove the causes of their delinquency.

4. It appears that the police affords a very inadequate protection to the public; that petty offenders and offences are prosecuted with great activity, while the evils of gaming among the higher classes, the frauds and impositions in provisions, especially milk, are suffered with impunity.

Lastly. It is our opinion that the patronage of £50,000 annually in the police offices; and the present constitution of the house of commons, will be insuperable obstacles to the reform of any abuse in this department, or any other, under the present system.

END OF THE POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS.

ON THE  
EXPENDITURE  
OF THE  
CIVIL LIST.

---

---

ROYALTY, after all, is an expensive government! What is a king without an aristocracy and a priesthood? and what are any of these, unless supported in splendour and magnificence? It is a system in which men are sought to be governed by the *senses*, rather than the *understanding*, and is more adapted to a barbarous than a civilized state. Pageantry and show, the parade of crowns and coronets, of gold keys, sticks, white wands, and black rods; of ermine and lawn, and maces and wigs;—these are the chief attributes of monarchy. They are ridiculous when men become enlightened, when they have learnt that the real object of government is to confer the greatest happiness on the people at the least expense: but it is a beggarly greatness, a barbarous system, which would maintain these fooleries amidst a famishing population,—amidst debts, and taxes, and pauperism.

In treating the subject of this article we shall distribute it under three heads. *First*, we shall give some account of the history and amount of the *Civil List*. *Secondly*, the chief objects to which it is applied. And, *thirdly*, we shall subjoin, from official documents, a statement of the amount of the different sums under the various heads of expenditure.

The revenue of the crown was formerly derived from various sources: as forfeitures in courts of justice, the post duty, the duty on wine licences, the income from the crown lands, a profit on waifs and shipwrecks, the incomes of bishoprics during a vacancy, treasure trove, wild fowl, and various other items. These formed the hereditary revenue of the crown; in lieu of which, the king, at the commencement of the present reign, accepted £800,000 per annum from Parliament, for the maintenance of the *Civil List*. This sum being found insufficient, in 1777, was increased to £900,000, to which, by the 44 Geo. III. an additional sum of £60,000 was added.

*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

This forms the regular parliamentary provision, but is far from including the whole of the sums absorbed by the Crown. The debts of the King, as well as the Regent, have been frequently paid by the people. The Crown, in 1810, had received of Admiralty droits £7,344,000, and of the 4½ per cent. Leeward Island duties, so far back as 1812, £1,600,000. The revenues from the duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster are very considerable. The king's hereditary revenues in Scotland, in 1816, amounted to £105,373 : 4 : 2. From the statement of Mr. Hume too, in the last Session, it appears, that duties have been levied on various articles at Gibraltar, without consent of parliament, from which the crown derived a yearly income of £18,000. These, however, are all insufficient to meet the immense expenditure in this department. Every year enormous sums are voted to make up deficiencies, and to defray expenses not in the ordinary charges of the civil list. In 1817, the sum voted for this purpose was £500,000; this year the sum voted was £700,000.\*

\* As a specimen of the objects to which the grant of £500,000, in 1817, and the grant of £700,000 in the present year, have been applied, we have selected the following items:

	£.	s.	d.
Robert Quarne, esq. to make the emoluments of his office £7000 per annum . . . . .	1433	1	0
Charles Manners Sutton, for his equipage as speaker of the house of commons . . . . .	1000	0	0
_____ in lieu of plate, usually allowed to the speaker on his nomination . . . . .	1637	7	8
_____ in lieu of stationary . . . . .	136	0	7
Arabella Walker Heneage, for necessaries supplied to the court of exchequer, and diet . . . . .	945	0	0
Expenses for works and repairs of public buildings . . . . .	41,195	4	10
<b>LORD CHAMBERLAIN'S OFFICE:—</b>			
Expenses for repairs of the royal sovereign yacht . . . . .	1267	10	11
For providing collars, badges, and mantles of the several orders of the bath, garter, and thistle; silver trumpets for the life and horse guards; gold chains, badges, and mantles of the officers of the several orders; silver collars and embroidered coats for the heralds; furniture for the royal yachts; and septennial and triennial services for the drummers; and royal standards for the foot and life guards . . . . .	755	12	0
Matthew Martin, esq. for continuing his inquiry into the state of mendicity in the metropolis . . . . .	316	15	0
Thomas Wyon, esq. for engraving seals . . . . .	636	18	9
W. Horne, for obtaining returns of the insane persons in Scotland . . . . .	84	3	9
For illuminations at Madrid on the marriage of " <i>Ferdinand the beloved</i> " . . . . .	261	1	9
For SNUFF BOXES, as presents to foreign ministers and im- perial coachmen . . . . .	22,510	15	1

Having given some idea of the money which flows into this immense gulf, our next object will be to show the various purposes for which it is drawn out again. And, first, we will speak of the king's *privy purse money*.

Before the present reign, no such thing as a *privy purse* was known. The king's income was always considered public property attached to the office, but not to the person of the monarch. The first time any mention is made of the *privy purse*, is in Mr. Burke's bill, in 1782, and then again in the 39th of the king; but it was not till the time of the Regency, when it was vested in the hands of commissioners, that it was recognised as a fixed annual sum, the private property of the king. But though this anomaly has been only recently acknowledged by any public act, its origin is coeval with the king's reign. When the sum of £800,000 was first set apart for the civil list expenditure, the king was at liberty, with the advice of his ministers, to apply what portion of it he thought proper for his private use. The sum at first set aside for this purpose was £48,000; and the king's family increasing, it was extended to £60,000. At this sum it has remained ever since, and forms the *privy purse*.

No part of this fund is applied to defray the expense of the royal household, nor of any other function of his office; it is limited entirely to his personal expenses, and may be more properly denominated the king's *pocket money* than his *privy purse*. Why it should be separated from the general income of the *civil list*, unless to gratify a puerile avarice in the monarch, it is not easy to conjecture. It is from the savings from this source, and his income of £10,000 a year from the duchy of Lancaster, that the king's private property in the funds, and other securities, has accumulated. Even since his majesty's indisposition, both these sums have been accumulating in the hands of the keepers appointed in the act of the 51st. At the debate on the Windsor establishment, it was proposed to pay the memorable grant of £10,000 to the duke of York from these funds; but it was opposed by lord Castlereagh, as an *infamous violation of the king's private property*. The whole of these savings will most probably fall to the different members of the royal family at the king's decease.

Next to the *privy purse* are various annuities to the *royal family*, payable out of the civil list. The income of the princes and princesses, are,

	£.	s.	d.
For the expenses of duke Nicholas, while on a visit to John Bull . . . . .	13,000	0	0
Lord Castlereagh and duke of Wellington, for expenses while at Aix-la-Chapelle . . . . .	8432	0	0
Royal George yacht, for the furniture of one room . . . . .	3193	12	0



*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

however, principally charged upon the consolidated fund. The following is a statement of the sums payable out of the civil list.

Prince of Wales . . . . .	£66,000
Duke of York . . . . .	12,000
Duke of Clarence . . . . .	2,500
Princess Augusta Sophia . . . . .	4,000
Princess Mary, duchess of Gloucester . . . . .	4,000
Princess Elizabeth . . . . .	4,000
Princess Sophia . . . . .	4,000
Duchess of Cumberland . . . . .	4,000

The great head of charge on the civil list is the *king's household*. This forms a most ponderous establishment; and affords ample scope for retrenchment under a government really wishful to economise. It is the great nursery of indolence, parasites, and courtiers. It is formed upon manners and customs that have long since expired,—upon old *feudal principles*. It not only retains traces of its Gothic origin, but it is formed also on the principles of a *body corporate*; and has its own law-courts, magistrates, and bye laws.

In ancient times these establishments were supported on a principle of *purveyance* and *receipt in kind*. The household was then vast, and the supply scanty and precarious. The king's purveyor used to sally forth from under the Gothic portcullis, to purchase provisions, not with money, but power and prerogative. Whole districts were laid under contribution by the jackals of the royal table, who returned from their plundering excursions loaded with the spoils, perhaps, of a hundred markets, which were deposited in so many caverns, each guarded by its respective keeper. Every commodity being received in its rawest state, it had a variety of processes to pass through before it was prepared for the king and his guests. This inconvenient mode of receipt multiplied offices exceedingly; and hence has arisen the butchery, buttery, pantry, and all that "*rabble of places*," which, though profitable to the holders, and expensive to the state, are almost too mean to mention.

Let us hear what BURKE said on this subject, in his *reforming days*:—  
 "But when (says he) the reason of old establishments are gone, it is absurd to preserve nothing but the burden of them. This is superstitiously to embalm the carcass, not worth an ounce of the gums that are used to preserve it. It is to burn precious oils in the tomb; it is to offer meat and drink to the dead,—not so much an honour to the deceased as a disgrace to the survivors. Our palaces are vast inhospitable halls; there the bleak

*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

winds, 'there Boreas, and Euras, and Cauras, and Argestes, loud' howling through the vacant lobbies, and clattering the doors of deserted guard-rooms, appal the imagination, and conjure up the grim spectres of departed tyrants,—the Saxon, the Norman, and the Dane; the stern Edwards and fierce Henries,—who stalk from desolation to desolation through the dreary vacuity and melancholy succession of chill and comfortless chambers. When this tumult subsides, a dead and still more frightful silence would reign in the desert, if every now and then the tacking of hammers did not announce that those constant attendants on *all courts*, in all ages, jobs, were still alive; for whose sake alone it is that any trace of ancient grandeur is suffered to remain. These palaces are a true emblem of some governments; the inhabitants are decayed, but the governors and magistrates still flourish. They put me in mind of *Old Sarum*, where the representatives, more in number than the constituents, only serve to inform us that this was once a place of trade, and sounding with the '*busy hum of men*,' though now you can only trace the streets by the colour of the corn; and its sole manufacture is in members of parliament."—*His Works*, v. iii. pp. 277-8. *Speech on Economical Reform.*

The great branches of the household are under the direction of the lord chamberlain, (marquis of Hertford;) the lord steward, (marquis Cholmondeley;) and the master of the horse, (duke of Montrose.) The office of the *lord chamberlain* is to take care of all the officers and servants belonging to the king's chambers, except those belonging to the king's bed-chamber, who are under the groom of the stole. He has the oversight of the officers of the wardrobe, of tents, revels, music, comedians, handicrafts, and artizans; and, though a layman, he has the oversight of all the king's chaplains, heralds, physicians, and apothecaries. It is his office to inspect the charges of coronations, marriages, public entries, cavalcades, and funerals; and into all furniture in the parliament-house, and rooms of address to the king.

The *lord steward* has the estate of the household entirely committed to his care, and all his commands in court are to be obeyed; his authority reaches over all officers and servants of the king's house, except those of the king's chamber and chapel. The counting-house, where the accounts of the household are kept, the treasurer of the household, comptroller, cofferer, and master of household, clerks of green cloth, &c. are under his controul.

The *master of the horse* has the charge and government of all the king's stables and horses. He has also the power over equeries, pages, footmen,

*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

grooms, farriers, smiths, saddlers, and all other trades any way connected with the stables. He has the privilege of applying to his own use one coachman, four footmen, and six grooms, in the king's pay, and wearing the king's livery. In any solemn cavalcade he rides next behind the king.

Besides these officers, the *lord privy seal*, whose office is to put the seal to all charters, grants, and pardons, signed by the king; \* the lord president of the council, whose office is to manage the debates in council, to propose matters from the king, and to report to him the resolutions thereupon; and the commissioners of the treasury may be considered as part of the household.

The little necessity for this immense establishment was sufficiently evident during the limitations on the Regency. At that time the Regent discharged all the duties of the Executive with only his establishment as Prince of Wales. It did not appear then, no more than now, there was any want of attendance to give dignity and efficiency to the first magistrate. Burke mentions in his time, that at least one half the household was kept up solely for *influence*. He also mentions that one plan of reform, set on foot by lord Talbot, was suddenly stopped, because forsooth it would endanger the situation of an *honourable member who was turnspit in the kitchen!* Whether the duties of this important office continue to be discharged by a member of the *honourable house* we are not sure; but in looking over a list of the household, we observe that two *noble lords* occupy situations little inferior in dignity and utility: the duke of St. Albans is *master of the hawks*, salary £1372, and the marquis Cornwallis is *master of the dogs*, salary £2000. These offices sound rather degrading to vulgar ears; but "*love*," as the poet says, "*esteems no office mean*;" and no doubt it is the *love* of the sovereign rather than £3000 of the *public money* which actuates these noble personages. In 1811 there were no fewer than *twenty-six* peers and *four* commoners, who held situations in various departments of the household.

The parade of useless offices is not less great, and still more ridiculous, in the counties palatine of Durham and Chester, and the duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall, and the principality of Wales. These have all separate establishments, sufficient for the government of a kingdom, while their jurisdiction is confined to a few private estates. There are courts of chancery, ecclesiastical courts, chancellors, attorney-generals, solicitor-generals, privy

\* Before the privy seal is affixed to any instrument, it receives the royal sign manual; it then passes under the signet, which is a warrant to the privy seal; after the privy seal, it receives the great seal from the lord chancellor, which is the *finale*. The performance of these different formalities costs the public perhaps £30,000 a-year, while the whole of the duties might be discharged as well by any honest man and his clerk, for about £400 a-year.

*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

counsellors, registrars, cursitors, prothonotaries, auditors, and all the other mimicry of royal government. They bring nothing into the public treasury, but greatly add to the patronage of the crown, whose dignity they degrade. In one part of his kingdom the sovereign is no more than prince of Wales; go to the north, and he dwindles down to the duke of Lancaster; turn to the west, and he appears in the humble character of earl of Chester; travel a few miles farther, the earl disappears, and he pops up again as count palatine of Lancaster. Thus does the king, like Matthews in the play, perform all the different characters in his own drama.

The *landed estate* of the crown, and the royal forests and forest-rights, form another great source of abuse and patronage. These ought all to be sold, with the exception of those houses, gardens, and parks, which are necessary for the king's residence. They are now greatly neglected; in the hands of private persons they would afford employment to the people; the produce would be greatly increased; and many individuals relieved of the grievance of forest-rights, which extend over their possessions.

But here again there is the old obstacle to improvement, which we meet in every department; there are many good places attached to the crown lands, of which the chief duty is to receive the salary. That neat, civil, *ci-devant* jacobin, Mr. Huskisson, would lose his situation, and all the influence attached to it, as *commissioner of woods and forests*. Then there are the *two chief-justices in Eyre*, with salaries of £4566 for nothing; and their numerous train of dependents, they too would be sacrificed. In fact, it cannot be done—we must go on with our subject.

Having finished the royal household, and other great heads of expenditure, we shall only briefly enumerate the minor charges on the civil list. The first is the salaries of the foreign ministers and their secretaries, and the charges of the different consuls abroad. The expense for the out-fit, and service of plate to these gentlemen, is also very considerable; but these appear under the head of deficiencies of the civil list, and do not form a part of the ordinary charges.

The next charge is the salaries of the judges, the commissioners of the treasury, and chancellor of the exchequer. With the exception of pensions, which amount to a very considerable sum, and certain occasional payments, there are no other charges on the civil list.

We shall now give a general statement of the amount of all the different charges of which we have been speaking, for seven years preceding the appointment of the regency, distinguishing each year, and the estimated charge in 1804. The statement is compiled from an account laid before parliament, and ordered to be printed, 2d of March, 1812.

AN ACCOUNT, showing the ACTUAL CHARGE upon the CIVIL LIST from 1805 to the 5th July, 1811, compared with the Estimate laid before Parliament 31 July 1804.

	Charge for the year ending 5th July															
	1805.		1806.		1807.		1808.		1809.		1810.		1811.			
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.		
1st. Class.—Royal Family . . . . .	222,500	0 0	222,500	0 0	222,500	0 0	222,500	0 0	220,500	0 0	218,000	0 0	215,000	0 0		
2d. — Lord, Chancellor, & Speaker, Judges, &c. . . . .	32,955	0 0	32,955	15 9	32,435	0 0	32,960	0 0	32,955	0 0	32,955	0 0	32,955	0 0		
3d.—Minister of Foreign Cts. 4th.—Bills of Trade-men.	112,350	0 0	119,228	18 2	104,525	17 6	101,571	11 0	59,835	0 0	67,462	10 0	77,064	14 1		
Lord Chamberlain's department.	65,000	0 0	133,809	9 2	136,086	15 5	124,108	4 4	95,151	16 10	149,618	0 5	141,669	15 8		
Lord Steward's ditto . . . . .	75,000	0 0	129,924	10 6	117,868	19 9	83,591	16 8	87,899	13 11	95,697	18 2	107,564	6 2		
Master of the Horse ditto . . . . .	30,000	0 0	30,298	11 9	28,899	8 2	28,138	16 5	30,599	13 7	29,153	13 9	28,005	11 5		
Master of the Robes ditto . . . . .	2,505	19 4	2,728	18 0	2,747	8 0	2,683	8 0	2,034	8 0	2,613	8 0	3,060	8 0		
5th.—Metal Servants.																
Lord Steward's department.	50,651	19 5	32,180	9 8	35,739	9 8	35,990	9 8	35,858	15 5	35,877	4 8	35,303	17 6		
Master of the Horse ditto . . . . .	15,400	0 0	14,319	9 10	14,284	6 10	14,244	19 5	14,498	8 8	14,626	12 4	14,511	13 8		
Lord Chamberlain's ditto . . . . .	51,410	0 0	52,007	6 4	52,050	1 0	52,050	1 0	51,652	11 0	51,651	17 6	51,715	16 9		
6th.—Pensions and Com-pensations . . . . .	131,252	16 4	133,343	3 3	134,929	9 11	147,987	18 7	155,727	18 10	158,382	11 1	159,107	2 2		
7th.—Small salaries pay-able out of the Civil List	55,398	8 1	55,092	2 1	56,799	2 7	57,601	12 7	57,062	1 10	56,660	10 1	54,150	12 6		
8th.—Lords commissioners of the Treasury, and chancellor of the Excheq. including presents to foreign ministers; home secret service; alms; equipage to ministers at foreign courts, &c.	13,022	0 0	13,822	0 0	13,460	17 11	13,822	0 0	13,822	0 0	13,822	0 0	12,405	0 6		
9th.—Occasional Payments, including presents to foreign ministers; home secret service; alms; equipage to ministers at foreign courts, &c.	135,737	6 7	126,190	19 2	186,743	9 10	199,624	9 7	207,620	0 3	172,709	11 8	219,194	7 1		
	979,043	10 5	1,099,221	14 10	1,142,280	6 11	1,117,150	7 5	1,068,232	8 6	1,080,673	19 7	1,122,937	11 5	1,089,053	15 3

## Expenditure of the Civil List.

This statement merely exhibits the total sums under the different heads of expenditure for seven years. We have selected the period from 1805 to 1811, because it exhibits the ordinary charge on the civil list under the King's government, prior to the Regency. To show the nature, necessity, and influence of these different branches of expenditure, it will be necessary to give a more particular analysis of each class. This we will do in the order in which they stand. And, first, of the—

*Royal Family.*—We have already remarked that the incomes of the princes and princesses, are principally paid out of the consolidated fund, and it is only a few small annuities which are payable out of the civil list. We will lay before the reader a correct statement of the total sums which are annually drawn out of the pockets of the people, by the different members of the family. A more particular account will be found in our *List of Places* under their respective names.

## INCOMES OF THE ROYAL FAMILY.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
THE KING.—Privy-purse .....	60,000	0	0			
————— from the duchy of Lancaster .....	10,000	0	0			
————— Windsor establishment .....	50,000	0	0			
				130,000	0	0
PRINCE REGENT.—Privy-purse .....	70,000	0	0			
————— by act of Parliament .....	65,000	0	0			
————— as prince of Wales .....	60,000	0	0			
————— expense of that portion of the royal household attendant on the Regent, about .....	400,000	0	0			
				595,000	0	0
Wales, princess of, wife of the Regent .....				35,000	0	0
York, duke of .....				100,000	0	0
Clarence, duke of .....				* 27,782	0	0
Kent, duke of .....				31,205	4	2
Cumberland, duke of .....	19,008	10	10			
————— duchess of .....	6,000	0	0			
				25,008	10	10
Sussex, duke of .....				18,000	0	0
Cambridge, duke of .....				24,000	0	0
Gloucester, duke of, (nephew to the king) .....				28,000	0	0
Augusta Sophia .....				9000	0	0
Elizabeth, wife of prince Hombourg .....				9000	0	0
Sophia .....				7000	0	0
To which add prince of Coburg .....				50,000	0	0
				£1,078,997	15	0

\* This includes £2500 payable out of the civil list, omitted in our *List of Places*, &c.

*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

Here then is the present annual cost of a single family to the people of England. Will any body assert there is no room for *retrenchment*? Ought the people quietly to submit to such abominable profusion, when agriculture and commerce are paralysed by taxation, and the industrious artisan is famishing on five shillings a week? Will any part of the community be so stupid and so unjust to the rest of their countrymen, as to form *armed associations*, to defend such shameless, such unfeeling extravagance? This statement includes no charge for ambassadors, for the salaries of judges, nor pensions, nor any other extraneous item; it is the mere *personal cost* of *fourteen individuals*; and for what? What use are they? What services do they render the state? Do they fight its battles? Do they conduct its negotiations? Do they administer justice to the people? No: they do none of these; they neither grace the country by their wisdom; spread its fame by their valour; nor conciliate the people by a just and equitable administration of its laws. Their office is as useless as that of the gilded ball on the dome of St. Paul's; and their labours as valueless as the labours of any *fourteen paupers* in the kingdom.

The late queen had £58,000 a-year, besides £10,000 a-year for taking care of the king. The princesses have various sums on the Irish pension-list, besides a contingency of £30,000, to commence on the death of his majesty. Of the Regent's income, as prince of Wales, £50,000 is set apart for the payment of his debts. His *privy purse* is exactly of the same nature as the *privy purse* of the king; it has no ostensible object: his attendants, and every other department of his establishment, are supported out of other funds: the only objects to which it can be applied are gratuities and pensions to favourites, mistresses, or such objects as vice or caprice may suggest.

We have already said, that till the present reign, no such thing as a *privy purse* was known. But now the evil is twofold; for, behold! there are two *privy purses*; one for his gracious majesty the King, and another for his royal highness the Regent. Should the prince become incapable, like his father, the public may prepare for another *privy purse* for the duke of York. Already the private property of the crown, including the king's income from the duchy of Lancaster and the two *privy purses*, amounts to £140,000 a-year; a sum wholly unknown to the constitution, and even the practice of any former reign.

Of the immense sums the public have advanced to pay the debts of the crown and the Regent, we cannot just now give any estimate. The different branches of the royal family had received out of the *admiralty droits*, from 1793 to March 1818, £209,848. The Whites, while in office, gave to the

*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

dukes of Clarence, Kent, Cumberland, Sussex, and Cambridge, £75,000 out of this fund, which in justice ought to have been divided among the sailors. It was these precious WHIGS, too, who added £6000 a-year to their incomes at the same period. The claims of this *faction*, who solicit the confidence of the people on the grounds of *economy* and *retrenchment*, ought to be well understood. There is an account of a neat little Whig job in the "*Reply to Lord Erskine*," which will serve to illustrate their pretensions on this head. It relates to alterations in the *audit-office*.

## ADDITIONS TO THE AUDIT-OFFICE IN 1806.

One chairman of the board, per annum . . . . .	£1500
Four new members, each £1200 . . . . .	4800
Secretary (Mallett, a foreigner) . . . . .	1000
Six inspectors, £600 each . . . . .	3600
Four examiners, £260 ditto . . . . .	1040
Four examiners, £150 ditto . . . . .	600

With numerous other appointments, which increased the expense of the establishment from about £14,000 to £38,000 per annum; and, after all, the office was made less efficient than under the old and less expensive system.

2. *Salaries of the Judges.*—After reading our observations on sir Charles Abbot and Lord Eldon, it will be obvious, that the judges have other emoluments besides their salaries.

3. *Foreign Ministers.*—The following is a more particular statement of the estimated expense of foreign embassies, at different courts, in 1804:—

Paris . . . . .	£12,129
Petersburgh . . . . .	12,129
Constantinople . . . . .	9869
Vienna . . . . .	8312
Madrid . . . . .	5768
Hague . . . . .	5768
Berlin . . . . .	5768
Naples . . . . .	3688
Lisbon . . . . .	5548*
America . . . . .	4600
Copenhagen . . . . .	3604
Munich . . . . .	3604
Stockholm . . . . .	3256
Dresden . . . . .	3004

\* The mission of George Canning, when there was no court, cost the public £18,000; but then he was a right honourable gentleman, and, of course, his expenses would be great.



*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

Electors of Wirtemberg . . . . .	£2178
Sardinia . . . . .	1344
Republic of Seven Islands . . . . .	1344
CONSULS to Madrid . . . . .	1672
— Naples . . . . .	388
— Eastern States of America . . . . .	1672
— Baltimore . . . . .	348
— Egypt . . . . .	1672
— Genoa . . . . .	365
VICE-CONSUL to the Brazils, charge about . . . . .	365
CONSUL-GENERAL, Morocco, ditto . . . . .	1138
— Tunis, ditto . . . . .	930
— Algiers, ditto . . . . .	1035
— Russia, ditto . . . . .	1018

These selections will be sufficient to show the annual cost of this class of public servants. The expense of their outfit, a service of plate, and their equipage, on going abroad, is paid by the public; and, on their return home, after the absence of two or three years, they receive a pension to about half the amount of their salaries, for life.

4. *Tradesmen's Bills.*—The amount of these bills, from 1805 to 1811, appears gradually to have increased. It is easy to imagine the influence, dependence, and *loyalty*, which must be created among a numerous class of tradesmen in the metropolis, by the disbursements to the amount of £250,000 annually.

5. *Menzial Servants.*—The expenditure in the department of the lord chamberlain is greater than in any other department of the household. The following were the estimated charges in 1804:—

	£	s.	d.
Salaries in his department . . . . .	30,141	14	4
Vice-chamberlain . . . . .	600	0	0
Groom of the stole . . . . .	2000	0	0
Twelve gentlemen of the bed chamber . . . . .	12,000	0	0
Thirteen grooms ditto . . . . .	6500	0	0
Apothecary to the king . . . . .	115	0	0
Ditto to the household . . . . .	53	6	8

This officer defrays all expenses for the repairs of the royal palaces, the two houses of parliament, the expense of funerals, royal visitors, ambassadors, governors, processions, &c. which do not enter into the ordinary charges of the civil list. The following account, taken from the civil list in the "Extraordinary Red Book," exhibits a statement of the actual expendi-

*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

ture, principally on these subjects, from the 5th April, 1812, to the 5th January, 1815:—

## EXPENDITURE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE LORD CHAMBERLAIN.

HEADS OF SERVICE, Or Places or Palaces at which the Expense was incurred.	One Year ended 5th April, 1813.			One Year ended 5th April, 1814.			Three Quarters of a Year, to 5th Jan. 1815.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Carlton-house . . . . .	61,772	17	4	65,053	17	5½	54,131	11	6½
Brighton . . . . .	227	17	1	829	18	0½	5,319	15	10
Cottage, and Camberland-lodge, Windsor . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	17,320	12	5
Cranbourne-lodge . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,917	15	5
St. James's . . . . .	4,126	10	5	3,194	3	7½	2,278	1	7½
Queen's Palace . . . . .	1,549	17	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kensing on . . . . .	5,242	4	7	6,828	16	9½	1,229	2	1
Hamp n-court, Newmarket, and Kew . . . . .	970	1	9	4,108	18	4½	724	16	0½
Swinly-lodge . . . . .	—	—	—	233	1	9	—	—	—
House of Lords . . . . .	1,325	2	10	—	—	—	—	—	—
House of Commons . . . . .	558	18	9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Speaker's House . . . . .	28	10	9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Whitehall, Westminster, and secretaries of state . . . . .	1,755	11	10	2,160	9	5	1,261	11	7
Royal yachts . . . . .	—	—	—	645	10	8	—	—	—
Knights of the several orders . .	8,629	16	9	4,257	1	5	2,668	17	9
Ambassadors and governors . .	2,540	1	10	6,008	6	10	17,286	13	8
Plate to great officers . . . . .	3,294	15	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Investment of foreign Sovereigns	—	—	—	1,004	12	0	4,672	4	9
Royal visitors . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	35,449	1	9
Herald at arms . . . . .	—	—	—	140	3	0	69	9	8
Funeral of the duchess of Brunswick . . . . .	2,915	15	10½	—	—	—	—	—	—
Proclamation of peace, and thanksgiving at St. Paul's . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,179	14	6
Yeomen, maundy, trumpeters, &c. . . . .	9,988	18	4	6,908	11	3	8,223	10	9½
Stationary for his majesty, &c.	168	2	3	220	5	0	78	2	7
Miscellaneous services, &c. . .	1,774	6	10	2,384	4	11	2,158	5	7
£	106,869	9	3¼	105,978	0	6½	156,939	7	6½

For the expenses of work and the repairs of public buildings, the following were sums laid before parliament in 1818:

ROBERT BROWN, esq. for several works at both houses of parliament .	£	s.	d.
	5362	1	8
at the Speaker's house . . . . .	334	14	4

*Expenditure of the Civil List.*

	£.	s.	d.
Robert Brown, esq. for several works at Somerset-house . . . . .	7146	4	4
_____ at the Fleet prison . . . . .	1211	19	2
_____ at the Marshalsea prison . . . . .	256	17	4
_____ at the King's Bench prison . . . . .	3871	19	3
_____ at the British Museum . . . . .	4781	18	8
_____ at the Tower . . . . .	1789	6	4
_____ at Whitehall . . . . .	2087	18	9
_____ at Westminster . . . . .	764	1	10
_____ at his Majesty's Mint . . . . .	6926	10	0
Robert Smirke, esq. for balances to tradesmen employed at the New Mint prior to 1812 . . . . .	6159	10	0
Robert Browne, esq. to pay fees on issues made to him for expenses of work done at various public buildings . . . . .	701	3	0
	£41,195 4 0.		

It is unnecessary to remark the profitable jobbing, and the loyalty which will be manifested in illuminations, mournings, addresses of condolence, and the forming *armed associations* to oppose the people, in consequence of these various disbursements.

6. *Pensions.*—These are principally in the nature of compensations and bounties to different servants of the household, and in pensions to late foreign ministers.

7. *Salaries of other Places, &c.*—The sums paid under this head are too numerous, too miscellaneous, and too small in amount to bring under any particular description.

8th and 9th classes include various miscellaneous payments to foreign ministers, for alms, secret service money, allowances to certain corporations, the universities, &c. of which, in a subsequent part of the article, we shall give a more particular detail.

## CIVIL LIST EXPENDITURE

### DURING THE

# REGENCY.

Our preceding observations apply more particularly to the period prior to the indisposition of the King. By referring to our statement in page 117, it will be seen, that the average expenditure for the seven years up to 1811, inclusive, amounted to £1,103,000. Under the government of the Regent, this sum was found vastly inadequate to meet the increased charges on the Civil List. The expenditure

Of the year 1812 was . . . .	£1,374,000
————— 1813 . . . . .	1,316,000
————— 1814 . . . . .	1,361,000
————— 1815 . . . . .	1,436,000

And the year ending 5th Jan. 1816 . . . . . 1,480,000

From a Report made to the house in 1815, it was clear, that there had been the most profuse expenditure in different departments of the household ever since the commencement of the Regency. In the first two years and three quarters, the expense of furniture and tradesmen's bills for Carlton-House alone, amounted to £160,000. The following statement will show at one view the rapid increase of expenditure during that period, in four branches of the lord Chamberlain's department:—

	1st Year.	2d Year.	3-4ths of the 3d Year.
Upholstery..	£19,000 ..	28,000 ..	46,291
Linen-drapery .	33,000 ..	41,000 ..	64,000
Silversmiths . . .	32,000 ..	37,000 ..	40,000
Wardrobe . . . .	43,000 ..	47,000 ..	72,000

The Regent, on assuming sovereign power, had a grant of £100,000 as an outfit. This sum was intended to defray any additional expense he might incur in consequence of his new office; but instead of being applied to that object, it was appropriated to the liquidation of the debts he had contracted as Prince of Wales; and the public were called upon, under a new

*Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.*

form, to defray expenses for which they had already provided. In 1815, £50,000 was expended on additional buildings at Brighton, and £20,000 for furniture. Both these sums were paid out of the public purse, although the pavilion is considered the private property of the Prince. The cost of the Windsor establishment was not less unjustifiable. While the Regent was lavishing the public money on tailors, jewellers, glass and china manufacturers, upholsterers, builders, perfumers, embroiderers, &c. the old King was kept bolstered up in the most ridiculous state imaginable. He had four lords of the bed-chamber, a groom of the stole, and a great number of other officers, of whose services, and even existence, he was quite unconscious. The cost of his establishment was £100,000 a year; besides which, his faithful commons allowed him £60,000 for *pocket money*, and the Queen had 10,000 a year for superintendence.

Another great cause of the augmented charge on the *Civil List* was the increased expense of the foreign ministers, which, during the period we are speaking of, had increased £150,000 a year. The expense of lord Castlereagh's missions to Paris and Vienna in 1815 and 1816, amounted to £43,096, which, with his official salary of £12,000, formed an expenditure for two years of £55,809. His brother, lord Stewart, was also out on a special mission, and his expense amounted to £24,000; besides which, he received £2000 from his commission as general on the staff. The expense of lord Cathcart, who, as well as lord Stewart, was considered merely an understrapper to the *noble lord*, was still greater. This nobleman, on going out on his embassy to Petersburg, instead of the usual compliment of a *service of plate*, was pleased to accept a present of £4,400.

From these, and some other causes, the arrears on the *Civil List*, in 1816, had accumulated to an enormous amount. The average excess of the expenditure above the receipt during the four years was £258,000, or about one-fourth of the total expense for the seven preceding years, making a deficiency of more than *one million*. What was to be done? Prudent men, when their expenditure exceeds their income, endeavour to make them meet by a reduction of the former: but economy has long been a stranger to the English government; and ministers are as jealous of abridgment in the expenditure, as any arbitrary prince could possibly be of his prerogative. Instead, therefore, of steps being taken to curtail this waste of the public money, a bill was introduced by lord Castlereagh to transfer certain charges on the *Civil List* to the Consolidated Fund, or provide for them by new grants from parliament. It is conformable to this bill, that the *Civil List*

expenditure is now regulated; and to make the reader fully acquainted with the present state of this important subject, it will be necessary to give some account of its principle and provisions.

The principle of the bill was to prevent future excess in the Civil List expenditure, by relieving it of certain charges of expensive and uncertain amount. The first charge we shall notice of this nature is *tradenen's bills*. The total amount of these bills in future was estimated at £234,000. Of this sum, it was proposed to defray by grants from parliament all charges for furniture and other articles heretofore provided by the lord chamberlain, for certain public offices; also the expense of plate to foreign ministers; collars, badges, and mantles, of the several orders of the Garter, Bath, and Thistle; and also all expense for the repair of public offices and buildings at the Tower, Whitehall, Westminster, and for works in St. James's Park, and of private roads, which had formerly been defrayed out of the Civil List. The annual amount of these charges to be provided by parliament was estimated at £25,000.

The next charge to be provided for by new grants was under the head of *Occasional Payments*, amounting to £222,000. Of this sum parliament was to provide £197,000, including all charges for outfit to ministers to foreign courts, and for their extraordinary disbursements; also for presents to foreign ministers, incidental expenses of the treasury, deficiency of fees to the secretaries of state, and in the home department. Besides these, salaries to certain officers and persons, amounting to £3268, were to be provided for; and the whole of the sums payable out of the Civil List to the junior branches of the royal family, amounting to £30,500, were to be transferred to the consolidated fund.\* The total amount of the different charges, of which it was proposed to relieve the Civil List, were estimated by lord Castlereagh at £255,768. Events have proved that this estimate was greatly below the mark, and that it amounted to little more than one-third of the actual charge to the public. In 1817, parliament granted £500,000 for "*Civil Contingencies*," the name under which supplies for the Civil List are voted; and for similar charges in 1818, parliament have granted this year £700,000. We have already shown at page 111-12, some of the

\* For an account of these sums, see page 113. The whole is now payable out of the consolidated fund, as well as the £2500 to the duke of Clarence, mentioned page 118.

*Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.*

objects to which these enormous sums had been applied, therefore it is unnecessary to repeat them.

But the most remarkable feature in the Civil List Bill was the appointment of an entire new office, under the name of Auditor of the Civil List, with a salary of £1500 a year. This is exactly the way in all attempts at reform and regulation; whenever any expense is curtailed, or useless office abolished, ministers are sure to keep up the same amount of patronage by some new creations. We had an instance of this in the consolidation of the revenue of England and Ireland; when a vice-treasurer and his deputy were appointed with a salary of £3000 a year, merely to keep up the *quantum* of ministerial influence and corruption. The duties of the new officer on the Civil List are to audit the accounts of the lord chamberlain, lord steward, and the master of the horse; but certainly these were the duties which ought to be performed by the heads of these departments. For what do they receive their enormous salaries? Would the public be more secure against profusion in the household when confided to the watchful vigilance of a *commoner*, than when confided to the wisdom and integrity of three peers of the realm? The thing was ridiculous; but it answered the desired purpose of a *pretence* for dipping into the pockets of the people. Mr. Herries is now auditor of the Civil List. He was appointed on the abolition of the office of commissary in chief.

Deducting the various sums yearly to be provided for by parliament, and the pensions and annuities transferred to the consolidated fund, the annual charge on the Civil List, according to the new regulation, was estimated at £1,083,727; at which sum it now remains. An estimate, which we will insert, was laid before parliament in 1816, of the objects to which this sum was to be applied.

AN ESTIMATE of the Annual Charge on the CIVIL LIST, after deducting the sums payable under the head of Civil Contingencies, amounting this year to £700,000; and also the income of the ROYAL FAMILY, payable out of the consolidated fund:

Pensions and allowances to the royal family.....	£298,000
Allowances to the lord chancellor, judges, &c. ....	32,950
Bills of his majesty's tradesmen .....	209,000
• Allowance to foreign ministers, including pensions to foreign ministers, and salaries to consuls .....	226,930

*Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.*

Salaries to the different departments of the household, including compensations and allowances payable within these departments .....	140,700
Pensions limited by act 22 Geo. III. ....	95,000
Salaries and allowances to certain officers and pensions .	41,300
Salaries to the commissioners of the treasury and chan- cellor of the exchequer .....	13,822
Occasional payments .....	26,000
	£1,083,727

*Remarks* — From the first of these sums must be deducted the £68,000 granted to the late queen; but of this sum little has been saved to the public; nearly the whole having been granted in pensions to her servants, and in the infamous grant of £10,000 to the duke of York.

In judging of the incomes of the royal family and the expenditure of the Civil List, the reader is liable to error from the various heads under which they are distributed. For a summary statement of the incomes of the royal family from different sources, he must turn to page 118. From what has been said, it is evident, that the annual expenditure of the Civil List, including sums payable out of the consolidated fund, the annual grants, for civil contingencies, and the permanent charge of £1,083,727, cannot be less than TWO MILLIONS A YEAR.

Kings, it is said, are the fathers of their people; but England exhibits the barbarous spectacle of its sovereign wasting the substance of his famishing children, in luxury and ostentation. A republican would contend that the whole of the *two millions* expended on the civil list might be spared to the community, because it does not serve any important object for which governments are instituted. But even an admirer of monarchy, after perusing the details we have exhibited of the profusion in the royal household, especially in the department of the Lord Chamberlain; and after remembering that the duties of the executive were, at one period, discharged by the Regent without any part of this establishment; he must allow, that, at least, one great branch of expense, amounting to £400,000 annually, might be saved to the country without the smallest diminution of the necessary splendour to the sovereign power. Instead of such useless parade and profusion increasing the dignity and respect of the first magistrate, they degrade him in the eyes of the people, and render him an object of contempt and abhorrence. Men feel neither respect nor admiration for an ostentation by which they are deprived of the means of subsistence; and the barbarous idolatry which could worship the idle pageantry of cocked hats, wigs, gowns, and robes of gold, has long since disappeared.



*Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.*

Among the Americans, a country where the enemies of the people loathe, above all others, to look for examples of economy and wisdom, things are ordered differently. Their king only costs them about five thousand instead of one hundred and twenty thousand a year, and their vice king only one thousand, instead of five hundred thousand a year. Their other officers are equally cheap and reasonable. As for lords of the bed-chamber, grooms of the stole, master of the horse, master of the hawks, and many other masters and lords; they have none of these things. And where is the misfortune? The government appears neither deficient in dignity nor in efficiency, neither at home nor abroad; and as to the duties of their executive, they are discharged quite as well—aye, and infinitely better than our own.

There is one practice relative to public offices in the United States, which, if adopted in this country, would be productive of many advantages. According to a resolution in Congress, April, 1816, the secretary of state is required to compile and print once in every two years, a register of all officers and agents, civil, military, and naval, in the service of the Union; exhibiting the amount of compensation, pay, and emolument allowed to each officer, the state or country where he was born, and the place of employment. Five hundred copies of this work, which forms the *Red* or *The Black Book* of America, are distributed to the members of Congress. The salaries of officers exhibit a singular contrast to the sums paid in this country. We have selected from the third volume of *Warden's Travels in the United States*, the pay of different officers in the civil department, and compared them with similar situations in our own country; and they exhibit a most singular contrast. We will lay the result before the reader. We have taken the dollar at one fifth the pound sterling, which is rather less than the real value, to avoid shillings and pence.

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT

OF THE

*Salaries of different Officers*

IN

## AMERICA AND ENGLAND.

AMERICA.		ENGLAND.	
President .....	£5090	King.....	£120,000
Vice President .....	1000	Prince Regent.....	595,000

## Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.

AMERICA.		ENGLAND.	
Brought over . . . . .	£6000	Brought over . . . . .	715,000
Secretary of State . . . . .	1000	Secretaries of State, for the home, foreign, and colonial departments, £6000 each . . . . . £18,000	} 28,900
Secretary of the Treasury ..	1000	Five under Secretaries £2000 each . . . . . 10,000	
NAVY.—Secretary . . . . .	£900	Seven Lords Commissioners of the Treasury . . . . .	13,600
— Chief Clerk . . . . .	400	ADMIRALTY.—Seven Lords Commissioners £11,000	} 16,000
— Three Commiss. . . . .	2100	First Secretary . . . . .	
Postmaster General . . . . .	600	Second Secretary . . . . .	2,000
Chief Justice . . . . .	800	Two Postmasters General ..	5,000
Six Associate Judges, each ..	400	Chief Justice . . . . .	6,000
Circuit Judges, about . . . . .	280	Puisne Judges, each . . . . .	4,000
Attorney General . . . . .	600	Circuit Judges . . . . .	4,000
Director of the Mint . . . . .	400	Attorney General . . . . .	6,000
Secretary of the Senate . . . . .	600	Warden of the Mint . . . . .	10,000
Secretary of the House of Re- presentatives . . . . .	600	Speaker of the House of Lords . . . . .	3,000
	£15,680	Speaker of the House of Commons . . . . .	6,000
			£816,600

## DIPLOMATIC BODY.

FOREIGN MINISTERS—to	FOREIGN MINISTERS—to
England . . . . .	America . . . . .
France . . . . .	France . . . . .
Russia . . . . .	Russia . . . . .
Netherlands ..	Netherlands ..
Spain . . . . .	Spain . . . . .
Sweden . . . . .	Sweden . . . . .
Portugal . . . . .	Portugal . . . . .
Six Secretaries of Legation, each 400l. . . . .	Four Secretaries of Embassy 1100l. each, and three secre- taries of legation 550l. each
Expense of outfit . . . . .	Expense for outfit . . . . .
£27,600	Allowance for house rent . . . . .
	£95,250

## Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.

## CONSULAR DEPARTMENT.

Two Consuls General, 800l. each .....	1600	Salaries of Consuls .... £30,000*
Five Consuls, £400 each ..	2000	

## SUMMARY.

AMERICA.	ENGLAND.
Officers of State.....£15,680	Officers of State.....£816,600
Diplomatic Body ..... 27,600	Diplomatic Body ..... 95,250†
Consuls ..... 3,600	Consuls ..... 30,000
£46,880	£941,850

“Look at this picture and at THAT.” What a contrast! The services which cost America £46,000 a year cost Old England £900,000. Why this difference? Are not Americans governed as well as Englishmen? Are not their fleets and armies commanded; their laws administered; their affairs abroad as ably conducted? Why again then we ask this difference? Has America been less prosperous than England? Compare their history for the last twenty-five years. Look at the increase in American population, her mercantile navy, and her agriculture. Compare their present situation. Look at poor England, sinking under her ponderous legal state and ecclesiastical establishments. Look at her two millions of paupers, her famishing artizans, and her ruined commerce and agriculture. Gracious heaven!

\* This sum, as well as the salaries of Foreign Ministers, allowance for outfit, and house-rent, are taken from Lord Castlereagh's Estimate on the 3d of May, 1816.

† We have only inserted the English Ministers at those places where the Americans have likewise an Ambassador. The total cost of Foreign Ministers, according to the estimate of Lord Castlereagh, is as follows:—

Salaries .....	£ 135,850
For House Rent .....	9,100
Outfit .....	51,150
Pensions to Foreign Ministers . . .	52,000
	248,100

His lordship's famous embassy alone cost considerably more than the whole *diplomatique corps* of America, and Mr. Canning's celebrated mission to Lisbon nearly as much.

are men to be termed *seditions* because they complain of this heart-rending contrast? Are they to be termed *incendiaries*, *anarchists*, and *revolutionists*, because they exclaim to a patient and suffering people—"There! there is the cause of your privations! Look at the cost of your Kings, your Princes, your Chief Justices, your Lord Chancellors, your Bishops, your Judges, and your Foreign Ministers; it is they who devour the food of your children, who reap the reward of your industry and the profit of your commerce and manufactures!"

Ought such a state of things to continue? Is it possible that such a system of iniquity, extravagance, and folly, can stand against the knowledge and misery of a whole kingdom? Would any just or sensible man wish to see it perpetuated? Would he wish to see the horrible privations of millions protracted, that an unfeeling and contemptible minority may wallow in luxury and profusion? Would he wish to see the country always kept rocking on the brink of despair, despotism, or revolution? Sometimes a few months of quiet and apparent prosperity; then again embarrassment and distress, and the flame of discontent, stimulated by famine and injustice, bursting out anew, and the whole country exhibiting the dangers and uncertainties of a state of nature, rather than of law and government. This has been the condition of England for years. Anarchy, revolution, or even despotism, would be preferable. It is neither life nor death, but infinitely worse than either; exhibiting the lingering tortures of national disease, without the ordinary comfort in affliction of either cure or annihilation.

The cost of *royalty* is a fact, on which the reader ought carefully to fix his attention. There is no part of the *constitution* more corrupted and diverted from its original object, not even the representative, than the executive part of the government. Formerly the Sovereign received his salary for real services to the state. He commanded the army, administered the laws, and took care of his own revenue. Those functions are now delegated to others, who again delegate them to their subalterns, forming a multiplication of office and expense unknown to preceding ages. The Prince, instead of being the most important, is rendered the most insignificant officer in the state; his existence is hardly identified with any one operation of government. With the people he has no point of contact or communion. He lives secluded from their sight and knowledge. Even the ordinary act of royal condescension of receiving their *petitions* is now delegated to his secretary; and they are only reminded of the existence of the great personage as the Athenians were of the devouring Minotaur, by the annual sacrifice of what they hold most dear to his rapacity.

*Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.*

A variety of statements connected with a full exposition of the Civil List Expenditure we have reserved to the end of the article. They will be more convenient for reference collected under one head, than distributed through the preceding observations. The first papers we shall insert contain an estimate of various charges on the *Civil List*, as laid before Parliament on the 3d of May, 1816, preparatory to the passing of the Civil List Regulation Bill.

## FIRST CLASS.

The ANNUAL CHARGE upon the CIVIL LIST in respect of allowances to the Lord Chancellor, Speaker of the House of Commons, Judges, &c.

Lord Chancellor .....	£5000
Speaker of the House of Commons .....	1825
Judges of the Court of King's Bench .....	8500
Ditto of the Common Pleas .....	7500
Barons of the Exchequer .....	6500
Chief and Second Justices of Chester .....	1230
Justices of the Court of Great Session in Wales .....	2400

Total £32,955

## SECOND CLASS.

The ANNUAL CHARGE upon the CIVIL LIST in respect of the bills of his Majesty's tradesmen in the departments of the Lord Steward, Lord Chamberlain, Master of the Horse, Master of the Robes, and Surveyor General of Works.

Lord Steward .....	£83,000
Lord Chamberlain .....	40,000*
Master of the Horse .....	40,000
Master of the Robes .....	4,000
Surveyor General of Works ..	40,000†

Total £209,000

\* A great part of the charge in this department is transferred to the Civil Contingencies.

† This sum was the estimated charge for repairs and alterations at the several royal palaces, &c. at Kew, Kew-House, Richmond, Queen's Palace, Carlton House, Mews, Kensington Palace and Garden, Windsor Castle, Hampton Court Palace, House and Park, and St. James's Palace. It was provided that in the event of any new buildings being undertaken, or extensive repairs, an estimate was to be submitted to Parliament previous to the commencement of the work.

## THIRD CLASS.

The ANNUAL CHARGE upon the CIVIL LIST, in respect of the salaries, compensations, and superannuation-allowances, in the departments of the Lord Steward, Lord Chamberlain, Master of the Horse, Master of the Robes, and Surveyor-General of Works; also for the salaries of several other officers of his Majesty's household.

LORD-STEWARD'S DEPARTMENT.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Lord Steward's salary, paid at the Exchequer	1540	0	0			
Salaries, compensations, &c. payable in this department	40,326	10	0			
				41,866	10	0
LORD CHAMBERLAIN'S DEPARTMENT.						
Lord Chamberlain's salary	3,000	0	0			
Vice-Chamberlain's salary	600	0	0			
Groom of the Stole	2,000	0	0			
Twelve Gentlemen of the Bedchamber	12,000	0	0			
Thirteen Grooms	6,500	0	0			
Apothecary to his Majesty	115	0	0			
Do. to the Household	53	6	8			
Salaries, compensations, &c.	34,793	14	0			
				59,062	0	8
DEPARTMENT OF THE MASTER OF THE HORSE.						
Salaries, compensations, superannuations, allowances, payable in this department				27,743	0	0
DEPARTMENT OF THE MASTER OF THE ROBES.						
Salaries payable in this department				1080	0	0
DEPARTMENT OF THE SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF WORKS.						
Salaries, compensations, and superannuation allowances payable in this department				10,946	6	3
				140,697	16	11
				<b>Total</b>		

## FOURTH CLASS.

The ANNUAL CHARGE upon the CIVIL-LIST, in respect of salaries and fees of sundry public officers, and annuities and payments for various purposes.

	£	s.	d.
Lord President of the Council	4000	0	0
First Clerk of the Council	250	0	0

*Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.*

	£	s.	d.
One Clerk of the Council.....	100	0	0
Keeper of the Council-Chamber .....	36	10	0
—— at 2s. 6d. per day .....	45	12	6
Lord Privy Seal .....	3000	0	0
Constable of Dover Castle .....	4100	0	0
Governor of Windsor Castle .....	182	10	0
Master of the hawks .....	1372	10	0
Chief Justice in Eyre, North of Trent.....	2250	0	0
—— South of Trent .....	2316	13	4
Chancellor of the Garter .....	570	5	0
University of Oxford, for a Preacher, on a perpetuity .....	10	0	0
—— Professor of Divinity .....	13	6	8
—— Law .....	40	0	0
—— Physic .....	40	0	0
—— History .....	400	0	0
—— Botany .....	200	0	0
University of Cambridge, on a perpetuity .....	10	0	0
—— for a Preacher .....	10	0	0
—— Professor of Divinity .....	13	6	8
—— Law .....	40	0	0
—— Physic .....	40	0	0
—— History .....	400	0	0
—— Botany .....	200	0	0
Emanuel College, Cambridge .....	16	13	4
Dean and Chapter of Lichfield.....	10	0	0
Vicar of Lichfield .....	15	0	0
Master of the Temple .....	37	6	8
Reader at Hampton-Court Chapel .....	40	0	0
Fellows of Eton College, perpetuity .....	42	0	0
Dean and Chapter of Westminster, for French Minister, Savoy	60	0	0
Minister, Isle of Man .....	100	0	0
Bishop of Chester, for four Preachers .....	200	0	0
Vicar of the Tower .....	6	13	4
Minister of St. Botolph, Aldgate.....	7	0	0
Churchwardens of St. John the Baptist, for relief of the Poor	7	13	4
—— St. Michael, Cornhill, ditto, perpetuity	12	4	0
—— St. Magnus, ..... ditto, .... ditto..	21	4	8
Schoolmaster at Southwell..... ditto.....	10	0	0
Corporation of Dartmouth .....	40	0	0

## Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.

	£	s.	d.
Mayor of Macclesfield .....	50	0	0
Corporation of Lyme Regis .....	100	0	0
for repairing the pier .....	100	0	0
Corporation of Berwick, for repairing the bridge .....	100	0	0
Christ's Hospital .....	370	10	0
Representatives of Sir John Hynde Cotton, perpetuity .....	5	6	8
Heirs of Colonel Fairfax .....	100	0	0
Nicholas Yates .....	100	0	0
Astronomer Royal .....	420	0	0
Housekeeper at Westminster .....	9	2	6
Keeper of the Lions in the Tower, including <i>extra allowance</i> for the animals .....	450	0	0
Knight Harbinger .....	195	16	8
Latin Secretary .....	280	0	0
Examiner of Plays .....	400	0	0
Gentleman-Usher of the Black Rod .....	200	0	0
Master of the Mechanics .....	150	0	0
Engraver of Seals .....	50	0	0
Keeper of the Tennis Court .....	192	3	4
<b>OFFICERS OF THE CEREMONIES.</b>			
Marshal of the Ceremonies .....	100	0	0
Assistant Master of ditto .....	121	13	4
Master of the Ceremonies .....	200	0	0
Ditto in lieu of bills .....	100	0	0
	521	13	4
<b>BATH OFFICERS.</b>			
Genealogist of the Order of the Bath .....	100	0	0
Bath King at Arms .....	90	0	0
Secretary to the Order of the Bath .....	90	0	0
Register to ditto .....	90	0	0
Gentleman Usher to ditto .....	90	0	0
Messenger to ditto .....	40	0	0
	500	0	0
<b>KINGS AND HERALDS AT ARMS.</b>			
Four Pursuivants at Arms .....	80	0	0
Eight Heralds at £26: 13: 4 each .....	213	6	8
Three Kings at Arms .....	120	0	0
Garter King at Arms .....	100	0	0
	513	6	8



*Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.*

			£	s.	d.
<b>BAND OF GENTLEMEN PENSIONERS.</b>					
Gentleman Harbinger .....	70	0	0		
Forty Gentlemen Pensioners, £100 each ..	4000	0	0		
Clerk of the Check .....	120	0	0		
Standard Bearer.....	310	0	0		
Captain .....	1000	0	0		
					6000 0 0
<b>KEEPERS OF RECORDS.</b>					
Keeper of Records at the Tower.....	1435	16	0		
Keeper of the Council Records .....	500	0	0		
Keeper of the Records at Whitehall .....	160	0	0		
Keeper of the Records of Forfeited Estates	200	0	0		
State Paper Office.....	970	0	0		
Keeper of Records Court of Exchequer ..	900	0	0		
					4165 16 0
<b>OFFICERS OF THE COURTS OF EXCHEQUER AND COMMON PLEAS.</b>					
Cursitor Baron of the Court of Exchequer	263	6	8		
Solicitor to the Court of Exchequer .....	150	0	0		
Treasurer's Remembrancer .....	64	2	2		
Two Secondaries .....	9	0	0		
Second Secondary.....	26	13	4		
Clerks.....	11	5	0		
Foreign Apposer .....	40	0	0		
Clerk of the Foreign Estreats.....	96	13	4		
Clerk of the Nichills .....	20	0	0		
Clerk of the Pleas.....	6	10	0		
King's Remembrancer .....	55	17	4		
Clerks in the Office of ditto .....	7	13	4		
Secondaries in ditto .....	8	0	0		
Eleven Masters in Chancery .....	1100	0	0		
Clerk of the Hanaper .....	2000	0	0		
Twenty King's Counsel, £40 per ann. each	800	0	0		
Attorney-General .....	31	6	8		
Solicitor-General .....	70	0	0		
King's Prime Serjeant .....	41	6	10		
Ten Serjeants at Arms, at £100:7:6 each	1003	15	0		

*Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.*

		£	s.	d.
King's Clerk in the Crown-Office .....	50	0	0	
Clerk of Foreign Estreats, Common-Pleas..	20	0	0	
Advocate-General.....	20	0	0	
		<u>90</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
PIPE-OFFICERS.....			171	15 10
Total.....		<u>£41,297</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>

## FIFTH CLASS.

The ANNUAL CHARGE upon the CIVIL LIST in respect of Salaries to the Commissioners of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer.

	£	s.	d.
Commissioners of the Treasury.....	6000	0	0
First Commissioner of ditto .....	4022	0	0
Chancellor of the Exchequer .....	1800	0	0
Total,.....	<u>£13,822</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

## SIXTH CLASS.

The ANNUAL CHARGE upon the CIVIL LIST in respect of OCCASIONAL PAYMENTS, not included in any of the foregoing Classes.

	£	s.	d.
Special service and royal bounty .....	10,000	0	0
Home secret service money .....	10,000	0	0
Lord Almoner for alms .....	1119	0	0
Archbishop of York, for charities and Arabic professors....	900	0	0
Chamberlain of London, for the poor of that city .....	1000	0	0
Chelsea water-works, for supplying the Treasury .....	52	14	0
Fees, &c. on the receipt of the privy purse of his Majesty and of his Royal Highness the Regent.....	522	0	0
His Majesty's charity to female objects in distress .....	1212	2	6
Chairman of the Westminster sessions, for dinners .....	214	3	0
Mayor, aldermen, and sheriffs of the city of London, for impost on wine,.....	100	16	0
	<u>£23,110</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>

Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.

The ESTIMATE of the Expenditure of the CIVIL LIST in 1804; the actual Average Expenditure for SEVEN YEARS to 5th July, 1811; the actual Average Expenditure for Two Years and Three Quarters to 5th January, 1815; the Estimate of the future Charge to the present Time; and the Estimate of the Charge of which it was proposed to relieve the CIVIL LIST, by the CIVIL LIST REGULATION BILL of 1816.

	Estimate of 1804.			Average Annual Expenditure for 7 Years, to 5th July, 1811.			Average Annual Expenditure for Two Years and Three Quarters, to 5th Jan. 1815.			Future Estimated Expenditure 3d May, 1816.			Future Estimate of Charge from which the Civil List was relieved by the Bill of 1816.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Pensions and allowances to the royal family ..	222,500	0	0	220,640	0	0	334,500	0	0	293,000	0	0	30,500	0	0
Allowances to the Lord Chancellor, Judges, &c.	32,955	0	0	32,870	0	0	32,854	0	0	32,955	0	0			
Allowance to foreign ministers .....	112,330	0	0	82,060	0	0	115,872	0	0	228,950	0	0			
Pensions to ditto .....	27,412	0	0	52,700	0	0	56,056	0	0						
Bills of his Majesty's tradesmen .....	172,505	19	4	259,933	0	0	360,924	0	0	209,000	0	0	25,000	0	0
Salaries to the departments of the Lord Chamberlain, Lord Steward, Master of the Horse, Master of the Robes, .....	98,542	0	5	102,237	0	0	111,630	0	0						
Salaries in the Lord Chamberlain's department and Office of Works, .....	7,058	8	4	6,682	0	0	3,960	0	0	140,700	0	0			
Compensation and Superannuation allowances	11,258	12	0	10,100	0	0	11,644	0	0						
Pensions .....	92,582	4	4	86,391	0	0	87,160	0	0	95,000	0	0			
Salaries and allowances to sundry persons .....	48,339	19	9	48,710	0	0	46,464	0	0	41,300	0	0	3,268	0	0
Salaries to the Commissioners of the Treasury	13,822	0	0	13,310	0	0	13,452	0	0	13,822	0	0			
OCCASIONAL PAYMENTS .....	139,737	6	7	187,050	0	0	393,270	0	0	26,000	0	0	197,000	0	0
	£ 979,043	10	9	1,102,683	0	0	1,497,786	0	0	1,085,727	0	0	255,768	0	0

Having mentioned the *hereditary revenues* of the crown in Scotland, we shall insert a statement of their amount and application in 1816. The sums from this source alone ought to maintain the whole of the royal family; but it will be seen that they are wasted on persons and objects almost entirely unknown to the public.

## HEREDITARY REVENUES OF THE CROWN IN SCOTLAND.

*Receipts for the Year to 2d February, 1816.*

	£	s.	d.
Balance on 2d February, 1815 .....	24,726	19	4
Crown rents and casualties .....	3,972	15	9
Compositions on signatures .....	634	14	8
New subsidy of customs .....	35,480	0	0
Fines and forfeitures of customs .....	2,280	0	0
Hereditary revenue of excise, including fines and forfeitures	37,534	13	6
Interest received from Bank for money deposited .....	744	9	0
<b>Total Receipts.....</b>	<b>£105,373</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>

## APPLICATION.

	£	s.	d.
<b>PENSIONS.....</b>	<b>49,061</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>
Professor of botany and expense of botanic garden .....	104	15	9
Solicitor of tithes .....	37	4	2
Ditto, extra allowance.....	9	11	0
King's plate, to be shot for by Royal Company of Archers, two payments .....	40	0	0
Sheriff of Forfarshire, for preserving from decay the Abbey of Aberbrothock .....	355	12	4
Annual allowance for trouble in comparing charters .....	5	0	0
Robert Mitford, Esq. in aid of his Majesty's Civil List in England, March 21st .....	10,000	0	0
Crown agent for defraying expense of criminal prosecutions	4,000	0	0
For repairing church of Linlithgow .....	420	0	0
Professor of botany, May 3d.....	104	15	9
Chamberlain of Ettrick forest, salary to Whitsunday 1815	250	0	0
Procurator for church of Scotland, to pay itinerant preachers	2,098	10	0
His Majesty's high commissioners to General Assembly of the church of Scotland.....	2,085	10	0

*Civil List Expenditure during the Regency.*

	£	s.	d.
Annual allowance for coach-house and stables to the barons of the Exchequer.....	60	0	0
For making up new cess books for shire of Edinburgh ....	250	0	0
For King's plate, to be run for over Leith sands.....	105	0	0
King's almoner for alms and beedsman's gowns, extra allowance .....	157	17	5
Professor of natural history and expenses of Edinburgh Museum .....	99	16	0
Alexander Mundell, for preparing public bills relative to Scotland .....	409	6	0
Professor of botany, 5th July.....	104	15	9
King's plate to Caledonian hunt.....	105	0	0
Expense of building a bridge over the river Don, Aberdeenshire .....	1,157	5	0
Solicitor of tithes, 23d July, 1815 .....	40	0	0
Royal donation for Scotch episcopal clergy . . . . .	1,208	17	6
Professor of botany, November 7th . . . . .	104	15	9
Chamberlain of Ettrick forest, November 27th . . . . .	250	0	0
Agents before the Court of Session, for matters relative to Teinds . . . . .	765	13	5
Purchase of lease of lands for new botanic garden . . . . .	1,200	0	0
Sheriff of Forfar, for repairing abbey of Aberbrothock, Dec. 21 . . . . .	250	0	0
For repairing palace of Holyrood-House . . . . .	100	0	0
Expense of botanic garden, January 27th . . . . .	104	15	9
Towards completing a transaction for removing site of botanic garden . . . . .	330	19	8
Sundries . . . . .	85	6	0
BALANCE in hand . . . . .	29,755	13	8
<b>TOTAL PAYMENTS . . . . .</b>	<b>£105,373</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>

Examined and certified,

ROBERT STEWART, D.R.G.

Exchequer-Chamber, Edinburgh,  
25th April, 1816.

END OF THE CIVIL LIST.

# ROBBERY

OF

## CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS.

WHEN the reformers reflect how many interests are identified with the present system, they can feel no surprise at the difficulties they encounter. There is not a village in England, however small, where corruption has not extended her influence and her agents, whose emoluments depend on the present Representation. Tithes, partial taxation, the cost and intricacy of legal proceedings, chartered communities, and the abuse of charities, all rest upon this foundation. Connected with these, individuals are found in every part of the kingdom, betwixt whom and the government there is a very obvious dependence.

Abuse must always depend upon abuse for support. A government founded on the usurpation of the rights, and maintained by the sacrifice of the interests of the people, cannot look to the people for support; neither can abuse founded on similar injustice. Their dependence is not upon the people, but upon each other. Abuse supports government, in order to be protected; government protects abuse, in order to be supported. Thus is the connivance at fraud necessary to government for the maintenance of its power; and prostitution to government necessary to abuse, for the enjoyment of its plunder. A diabolical compact, founded on the same principle which sometimes unites the outcasts of society; a general consciousness of guilt; but also a consciousness of the necessity of union for their common safety.

Looking at the subject in this point of view, and knowing the ramifications of abuse through all parts of the empire, we feel no surprise at the formidable array against the people. We are not surprised at the alarm which pervades the clergy, the bar, and the aristocracy. We feel no surprise when we read the charges of Justice Bailey and Sir William Garrow, to the grand juries of York and Surrey, nor the charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the clergy. The alarm of these classes is natural; their present emoluments and future prospects depend on abuses which it is the object of Reformers to eradicate. The Clergy feel apprehensive

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

for their tithes; the aristocracy for their rents and rotten boroughs; and the bar for the fat emoluments of litigation. But why should the panic of these men, originating in the most obvious causes, spread among the middling classes? What interest in common have the agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing classes with the privileged orders that they should be the dupes of their selfish fears and misrepresentations? How could their interests be endangered?—nay, would they not be infinitely bettered by a RADICAL REFORM? How could the farming classes suffer by the abolition of tithes, and the ministers of religion being dependent on the voluntary contributions of their followers? How could the mercantile classes suffer by the abolition of the assessed taxes, the stamp duties, and other imposts, which impede, fetter, and impoverish all their operations? How could any of the productive classes suffer by a general reduction in their burdens, and their transfer to the shoulders of the borough-mongers, whose infatuated measures have rendered them necessary? How could they suffer by the abolition of a standing army and the substitution of a national militia, the cheap, natural, and constitutional defence of both the country and government? Lastly, how could they suffer from the saving of five millions a year in the management of the revenue; the abolition of 100,000 tax-gatherers; the expenditure reduced to one-sixth of its present amount; agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing industry relieved of their most oppressive burdens; thereby employment created for all classes, and the entire annihilation of the degrading and burdensome system of poor laws and poor rates?

These are the ultimate objects contemplated by the Reformers. They seek neither massacre, pillage, nor revolution. Their object is not the destruction of every thing, but the preservation of every thing. They seek not to violate property, but to preserve it from violation. They seek to lessen the cost of government,—a more equitable distribution of the national burdens,—the security of every class against partial oppression; and the mitigation of the sufferings of millions of their countrymen, struggling with unmerited and unparalleled privations.

Whence, then, again we ask, these absurd fears of the middling classes? Why are they afraid? They are not the objects of attack. They need not tremble from conscious guilt, from “crimes unwhipt of justice.” They have not been wallowing in the plunder of the people; nor have they usurped the rights of their fellow-citizens. There is no intention to diminish, but rather to add to their possessions. Why then should they keep aloof from the meetings of the Reformers? Either the people are right, or they are wrong.

If they are right, they are clearly entitled to their support; if they are wrong, why not exert their talents and influence to convince them of their error. In either case, their present conduct is culpable in the highest degree. They behold their sufferings and privations. They see the unexampled patience with which they are endured, when goaded to violence by every artifice their black-hearted oppressors can suggest. Seeing and knowing these things, how can they reconcile to their consciences, that criminal neutrality, which neither supports any measures to alleviate the sufferings, nor to guard them against the diabolical machinations of their enemies. Nay, the conduct of some is still more deplorably wicked and fatuous. They have taken arms to defend a plundering Oligarchy, and, with tiger ferocity, lent their aid to stifle the complaints of misery and famine, by the sabre, the bayonet, and the dungeon!

It is not, however, to the humanity of these classes we appeal at the present crisis; we appeal to motives much more influential—we appeal to their *interests*—which we are persuaded are identified with the cause of *Radical Reform*. Under the present system, property cannot endure nor industry thrive: remorseless taxation, overwhelming poor-rates, the consequence of that taxation, must ultimately devour the one, and paralyse the other. For the security of property, then, and the revival of industry, this great evil of **TAXATION** must be reduced; and this again, we say, and we could adduce a thousand arguments to prove it, will never be done without a **RADICAL REFORM** in the Representation.

How utterly hopeless the reform of any abuse is under the present system, we shall fully demonstrate in the exposition we are going to give of the robbery of Charitable Foundations. A more flagrant, more widely diffused, and more unprincipled abuse, was never brought to light. On the full exposure of this impious robbery, a government with the least sense of shame or justice, if it had not brought the illustrious, the sanctified, and the magisterial robbers to punishment, for the violating of their trust, would at least have compelled the restitution of their plunder. Instead, however, of either punishment or restitution, every artifice was resorted to shield the memorable fraud from investigation. A commission was appointed, composed of men who from prejudice, family connexion, and education, were more likely to *screen* than bring to light the abuses they were appointed to examine. Their powers were limited; the most aggravated cases of abuse **THEY** were wholly restrained from investigating; and they were so ingeniously subdivided into boards, that they might examine the fewest number of cases in the longest time!



The public, however, is well acquainted with this mockery of justice; moreover, it does not fall within our plan to give an history of the vile transaction. Our object in treating this subject, as in every other, is to give some idea of the number of individuals connected with the abuse of public charities; their names, and, as far as possible, the amount of corrupting influence at their disposal. The time is peculiarly fitted for an exposition of this nature. Thousands of the infirm and aged are now famishing for the funds, wasted in luxury and riot, and to which they have an undeniable claim. There are thousands more, young, industrious, and able-bodied, perishing for want of employment, and destitute of the means of transporting themselves to countries where employment might be obtained, and their families comfortably supported. To these classes, it will be right to point out the immense property of which they have been defrauded, to which they have a legitimate claim, and which ought to be administered to relieve their present necessities.

We shall divide our essay on this subject into three heads. *First*, we will select a few of the most notable cases of charitable abuse. *Secondly*, we will give the names of the principal persons connected with charitable foundations; the incomes of particular endowments, and an estimate of the total revenue of all public charities. *Thirdly*, we shall say a few words on the exclusive right of the poor to these funds. And, *lastly*, we shall probably say a few words on "*the fraternal hug*" on this subject, betwixt lord Castlereagh and Mr. Brougham, during last session of parliament.

We have already noticed in our *List of Places* the connexion of a *Right Reverend Bishop* and a *Noble Peer*, with this wholesale robbery of the poor, we shall therefore pass over the cases of Mere, Spital, and St. Bees,\* and come at once to that of Pocklington, situate in the East Riding of Yorkshire. This school was founded by John Dowman, in the year 1525, for the gratuitous instruction of the inhabitants. Parson Shield is the master, and the Reverend Thomas Brown, unfortunately DEAF, the usher. For many years they have been sharing a yearly income, according to the Parson's account, of £900; but according to the evidence of some of the parishioners, £1200 for the management of a school, where, for eleven years together not a single scholar was taught. St. John's College, Cambridge, is visitor to the charity. On the publication of the *First Report of the Education Committee*, a panic spread through all the monkish establishments in the kingdom; and Dr. Wood, master of that college, sent two persons

\* Vide Dr. Tomline and Lord Lowther.

down to examine into the condition of the school. Things were found in a very deplorable state; in the lower room, the floor was up, and the windows broken in; in fact, the room had been turned into a carpenter's shop. There was only *one* scholar; he was busily engaged in the master's house, most probably turning the spit, or occupied in other domestic drudgery. Parson Shield, who, it appears, was very anxious about the revenue, though very careless about the duties of the school, had been about ten months in Chancery, endeavouring to set aside some of the leases, on account of the lowness of the rents.

After ascertaining the gross abuses of this charity, we should have imagined Dr. Wood would have quite new-modelled the school. No such thing; every thing was left nearly in the same state: he suggested some regulations relative to prayers, morning and evening, Michaelmas and Lady-day, and that was all. That vigilant reformer of abuse, Mr. Wilberforce, many years representative of the county of York, lately expressed his surprise that the perversion of this charity should have been so long unnoticed by *him*. We should have been equally surprised, had this, or any other abuse of importance, ever attracted his attention, and *he* applied an adequate and efficient remedy.

**HUNTINGDON SCHOOL.**—This case exhibits a refinement on the ordinary mode of corruption at elections. The poor are plundered of their property by the magistrates, and that property is again employed in the purchase of their votes on the election of their representatives. The case is this: In the reign of Edward II. land had been left, to the amount of 143 acres, for the maintenance of a free school. At that time, the annual rent was £35, now it lets for £160, although, on the lowest estimate, it could not be worth less than £900 per annum. The corporation, to procure the return of the members at the least expense to themselves, let out, or more properly give away, this property of the poor to the burgesses, as bribes to return such persons as they approve. There is never, as one may naturally expect, a contested election in this place; for, should any of the electors vote in opposition to the corporation, he is immediately turned out of the poor land, for which they are in trust. This case needs no comment.

We shall only briefly notice some of the charities in the country, in order to come at those in the metropolis, which are less known, no account having appeared of them, except in the First Report of the Education Committee. At Wellingborough, in Northamptonshire, there are lands belonging to different charities, which a short time ago let for only £68, although worth nearly £1100: the trustees at one period enjoyed the leases. At Yeovh,

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

in Somersetshire; there are estates possessed by trustees destined for four different charities, all four of which are equally abused. One estate worth £700 a year, only educates *seven* or *eight* boys; lands valued at eleven or twelve hundred pounds a year, only afford a wretched pittance to *sixteen* paupers; and land worth £150 a year is let for £2 : 1 : 4, chiefly to the trustees. The estates appertaining to the hospital of Croydon, founded by Archbishop Whitgift, were valued by the surveyor of the house at £2673 a year; yet they are let for £860; and, down to 1812, they fetched no more than £336. A free school too was specially appointed to be kept for the benefit of the inhabitants; but none has been taught within the memory of man, although the master receives the emoluments, teaching another school for his own profit; and the inhabitants are now instructing the children of the poor, at their own expense, in the very room devised for their gratuitous instruction. At a richly endowed school at Berkshamsfead, the master only taught one boy, and the usher lives in Hampshire. Lately the fines on the renewal of the leases, amounted to £5000, which were shared betwixt these two industrious individuals.

All the charities we have mentioned were exempt from the investigation of the Commission of Inquiry appointed last year. It is impossible but the participators in so much speculation, fraud, and abuse, should feel grateful to the government by whom they were protected; and, no doubt, they perfectly agree with lord LONSDALE, who sends *eight members* to parliament, has the gift of four or five church livings, and participates largely in the revenue of St. Bees' Charity, that the *English constitution* is "*the MOST GLORIOUS which could be devised!*"

The charities in the Metropolis for the relief of the aged and infirm, the education of the children of the poor, and for gratuitous lectures to the public, are very numerous. In some of these the funds are accumulating in the hands of the trustees; in others they are appropriated wholly foreign to the intention of the founders; while, in some instances, ample revenues are limited to a few objects, conformable indeed to the letter, but by no means to the spirit of the endowment. Of the numerous bequests of this nature, we can only spare room for a few of the most important and flagrant cases of abuse; first premising, that the whole of the facts are taken from the evidence of the parties themselves, as published in the Reports of the Education Committee.

The first charitable foundation we shall notice is *Christ's Hospital*. The average income of this foundation is more than £40,000 per annum, de-

rived from extensive estates in Surrey, Essex, and Lincolnshire.\* It was founded by EDWARD VI. to which very valuable legacies, by private individuals have subsequently been added. Lady Ramsey left an estate worth £4000 per annum; and Mr. Stone a capital estate in Lincolnshire worth £3200 per annum. The governors are the Lord Mayor, aldermen, and twelve common councilmen; besides benefaction governors, who give to the institution not less than £400. Including the Hertford establishment, there are about 1000 children maintained and instructed in reading, writing, classics, mathematics, and other branches of learning. The total amount of salaries is £6990, including £1054 paid in pensions to retired officers and widows. Dr. Trollope is the head master;—salary £240:16:8, with the privilege of selecting the scholars for the exhibition at the Universities, for whom there is a provision of £70 a year each. The salaries of the under masters are about £200 per annum.

Great abuses prevail in the introduction of improper objects on this foundation. The original charter of King Edward clearly limits the charity to the aged, infirm, and destitute; nevertheless, children of opulent persons, principally clergymen's, have been admitted to the benefit of the institution. There was a child of the Rev. *Duwson Warren*, minister of Edmonton, who, according to his own statement, had an income of £850, and according to the affidavit of a churchwarden of his parish, £1200 a year. There was admitted a child of the Rev. *Baptist John Proby*, a relation of *Lord Carysfort*, commissioner of the custody of the Rolls. Mr. Proby had two livings of £400 a year; he had received £3500 from his father; he had an expectancy on his mother's decease of £3000; he had £80 a year in the right of his wife, and £1000 of marriage portion; nevertheless the committee of the governors decided, after "*much deliberation*," that John Carysfort Proby, the name of the boy, was a proper "*object for maintenance and education in the hospital*."

Several other cases of improper admissions have been brought to light, principally from the activity of Alderman Waithman, relative to the children of Egerton Stafford, Mason Wright, Dr. Markham, and others. In some of these cases proceedings were instituted in Chancery; they were long and learnedly argued; but, though some years have elapsed, no judgment, we believe, has yet been pronounced.

\* Income in 1814....£44,625.....Expenditure....£41,061  
Income in 1815....£43,386.....Expenditure....£40,420

*Evidence of the Treasurer.—Report 1816. p. 60.*

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

**CHARTER-HOUSE.**—This great establishment was likewise founded for the benefit of the indigent, for the maintenance of eighty *poor men*, and for “*the instructing, teaching, maintenance, and education of poor children and scholars.*” THOMAS SUTTON, a merchant of London in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and a great benefactor to the poor, was the founder. The scholars on the foundation are limited to forty-two; but there are others, not on the foundation, who pay for their education. The yearly expenses of the establishment are from £17,000 to £18,000 per annum. Seven church livings belonging to the Charter-house, some of which are worth from £1000 to £1200 a year, are in the gift of the governors. Dr. FISHER is the head master; salary £800 a year, a house, candles, vegetables, and an allowance for linen. The other temporal advantages enjoyed by this gentleman, are a college-living at Elton; a stall at Norwich; and a living in Lincolnshire; besides which, lately he had a *nephew* on the foundation, and two *sons* exhibitioners at the Universities, with incomes of £80 a year from the institution. The emoluments of the other officers appear not so exorbitant. The salary of the master of the school is about £300 a year, of the usher £160, and the registrar has £290, with a house to live in.

The dereliction from the ordinances of the founder, and the abuses which prevail, appear more flagrant than in Christ's Hospital. Instead of the scholars being “*poor children,*” they are, generally, the children of opulent persons. The following extract from the Minutes of Evidence before the Education Committee, will give some idea of the connexions and necessities of the “*poor children and scholars*” now upon the foundation. It is the Receiver of the House, Mr. Barber, who is interrogated.

Can you tell the Committee what, in point of fact, is the general description of the boys who are upon the foundation?—I am not competent to do that from my own knowledge; of a few of them I can speak, knowing them.

As to those whom you *personally* know?—There is a son of Mr. Chester, *deputy master of the ceremonies*; there is a young man of the name of Fuller, whom I know.

Who is he?—His father is a surgeon in the country.

Do you know any others?—There is a boy of the name of Proby,\* the son of a clergyman.

Is he a *kinsman of Lord Carysfort*?—I rather think he is: there is also a young man of the name of Ramsden, the grandson of the late master of the hospital, whom Dr. Fisher has succeeded; there is also a boy of the name of Fisher, a nephew of the master; but there are no others that I know of.

\* Master Tonson again! This, no doubt, is the same Mr. Proby whom we have just noticed as having, contrary to the charter, got another of his children admitted into Christ's Hospital.

Should you say, generally speaking, the boys are gentlemen's children?—Generally speaking, I should suppose the boys on the foundation of the Charter-house were the children of gentlemen of moderate fortunes, with large families, to whom *academical education is a great object.*\*

*Academical education* may be a *great object* to men of moderate fortunes, but it is a still greater object to the community that *one hundred and twenty thousand children* in the metropolis, destitute of all means of education, should be instructed in the rudiments of knowledge; and in favour of the latter it may be urged that they have a *legitimate* claim on the revenues of the Charter-house; while men of moderate fortunes have no right whatever to the benefits of the Institution.

ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL.—This is a very rich foundation; the revenues properly applied, instead of being wasted in extravagant salaries and pensions to the masters, might be productive of immense advantages to the poor of the capital. The present income is betwixt five and six thousand pounds a year. The following is a statement of the principal disbursements as given by the clerk of the Mercer's Company.

High Master (Dr. Sleath) .....	£618
Sur-Master .....	307
Usher .....	227
Assistant-Master .....	257
Pension to the late High Master, Dr. Roberts .....	1000
Ditto to the late Sur-Master's Widow: .....	60

There being a considerable surplus revenue, it is generally contrived to expend large sums in repairs, surveyors' charges, law charges, literary prizes, the purchase of books, the binding and rebinding of books, and other miscellaneous objects. In the statutes, the founder, [speaking of the High Master, says "*his wagis shall be a mark a weke, and a livery gowne of iiii nobles delivered in clothe.*" Of the Sur-Master, who is to be a man "*hoole in body,*" he says "*his wagis shall be vis. viiid. a weke, and a livery gowne of iiii nobles delivered in clothe.*" These allowances of 8s. 6d. and 6s. 8d. a week have been interpreted to mean, allowing for the difference in the value of money, £618 and £307 a year. When the salaries of the masters are concerned, they always give a liberal interpretation of the statutes; but when the comfort of the scholars, or an increase in their duties are involved, they always adhere strictly to the letter. For instance, they will not admit more than 153 scholars, although the revenues

\* Vide First Report, p. 140.

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

would educate ten times as many, merely because that is the number mentioned by the founder; and they also continue to burn wax tapers, instead of candles, because, forsooth, that is likewise directed by the statutes. These things show on what ridiculous and selfish principles these rich establishments are conducted, and the necessity of an entire reformation of the whole.

St. Paul's school was founded by Dean Colet, by warrant from Henry VIII. in the year 1521. The surplus revenues vested in the funds had accumulated, in 1816, to the amount of £26,000. On a vacancy children of all ranks are entitled to admission on the payment of 1s.; but this general principle of admission is of little avail to the public; reading, writing, and the most generally useful branches of education being excluded.

Having given an account of three of the richest foundations in the metropolis, we shall only briefly notice some of the remainder. The *Foundling Hospital* has a revenue of £10,000 a year, which, in a few years, will be increased three or four fold; all originally intended for the maintenance of children "cast off, deserted, or exposed by their parents." The Bedford Charity, in Holborn parish, consisting of thirteen acres, lets for seven or eight thousand pounds a year. The income of St. Olave's school, founded by Queen Elizabeth, about £1500 a year. St. Clement Dane's school, the receipts are more than £800 a year; and Archbishop Tenison's school, in King's street, has an income to the same amount. St. Saviour's Free-Grammar school, Southwark, founded by Queen Elizabeth, and managed by trustees, who nominate their successors, has an annual revenue of about £380, and only educates about thirty scholars. Westminster School, another royal foundation of Queen Elizabeth, endowed with certain lands vested in the Dean and Chapter, has forty scholars on the foundation, and twelve pensioners, who receive donations of meat, &c. The king's scholars pay for their education, and partly for their board. The expense of the school is about £1000 or £1200 a year. The *Grey-coat School* West, parish of St. Margaret, has an income of £2000 a year, and educates and maintains about ninety children. The governors are nominated by the treasurer and chairman, and present the children in rotation. The *Green-Coat School*, founded by Charles I.; income £700; educates and maintains twenty-four boys; the children of poor and decayed house-keepers. In Whitechapel-road is a school endowed by *Ralph Davenant*, in 1680; income six or seven hundred pounds a year. These funds appear to be tolerably well applied; clothing, and educating about 200 boys and girls. In Wapping is an *Orphan Hospital*, to which Mr. Troutback be-

queathed £2000; but here "*hangs a tale*," which we must explain; and first we will call in Mr. *Waggoner*.

"Mr. *Frederick Matthew Waggoner* called in and examined.

"Do you know any thing of the proceedings that have been had with respect to Mr. *Troutback's* will?—I do; he bequeathed £2000 for erecting an Orphan Hospital, and the whole of his money amounting, with accumulations, to upwards of £100,000, and trustees, for erecting an additional wing, or separate building to the charity school of St. John of Wapping, and for maintaining and educating poor children of that parish.

"Are there as many poor children as would require such funds to educate?—Yes; more within the parish.

"Do you think £5000 a year would not educate the poor of the parish?—The will is for the education, clothing, and maintenance.

"What has been done with respect to it?—We understand that it has been set aside by the Court of Chancery; and that the testator having no next of kin, the money has gone to the Crown."—Report of the Education Committee, 1816, p. 289.

Yes, Mr. *Waggoner*, the money "*has gone to the Crown*."—But what do you think became of it afterwards? Why, his Royal Highness the Regent, living in a riotous and extravagant manner, had, in the year 1816, incurred an enormous debt. In that year the marquis of Hertford, lord chamberlain of the household, and whose wife is a great favourite of the Prince, applied to the lords of the treasury to know how this debt was to be discharged. The lords of the treasury, after much consultation, determined that this debt, amounting to £277,000, should be defrayed partly out of the money bequeathed by Mr. *Troutback*, for charitable uses, partly out of the *Droits of Admiralty*. Thus you see, Mr. *Waggoner*, that the money piously left to clothe, educate, and maintain the poor children of your parish, has been applied to pay the furniture-bills, tailor bills, haberdasher bills, and bills perhaps of a still less creditable description, of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent. It vexes one to see to what base purposes the best of things may sometimes be perverted. How many poor children of Wapping the money of *Troutback* would have preserved from the gallows and transportation it is impossible to say; but it is certain, had we had a more economical Prince, or a Prince who thought the welfare of his subjects of more importance than vicious indulgence, the money of *Troutback*, notwithstanding any informality in his will, would have been suffered to go to the noble objects for which it had been generously bequeathed.\*

\* The reader may imagine the story about *Troutback's* will is a pure fiction; but



*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

After the case of Mr. Troutback, we shall not trouble the reader with an account of any more of the charities in the metropolis. Foundations for the advantage of the poor, and bequests of various kinds for their education, clothing, and maintenance, may be found in almost every street and alley in London; and barely to enumerate their names would occupy a volume, instead of the few pages we can devote to the subject. Of the immense extent of charities in this part of the kingdom we may judge from the fact, that there are in Middlesex 36 institutions connected with education alone, of an *obscure* description, whose united income amounts to £21,000 a-year. What we have said will give some idea of the immense property of the poor in London, and the shameful manner it has been perverted from its legitimate object. We have seen that the revenues of the four great charities of the Charter House, Foundling Hospital, Christ's Hospital, and St. Paul's, amount to more than £84,000 per annum. Of this immense sum, the revenues of the three first are unquestionably the property of the poor, and of the last, they belong to the rich and the poor indifferently. Great as this fund is, the poor derive very little benefit from its application, and the whole is expended in the education of about 1600 children, principally of opulent parents.

Having spoken of the principal charities in the metropolis, and also the most flagrant cases of abuse in the country, we shall next take a short survey of the two great foundations of Eton and Winchester. In a work which will contain a record of every important abuse tolerated under the borough system, it would be unpardonable not to give some account of those corrupt and perverted establishments. We shall first speak of the royal college of Eton.

This college, founded by Henry VI., and situated near Windsor, was intended for the education of "*seventy poor and indigent scholars*," who were enjoined by the founder to swear they had not £3 6s. a-year to spend.

by turning to that part of the Education Report to which we have referred, and to vol. 34, p. 272, of Hansard's Parl. Debates, he will find the fact exactly as we have related. Mr. Troutback died without heirs, and left his property for an orphan hospital, and St. John's Charity School, Wapping. The will was set aside by the Lord Chancellor, and the money, as a *droit* of the crown, applied to defray the debt contracted in erecting additional buildings, and for furniture for that royal hobby-horse, the pavilion at Brighton. It was a windfall to the crown, of which, as Mr. Tierney remarked, the public would never have obtained any knowledge, had not the civil list been in arrear, and it became necessary to apply to parliament for an additional allowance.

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

The exact amount of the revenues it is not easy to ascertain, as it is a fact carefully concealed by the heads of the college; but according to the evidence of Mr. Hinde they amount to considerably more than £10,000 a-year, and arise from various manors, estates, rectories, and tenements belonging to the foundation. The government of the college, and the management of this immense income, is vested in the provost and "seven fellows;" the salaries of the latter, according to the statutes, are £10 a-year, and of the former double that sum. The Right Reverend Bishop of Lincoln, of Mere and Spital celebrity, is the visitor. Besides the foundation scholars there are more than 400 *oppidens*, or town scholars, who pay for their education; though like the rest of the boys they are entitled to gratuitous instruction. The scholars are instructed by masters and assistants, who in fact do all the business of the college, and, as is usual in such cases, get the worst paid; the head master receives only £63 a-year; the under master fares still worse, and is paid in a trifling "*allowance of bread and beer.*"\*

The most interesting subject for inquiry is, what becomes of the revenue, when all the work is done at such a very cheap rate? Nearly the whole of this, at the present, appears to be divided betwixt the provost, the *reverend Dr. Goodall*, and the fellows; the share of the former in *good years* has amounted to £2500; but the incomes of the latter are made up of such a variety of items, they are not easily estimated. It is certain, however, their incomes are enormous. Besides the total income of the college, thirty-seven livings, some of which are worth £800 per annum, are in the gift of the fellows; they have the power of presenting themselves to one of these livings, which of course would not be the worst. They receive about £550 in money annually from the fines; a yearly stipend of £50; and a liberal allowance for gowns, coals, candles, &c. Moreover they generally confer some office on themselves in the college, as bursar, precentor, sacrist, or librarian; for which they receive salaries. These are the principal items; but it is impossible to discover exactly what the fellows receive in all: their gross incomes cannot be much less than £1000 a-year.

After Dr. GOODALL has taken the lion's share, and the fellows nearly as much as they please, the remainder is applied to support the establishment. According to the statutes, the scholars ought to be fed, clothed, educated, and lodged, free from expense; they have reduced their meals to two, namely, dinner and supper; clothing they have none; for their education they pay a gratuity of six guineas to the master, and their other yearly ex-

\* Third Report, p. 72.

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

penses amount to about £60; while at the same time they swear, or ought to swear, they have not *three pounds six shillings a-year to spend!*

These exactions, however, are so shameless, unjustifiable, and so directly in the teeth of the statutes, that when any person ventures to object to their payment, to prevent inquiry, the charges are remitted. This indulgence is extended to a very small number; and to prevent such a dangerous example spreading through the school, the fact is carefully concealed from the rest of the boys. That this illegal demand for teaching may excite as little notice as possible, it is always thrust into the bill of the person with whom the boys board.\*

Such is a brief account of the royal college of Eton. It only now remains to point out the more flagrant abuses which prevail in its management, and the manner the *poor* have been robbed of their rights and interests in this celebrated foundation.

First, instead of the revenues being expended in feeding, educating, and clothing "*seventy poor and indigent scholars,*" they are divided among eight clerical sinecurists; and children of opulent persons, who can afford to pay £70 a-year for their education, are alone admitted to the benefits of the foundation.† The statute provides, that one-third part of the yearly savings should be placed in the treasury for the use of the college; although there has been annually a surplus revenue to a very considerable amount, instead of being applied to the enlargement of the college, or any other laudable object, it has been divided and pocketed by the "*reverend fellows*" and the provost; one hundred marks, too, piously left to clothe the "*poor and indigent scholars,* have in like manner, been shared as lawful plunder by the same reverend persons. In consequence of the spoliation of Edward the IVth, the number of fellows was reduced from ten to seven; but although the revenues have increased so enormously, that they would very well support the old statutable number, yet have they for centuries been kept at the present amount, contrary to the intentions of the founder. Finally, the reverend fellows have all sworn not to obtain a dispensation for the holding of livings; or, if obtained, not to use it; yet, notwithstanding their oaths,

\* Third Report, p. 71, evidence of the Rev. Dr. Goodall.

† Lately, owing to an attempt to control the expensive pleasures of the high-blooded youths on this establishment, a most furious rebellion broke out among the students, and among the names of the principal rebels we observed a *nephew* of Mr. Marryat, M.P.; a *son* of Mr. Justice Holroyd; and a *brother* of Sir Lawrence Palk, who were receiving the benefits of this obarity.

notwithstanding the dreadful maledictions of the founder, such has been their greediness for the emoluments of the church, that they have obtained a dispensation to hold church preferment; and the right reverend visitor has sanctioned this gross infringement of the ordinances of the founder.

But these are not the whole of the injuries sustained by the founder from these "*fellows*" in *holy orders*, who are living riotously on the funds he left to clothe and educate the children of the poor. The copy of the statutes now made use of by the bursars and vice-provost, is widely different from the original statutes of the founder. In the vice-provost's book, which is generally used on college business, some parts of the original statutes are entirely omitted, in other places additions are inserted, and in many places there are lines running down the margin, "*seemingly so noted*," in order for *omissions* in such parts of the statute which run counter to the notions of temporizing men, who, hereby, from time to time, have shown the little regard they have to the *sacredness of repeated oaths*, to the direful imprecations of the pious founder, or to the true literal sense and meaning of any one of his statutes, which are by these vile methods thus perverted, and by CLERICAL MEN, to purposes quite contrary to his intentions."—Huggett, p. 65, *Fourth Report*.

These are the reflections of a member of the college, on the shameful conduct of his brethren. But this is not all; at the end of the vice-provost's book, is a short convenient oath, written in a very "*modern hand*," which we believe is administered to the scholars and fellows instead of the original oaths of poverty and against church preferment prescribed by the founder. This oath merely enjoins that they will observe just so much of their oaths as has been agreed to among themselves; although the founder has insisted that unless the *whole of his oaths* have been sworn to, no person should be admitted into the college, or partake of its emoluments. The fellows, by the injunction of the founder, are bound to read over the statutes once a year; some of them, however, never read the statutes at all, being as Huggett says, "*very willingly ignorant of them*." In passing from a scholarship to a provostship, a person may swear six times on the "*Holy Evangelists*," and for the sake of a living violate them all; and yet these are the men paid for teaching the people morality, and to declaim against lying and false swearing. Enough, however, of the abuses of Eton College. The reader must perceive that similar fraud, meanness, perjury, and corruption prevail in this establishment as prevailed in the monkish establishments of the fourteenth century; nevertheless, it is

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

under the visitation of the Right Reverend Bishop of Lincoln, and his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

*Winchester College* was founded by William of Wykeham, in the fourteenth century, and, like that of Eton, intended for the education of seventy "poor and indigent scholars:" so careful was the founder to confine the benefits of his institution entirely to the poor, that the boys, when they attain the age of fifteen, solemnly swear they have not *three pounds six shillings* a year to spend; and it is expressly ordered, if ever any scholar come into the possession of property to the amount of five pounds a year, he shall be expelled. The management of the college is vested in the warden, the Bishop of Hereford, and ten reverend divines, termed "fellows," subject to the controul of the Bishop of Winchester, the visitor. The warden, fellows, and scholars, all swear to observe the statutes, "according to their plain, literal, grammatical sense and understanding." Peculiar privileges are secured to the founder's kin, ten or twelve of whom are now upon the foundation. From the statement of the burars, the revenue of the college in the year ended December, 1817, amounted to £14,433 : 8 : 5; and the total expense to £10,941 . 10 : 4; leaving a surplus of £3,691 : 18 : 1. The value of a fellowship, according to the evidence of Mr. Williams, is four or five hundred pounds a year, with meat and drink gratis in the college; also the use of knives, forks, plates, and as many church livings as they can obtain. The emoluments of a warden are double those of a fellow, with travelling expenses; &c. The scholars are chosen yearly, by six electors; they seem to fare "sumptuously every day," having bread and butter to breakfast; beef, bread, and cheese to dinner; mutton, bread, and cheese to supper, with beer at every meal. They have no spoons, knives, nor forks, nor vegetables of any sort, allowed by the statutes, but they have salt and wooden trenchers found, and one gown is given annually to each scholar for clothing. The allowance for the sustentation of the boys, may be varied agreeably to the statutes, according to the price of corn and provisions.

Such we collect from the Third Report, to be the history and nature of this foundation, which has been very strangely perverted and abused. First, instead of the scholars being "*poor and indigent*," they are all children of opulent persons; some, we suspect, of noble families, who, at the time they solemnly swear they have not *three pounds six shillings* a year to spend, are paying ten guineas a year to the masters, and the average of their other expenses exceeds fifty. By a liberal translation of

the warden, who has sworn to observe the statutes according to their *literal and grammatical sense*, one hundred shillings are considered equal to £66:13:4. It is strictly enjoined that no boy shall be admitted above twelve years of age. This is wholly disregarded. The fellowships are augmented to four or five hundred pounds a year by a liberal interpretation of the term describing their money payments; while the strictest construction is adopted towards the scholars and founder's kin; the latter continuing only to receive their old statutable allowance of forty shillings a year. Thus too, while the scholars are refused the convenience of knives, forks, spoons, plates, &c. on the grounds that such articles of furniture were unknown in the time of William of Wykham, the fellows are allowed those accommodations, although the fellowships were endowed at the same early period. That a surplus revenue of three or four thousand pounds may be divided betwixt the warden and fellows, the parents of the scholars pay between sixty and seventy pounds a year for their education; although it was intended by the founder they should be instructed and maintained gratuitously.

: During the inquiries of the Education Committee, a singular sort of delicacy was manifested by the heads of this college, to screen the abuse of the institution from investigation. They affected to be extremely willing to give every possible information relative to the college; but unfortunately they had sworn, conformably to the statutes, not to disclose the *private affairs* of the college; and until their scruples relative to this *moral and religious obligation* were removed, they could not, forsooth, submit their concerns to the investigation of the Committee. Now, this would have been all well enough, had it not been notorious that the warden, fellows, scholars, and even the right reverend visitor, on every occasion, when it suited their interest, had shown the greatest contempt both for the oaths and ordinances of the founder; nay, with so little respect had these precious relics been treated by the reverend hypocrites, who affected to be suddenly seized with a profound veneration for them, that they had been left exposed to the boys of the school, who scrawled upon them whatever nonsense they pleased. But the truth is, they wished to avoid inquiry,—as well they might; and they attempted to play off the same artifice on the Committee, in the construction of the statutes, which enabled them to deprive the scholars of knives, forks, vegetables, and the kinsmen of the founder of their yearly incomes.

: Having selected the principal cases of charitable abuse in the country,

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

the metropolis, and the two colleges of Eton and Winchester, it remains to give an estimate of the total revenue of all charities in England and Wales. There is, however, another case of charitable abuse—Tunbridge Free Grammar School, in Kent, which ought to have been noticed before, and which has just been brought to light, that we might as well give a short account of in this place. The facts are briefly these: the school was founded by Sir Andrew Judd, in the reign of Edward VI. and the Skinners' Company of London were appointed, as a corporation, trustees of the property, under the title of "Governors of the Possessions, Revenues, and Goods of the School." From the rise in the value of the estates, the annual revenue amounts to nearly £5000; out of which sum the day scholars are taught Latin and Greek. The total money payments to the master and usher, and for the expense of the school, amount to £466 a year; to which the Worshipful Company of Skinners have generously added an additional gratuity of forty-three guineas to the master, usher, and examiner. The money payments to the Skinners' Company were fixed by the founder at exactly £8 : 13 : 4 a year; but these worshipful gentlemen having the good fortune to receive the money, are pleased to retain, in addition, the *small sum* of £4058 : 1 : 10, being the residue of the rents of the three estates devised to them for the charity!

Proceedings, we understand, have been instituted against the Skinners' Company, to recover this property of the poor, and also arrears to the amount of £24,000. This is one advantage, it is but justice to add, which has resulted from the Commission of Inquiry appointed last year.

REVENUE  
OF  
CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS.

PURSUANT to the 26th Geo. III. commonly called Mr. Gilbert's Act, returns were made by the ministers and churchwardens of charitable donations for the benefit of poor persons in England and Wales. An abstract of these returns, prepared by Mr. Rickman, was laid before the Education Committee in 1816. The results of this abstract we shall lay before the reader ; specifying the sources whence the income is derived, whether from money, land, or rent charge ; the total annual produce ; and the number of donations.

*Amount of charitable Donations for the Maintenance of Schools  
in the Year 1785, in England and Wales.*

	Money.	Land.	Rent Charge.	Total Annual Produce.	Number of Donations.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	
ENGLAND.	12415 17 0½	42638 13 5½	9601 1 11½	64655 12 5	3716
WALES...	468 8 2	933 6 11½	178 8 4	1280 3 5½	182
Total..	12884 5 2½	43272 — 4½	9779 10 3½	65935 15 10½	3898

This statement only exhibits the amount of school charities ; the yearly income from all charities, according to the same returns, was estimated at about £48,000 in money, £210,000 in land. But how defective these returns are we may judge from the following facts : in the East Riding of



## Revenue of Charitable Foundations.

Yorkshire, 73 places are said to possess 67 donations for schools, and their united revenue is stated at £880: whereas, it has since been ascertained, that one school alone, that of Pocklington, has a revenue of about £900 a year. In Middlesex, the whole revenue is returned under £5000, in 151 donations, possessed by 64 places; but the revenues of three schools, the Charter-house, Christ's hospital, and St. Paul's school, are proved to exceed £70,000 a year. It appeared from evidence laid before the Committee, that in one county, Berkshire, that only one-third part of the funds was returned; and supposing this the average deficiency in the whole returns, it will follow, that the whole income actually received by charities in the year 1785, was between seven and £800,000 a year. Allowing for the rise in the value of land since that time, and in some instances for the deficient powers of trustees for the most advantageous management of the property; and, "add to all these (says Mr. Brougham) the large, wilful, and corrupt abuse in its various branches; and we shall probably underrate the amount of the income which *ought now* to be received by charities, if we say that it is nearer TWO MILLIONS than fifteen hundred thousand pounds a year; by far the greatest part of which is derived from real property."—*Speech of Mr. Brougham, May, 1818.*

How rich are the poor! Here is a good, round, substantial sum belonging to them, arising too, not from the funds, or any fallacious security, but fixed, in great part, in the soil of the country. Shakspeare says, were honours and degrees distributed according to merit, how many would be covered that now stand bare; and how many be commanded that command and we may add, supposing every one had their own, how many would be, perhaps, sweeping the streets, over which they are now rolling their chariots.

This immense sum devised to the poor by the "higher orders" of former times, affords a singular contrast to the rapacity and injustice which generally pervade the same classes at the present day. As to their exclusive right to this immense fund, we think there can be little doubt. The very nature of a charity implies it is for the indigent: and it seems a paradox to contend, that any funds should ever be set apart for the education and maintenance of those, who are already possessed of the means for that purpose, independent of any such aid. But from all the statutes and ordinances we have seen relative to these endowments, it is clear, that they were not only intended to be confined to the poor, but the *extreme poor*, and they seem to have been drawn up by their founders, with peculiar care, to prevent the intrusion of rank, birth, and opulence. The statutes of Eton and Win-

chester colleges require the scholars to swear they have not five marks (£3:6s.) a year to spend; and at the latter foundation it is ordained, that if ever any scholar comes into the possession of £5 a year he should be expelled. The Westminster statutes expressly forbid any boy being elected upon the foundation, "*who has, or at his father's death will inherit, a patrimony of above TEN POUNDS.*" The charter of the Hospital and Free Grammar School in the Charter-house says, "*One free-school for the instructing, teaching, maintenance, and education of POOR CHILDREN and schollars.*" Again, in respect of the Hospital, further on it says, that "*the premises shall from henceforth and ever hereafter remain and continue, and be converted, employed, and used for an hospital and house for the abiding, dwelling, sustentation, and relief of such numbers of POOR PEOPLE, men and children,*" as the founder, and after his death the governors, should appoint. The charter of Christ's Hospital begins, "*Whereas, we pitying the miserable state of the POOR, FATHERLESS, decrepit, aged, sick, infirm, and impotent persons;*" and then the charter goes on to enumerate the lands and tenements allotted for their maintenance, and also for the education of indigent children. *Report, 1816, p. 61.*

The foundation of St. Paul's School appears different from any we have mentioned; here certainly the higher orders are entitled to admission; but by no means to the exclusion of the poor, as has been erroneously asserted. How otherwise can we account for the following passage in the statutes, relative to the children, where it is said, "*To their urine they shall go thereby to a place appointed, and a POOR CHILDE of the schole shall se it conveyed away fro tyme to tyme, and have the avayle of the urine; for other causes if nede be, they shall go to the watersyde.*"\* From this it is evident, that *poor children* were originally admitted into the school; and from the nature of the emolument described, even the *Quarterly Reviewers* would hardly contend it belonged to the *higher orders*.

We shall now conclude this part of our subject. The right of the poor to the whole charitable funds in the kingdom, with only one or two exceptions, has been admitted and defended both by the Edinburgh Reviewers and Mr. Brougham; and it is to them we may safely leave the defence of this part of the subject. It only now remains to offer a remark on the measures which have been adopted for rooting out the numerous cases of abuse we have mentioned; and for restoring to the poor the property of which they have been basely plundered.

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

The reader will remember the mockery of inquiry instituted last year into the robbery of the poor, and to which we have already alluded. The clamour justly and loudly excited against that fraudulent measure, principally from the admirable letter of Mr. Brougham to sir Samuel Romilly, seems to have had some effect even on the present ministers. Two acts have passed this session, in order to give greater efficiency to the bill of last year. The number of boards of inquiry have been increased to five, and the number of stipendiary and honorary commissioners to ten each. Instead of their inquiries being confined to charities connected with education, they are now to extend, with only one exception, to all charities whatever. They have, likewise, authority to examine accounts and convict; but the power of imposing fines on refusal is vested in the Court of Chancery or Exchequer.

These alterations, it must be admitted, are important improvements; but still, in our opinion, the present measure is vastly inadequate to cleanse the Augean abuse of public charities. The exception of visited charities from inquiry, unless the visitors are also trustees, seems a capital objection. Why should these charities be exempt, when it has been proved they are the most abused of any in the kingdom? According to this clause it is calculated that no fewer than 2000 charities will be protected from all investigation whatever: and among the number such places as Pocklington-school, the Mere and Spital charities, and the Colleges of Eton and Winchester.

But when are the labours of these twenty commissioners to terminate? How many years are likely to elapse before all the charities in the kingdom will be examined? And how much will the commission cost the public in salaries and expenses before their labours are concluded? These are questions it is desirable to have answered. Lord Castlereagh calculates that the commissioners will be occupied at least *nine years*: but according to a calculation of our own they will be occupied a much longer time. It is supposed there are about 40,000 charities in England and Wales. From the Report of the eight Commissioners appointed last year, it appears they have been able to examine exactly 252 charities. Their number being increased to ten, they will be able to go through a proportionably greater number of cases. The *Edinburgh Reviewers*, who seem mightily pleased with the adoption of the clauses of Mr. Brougham's bill, say they will be able to examine two thousand charities the first year; but how many will they inspect the second, third, and fourth years? How many will they inspect when the vigilance and suspicion of the public have subsided? Will they examine

1500, 1000, or 500 per annum? We believe not. We are afraid that the appointment of this commission will, in a great measure, lull to sleep public curiosity, and that, in a few years, both public charities and the commissioners will be forgotten. We are afraid, too, that the commissioners themselves will have forgotten every thing relative to their office, except the receipt of their salaries, and, in that time, they will be in possession of very snug sinecures, each worth £1000 per annum.

Let us suppose, however, what is very improbable, they examine two thousand charities every year. Why, then, it would take twenty years to survey England and Wales. Only think of that. Think, too, of the cost of these gentlemen; their salaries £10,000 a year, besides £8000 a year for expenses. This is £18,000 per annum, which in twenty years, without reckoning compound interest, would amount to exactly £360,000. Then again, think of the bill of Andrew Strahan, M.P. for printing Reports. This would come to a pretty round sum. The examination of the two hundred and fifty two cases already mentioned has produced a prodigious folio of two hundred and forty-one pages, besides an appendix of four hundred and one pages more; so that working by the rule of three, the whole of the forty thousand charities will produce one hundred and fifty-eight thick folio volumes of more than six hundred pages each. What a prodigious job for Mr. Strahan! What a prodigious bill too for the public! And, altogether, what a glorious job the investigation of charitable abuses will be for the ten paid commissioners and the king's printer for twenty years to come!

Thus it is every attempt at reform ends in a tremendous job. This is the *Charlatanerie* of the system. Our state doctors, instead of diminishing, generally add to the mass of corruption. Instead of cutting away the wounded parts, they are only punctured and inflamed, and fresh eruptions created on the body politic. Altogether, the plan of examining such a widely diffused subdivided abuse as that of public charities, extending to almost every village and hamlet in the kingdom, by ten itinerant commissioners, appears quite chimerical. The experiment has been tried, and what has been done compared with what remains to be done? Nothing. Their labours would never terminate. The proceedings they would institute in Chancery, their examinations of evidence, and titles, and deeds, why, there would be no end of such things. And then again these tremendous reports the public would never read, nor think of them. It would be as easy to obtain a knowledge of the law as public charities from these sources, and would require a whole life devoted to the undertaking. They would only be so

---

*Robbery of Charitable Foundations.*

---

much rubbish, tending to hide that which is already sufficiently obacured from public view.

To us it appears, that a plan much more simple, efficacious, and which would cost nothing at all, might be adopted for rooting out this grievous, shameless, and wide-spread, abuse. In our humble opinion, the whole might be done in *one year*, and without any jobbing whatever. We should propose, that a local tribunal should be established in every parish, composed of the resident parishioners, who should be empowered to examine every charitable institution in their respective jurisdiction, and to make such regulations relative to education, and application of the funds, as would be most conducive to the interest of those for whose benefit they were originally bequeathed. This would be at once prompt, general, and efficacious; and there would be no occasion for Reports, proceedings in Chancery, and £18,000 a year expended in salaries and expenses; all would be speedy, summary, and economical. Surely a sufficient number of disinterested individuals might be found among the magistracy, the established and dissenting clergy, to undertake the office gratuitously; but, if that were impossible, the tribunal might be composed of Radical Reformers, who are to be found in every place, and who would not require a greater reward for their labour than the pleasure of bringing to justice the base spoilers of the poor.

**DROITS OF ADMIRALTY,**  
**AND**  
**DROITS OF THE CROWN.**

---

**NOTWITHSTANDING** the efforts of political writers to expose the abuses of the borough system, an immense number still remain, of which the public have no knowledge, and of which they have scarcely any means of obtaining information. Where, for instance, till the commencement of our publication, could accurate and complete information be obtained relative to the Expenditure of the Civil List, the cost of the Police Department, or on the subject of which we are going to treat, the Droits of Admiralty? Information on these important subjects could only be obtained from the parliamentary debates, parliamentary reports and papers, to which few persons have access, and still fewer leisure to peruse these voluminous and ponderous details. This was certainly a *desideratum* in the political knowledge of the people, which we have attempted to supply; and we may truly say, from the immense circulation of our publication, that the knowledge which heretofore had been confined to some few thousands, will hereafter be familiar to millions among all classes of the community.

Of the different subjects connected with government, there is none of so much importance, and, we may say, so little known, as the revenue of the crown. The immense sums swallowed in this royal sinecure almost exceed belief. At the commencement of the present reign, the Civil List establishment was fixed at £800,000 a year. By papers laid before the House of Commons, it appears, that this sum was first raised £100,000; at a subsequent period, £60,000 was added; then again, by the abstraction of certain charges, to which it was before subject, it was virtually raised £135,000 more; lastly, in 1816, it was again relieved of charges to the amount of £195,000: thus making a real annual increase to the original £800,000, of the sum of £500,000. At one period, a sum of £100,000 was voted to the

*Droits of Admiralty.*

king, to defray the expenses of new palaces and buildings. Parliament have several times paid the arrears of the Civil List debt; and, in the year 1802, voted the enormous sum of £900,000, for that purpose. The whole of the sums voted at different periods to pay the debts of His Majesty, is between *four and five millions.*

Tremendous as this statement may appear, there are various other sums appertaining to royalty, of which the public have scarcely ever heard, and over which even parliament have no controul. The reader has seen what became of poor Troutback's money. This was considered a *droit* of the crown, and of which it was from mere accident parliament obtained any knowledge. There are several other *droits* of a similar description, of which it will be proper to say a word or two, before we come to the greatest of all *droits*, those of Admiralty.

During the minority of the Prince of Wales, when there is no Duke of Cornwall of a proper age to receive the revenues, amounting to £13,000 a year, they are claimed by the crown. Besides this annual sum, the fines, during the infancy of the Regent, were estimated at £130,000; so that the King, from the duchy of Cornwall alone, must have received nearly half a million of money during the minority of the Prince. He has also received very considerable sums from the duchy of Lancaster, and the Scotch Civil List. But the most important fund of the crown, independent of Parliament, is the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  duties raised in Barbadoes and the Leeward Islands. These duties are levied upon the dead commodities of the island, and form a most intolerable grievance to the inhabitants. They were originally granted to defray the charges of maintaining the King's authority, but have been subsequently applied to very different purposes, and formed the most famous jobbing fund of the crown. From a statement of Mr. Creevy, it appears, that from the accession of the king, to the year 1812, these duties had produced £1,600,000.—The following statement of the expenditure of this enormous sum, by the same gentleman, is also curious:—

Pensions to persons in this country . . . . .	£740,000
Special and secret service money . . . . .	326,000
Salaries to the governors . . . . .	400,000
For civil list expenditure . . . . .	170,000
To different secretaries of the treasury, supposed for electioneering purposes . . . . .	48,000





*Droits of Admiralty.*

one of £457 : 4 : 6, and another of £1500. Another payment, equally singular, was the sum of £5077, to the Reverend W. B. Daniels, the author of a work on *Field Sports*, which lately we saw advertised, not for the first time, in the Doctor's paper. The way in which the Reverend Mr. Daniels became entitled to £5077 from government, it may be worth while to state a little more in detail.

A Mr. Jacob, the owner of the privateer *Daphne*, captured, in 1799 or 1806, the French vessel *Circe*, worth £30,000, which was condemned as lawful prize, and all claim to the contrary disregarded. The year and day for appeal having transpired, the condemnation became final, and £15,000 was shared among the captors. Ten thousand pounds more lay ready to be distributed. At this point of time, information was laid against Mr. Jacob, for having disregarded the 33d of the King, by which the muster of the crew of a privateer before sailing is enacted. On the letter of this law they were convicted; the £10,000 stopped; and the £15,000 recovered; all of which became *Droits of Admiralty*. The mere ignorance of the law was admitted as no excuse for Mr. Jacob, and the result to him was, besides the loss of his prize, costs to the amount of £1700, and utter ruin. From having been in a respectable trade, he was thrown into gaol, and reduced to beggary. But on whose authority does the reader imagine Mr. Jacob and his family were, reduced to beggary? Here it will be necessary to introduce the Rev. Mr. Daniels. This gentleman, after publishing his work on *Field Sports*, had been confined for debt, and reduced, as Mr. Brougham says, to the rank of a primitive Christian. After all other attempts to patch up his broken fortune had failed, he, at last, turned a broker in evidence, and procured two men, of the names of Thatcher and Guzman, one of whom had been convicted of perjury, and the other had been flogged at the cart's tail, to swear as much as was necessary to convict Mr. Jacob. For this signal service, the worthy and Reverend Mr. Daniels received £5077 out of the Admiralty *Droits*, and the first of his witnesses £87 : 13 : 7, as a *gratuity for evidence given*.\*

Besides the payments to Messrs. Stoddart and Daniels, there are others quite as extraordinary and unaccountable. There is a sum of £2250 granted to Sir George Young, on the 20th of September, 1803, being one

\* We should not be at all surprised, if the Reverend Mr. Daniels, besides his famous work on "*Field Sports*," is not the writer of some of those neat tracts advertised in the *New Times*, and intended for the instruction of the poor, intituled, "*Reasons for Contentment*," "*Church and King, or Old Chimes better than New Changes*," "*Touch no State Matters*," and many others, all tending to promote the glory of God and the happiness of the people, no doubt.

third of the Dutch ship Frederick, taken at the Cape. This item is remarkable, because at the time Sir George is represented capturing ships at the Cape, he was serving in parliament as member for Honiton, filled a lucrative situation, and on failing in a subsequent election, was appointed governor of that colony. The Earl of Dunmore, father-in-law of the Duke of Sussex, is also down for the sum of £2792, under similar circumstances. Sir William Scott, brother of the Lord Chancellor, is inserted for £932, "for services in deciding upon cases relative to American captures." There are two grants to Lord Keith of £20,521 and £1800, to make up losses he had sustained from an action brought against him for wrongfully detaining an American ship at the Cape of Good Hope. There is a grant of £700 to one Captain Temple, to defray the expenses of a prosecution for the alleged murder of a seaman, of which crime he had been acquitted; and another grant of £219 to a Turk, for some losses he had sustained at Constantinople.

The objects for which all these grants have been made, appear very questionable and mysterious. Let us now come to the larger sums. To that pious nobleman, Lord Gambier, the great patron of Bible Societies, and to Lord Cathcart, is the enormous sum of £348,621, as their share of the prize-money, or rather plunder, at the memorable expedition to Copenhagen. There is another enormous payment to one John Alcock, "to be by him paid over to the merchants, &c. trading to Spain, whose property had been sequestered in 1796 and 1797." Another singular item of £54,921 is entered, as an "indemnification to sundry commanders of his Majesty's ships for condemnations, by a Court of Vice-Admiralty, at Cape Nicola Mole, afterwards found not to have jurisdiction." There is another grant to Sir Home Popham of £20,000, as a compensation for losses he had sustained from having embarked in a smuggling voyage. A sum of £887 to Captain Spencer, in the year 1807, pursuant to his Majesty's warrant; £10,000 and £1900 to William Bourne and others, as commissioners of Spanish and Portuguese property.

The complexion of all these grants is bad enough. We shall now speak of the immense sums taken out of this fund by the different branches of the Royal Family; and the reader must bear in mind that these grants are independent of the enormous sums they derive from other sources. The Droits have formed an inexhaustible mine for relieving the necessities of the King, the Regent, the Princes, and Princesses, in all their embarrassments. The facility with which money was granted by different ministers from this fund, and by none more so than the Whigs, rendered economy on their part wholly unnecessary. Prior to 1812, there had been taken from the Droits

*Droits of Admiralty.*

the enormous sum of £760,000, simply for the payment of tradesmen's bills. The whole of the sums granted in aid of the Civil List, from 1793 to 1818, amounted to £1,324,000. The total sum paid, during the same period, to different branches of the Royal Family, amounted to £266,331:17:3. Besides these sums, there is a grant of £40,000 in aid of the 4½ per cent. Leeward Island duties. A sum of more than £58,000 to defray expenses of additional buildings and furniture at Brighton. The sum of £14,579 for additional expenses in different departments of the household, occasioned by the visits of foreign princes. Lastly, from the same inexhaustible fund of Droits of Admiralty, the Prince Regent's munificent donation of £5000 to the poor of Spitalfields. Doubtless this act of charity would have been much more gracious had it proceeded out of the Regent's privy purse, than out of a fund, which, if it does not belong to the nation, unquestionably belongs to the officers and seamen of the navy.

With the exception of payments to captors, we have mentioned the principal objects to which the Droits have been applied since the commencement of the French war. We shall hereafter insert some documents to illustrate and authenticate our statements; but it will be first proper to say a few more words as to the origin and right of the Crown to this enormous fund.

From the sources whence the Droits have originated, they evidently appear little better than buccaneer or piratical plunder, obtained under circumstances disgraceful for any government to sanction. Ships detained previously to a declaration of war, coming into port ignorant of hostilities, or taken before the issuing of a proclamation, are all considered lawful prizes, sold, and their profits form Droits of Admiralty. The sufferers in these cases violate a law of which they are ignorant, and of which it is impossible they should have any knowledge. They are caught in a spider's web impervious to the sight. An *ex post facto* law, or the laws of the Roman tyrant, who placed them so high that they were illegible to the beholder, were not more unjust and tyrannical. In the case of the Danish and Spanish wars, we have two memorable instances to what base purposes this principle has been applied. In the attack upon Copenhagen, government might be actuated by its fears as well as its love of plunder; they might dread the Danish ships of war falling into the hands of the enemy; though in either case it was equally disgraceful to a great nation to be stimulated to such a flagrant outrage on the law of nations. But what can be urged in defence of the attack on the Spanish ships in 1805? The object, in this case, unquestionably was plunder for the Droit Fund. There could be no fear of the

Spanish ships joining the enemy, because they were merchantmen, and not ships of war. We were at peace; the Spanish envoy in London, and the English ambassador at Madrid, were carrying on a negotiation, and yet, under these circumstances, a squadron of ships of war was fitted out; the homeward-bound Spanish fleet, from South America, loaded with treasure, —attacked, the crews massacred, and the ships burnt, and the proceeds of this unhallowed enterprise condemned as *rights of the crown*.

Posterity, in looking to the foreign and domestic policy of England for the last thirty years, will be at a loss which most to condemn—the machinations of her rulers against the liberties of the people, or their atrocious attacks on the right of other states. The balance of injustice and wickedness seems nearly equal. At home, the liberty and property of the people have been assailed by the Bank Restriction Act, Seditious Meeting Bill, new Treason Acts, and a thousand other iniquitous measures. Abroad, we may reckon among the black catalogue of crimes, the piratical attack upon Copenhagen, and the Spanish fleet; besides our still more diabolical efforts to stifle the liberties of the people in South America, and to re-establish the corrupt and tyrannical governments of the old world.

To return, however, to the Droits of Admiralty. We were going to speak on the objects to which this fund was originally applicable. Perhaps we cannot better illustrate this part of our subject, than by making an extract from a speech of Mr. Brougham, on the Admiralty Droits, on the 21st of January, 1812.

“Leaving (says he) the general question, he would ask in what shape these Droits were vested in the crown? They were so vested, (and all the great law authorities proved the fact) for the attainment of certain specific purposes; and the specific purposes in this case, the *guarding and maintaining the rights and privileges of the seas*. In the 4th institute of my lord Coke, it was laid down, that tonnage and poundage were specifically granted to the crown for safeguard of the seas, and that it pertained to the lord high admiral to see this droit administered; and, quoting from the archives of the Tower, he had further observed that the guard of the sea belonged to the high admiral, and to private adventurers also who fitted out vessels for the purpose. In the 7th and 9th Henry IV. the right of private merchants was also recognized. But there were other instances where the appropriation of those different funds, which went under the general name of Droits of Admiralty, were mentioned; and it would be found that wrecks at sea became one of the sources; and in the 2d institute, the reason of

*Droits of Admiralty.*

wreck being given to the crown, was stated to be, because the crown had to keep the narrow seas free from cruizers, the expense of which was to be defrayed by that fund.\*—*Parl. Debates*, vol. xxi. p. 245.

\* The resolutions moved by Mr. Brougham on this occasion, as they exhibit the legal and constitutional view of that gentleman, on this important subject, we shall here insert. It is unnecessary to say they were negatived by a large majority. The resolutions were as follow:—

“That the possession, by the crown, of funds raised otherwise than by the grant of supplies from the commons in parliament assembled, and applicable to purposes not previously ascertained by parliament, is contrary to the spirit of the constitution, liable to great abuses, and full of danger to the rights of the subject and the interests of the country.

“That it is the peculiar duty of the Commons House of Parliament to investigate the nature and foundation of all such funds as are pretended or asserted to be vested in the crown in the manner above-mentioned.

“That the funds arising from wreck, whether at sea or on shore, goods of pirates, prizes made before proclamation, prizes made by non-commissioned captors, vessels and cargoes detained in port before the commencement of hostilities, or forced into port by ignorance of war having taken place, or through stress of weather, and all other profits from the sea accruing to the king, either in right of his crown or in virtue of his office of Lord High Admiral, and pretended or asserted to belong to his Majesty as a separate property, over which parliament hath no control, have risen to such an amount during the last and present wars, as calls for the most serious consideration of this House.

“That it appears from the papers on the table of this House, that the net and clear proceeds of the aforesaid funds, which had accrued between the 1st day of February, 1793, and the 30th day of May, 1810, amounted to the sum of £7,334,679; and that in all probability it has since that time been considerably augmented.

“That these monies have been received by the crown at different times in large sums, and not in any regular proportion by the year; and that these sums have been at the disposal of the crown without any interference or control of parliament, though parliament had, during the whole course of that period, not only provided the supplies for the prosecution of the war, and raised the sum necessary for the internal administration of the country, but provided the supplies estimated to be necessary for the support of his Majesty's household and family, and the dignity of the crown, and paid large sums for defraying such debts as had arisen in those departments.

“That this House, taking these things into its consideration, will forthwith proceed to inquire into the most fit and efficacious means of bringing the aforesaid funds under the immediate control of parliament, for the purpose of applying the same to the public service, and of providing such additional sums, if any, as may appear to be necessary to the maintenance of the household, and of the honour and dignity of the crown.”

In a legal question, the authority of Mr. Brougham is of considerable importance; and from his statement, we may learn that the Admiralty Droits were originally granted to the King in his capacity of lord high admiral; and the specific objects for which they were granted, was the guardianship of the seas; so that the whole of this fund, according to law, ought to have been expended on the ships, officers, and men of the English navy. How differently it has been applied we have sufficiently shown; instead of being devoted to these national objects, it has been employed in discharging the arrears of the Civil List—advances to different branches of the Royal Family—paying tradesmen's bills—defraying the expense of visits from foreign princes—and, in general, in discharging any casual debt or expense which the caprice or extravagance of royalty might incur.

The management of this fund is not less singular than the objects on which it is expended. It is not paid into the Exchequer, like the taxes, but remains in the hands of the registrar of the high court of Admiralty, the receiver-general of Droits, the commissioners of prizes, and the Bank of England. There is no responsibility attaches to the persons receiving or issuing this money. No account is kept of the receipts and outgoings at the treasury. It is drawn out of the Bank of England, not on the authority of the privy seal, but of a warrant under the sign manual only. In short, it is a fund wholly out of the control of parliament; and it is entirely at the disposal of the minister of the crown: It may be expended on the hirelings of the press, in rewarding spies and informers, in purchasing votes of members of parliament, in bribery at elections, in minions or mistresses, or any other purpose of royal or ministerial corruption.

A fund performing so many important offices in the borough system, and which for the last 26 years has placed at the absolute disposal of ministers near £200,000 per annum, is not likely to be abandoned. It will be retained under the pretence of supporting the *splendour of the crown*, the maintenance of the *royal dignity*, or some other splendid illusion under which the people are daily plundered. For these important purposes every grant is inadequate; there is always a deficiency; and Bentham says, the "Droits of Admiralty are sent by Almighty Providence to feed, though never to fill up—for nothing can ever fill up—the deficiency. The persons, for the reward of whose merit more and more of that object is universally wanted—these persons join with one another, not only in commencing groundless war, but in commencing that war in a groundless manner,—in a manner in which the monarch may add millions to the conjunct splendour;—not only the foreigners, who then and for this purpose have been converted into

enemies, are plundered, but the men by whose hands the plunder is got in, deprived of that, which had the war been commenced otherwise than in the way of piracy, would have been their due. Thus do those on whom it depends, bribe one another to commit piracy!—*piracy which has been made legitimate, because by their power, and for their own benefit, it has been made unpunishable.*—Plan of Parliamentary Reform, p. xvii.

There is nothing more nauseous, than to hear men of sense sometimes talk about the *splendour and dignity of the crown*. Where is the necessity and utility of this royal ostentation? Is it intended to inspire the people with fear or respect for majesty? Men are widely different in a barbarous and civilized state. When they become enlightened, they value things in proportion to the benefit they confer; and they are neither filled with love nor fear by external appearances. It is the reality, and not the semblance, they worship. The mere profession of religion will not then protect from abhorrence its sanguinary, rapacious, and hypocritical ministers. The judges and magistrates of the land are subjected to the same ordeal. They are abhorred and despised when, instead of being the impartial ministers of justice, the protectors of the weak against the violence of the strong, a terror to evil-doers,—they are the mere tools of a corrupt and plundering system, the oracles of delusion, the revilers of the poor, who arm themselves with the terror of the law only to stifle the complaints of hunger and privation, and screen from punishment the lawless excess of opulence and power. Lastly, royalty itself is subject to a similar inquisition. Men compare the cost with the benefit. They consider the utility and the end of the office; and they reflect whether the name of King and Prince, without discharging any necessary duty in the commonweal, is a sufficient equivalent for withholding from 100,000 persons the means of comfortable subsistence.

The examination of the various sources of the royal income, has by no means tended to increase our respect for monarchy. The present family, since the accession of the King, cannot have received much less than 100 millions of principal money out of the pockets of the people. When we reflected on this enormous sum—and how much it had abstracted from the enjoyments of the community, we could not also help reflecting on the services and characters of the individuals by whom it had been wasted. Of the old King, of course, it was impossible to think any thing but good; for although his obstinacy lost America, he preserved Hanover; and although he incurred 400 millions of debt, and plunged one-fifth of the population into pauperism, he preserved to the community the blessed comforts of religion and social order, which they now enjoy.

For a king to discharge his duty to his people, it is hardly sufficient that he is neither passionately addicted to wine, nor women, nor gaming, and that he does not occasionally amuse himself with cutting off the heads of his subjects, like the Dey of Algiers. Betwixt private men, and those who fill important public stations, there is a wide difference. The former may live and die fools, and society has no right to complain, provided they observe the laws, and neither burden the parish nor their friends. But the condition of a king is widely different: he has no privilege to be a fool; he has important duties to perform, which it is incumbent upon him to discharge; he is elevated above the rest of mankind; he receives an enormous income: it is not sufficient that he is harmless and inoffensive; he ought to be actively beneficial. To judge of the benefits derived from the present King, it is sufficient to compare the state of the country when he ascended the throne, with the condition to which it was brought when his intellectual twilight subsided into total darkness. It may indeed be said, that the King has been a mere instrument in the hands of the boroughmongers; that he has been altogether passive, and had little or no share in producing the calamities under which the people now suffer. It is no great defence for any man to say, that he is an instrument in the hands of others, especially a mischievous instrument; but has it ever been proved, or even asserted, that the wishes or judgment of the King were in opposition to the pernicious policy of the last fifty years? It seems much more probable that he has been a willing leader, than a reluctant follower, of that system, whose leading principles are alike hostile to the civil and religious liberties of mankind. This supposition at least is warranted by the general character of the King. His intellectual endowments have always been supposed nearly on a par with those of the Yeomanry cavalry. His religion partook more of the bigoted intolerance of the fifteenth, than the liberality and indulgence of the nineteenth century. His whole reign has been the triumph of high tory principles; the maxims of his government being formed on the despotic principles of Lord Bute;—and whatever may be urged about the passiveness and inoffensiveness of his character, it cannot be denied, that he has always shown sufficient energy to choose, and obstinacy to persevere, in counsels which, events have proved, tended more to the misery than the welfare of his people.

Avarice too has always formed a prominent feature in the King's character: There can be little doubt his Majesty is the richest individual in Europe, perhaps in the whole world. His savings from the revenues of the ducty of Cornwall; the privy-purse, the Scotch fund, and the Leeward Island duties must be immense,—several millions at least. He is a great



---

*Droits of Admiralty.*

---

landholder and fundholder, and thus connected, by the ties of interest, with the two great branches of the system. Notwithstanding, however, this enormous private property, whenever his prodigal children had outlived their incomes, or even when there was any excess in the expenditure of his own Civil List, instead of this property been applied to meet these charges, the public was invariably called on for additional supplies.

The history of the different members of the royal family is too well known to require illustration. The notable scheme of the lottery Duke, and the filial affection of the presumptive heir to the crown, will not alter the impression previously formed by the public on the virtues of this family. The present conduct of the Regent seems entitled to some consideration. The crisis is important; and as we have said so much about the incomes of these great personages, it seems right we should say a few words about their duties. This too is proper at a moment, when some men seem at a loss whether to ascribe their sufferings to the Oligarchy or the Monarchy.

Some have imagined a resemblance betwixt the Regent and the Emperor Tiberius. Both certainly disappointed the expectations men had formed of their virtues and capacity before their accession to power. One lived secluded from the sight of his subjects at the island of Capri, and the other at Brighton. Women and wine formed the chief employment and amusement of both. Here, however, the parallel seems to end. There was considerable difference in the elements of the two characters, as well as in the degree in which these elements predominated. Profound dissimulation and wanton cruelty cannot justly be ascribed to the Regent, but these were the leading traits in the character of the licentious and sanguinary monster of antiquity. The claims, however, of his Royal Highness to the character of a manly, generous, and humane prince begin to appear rather equivocal. Where are we to look for the manly qualities of the Regent? In submitting to the guidance of such men as Castlereagh, Vansittart, and Sidmouth, with whose names is associated every thing that is despicable, and nothing that is great or honourable in human nature? Are we to look for his generosity in his ostentatious charity to the Spitalfield weavers, out of the property of English sailors? Are we to look for his humanity in his letters of thanks for the Manchester atrocities? To this, and every similar question, it is usually answered, it is the ministers, and not the Regent who is to blame. But who are we to blame for the employment of such characters? Who is to blame for the prevalence of such councils? Are these evils to be ascribed to the borough-mongers, or the Prince? To us it appears, notwithstanding the influence of the borough faction, that a

*Droits of Admiralty.*

patriotic and clever prince has sufficient power to govern the country conformable to his own inclinations, whenever those inclinations are favourable to the happiness and welfare of the people. Men are justly accountable for crimes it is in their power to prevent; and if the Regent, from indifference, the love of pleasure, or any other cause, suffer other men to ruin the country, and trample on its laws, it is rather too great an indulgence to royalty to exempt him from reprobation.

Having now given a full exposition of the Droits of Admiralty, we shall subjoin some official documents to confirm and illustrate our preceding statements. The following are taken, *verbatim*, from a parliamentary paper, intituled "Accounts relating to Droits of the Crown and Admiralty," and ordered to be printed on the 1st of June, 1818.

*A Summary Account of all Monies received as Droits of the Crown and Droits of the Admiralty; specifying the Nations from which they have arisen, and the general heads of Expenditure to which they have been applied, from the 1st February 1793 to the 18th March 1818, so far as the same have passed through the Registry of the High Court of Admiralty, and High Court of Appeals for Prizes.*

## RECEIPTS.

	£	s.	d.
Spanish Prizes . . . . .	1,687,291	9	1
Dutch . . . . .	736,602	6	4
Prussian . . . . .	246,598	8	1
Danish . . . . .			
Russian . . . . .			
Ottoman . . . . .			
Ragusan . . . . .	1,236,637	0	11
Tuscan . . . . .			
Roman . . . . .			
Ionian . . . . .			
American . . . . .	573,879	12	9
Droits of the King in his office of Admiralty, including sundry miscellaneous condemnations, not classed under any of the above national heads . . . . .	914,896	3	6
<b>Total paid in . . . . .</b>	<b>£ 5,395,935</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>

*Droits of Admiralty.*

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward . . . . .	5,398,968	0	0
Interest arisen by the Investment (by the Registrar) of the Droits Funds in Exchequer Bills . . . . .	278,766	4	8
Interest paid in by the American Commissioners . . . . .	18,000	0	0
Ditto by the Danish Commissioners . . . . .	191	5	0
Ditto by the Spanish Commissioners . . . . .	157	10	0
	<u>297,054</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>
	<u>£5,692,960</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>

## PAYMENTS.

	£	s.	d.
To Captors . . . . .	2,914,074	8	0
Indemnification to sundry Commanders of His Majesty's Ships for condemnations by a Court of Vice-Admiralty at Cape Nicola Mole, afterwards found not to have jurisdiction . . . . .	54,921	8	9
Messrs. Harrison and Litchfield, to enable them to satisfy Claims made on Captors for the American cases the Flora, Tapster, and Venus, which were placed in the hands of Messrs. Willis and Waterhouse, Captors' agents . . . . .	£32,848	0	6
Deduct dividends received from the Estate of Messrs. Willis and Waterhouse, under Assignments from the Claimants . . . . .	<u>13,413</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>
		<u>19,434</u>	<u>10</u>
John Crispin, Esq. as a Compensation for important Services rendered to the British fleet under Earl St. Vincent . . . . .	4,335	12	4
Marshal of the Admiralty . . . . .	46,975	7	10
Expenses of Repairs to Prizes, Charges at the Outports, Agents Expenses, &c. . . . .	32,456	8	9
Law Charges, including bills of costs of the King's Proctor, Admiralty Proctor, and others . . . . .	103,383	7	9
Registrar for Poundages on issues of money and other charges . . . . .	16,256	3	5
Receiver General of the Droits of the King, in his office of Admiralty . . . . .	318,688	11	9
Claimants, including Primage and other allowances to Masters . . . . .	272,071	6	5
The Exchequer: . . . . .			
In aid of the Civil List . . . . .	£1,199,000	0	0
In aid of the 4 per Cent Duties . . . . .	40,000	0	0
	<u>1,239,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
The Treasurer of the Navy . . . . .	150,000	0	0
The Treasurer of the Ordnance . . . . .	100,000	0	0

*Droits of Admiralty.*

	£	s.	d.
To the Receiver General of Customs, the Proceeds in the case of the			
Beaver .....	1,470	14	8
Different branches of the Royal Family.....	209,848	15	9
Buildings and Alterations at the Pavilion, Brighton, and for			
Furniture .....	58,560	10	1
Expenses in different departments of the Royal Household, oc-			
casioned by the visits of foreign Princes to England.....	14,579	2	4
The Prince Regent's Donation to the Poor in Spitalfields.....	5,000	0	0
Miscellaneous .....	5,398	19	0
	<b>£5,566,256</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>

*Note.*—The remaining balance is subject to various unsatisfied claims of captors and others.

Admiralty Registry, Doctors Commons, }  
19th March 1818. }

J. Farquhar, } Deputy Registrars.  
H. B. Swaby, }

*A Summary Account of all Monies received as Droits of the Crown and Droits of Admiralty; specifying the Nations from which they have arisen, and the General Heads of Expenditure to which they have been applied, from the 1st February, 1793, to the 10th February, 1818; so far as relates to the Receiver General of His Majesty's Rights and Perquisites of Admiralty.*

## RECEIPTS.

	£	s.	d.
Among the Droits received from the Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty, from G. Gostling, Esq. Admiralty Proctor, and from sundry other Persons.....	489,885	10	9
	<b>£489,885</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>

## PAYMENTS.

To Captors .....	120,066	3	11
Claimants .....	80,398	13	6½
Sundry Payments by Orders of the Lords of the Admiralty .....	16,585	17	8
Ditto by Orders of the Lords of Appeal .....	2,118	19	1
To the Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty, for Poundage, &c.	6,535	18	1
the Marshal of the Admiralty.....	1,598	10	7
Salaries paid to Officers.....	13,756	6	8
King's Proctors Bills .....	405	7	0
Admiralty Proctors Bills .....	24,880	12	8

*Droits of Admiralty.*

	£	s.	d.
Proctors Bills .....	888	11	10
Per Centage to Greenwich Hospital and Chest (deducting 62l. 8s. received) .....	5,755	12	8
To the Exchequer, in aid of the Civil List .....	125,000	0	0
the different Branches of the Royal Family (deducting repayment of 1000l.) .....	56,458	11	6
the Commissioners for the care and management of Portuguese Property .....	10,950	0	0
His Majesty's Physicians, for their attendance .....	16,679	10	0
Sir William Scott, for his Services in deciding upon Cases respecting American Vessels .....	932	1	6
Dr. Stoddart, for conducting Prize Causes at Malta .....	457	4	6
Ditto, for the use of Doctors of Law .....	1,500	0	0
A. Mulgrave, Esq. Superintendent of Telegraphic Establishment at Guernsey, in consequence of a severe wound .....	800	0	0
the Commissioners for settling Fees of the Vice Admiralty Courts	1,377	16	0
S. Hancock, Esq. for Expenses incurred in the Investigation of Matters connected with Prize Affairs and Prize Agency ....	3,071	19	11
Woodbine Parish, and J. Sedgwick, Esqrs. for their Services in examining the Accounts of the Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty .....	1,232	7	0
J. C. Esten, Esq. for business done in American Treaty Cases..	227	4	6
Sundry small Payments .....	18	3	0
	£491,670	11	7½

Whitehall, Treasury Chambers, }  
29th May 1818. }

C. ARBUTHNOT.

*An Account of the State of Droits arising to his Majesty, either in Right of his Crown, or as Droits and Perquisites in his Office of Admiralty; showing the Receipts and Payments in respect thereof, by the Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty, from the 14th February, 1817, to the 18th February, 1818, inclusive.*

	£	s.	d.
Balance 14th February, 1817 .....	179,457	8	5
Amount of monies received in the above period .....	46,008	2	7
	£225,465	11	0



*Droits of Admiralty.*

	£ s. d.
Paid into the Exchequer, being Monies recovered from Captors under Assignments made by Claimants under the American Treaty . . . . .	166 10 0
Balance, 18th February, 1818 . . . . .	146,129 12 8
	£225,465 11 0

*Note.* The Balance of £146,129 : 12 : 8 is subject to the Claims of various Captors for Rewards not yet determined on, and to other Contingencies chargeable on this Fund.

Admiralty Registry, Doctors Commons, } 18th February, 1818. }		James Farquhar, } Deputy H. B. Swabey, } Registrars.
--	--	---

*Account of Monies received as Droits of the Admiralty, and of the manner in which the same have been applied, from the 21st day of February, 1817, to the 10th day of February, 1818, by the Receiver General of His Majesty's Rights and Perquisites of Admiralty.*

## RECEIPTS.

		£ s. d.
1817.		
Mar. 8,	By Mr. Gostling . . . . .	600 0 0
May 27,	a Bill from the Treasury; Proceeds of Cargoes of Grain seized at the Island of Liassa . . . . .	1,712 9 0
	Order of the Treasury, received from the Registrar of the Admiralty . . . . .	13,743 18 11
June 14,	Interest on Exchequer Bills . . . . .	199 1 3
Nov. 6,	Exchequer Bills sold . . . . .	1,027 16 8
24,	Mr. Farquhar, Deputy Registrar of the Admiralty, Proceeds of sundry Droits . . . . .	2,469 10 1
Dec. 1,	Custom House at Cardigan, Balance of Brandy sold Captain W. Smith, of Ship Atlas, for Cask of Oil picked up in the Mediterranean . . . . .	1 7 6
		£19,781 10 11

## DISBURSEMENTS.

		£ s. d.
1817.		
Feb. 24,	To G. Gostling, Esq. his Bills for year 1815, Admiralty Warrant, dated 21st . . . . .	274 17 1
Mar. 1,	Charles Bicknell, Esq. Half a year's Salary . . . . .	100 0 0
	Sir C. C. de Crespiigny, and Clerk, for ditto . . . . .	175 0 0

*Droits of Admiralty.*

		£	s.	d.
April 2,	George Gostling, Esq. his Bill . . . . .	71	5	7
18,	Mr. Robert Ross, part of Proceeds of Ship Rambler, King's Warrant, dated 22d June, 1816 . . . . .	200	0	0
26,	Lord H. C. Somerset and W. L. Brickwood, Esq. Salvage of the Recapture of Ship Mary, H. M. Warrant, dated 11th March . . . . .	369	15	6
May 2,	Captain Collie, part of the Proceeds of Ship Maria, H. M. Warrant, dated 18th April . . . . .	300	0	0
22,	Crew of the Boadicea, moiety of Cargo of Ship Ranger, H. M. Warrant, dated 30th April . . . . .	800	4	2
June 27,	Registrar of Admiralty's Poundage of Valentine and Montecello . . . . .	121	10	12
30,	King's Proctor's Bill in ditto . . . . .	9	1	10
July 1,	Messrs. Maude, Agents to S. Minden, Esq. Proceeds of Valentine, by order of Treasury . . . . .	5,962	4	8
	Messrs. Ommanney and Druce, Agents to Ship Race- horse, Proceeds of Montecello, by ditto . . . . .	7,775	8	9
Sept. 18,	the Crew of the Atalanta, Proceeds of the Prize Ocean, H. M. Warrant dated July 11 . . . . .	400	0	0
24,	Mr. Gostling, 2 bills . . . . .	55	17	7
	Mr. Bicknell, Half-year's Salary, to 1st inst. . . . .	100	0	0
	Sir C. C. de Crespigny, ditto, for himself and Clerk. G. Gostling, Esq. his Bills for year 1816, Admiralty warrant . . . . .	175	0	0
	Lord Arden, Amount of Fees due to him, from 1st January, 1793, to 12th December, 1810, Admiral- ty Warrant, dated 16th July, 1816 . . . . .	1,644	6	1
	Mr. Farquhar, Deputy Registrar of the Admiralty, Fees on sundry Droits . . . . .	23	18	7
	150 days Salary, from 1st September, 1817, to the 28th January, 1818, the day of the decease of Sir C. C. de Crespigny, at the rate of £350 per annum	143	16	8
		<u>£20,113 13 4</u>		

*Note.*—By the account of Sir W. de Crespigny, Executor of Sir C. C. de Crespigny, passed the 20th April, 1818, the Balance was then £6466:11:4, and £4000 in Exchequer Bills.

Taken from the Accounts passed by the late Receiver General and his Executor, since his decease.

Lincoln's-Inn, 28th May, 1818.

G. F. Hampson.



*Droits of Admiralty.*

*An Account of Monies Received as Droits of the Crown and Droits of the Admiralty; and of the Manner in which the same have been applied from the 21st day of February, 1817.*

	RECEIPTS.			PAYMENTS.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
By the Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty	46,008	2	7	79,335	18	4
Deduct the sum paid to the Receiver General of Droits, the same being included in this Account - - - - -	16,213	9	0	16,213	9	0
	<hr/>			<hr/>		
	29,794	13	7	63,122	9	4
By the Receiver General of His Majesty's Rights and Perquisites of Admiralty - - - - -	19,781	10	11	20,113	13	4
By the Commissioners for the care and disposal of Dutch Droits - - - - -						
Ditto                      Spanish Droits - - - - -				Nil.		Nil.
Ditto                      Danish and other Droits						
Ditto                      Prussian Droits - - - - -						
Ditto                      American Droits - - - - -						
	<hr/>			<hr/>		
	£49,576	4	6	83,236	2	8
	<hr/>			<hr/>		

*Note.*—The difference between the amount of Payments and Receipts arises from the Balances existing at the commencement of the Accounts, and from the Interest of Exchequer Bills, in which those Balances have from time to time been invested.

Whitehall, Treasury Chambers, }  
    29th May, 1818.                 }

C. ARBUTHNOT.

---



---

## EXPENSE

OF THE

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

---

LAW is an excellent thing, when cheaply, impartially, and speedily administered; and its professors too are excellent men, when they act independently of all sinister influence: neither intimidated by power, misled by ambition, nor swerved from the honest discharge of their functions by the love of gain. The Judges are almost without excuse when they fail to discharge their duties conscientiously and independently: they are dependent on no superior authority: they hold their situations during their lives, unless guilty of some flagrant outrage; it is only, therefore, the paltry hope of preferment, and not the danger of losing their present honours, that in any case can bias their decisions. Hitherto the people have had full confidence in their wisdom and integrity, unless when the interests of government were involved; but lately there has been witnessed such extraordinary scenes, that the people must now begin to despise them, not only for their ignorance, but their slavish devotion to the existing authorities. We of course allude to what has taken place since the Proclamation of the Prince Regent. It does not belong to our publication to discuss the politics of the day; but we may properly notice the *effect* proceeding from these abuses in our legal system, which it is the object of this article to investigate. To show the entire subserviency of the judicial authorities to the Crown, we shall first insert an extract from the Prince Regent's Proclamation, and then some curious passages from the addresses of the Judges to the Grand Juries.

“ And we do urge and command all sheriffs, justices of the peace, chief magistrates of cities, boroughs, and corporations, and all other magistrates throughout Great Britain, that they do, within their respective jurisdictions, make diligent *inquiry*, and bring to justice the author and printer of such wicked and seditious writings as aforesaid, and all who shall circulate the same; and that they do use their best endeavours to bring

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

to justice all persons who have been or may be guilty of uttering *seditions speeches and harangues*, and all persons connected in any *riots or unlawful assemblies*; which, on whatsoever pretext they may be grounded, are not only contrary to law, but dangerous to the most important interests in the kingdom."—*Prince Regent's Proclamation, July 30th.*

This was blowing the conch of war. No sooner was the ministerial bulletin issued, than it was re-echoed back from the grand juries, the judges, the magisterial, and all the judicial authorities in the kingdom. Some, in their zeal not to come short of the spirit and tenour of the proclamation, immediately began to sabre the people; others, equally zealous, expatiated on the indescribable blessings of debt and taxation; representing them as having supplied the rich with their capital, and the poor with all their comforts and enjoyments; and, altogether, there was exhibited such a mass of absurdity, sheer ignorance, and servility, that it is impossible but the people should now despise and mistrust those, whom heretofore they had looked upon with a considerable portion of respect and confidence. If they have fallen in the estimation of the people, as they unquestionably have, the fault is clearly their own, in openly appearing to the eye of the most stupid observer, the devoted advocates of the present plundering and deluding system. That the public may have a just estimate of the characters of those appointed to administer the laws, we shall now insert a few extracts from the addresses of the Judges to the Grand Juries in different counties, and also from the addresses of the Grand Juries: they will afford a memorable record of their ignorance and servility.

"It was a favourite opinion with many that *taxation* was the cause of all the distress experienced in any part of the country; but if it could be shown that the lower classes derived their *employment and comforts from taxation*, it could not be fairly alleged they were produced by taxation. It was undeniable that the prosperity of the country had increased in exact correspondence with the increase in the national debt. About forty millions annually were, by means of the national debt and taxation, circulated through the country, affording capital for great undertakings, creating credit and confidence, and diffusing among all classes industry and wealth."—*Mr. Justice Bailey's Address to the Grand Jury at York.*

"GENTLEMEN OF THE GRAND JURY.—I feel that I should be unfit for the dignified situation I hold, if I did not address you upon a subject which almost solely engages the public attention, and greatly agitates the entire country. I allude to those measures which have recently called forth from his royal highness the Prince Regent a proclamation in consequence of numerous bodies of people having met together, under the *specious pretexts of obtaining what they call a radical reform* in the

houses of parliament, but which, in reality, is neither more nor less than an intention of pulling down the ancient institutions of the country, and wresting from us our only glorious security,—the constitution as established by our forefathers. By numbers, I have said, and not by talents or respectability, have meetings of the most seditious nature been held throughout the country, where, by the most artful addresses, the misguided have been inflamed into the reception and dissemination of the most dangerous doctrines; the principle of which seems to be, that the mass of the people are not duly represented in the great houses of the nation, and that in fact the members of the legislature have sold, or are daily selling the birth-rights and privileges of the people for their own private interest or some other base purpose.”—*Mr. Justice Garrow to the Grand Jury of Surrey.*

“We, the Grand Jury of the county palatine of Chester, at the assize holden at Chester, on the 1st day of September, 1819, feel it incumbent at this time to declare our indignation at the machinations of artful and itinerant demagogues, who disseminate papers of the most dangerous and seditious tendency at public meetings; with freedom in their mouths, and fraud and plunder in their hearts, employ the most inflammatory language; insidiously inculcate, under the specious veil of reform, hatred and contempt of our constitution; and instigate the ignorant and unwary even to physical force (that is violence and open arms) for the enforcement of their visionary claims, at once useless to themselves, destructive of the rights and property of their fellow subjects, and involving the whole country in one general ruin.”—*Address of the Grand Jury of Chester.*

“Gentlemen,—I am fearful they are grasping at something beyond their professions, that they are spreading abroad the pernicious principle that the PROPERTY OF THE EARTH inhabitants of the country ought to be divided amongst its entire population. Such are the Utopian schemes they wish to propose to their followers; but, thank heaven, it has always been the boast of England, that what has been gained by honest industry, every man should quietly enjoy and transmit to his children.”—*Chester Assizes; Attorney General's Address on a Trial for Riot at Mucclesfield.*

These are the precious fruits of the Regent's proclamation. The first observation that must occur to every one, is the connexion betwixt a mere proclamation of ministers, and the duties of the judges, magistrates, and grand juries of the country. We may suppose that these gentlemen had already been discharging their duties according to law; what new powers could they derive from the manifesto of Sidmouth and Castlereagh? This document could not make that a crime which was not crime before; it could create no new law, nor give any new power to the judicial authorities. If the meetings of the people were lawful and peaceable, it could not render them unlawful and riotous; if the productions of the press were neither libellous nor seditious, they could not be rendered such by any ministerial dictum. What new powers then were given by this proclama-

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

tion? What connexion was there betwixt this proclamation and the administration of justice? Why should the magistrates and judges, in consequence of this ministerial edict, all at once alter their proceedings both towards the public press, and the people? Their duties and powers were already prescribed by the law of the land; and neither the authority of the R<sup>egent</sup> nor his ministers could alter them. But what was still more illegal and unconstitutional, the judges of the land—men holding their situation for life, solely that they may be independent of the Crown—making a royal proclamation the foundation for their proceedings in a court of justice, and of their advice and directions to the grand juries of the counties.

Let us now examine the speeches of the Judges more in detail. We shall not enter into any verbal analysis of the passages we have extracted, but merely endeavour to show their general principle and tendency. To the reader it must be clear, that the object of all the speakers was first to render the people of this country contented under the present iniquitous system, by convincing them it was better than any thing which could be substituted in its place; and secondly, to alarm the middling classes by inculcating the belief, that *reform* was a *mere pretext*—that the people ultimately designed the overthrow of the monarchy; the subversion of property; the entire dismemberment of the social fabric; and, in fact, a renewal of all the chimerical projects and unfortunate excesses which tarnished the glories, and partly frustrated the objects of the French revolution. The last is the great object of all the hirelings of the press, and the adherents of abuse: they labour incessantly to alarm the rich, the timid, and the imbecile classes of the community; the Reformers ought to be indefatigable in their efforts to circumvent their base artifices, to refute their never-ceasing calumnies, and show the whole world that they seek to establish no *new form of government*, nor the violation of the rights and property of any class of individuals.

Of Bailey's speech it is unnecessary to say much. It affords the most memorable instance of either judicial ignorance or base servility on record. What! taxation not the cause of the distresses of the people! Why, what then, Mr. Bailey, is the cause of their privations? Is it the want of industry, ingenuity, a fine soil, or favourable seasons? Nay, the learned Judge represents the burdens of the people as one great source of their comforts and prosperity. Will the trading and farming classes, or even country gentlemen, adopt this monstrous paradox? Will they believe that the payment of one-third of their incomes for the maintenance of placemen and pensioners, and to discharge the interest of the borough debt, is the means by which capital and employment are created, and the comforts of the working classes

increased? Will they believe, that the withdrawing of capital from the industrious and enterprising classes of the community to be lavished on idle and unproductive consumers, is the great secret of the wealth of nations? What confidence, what respect must the people feel towards a Judge, who, to reconcile the community to a remorseless system of taxation, should become the voluntary mouth-piece of such monstrous, false, and ridiculous doctrines?\*

Mr. Justice Garrow asserts that reform is a *mere pretext*, and the object is to *pull down the ancient institutions of the country*. We say, no such thing. The object of the people is not to pull down, but to build up. They seek no *new form of government*, but the restoration of the old to its original purity. Why should they wish, why should they seek more? Would not that alone accomplish every thing needful for national happiness and prosperity? Would it not, by economy and retrenchment, immediately cause an enormous reduction in the public burdens? Would it not render an immense *standing army* wholly unnecessary, by conciliating the minds of all classes of people? Would it not extinguish every remnant of religious persecutions, and give a full toleration to all sects and denominations? Would it not reform the whole system of criminal and civil jurisprudence; root out the abuses of public charities; and secure every class of the community against oppressive and partial laws? These are the only objects contemplated by the Reformers. What more is necessary to stimulate their exertions? If reform could produce no good; if the want of it had entailed no calamity on the country; then, indeed, their professions might be suspected and calumniated: but when it is clear that every evil has originated, and every abuse is perpetuated and upheld, solely from our corrupt and inadequate representation, that is quite sufficient to account for the exertions of Reformers. Their resolutions, their speeches, and their writings avow no other object, and the best pledge of their sincerity is, that nothing more is needful to restore them to their rights and alleviate their unparalleled sufferings.

Oh! but, says another limb of the law, "they wish to *divide the property of the rich*; beware of them; they are designing and artful villains; they want no reform; it is a mere pretext; they want your estates, to deprive

\* These notions of the Judge are not absolutely new; for Sir Robert Peel, the Lancashire cotton manufacturer, some forty years ago, attempted to establish similar positions in a pamphlet, intituled "*The National Debt productive of National Prosperity*." Bigots are to be found in all sciences and professions as well as in religion.

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

your children of their rightful inheritance.”—Base and atrocious calumnies. What authority had this tool of corruption for his cowardly aspersions? Was there no counsel honest and independent enough to retort in the teeth of this calumniator, that it was not the poor—the Reformers—the people of England, who sought to plunder the rich; but he and his employers, who plundered alike the poor and the rich. But we forgive the Attorney-general of Chester; he receives £1200 a year out of the public money, and like the rest of the servants of the people, he repays them in falsehood and abuse.

Stupid as these calumnies are, they form the great lever by which the agents of corruption act on the fears of the middling classes; and no doubt they have succeeded in persuading a considerable number that reform really is a mere pretext, and that its professors ultimately intend to proceed on the levelling system. Nothing can possibly be more false and ridiculous. We are persuaded no class of Reformers entertain any such ridiculous projects. They are fully persuaded, that in every stage of society, the pastoral, the agricultural, and the commercial, there must always be inequalities in men's possessions, resulting from diversities in talent and industry. This is the natural course of things, which no person would wish to see disturbed. Greater industry and talents will naturally accumulate a larger proportion of the wealth of the community; and negligence and indolence a smaller proportion. Of this no Reformer complains; but he complains, and justly too, when he sees the indigent classes struggling under the most intolerable privations, and almost exclusively contributing to the exigencies of the state.

The Manchester atrocities have brought things to a rather unexpected crisis. The decision of the Grand Jury at Lancaster—the proceedings at the Oldham Inquest—the thanks of Ministers—the attack on the liberty of the press, on the authority of Lord Sidmouth's circular—the connivance of the Whigs—the silence of the Judges, and all the legal authorities in the kingdom—show clearly, that the law and constitution are empty names; useful to enslave, but not to protect the people. Heretofore the property of the Reformers alone has been a prey to lawless taxation; but now their lives are at the mercy of legal assassins. Ought they to submit to this double outrage? Have they no means of redress? We say, none—from their oppressors. Would they petition their Sovereign? The *Police Lieutenant* would laugh them to scorn. Would they petition their *Mock Representatives*? Still more foolish. The Grand Juries capriciously reject their indictments;—from a magistrate they cannot obtain a warrant; and to complete the catalogue of their injuries, the bodies of their murdered countrymen are interred, and the cause of their death uninvestigated. Surely in England the people

have some means of redress. They have, but clearly not from the laws; but from themselves. We will shortly explain ourselves on this point, and then we will proceed in our exposition of legal abuses; though it is impossible we should expose a greater abuse in our laws, than that which suffers MURDER to be perpetrated in open day with impunity.

A sort of fiscal civil war has already commenced in Lancashire. The people of that brave county have already determined to abstain from the consumption of all heavily taxed commodities. This noble resolution, when it becomes general among the Reformers, will be a vital blow on the system; it would cut off a sum from the revenue far greater than the amount of the Income Tax. This will appear more clear from the following statement of the annual amount of taxes on different articles of consumption:—

British and Foreign Spirits - - - - -	£5,500,000
Beer, including duty on Malt and Hop - - - - -	6,000,000
Leather - - - - -	2,000,000
Wine - - - - -	2,000,000
Tobacco and Snuff - - - - -	2,000,000
Tea - - - - -	3,300,000
Sugar - - - - -	2,250,000
Salt - - - - -	1,500,000
	£24,750,000

From the population returns of 1811, it appears, that the working classes form at least three-fourths of the whole community; so that it is certainly not too much to suppose they consume at least one-half the amount of these commodities; on which they pay annually about *twelve millions* of taxes. Nearly the whole of this sum might and ought to be withheld from the grasp of the *Boroughmongers*. There is, however, another blow, which, combined with this, will render the whole ten times more effective. The Reformers being placed entirely out of the protection of the law and constitution, it is right that they should not only think of defending themselves, but also of attacking their enemies effectively, and in a way the least injurious to themselves.

Every one must have remarked, that there is a very numerous class of shopkeepers and others, almost wholly dependent upon the people for subsistence, and who, partly from fear, partly from indifference, and partly from baser motives, take very little share in their proceedings. These men ought immediately to be put in a state of activity. Neutrality has now become a crime; and no person can discharge his duty to society who remains a silent



*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

spectator of the atrocious scenes now transacting. The way in which these persons are to be operated upon is by rigorously abstaining from purchasing the most trifling commodity of those who are opposed to RADICAL REFORM, or of those who refuse to support any measures likely to accomplish that desirable object. By this means the Reformers would not only support and encourage those who are friendly to the public cause, but inflict a just punishment on its enemies, who have long acted on the principle here recommended.

Besides the defalcation in the revenue, the non-consumption of tea, beer, and sugar would embarrass many classes of tradesmen, as the grocers and brewers, a great part of whom have manifested a most culpable indifference to the sufferings of the people. But this is nothing compared to the total revulsion and embarrassment resulting from the Reformers not purchasing a single commodity of any but their friends. The whole social fabric rests upon the labouring classes; and we are persuaded they are not half acquainted with the extent of their power and influence, and the means they possess of exerting them in spite of every effort of their enemies. Since the Manchester Massacre we have reflected on the different classes into which society is divided, their incomes, and mutual dependence. Turning to COLQUHOUN'S "Treatise on the Resources of the British Empire;" we found a full exposition of this subject. We there found an estimate of the number and income of all the different classes into which society is divided. From the data there exhibited, we have drawn up a statement which will at once afford a complete view of this subject. This statement we will insert: it will show the sums annually expended by the working classes, and also the number of those classes who are dependent upon that expenditure for support; consequently, their own power, influence, and importance in the Community.

**A GENERAL VIEW OF THE DIFFERENT CLASSES OF SOCIETY, AND THEIR RESPECTIVE INCOMES.**

DESCRIPTION OF PERSONS.	Number of Persons, Total Income including their Families & Domestic.	of each Class.
<b>NOBILITY AND GENTRY:—Peers, Baronets, Knights, Country Gentlemen, and others, having large incomes</b>	416,535	£ 58,422,590

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

<b>CLERGY</b> :—Eminent Clergymen .....	9,000	£1,080,000
Lesser Ditto .....	87,000	3,500,000
Dissenting Clergy, including Itinerant Preachers.....	20,000	500,000
<b>STATE AND REVENUE</b> , including all Persons employed under Government .....	114,500	6,830,000
<b>LAW</b> :—Judges, Barristers, Attorneys, Clerks, &c.	95,000	7,600,000
<b>PHYSIC</b> :—Physicians, Surgeons, Apothecaries, &c.	90,000	5,400,000
<b>AGRICULTURE</b> :—Freeholders of the better sort....	385,000	19,250,000
Lesser Freeholders .....	1,050,000	21,000,000
Farmers.....	1,540,000	33,600,000
<b>TRADE</b> :—Eminent Merchants .....	35,000	9,100,000
Shopkeepers, and Tradesmen retailing goods .....	700,000	28,000,000
Innkeepers and Publicans, licensed to sell ale, beer, and spirituous liquors.....	437,000	8,750,000
<b>WORKING CLASSES</b> :—Agricultural labourers, Me- chanics, Artizans, Handicrafts, and all La- bourers employed in Manufactures, Mines, and Minerals.....	7,497,531	82,451,547

Here then the subject is clearly exposed ;—we see now how matters really stand, and who are the *pillars of the state*. We see the total number and income of each class ; consequently, their relative power, dependence, and importance in the community. The facts too are unquestionable ; it cannot be said they are founded on the exaggerated data of some Jacobin, drawn up for Jacobinical purposes ; they are the data of PATRICK COLQUHOUN, Receiver of the Thames Police Office, a most loyal man, and who, partly for his loyalty, receives out of the public purse more than £6000 per annum.

The inferences to be drawn from the above statement are many and important, and we shall enumerate them in order.

1. Peers, baronets, knights, country gentlemen, and persons of that description, including their families, amount to more than 400,000, and their total income to more than 58 millions, which is exactly £145 a year to each individual. The working classes, including their families, amount to seven millions and a half, and their total income to 82 millions, which is about £10 a year for each individual. These two classes, speaking after the

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

manner of ignorant and insolent men, form the *highest* and *lowest* orders—the two extremes of society; and, therefore, the most proper for contrast. We shall make no invidious comparison of their relative utility and importance;—we shall ask no questions whether a husbandman and a journeyman-shoemaker do not render more important services to the state than the Duke of Northumberland and the Duke of Devonshire;—we shall make no comparison of their vices and virtues, nor of their ignorance and knowledge, we shall merely put down the important fact, that those who neither cut wood nor draw water, who in short do nothing, receive, annually, fourteen times more than those who do every thing.\*

2. Eminent clergymen, including the bishops and dignified clergy, amount to nine thousand, and their total income to one million and eighty thousand pounds, which is exactly £120 a year for each man, woman, and child belonging to that profession. The dissenting clergy, including itinerant preachers, amount to 20 thousand, their total income to £500,000, which is exactly £25 a year each. In Ireland there are four catholics to one protestant; in England there are four dissenters to one member of the established church. The dissenting clergy have four times the number of followers which belong to the established church; in short, they do all the work of religion; they pray and preach incessantly, daily, nightly, week days, and Sundays: and, most assuredly, if we are to be saved by such things, it is to them we shall be indebted for salvation. The eminent clergymen do nothing; some of them have never preached a sermon, nor put up a prayer of their own composing in their lives; others preach once a year a sermon, stolen or garbled from the dissenters: in short, they do nothing they were appointed to do; they neither pray, nor fast, nor preach; their lives are spent in eating, and drinking, and sleeping, and in things far worse than these. Now, we respectfully ask the methodist preachers and dissenting clergy whether such a state of things ought to be supported? We respectfully ask them whether it is right or reasonable, or has either God or man intended it to be, that they themselves, who are incessantly labouring in the vineyard, should live in poverty, contempt, and obscurity, while those who are the mere lookers-on, the mere whited sepulchres, enjoy all the honours and emoluments of the priesthood?

\* Since Mr. Colquhoun published his work, in 1814, the price of labour has fallen at least *one-third*; so that £7 instead of £10 is now the average income of each individual of the *lower orders*; this makes the proportion betwixt the income of the *useless* and *useful* classes as twenty to one.

3. More than 100,000 persons employed in the collection and management of the revenue receive six millions a year; this revenue is principally appropriated to pay the interest of the borough debt and support the boroughmongers; it is clear, therefore, that, were there neither debt nor boroughmongers, 100,000 persons would be at liberty to till the ground or sweep the streets, and six millions of money remain in the pockets of the people to buy bread and cheese.

4. In law and physic there are 184,000 persons receiving 13 millions annually, which is £70 a year for each individual. We have put these two professions together, because there is betwixt them several points of resemblance:—*first*, they are the most lucrative professions in society;—*secondly*, in both there is a great deal of ignorance, mis-called learning, and of quackery and imposition;—*lastly*, both these professions have originated, and partly rendered necessary from similar causes, one from the moral and the other from the physical diseases of mankind.

5. The working classes may be compared to the soil, out of which every thing is evolved and produced; the other classes to the plants, trees, tares, weeds, and vegetables, drawing all their nutriment, nourished, supported, and maintained on its surface.

6. Leaving out of consideration physic, law, religion, and the useless, or at most ornamental parts of society, let us attend particularly to the numbers and incomes of the following orders:

Lesser Freeholders .....	1,050,6 <sup>0</sup>	£ 21,000,000
Farmers .....	1,540,000	38,600,000
Shopkeepers .....	700,000	28,000,000
Innkeepers and Publicans .....	437,000	8,750,000
WORKING CLASSES .....	7,497,531	82,451,547

Here is the solid substratum on which the whole community rests. When mankind attain a state of perfectibility; when vice, crime, and ignorance are banished from the world; when we require no physic to cure our diseases, no laws to punish our crimes, nor the terrors of religion to deter us from evil; these will be the only classes in existence. They are the only classes which ought to exist in a perfect state. The other classes have originated in our vices and ignorance. As mankind become more perfect, or which is the same thing, as knowledge is more extensively diffused, then will the honorary, legal, and medicinal classes disappear: having no employment their name and office will cease in the social state.

Having compared the really necessary and useful classes, which, it appears to us, must always exist, with the mere frothy, ornamental, and evanescent classes, let us now consider these classes in respect of each other; which will bring us to our main point.

The lesser freeholders, farmers, shopkeepers, innkeepers, and working classes, are as much dependent upon, and as necessary to each other as the mind is to the body, as oil is to the movement of a machine, or as money is for facilitating commercial exchanges. Their interests in all cases are exactly the same, and are generally opposed to the interest of other classes. This is the real case; but ignorance and a short-sighted avarice have caused them, instead of acting in concert, to be in almost constant opposition. To be more plain, while the labouring classes have been contending against the abuses of government; the trading classes have either been arrayed against them, or maintained a criminal neutrality. A crisis has occurred which renders this state no longer tolerable. The outrageous violation of the laws at Manchester—the thanks of the executive for that violation, the attack upon the press—have unmasked the horrid design of subverting entirely the remaining liberties of the people. It is now clear that every remnant of liberty is to be trampled down by open force, and a military despotism established. It is now clear that corruption is alarmed; that the plundering system cannot stand against the knowledge of the people—against free discussion, and these are to be stifled by the bayonet. It is now clear that England, the queen of the world, proudly peering above all the nations of the earth in liberty, knowledge, virtue, humanity, and valour too—it is now clear that this England is to be no better than Turkey or Algiers. Is not this enough to wake the dead? Is not this a time when men ought to buckle on their armour? Ought we, in the nineteenth century, when Germany, when even Spain is bursting her fetters, to stand tamely by, and see England retrograde; see the land which for ages has been the beacon of all the world; the land which contains the ashes of Sidney and Hampden; the land which boasts of a Magna Charta and a Bill of Rights; ought we to stand tamely by, and see these trampled down, and England plunged into eastern darkness and chains? And by whom is she to be undone? by whom are her proud bulwarks, cemented with her best and bravest blood to be demolished? By Sidmouth, Canning, and Castlereagh,—by a fanatic, a buffoon, and—oh God! what shall we term him?—ask Mr. Finnerty. It cannot be; the very graves would open; our dead ancestors would burst from their cerements, to blast their cowardly, degenerate, stupid posterity.

It is clear, however, that this is the Machiavelian design, and whether it will succeed, and England be rendered no better than Spain now is, or France was before the Revolution, must depend upon the people. The labouring classes have done their duty manfully, and the other classes must be *compelled* to do theirs. We said *compelled*, we ask pardon for the word; we are for no compulsion; it is right, however, that they should come forward. A frightful crime has been perpetrated; the laws shamefully outraged; property violated; murder committed; and the labouring classes are the great sufferers. Is it not right then that they should seek redress? Is it not reasonable that they should exert all the influence and power they possess to obtain justice? Is it to be borne that these classes, immediately dependent upon them for their daily bread should almost, on every occasion, either openly oppose them or what is equally criminal, countenance their enemies by their silence? This is not just. Let us see then how this ingratitude and folly can be punished.

The total income of the Working Classes is eighty-two millions a year; which is far greater than the total income of all the nobility, gentry, and opulent classes put together. This enormous sum is first paid away to the innkeepers and shopkeepers; these again, after deducting their profit, pay it to the farmer and freeholder; and from thence, after a certain portion is deducted, it at last ascends to the great and mighty *higher orders*. This is the mode it circulates through the community. Now, betwixt the farmers and working people, there is no immediate point of contact; the connecting link betwixt them is the shopkeeper. It is not, therefore, on the farmer, but the retailer that the people can directly act. It is quite clear, however, that any impulse of the nature to which we allude, impressed upon the shopkeeper, must be immediately communicated to the farmer; from the farmer to the landlord, and from the landlord to the gods in the supernal sphere: so that the first impression will vibrate through the whole chain of society.

The application is the easiest thing imaginable. The Working Classes are the first receivers of a great part of the annual income of the country, of which they have the distribution. Ought they to make no distinction in this distribution? Ought they to make no distinction betwixt those who tamely acquiesce in a flagrant violation of the law; and those who come manfully forward to vindicate their rights, their liberties, and the happiness and glory of England?

Now for a practical example. For this purpose we shall take ourselves, and point out the plan we intend to pursue. We are **RADICAL REFORMERS,**

To us it appears clear, that a system of military violence is about to be established, which it is our duty, in every possible way, both for the sake of ourselves and our children, to resist. To us it appears, that a number of persons do not discharge their duty as good citizens in the present crisis. We consider it, therefore, incumbent upon us to inquire what are the opinions of our baker, butcher, publican, and tailor, upon the following points:—First, what is their opinion upon the Manchester Massacre, the thanks of the Regent, and the attempt to fetter the press? Do they not manifest clearly a design to trample on the laws, and establish a Military Despotism? Do they think that any thing can save the country, but a radical change in the constitution of the House of Commons? And are they not willing to come forward, and make every reasonable sacrifice to obtain that desirable object? Now, if they are not quite clear, if they do not answer affirmatively to all these points, we shall consider them either fools or knaves: they shall not have a farthing of our money; we will not support such men; we will sooner travel twenty miles to find out an honest Reformer, who loves liberty to his heart's core, who sympathises with the unparalleled sufferings of the people, and who is not only indignant, but determined to exert his utmost influence to bring to condign punishment the perpetrators of the bloody outrage in St. Peter's Field.

Here are the Publicans too. These men are wholly dependent upon—they are literally fed and clothed by the Reformers. What is their conduct? On every public occasion they enrol themselves as special constables, and, like well-trained mastiffs, are ready to howl at or bite whatever the magistrate chooses to direct. We do not blame them for offering to preserve the peace when it is really endangered. The Reformers wish, as it is undoubtedly their greatest interest, to preserve the peace. It is by *holding to the laws*, and by their opponents violating them, that has caused reform to roll on like an *avalanche*. But we blame the Publicans for their blind subserviency to the magistracy; for the alacrity with which, on all occasions, they oppose the people, without ever reflecting whether the object for which the Reformers are contending is lawful, or whether their own interests are identified with its attainment.

We cannot better illustrate the conduct of Publicans generally, and show the manner in which they ought to be treated, than by relating an anecdote of what happened at Oldham, in Lancashire, on the fatal 16th of August. Previously to the meeting, the innkeepers were all sworn in as special constables; and with the Yeomanry of the town, were intended to keep in due order and subjection the "*turbulent Reformers*" of that place. When the

Reformers, who had escaped from the butchery in St. Peter's Place, returned, they found these truncheon heroes drawn up in *military array* ready to receive them, and by whom they were accosted, with a smile of evident satisfaction on their bloated countenances, "*How are ye, lads; are ye satisfied?*" When any of the survivors of the massacre, whose horror-stricken countenances formed a singular contrast to the countenances of these sleek-faced boobies, happened to stop with a friend to relate the bloody scene he had witnessed, he was immediately saluted with the truncheons of these grateful beings. This made the men of Oldham reflect. They considered how they fed and clothed these men by whom they were barbarously taunted and maltreated. From that time they determined not to drink too much of their adulterated beer; and the wakes following immediately, they purchased malt, brewed it at a private house; made themselves merry with their wives and children; punished the boroughmongers by withholding from them the excise; and were neither liable to be turned out by the innkeeper, nor interrupted by the unwelcome visits of the myrmidons of the Police.

This was exactly as it should be. It was a hit in the right place. It was not *brute force*; it was an intellectual blow; and, no doubt, has convinced the innkeepers of Oldham to whom they owe allegiance.

To render the plan we recommend effectual, it must not be merely talked about, it must be instantly and universally adopted. There is no occasion for any combination or concert; every individual must act as if the whole depended upon himself. He must inquire who is friendly to reform? If there be no retail trader in any village or town who is a Reformer, one must be set up without delay, and supported and encouraged. The Quakers do these things daily. They never purchase a single article but of persons of their own persuasion. Whenever they begin business, they invariably thrive and get rich; and solely from this fraternal principle of doing good to themselves alone.

The plan must infallibly succeed. Either the retailer and licensed victualler must be induced to join heartily and openly the public cause; or it must cause an entire revolution in property. If they still hold back, they must infallibly become bankrupt; a new class of tradesmen will be created, who, owing their origin to the people, must be entirely devoted to their cause. We have seen that their numbers are very considerable, amounting to more than a million; but it is not so much on that account they derive their importance, as from their local situation. They contribute largely to the revenue in direct taxes. They are not scattered like the farming class of



---

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

---

the agricultural districts. They live congregated in the manufacturing towns, or populous villages; and whenever the resistance to taxation becomes general, they must form a powerful and important auxiliary.

We see no difficulty in abstaining from nearly all the excisable articles we have enumerated. During the continental blockade, it is well known, that scarcely any, either sugar or tea, was consumed in France. Substitutes were found for both these commodities, and the same may be obtained in this country. There is little or any nourishment in either. They are more properly medicines than food, and tend rather to neutralise the pernicious effect of excess and luxurious living, than to strengthen the constitution. Tobacco is a thing we detest ourselves; but for those who cannot refrain from drawing their breath through a clay pipe, impregnated with a stinking weed—there is the untaxed and immortal Yarrow. Dram drinking is well known to be most pernicious; it would therefore be triple folly to put an enemy into the mouth, to steal away the brains, ruin the constitution, and support the Oligarchy. And as to malt liquors—porter and ale; we never drink either. We can speak with confidence on this subject. We formerly drank wine, spirits, and malt liquor, in great abundance. We now drink nothing but water. We are persuaded it tends to produce a more equable flow of spirits, clearer intellect, greater mental energy, and physical strength. Besides, porter and ale are the most adulterated, most baneful compounds imaginable. We would as readily swallow a scruple of poison daily, as be doomed to drink a pot of either Barclay or Hanbury's porter. It appears, from evidence before the House of Commons, that the brewers, to give their vapid beverage a colour, flavour, and intoxicating qualities, besides treacle, liquorice root, capsicum, dog poison, throw in linseed, opium, belladonna, ginger, and slaked lime. The effect of such a deleterious composition is obvious. That eminent physician, Dr. Trotter, in his valuable essay on drunkenness, says, that in the distilleries and breweries, where hogs and poultry are fed on the sediments of barrels, their liver and viscera are observed to be enlarged and hardened, and were these animals not killed at certain periods, their flesh would be unfit to eat, and their bodies become emaciated. The effect on the human frame must be exactly similar. It is evident, however, that those who have been accustomed to drink spiritous and fermented liquors, must feel a sort of faintness, weakness, and depression of spirits, from the absence of their usual stimulant. This is an evil of short duration—not more than a week or fortnight at the utmost. Pursue a rigorous self-denial for that short period, when the appetite for solid and wholesome food

will increase, the nerves become more firm and steady, the sleep more sound, and the whole physical and intellectual system amazingly invigorated.

In all we have said on this subject, we do not mean that the working classes should endeavour to live cheaper. What they do not expend in tea, tobacco, and drams, they must expend in other articles. They must by no means *economise*; that is what we abhor: they have economized too much already; they must keep up the same scale of expenditure: the object is only to elude the illegal imposts of the *boroughmongers*.

We have now treated fully of the two most effective means of redress in the hands of the people; and to which they can lawfully, and with the strictest justice, have recourse. Before we begin our exposition of legal abuses, we should wish to address one or two observations to the trading and commercial classes. We are anxious they should come forward in the present alarming crisis; and we regret the necessity of any division or conspiracy among those classes, whose interests are really identified. Our preceding observations must not be understood applying to the whole, but only to those who still remain in a state of criminal apathy. It is to them we wish now to speak. We wish to ask them, what would be their situation, were Castlereagh and Sidmouth to succeed in establishing a military despotism? What security they would have for their persons and property? What would be their rank and station in society under an aristocratical domination? Let them look to France for an example. What was the state of the French *bourgeoise*—the trading classes of that country before the Revolution? They were the most despised and degraded of men. They were excluded with every mark of contumely from the society of the privileged classes. Their children were not admitted to their balls, assemblies, and coteries. They were not entitled to hold any commission in the army or navy: they were excluded from all offices, civil and military. In short, they were considered little better than the brute creation, without rights, honour, or even understanding. And what was still more intolerable, they were almost the only tax-payers in the country; and contributed exclusively to the maintenance of a government, in which they did not in the least participate. This must be the state in every country, where hereditary titles are held in greater esteem than property and real merit; and this is the state to which England is clearly tending, unless the middling classes have sufficient virtue, sense, and courage, to come forward to frustrate the diabolical machinations of the Executive Government.\*

\* We see in the *Treasury Prints* the attempt to degrade the trading and commercial classes has already commenced; whether from an expectation of speedy success from the first essay to establish a Military Despotism at Manchester, we are ignorant.

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

After a long digression, we now return to consider the abuses in our Legal System. We shall treat on this subject under three heads: *First*, we shall premise a general account of the present state of the Common and Statute Law of England. *Secondly*, we shall give a statement of the number of persons connected with the administration of the laws, as Judges, Counsellors, Attorneys, Clerks, &c. *Lastly*, we shall give an estimate of the total expense of the Administration of Justice, and some instances of the cost of legal proceedings.

The whole body of English Law is divided into two kinds—the Common and the Statute Law. The Common Law is founded entirely on custom, precedent, and the decisions in the courts of justice. It is not founded on any Act of Parliament, nor on any legislative enactment; it is recorded in no public document: the only memorials of its existence, are to be found in traditional maxims, records of pleas, books of reports, or the treatises of men eminent in the profession. It is evident, that laws originating and preserved in this manner, must be very vague, obscure, absurd, and even contradictory. The Common Law is, in fact, a monument of the opinions, absurdities, knowledge, and ignorance, of every period of society; it has flowed down the stream of time, accumulating like some mighty river, and carrying along vestiges of the learning and ignorance, folly and wisdom, of every age through which it has passed.

How unworthy such an incongruous mass must be of the present age; how inapplicable to the usages of society; and how difficult it is for any individual to obtain a knowledge of such an *onus camolorum*, it is unnecessary to describe. Unsuitable as such a system of law is, to fulfil the ends for which all laws were originally intended, it forms a very considerable part of the laws of this country. It is in virtue of the common law, that the eldest son inherits from his father; that property may be purchased and transferred by writing; that a deed is void if not sealed and delivered; that money lent upon bond is recoverable by action of debt; and that a breach of the peace is punishable with fine and imprisonment. These are doctrines not established by any written statute, or any legislative enactment, but depend solely upon immemorial usage.

Having given some account of the common or unwritten law, let us take a view of the Statute Law, which exhibits a still more frightful chaos. Statute Law consists of all those acts, edicts, and statutes, made by the King, with The highly respectable meetings of York and Southwark, are represented as mere rabble, and their opinions unworthy of notice, solely because many of the gentlemen who attended were in business; and according to the *Courier*, principally brewers, soap-bottlers, grocers, and dissenting ministers. This was an egregious falsehood, by the bye; but it shows the principle of the faction and its ultimate object.

the consent of the Lords and Commons in parliament assembled. The oldest of these now extant, and printed in the statute books, is *Magna Charta*, confirmed in parliament by 9 Hen. III. There were doubtless many acts before that time, the records of which are now lost; and which most probably were the foundations of some of the maxims in the old common law.

There is not a man in England acquainted with the Statute Law—not even the Lord Chancellor nor the Lord Chief Justice. It is such a prodigious compilation, that a knowledge of it is wholly unattainable. No one knows what is law in England; though every individual is presumed to be acquainted with it, and ignorance is admitted as no excuse for its violation. Any one may become a legislator for the whole country; he has nothing to do but to turn to the statute book; he will there find laws in abundance of which no one has any knowledge; he may adduce them as the law of the land; he cannot be contradicted, unless some subsequent statute can be found by which it is repealed, and which it would probably require a year or two years labour to discover. We have had some instances, within these few weeks, of this mode of legislating. We have seen Professor *Christian*, the *Courier*, and *New Times*, for their base purposes, dragging unknown statutes from the reigns of the Plantagenets, the Stuarts, and the Guelphs, relative to public meetings. There is hardly any one knows whether the authorities they adduce are valid or not, and it can only be ascertained by a laborious research for other laws enacting the contrary. In some respects the statute book may be compared to the Scriptures. It contains many good maxims and excellent precepts; but as a whole it is a mass of contradiction, absurdity, and obscurity. What one part affirms, another part denies. Laws may be adduced from it, like texts from the Bible; proving any thing and every thing, adapted to all times, principles, and occasions: one affords profitable employment for one hundred thousand wrangling lawyers; the other profitable employment for as many polemical divines: one is termed the perfection of human wisdom; the other a bright emanation from the Deity.

How ignorant the most eminent in the profession are on the subject, we may gather from a speech of Lord Stanhope, on the 3d of May, 1816, on the revision of the Statute Book. Some of the most striking facts mentioned by his lordship, as they come from good authority, we will here insert. Conformably with a motion of his lordship, the judges were directed to prepare a bill reducing into one act, all the acts imposing the punishment of pillory. At the end of the bill the judges inserted some observations, stating that pillory was the punishment for some offences not merely by statute but at common law; and also they could not say whether there might

not, be statutes on the subject which had escaped their attention. Their surprise was just; for Lord Stanhope afterwards discovered two more statutes, passed in the reign of Geo. II. which had wholly escaped their investigation. Here then was an instance of the twelve judges not being able to discover all the acts inflicting a single punishment.

The same noble lord, wishing to ascertain how far the judges were agreed as to what was the law on several particulars, put to them various questions. For instance, he asked whether a person digging the brick earth from his own field, there manufactured into bricks, and sold, thereby made himself a trader liable to the bankrupt laws? The judges of the Common Pleas were clearly of opinion one way, the judges of the King's Bench were as clear the other. Lord Thurlow was reputed a most admirable common lawyer; but he was worsted on one occasion, in a dispute which he had with Lord Stanhope, on the subject of a statute; Lord Stanhope proving to be right, and old Thumbo wrong. This, says Lord Stanhope, was a great feather in my cap. One day as these noble lords were sitting together on the woosack, Lord Thurlow said, "I should be ashamed of myself if I was not accurately acquainted with the common law; but as to your d—d statute-book it is impossible to be acquainted with it." His lordship also related another anecdote of the celebrated Mr. Dunning, afterwards Lord Ashburton. Lord Stanhope consulted Mr. Dunning on a certain statute regulation relative to the excise, and his answer was, "Now I'll tell you all about it; but I never do answer these general questions when applied to by others. I always tell them, show me the statute to which you refer, and I will *expound* it for you, but that is all I can do." Now this was doing about as much as we could do ourselves, or as much as any person could do, who has a tolerably clear head, and drinks nothing but water.

The fact is, the lawyers and judges, in many cases, are as ignorant of the law as their clients and suitors. When a statute is produced, they can *expound* it, as Mr. Dunning terms it; so may any person who can read and understands the English language; but as to knowing whether it is the law of the land, whether it has been repealed or modified by any subsequent enactment, they are frequently as ignorant as the gaping spectator who looks upon them with stupid admiration as infallible and inspired guides. We do not, however, accuse them of wilful ignorance; we do not say that like the Fellows of Eton College, they are *willingly* ignorant of the statutes; they are generally men of laborious pursuits who spare no pains to obtain a knowledge of the law; but we accuse them of a culpable indifference to the defective state of the statute-book, of either by their silence or open hostility opposing every attempt to reduce it into an intelligible

form, originating either from a rooted prejudice against the reform of any thing and every thing, or solely from a wish to maintain the pecuniary interests of a multitudinous and rapacious profession.

Such is the immense number of law books, and their ponderous size, that it would require the age of the patriarchs to acquire a knowledge of them. They are literally Ossa piled on Pelion, a huge unformed mass, which no man can fathom. Lord Stanhope mentions, a little *pocket compilation*, Viner's Abridgement, comprised into twenty volumes folio, which, it is considered necessary for every lawyer almost to know by heart. Gracious heaven! only think of that! Mind too, this is a mere abridgement—bare memoranda of the great originals; and had it been continued to the present time it would have amounted to more than one hundred folio volumes, necessary to be carried either in the head or the pocket of every English lawyer. The most condensed edition of the Statutes yet given to the public, occupies sixteen volumes in quarto and two parts; five volumes and a half of which comprise the acts from Magna Charta to the end of the reign of George II. the remaining ten and a half being filled with those of the present reign. Since the Union with Ireland, a huge closely printed volume has been published every two or three years, and the average number of public acts passed in each of the last eighteen years amounts to one hundred and forty. It is calculated that at the end of the present century, the statutes will occupy fifty ponderous quarto volumes, and the number of public acts will amount to fourteen thousand. The present generation complain of being overwhelmed with law, but what will be the situation of posterity?

We have said nothing yet of Reports of Cases. These form an indispensable part of a lawyer's knowledge. It is well known that decisions in courts of justice become a part of the law; and when a point has once been decided, it must be determined in the same way again, unless the precedent can be proved erroneous. Reports of these decisions are published annually; they already amount to upwards of 200 volumes, exclusive of those which relate to election, admiralty, and ecclesiastical law. But this is not all: they are going on increasing amazingly; every year adds eight more to the original stock; so that in twenty years there will be 160, and within the century 800 additional volumes, making 1000 volumes of reports, which, with 50 quarto volumes of statutes, will form a lawyer's library, that it is not only necessary he should read, but digest, and, if possible, understand.

This is English law, the perfection of human wisdom! Let us, however, pause a moment, to reflect on this mass of legal lumber, this grossly absurd system of legislation. It is considered a settled maxim in jurisprudence, that every state, within the limits of its own territory, ought to

exact, and its subjects to yield obedience to all its laws. The foundation of the obligation on the part of the people (say the *Quarterly Reviewers*) is, that the legislative authority on its part is presumed to have made the laws so CLEAR, that every member of the community either knows them or must be *culpably inattentive if he does not*. This principle is undeniable. It would never do to allow ignorance to be an excuse for the violation of any law. But how can any person be acquainted with English law? How can the legislature have gone on for centuries legislating on such an absurd presumption, and presuming that every individual in the empire was acquainted with their enactments? How can men of business read, digest, and understand one thousand volumes of reports, and fifty quarto volumes of statutes? How can the people understand the law, when even the judges, whose whole lives are devoted to the subject, are in the most pitiable state of perplexity, uncertainty, and contradiction? Can any thing in the whole world be imagined more completely absurd and ridiculous? Had the whole system been blindly scraped together from every age, nation, and tribe in the universe, from the farthest extremity of Siberia to the remotest shores of America, it could hardly have presented a more confused and hideous jumble than the statute and common law of England.

Yet this farrago is not to be touched. The people are expected to know, to worship, and to obey this giant absurdity. The majesty of the law must be upheld! Oh! most venerable majesty! most perfect wisdom! most profitable absurdity! Thou art venerable, not because thou art just, but because thou art corrupt and decayed! thou art full of wisdom, because thou wert conceived in a barbarous age! thou art perfect, because thou art profitable! and thou must be upheld, not because thou securest the liberty, the property, and happiness of the people, but because thou art an inexhaustible source where bigots may light the torch of prosecution, and vile traitors to their country find new links to rivet the fetters of Englishmen.

We are far from having yet given a full exposition of the Statute Book. It may be worth while to inquire into the causes which have led to such a profuse and headlong legislation. A great number of laws are wholly at variance with the acknowledged principles of political economy; interfering with the import and export of commodities, and attempting, on the most arbitrary, impolitic principles, to regulate the price of labour. No fewer than nine acts have passed relative to combinations of different classes of workmen. There have been 194 acts passed prohibiting importations, and granting bounties and drawbacks on exportation; 54 respecting the cotton and linen manufactures; 29 relative to the corn trade; 50 relative to game;

46 have passed during the present reign relating to elections; and 66 for indemnifying dissenters for not qualifying themselves for offices and employments, according to the Test and Corporation Acts. There are many acts of a temporary and local nature. No fewer than 50 acts have passed for the recovery of small debts in different parts of the country, and 43 of them during the present reign. There are some acts relative to the baking of bread, and prohibiting the bakers from selling it unless it has been baked twenty-four hours. About the packing of butter, there are somewhere about half a dozen different acts; as though it were necessary to instruct people to pack butter by act of parliament. One act on this subject relates to the packing of butter at Malton, in Yorkshire; another to the packing of butter in the city of York, a few miles distant; and another on the same subject for Ireland. Innumerable laws have been enacted relative to the woollen, linen, and cotton manufactures, the whale, cod, herring, and pilchard fisheries; cheese, lace, sugar, glass, and almost every article of wear or consumption, have been the object of parliamentary regulation. Even women have not escaped the general mania. There is a statute of James I. still in force, by which it is illegal for women to leave the kingdom, without a licence signed by six of the Privy Council; and any person assisting them to go out of the country, is to lose his goods and chattels; and the master and mariners carrying them out, are liable to the most horrible penalties.

Lord Stanhope said (*Parl. Deb. vol. 34, p. 178,*) that the whole of the statutes on wool amounted to 977; on the subject of gold and silver, 283; on tobacco, 460; on the fisheries, 964; and on a variety of other subjects in proportion. Relative to the poor, there were 323 public acts; besides 117 local acts. By some of these acts, the poor are farmed out, by others flogged. Of these local acts, five passed in the reign of George II.; the remaining 112 in the reign of George III. Besides the number of acts, another great cause of the confusion and perplexity of the Statute Book, arises from the immense number repealed and re-enacted, and then partly repealed again; with a "so far as," and "so forth." No fewer than 1874 acts have been repealed; 419 in the reign of George II.; and 1455 in the reign of George III.; which made Lord Stanhope remark, "they had been passing bills in the present reign by waggon loads, and repealing them by cart loads."

Nothing, however, has tended so much to swell the statute book as the enormous increase in taxation, and the consequent increase in the number of Revenue Laws. During each of the last eighteen years, the number of acts passed which relate strictly to the revenue, has amounted to forty; and



those which are connected with them indirectly, and but for them would never have existed, to nearly twenty more: which comprises about half the whole number of laws annually enacted. The acts now in force with regard to Spirits alone, amount to 140; besides several others expressly or impliedly repealed, but which it is necessary to consult in order to explain those in existence, and enable the trader to avoid the penalties of the excise. The Stamp Acts are nearly as numerous, and connected in a similar manner. Soap, candles, and the distilleries are under excise lock and key; and, in many instances of exciseable manufacture, it is impossible to carry on the different steps of the process with advantage, from the delay and interruption from the visits of the excise.

The veriest slaves of the system are compelled to admit the restraint, vexatious, inquisitorial, and intolerable nature of the present system of fiscal law. In the last number of the *Quarterly Review*; there is an article on the subject, written with a freedom and apparent independence very unusual in that publication. What could induce the Inquisitor-General to suffer so much truth to go forth to the public, so little consonant with the general character and object of that journal, we are at a loss to imagine. The remarks of the writer on the immoral tendency of the present system of revenue law, and the odious system of *espionage* it has introduced, we shall insert.

“ The variety and high rate of duties at present imposed offer such irresistible temptation to illicit trade, and every species of contrivance by which the king can be defrauded; penalties so exorbitant are incurred that the offender calculates on their not being enforced; *the sanctity of an oath is so grossly abused*, and so much encouragement is given to that worst of all *necessary evils*—informers, that the deprivation of character and irregular habits occasioned by the extension of the revenue laws to so many articles of trade and manufacture, cannot be viewed without feelings of the deepest sorrow. One always suspects that being good as a measure of *finance*, which is so obviously hostile to good order and morality. The encouragement offered by the revenue laws to informers is one of the most objectionable. By 22 Geo. II. c. 36, not only the importer but all subsequent sellers, and also the *maker up of foreign embroidery*, and gold and silver lace are subjected to have the goods burnt, and pay a fine of £100 for each piece discovered, *the half of which goes to the informer*. By 18 Geo. II. c. 26, and 7 Geo. III. c. 48, any person importing or selling, except for exportation, or wearing French lawn or cambric, is made subject to a penalty of £5 for each offence; but if the wearer is prosecuted, and discovers, upon oath, the person from whom the same was purchased, he is relieved from the penalty. The 19th Geo. III. c. 19, which imposes penalties on persons who sell tea without having the words, ‘Dealer in Tea,’ painted over their doors, and on those who buy tea of such persons, indemnifies the seller if he informs against the buyer. The 11th Geo. I. c. 30, imposing penalties upon sellers of prohibited or run goods, and also on the buyers of such goods, or goods which the seller pretends to have been smuggled, exonerates the party who shall first prosecute the other with effect, from the penalties

incurred by himself. By 4 and 5 William and Mary, c. 15, every person who insures prohibited or smuggled goods, and every person who agrees to pay any sum of money for such insurance, incurs the penalty of £500; but if the insurer discovers the fraud, he may keep the insurance-money, is discharged from his own penalties, and is entitled to half the sum forfeited by the party making the insurance: or if the insured turns informer, he is to receive back his insurance-money, is discharged from his own penalties, and entitled to half the sum forfeited by the insurer. *The most direful necessity can hardly reconcile one to such a revolting method of accomplishing the intentions of the legislature, and thus to convert master and servant, buyer and seller, into SPIES and INFORMERS against one another, in direct violation of some of the most sacred obligations by which society is held together.*"—No. 42. p. 409.

The Reformers are unceasingly accused of entertaining designs inimical to property, morality, and even religion; while here we see the most unprincipled advocates of that system which the people are anxious to reform—the men whose almost only office is to extenuate its crimes, fatten on its abuses, and calumniate those who attempt their removal; we see these men constrained to admit that the system itself exhibits the most frightful inroad on morality, religion, and property—grossly abusing the sanctity of an oath, violating the most sacred ties of social life, and establishing the most odious inquisition into men's property and private affairs.

The writer talks about informers being *necessary evils*. Truly, we will allow they are *necessary* under an *evil system*; but what would they be under a system of justice? What would they be under a system founded on the hearts of the people? There would be no need of informers: every man would be an informer, he would not only contribute freely and without collusion to the exigencies of the state, but also consider it a paramount duty to watch over the contributions of his neighbours: the necessity of hired spies and informers arises from the iniquity of the system; from its having lost the confidence of the people; from its being looked upon as a system of rapacity and extortion, which men by supporting only nerve the arm of despotism, and forge fetters for themselves and children.

On the Middling Classes the revenue laws are peculiarly oppressive;—and yet they are unceasingly told, and many of them apparently believe, that a reform in parliament could do no good. Would it not, we would ask, relieve them from that vexatious inquisition and endless interruption and restraint on the operations of trade under which they now labour? Would it not, in short, cause an entire revision of that cumbersome and absurd system of jurisprudence which we have attempted to describe;—reduce the Statute-Book to one-hundredth part its present bulk; consolidate the almost innumerable local acts into more general laws; and abolish all

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

those unjust and impolitic laws which absurdly attempt to regulate labour and commerce. These numerous enactments are no doubt useful to the profession, they afford a fruitful and endless source of litigation; they are glorious things, as Lord Stanhope remarked, for attorneys, conveyancers, special pleaders, barristers, and so forth, but most inglorious and calamitous for the public.

We shall only make one more remark on statute law, and that is relative to the language and manner in which acts of parliament are drawn up. It is evident that all laws ought to be intelligible to those on whom they are intended to operate; otherwise it is creating an ignorance which will not be admitted as any excuse for their violation. It is difficult to see why they could not be so clearly and simply worded as to be intelligible to ordinary capacities, without the assistance of either attorney or lawyer. They involve no abstract theorem; they are a mere statement of facts, requiring something to be done or not to be done; which, really one would think might be made intelligible without the continual assistance of interpreters at an enormous expense.

The obscurity and perplexity of English laws arise principally from a perverse deviation from the ordinary language of civil life, an overwhelming verbosity and endless repetition of "he, she, they," "him, her, and them," the "aforesaid," and "so far as," the "so forths," &c. which render the whole so involved and perplexed, that one would suppose the legislature instead of endeavouring to render the laws as clear as possible, had purposely involved them in the greatest possible obscurity. As an example of this "damnable iteration," we shall make an extract from a recent statute, 54 Geo. III. c. 56, for the encouragement of statuaries and bust-makers. It runs on in the following beautiful jargon:

"Be it enacted, &c. that from and after the passing of this act, every person or persons who shall make or cause to be made any new and original sculpture, or model, or copy or cast of the human figure or human figures, or of any bust or busts, or of any part or parts of the human figure clothed in drapery or otherwise, or of any animal or animals, or of any part or parts of any animal combined with the human figure or otherwise, or of any subject being matter of invention in sculpture, as of any alto or basso relievo, representing any of the matters or things hereinbefore mentioned, or any cast from nature of the human figure, or of any part or parts of the human figure, or of any cast from nature of any animal, or of any part or parts of any animal, or of any such subject containing or representing any of the

matters and things hereinbefore mentioned, whether separate or combined, shall have the sale, right, and property of all and in every such new original sculpture, model, copy, and cast of the human figure or human figures, and of all and in every such bust or busts, and of all and in every such part or parts of the human figure, clothed in drapery or otherwise and of all and in every such new and original sculpture, model, copy, and cast representing any animal or animals, and of all and in every such work representing any part or parts of any animal combined with the human figure or otherwise, and of all and in every such new and original sculpture, model, copy, and cast of any subject being matter of invention in sculpture, and of all and in every such new and original sculpture, model, copy, and cast in alto or basso relievo, representing any of the matters or things hereinbefore mentioned, and of every such cast from nature, for the term of fourteen years, from first putting forth or publishing the same."

Now what does the reader imagine all this verbiage is intended to express? Why simply this, that the maker of any new piece of sculpture shall have the sole right and property therein for the space of fourteen years.

Notwithstanding the laborious and tiresome precision of acts of parliament, they frequently contain the most egregious blunders. There is a singular instance of one in the 52d of the present King, mentioned by Lord Stanhope, in the speech to which we have already referred. By the 18th section, one half of the penalty was to go to the king, and the other half to the informer; but the penalty happened, in this case, not to be a fine, but a fourteen years' transportation; so that fourteen years' transportation were to be equally divided between the informer and his Majesty.

We have now given a pretty copious account of the nature of common and statute law; it next remains to give some account of the number of persons employed in their administration. It is impossible to conceive laws which would be better adapted to promote the interests of the profession and so little to benefit the community. We shall first give an account of the number of courts of justice and of professional men in the metropolis.

The following statements, with some slight alteration, are taken from Mr. Colquhoun's Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis.

## COURTS OF JUSTICE

IN THE

## CITIES OF LONDON AND WESTMINSTER.

The High Court of Parliament.

The House of Lords; being the Appeal in the last resort in all causes criminal and civil.

The Court of Exchequer Chamber, before which writs of Error are brought on judgments in the Court of King's Bench and other Courts; it is composed, in certain cases, of all the Twelve Judges, and the Lord Chancellor; but sometimes of a smaller number.

The High Court of Chancery—at Westminster Hall—and Lincoln's Inn Hall.

The Court of King's Bench, held in Westminster Hall.

The Court of Common Pleas, held in Westminster Hall.

The Court of Exchequer—a Court of Law, Equity, and Revenue; held at Westminster Hall and Sergeant's Inn.

The Court of Appeals in Colonial and Prize Causes; before the Lords of his Majesty's Privy Council at Whitehall.

The High Court of Admiralty, for Prizes, &c. at Doctors' Commons; and in Criminal Cases, twice a year, at the Old Bailey.

Supreme Courts.

Four Ecclesiastical Courts.

Prerogative Court, for Wills, and Administrations.

Court of Arches, for Appeals from inferior Ecclesiastical Courts in the Province of Canterbury; the Court of Peculiars is a branch of this Court.

Faculty Court, to grant Dispensations to marry, &c.

Court of Delegates for Ecclesiastical Affairs.

Doctors' Commons.

	The Court of Oyer and Terminer and Goal-Delivery, for trying Criminals at the Justice Hall, Old Bailey.	Held by His Majesty's Commission to the Lord Mayor, Judges, Recorder, and Common Serjeant, &c.
Seventeen Courts in the City of London.	Court of Hustings;	The Supreme Court of the City for Pleas of Land and Common Pleas.
	The Lord Mayor's Court.	For Actions of Debt and Trespass, and for Appeals from inferior Courts and for foreign attachments; giving decisions in all cases whatever, in 14 days, at an expense not exceeding 30s. held in the King's Bench, Guildhall, by the Lord Mayor, Recorder, and Aldermen.
	Court of Requests.	Held by two Aldermen and four Members of the Common Council, appointed by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen; three of whom form a Court for the recovery of small debts under 40s. at the expense of 10d.
	Chamberlain's Court.	Held every day to terminate differences between masters and apprentices; and to admit those qualified to the freedom of the City.
	Sheriff's Court.	Held every Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, at Guildhall; where Actions of Debt and Trespass, &c. are tried by the Sheriff, and his Deputy, who are Judges of the Court.
	Court of Orphans.	Held before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, as Guardians of the Children of deceased Freemen under twenty-one years of age, &c.
	Pie-Poudre Court.	Held by the Lord Mayor and Stewards, for the administering instantaneous justice between Buyers and Sellers at Bartholomew Fair, to redress all such disorders as may arise there.
	Court of Conservancy.	Held by the Lord Mayor and Alderman four times a year, in Middlesex, Essex, Kent, and Surrey; who inquire by a Jury into Abuses relative to the Fishing on the River Thames, and redress the same; from <sup>S</sup> taines West, to Yenfleet East.

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

Seventeen Courts in the City of London.

Court of Lord Mayor and Aldermen. — Court of Common Council. — Court of Common Hall. Court of Wardmotes.

These relate to setting the Assize on Bread and Salt—to the municipal Officers of the City—to the Elections of Lord Mayor, Sheriffs, and Officers of the City—and to the management of the public property of the City, and removing Nuisances. The Wardmotes are held chiefly for the Election of Aldermen and Common Councilmen.

General and Quarter Sessions of the Peace, held by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, eight times a year.

Petty Sessions for small Offences, &c. held at the Mansion House by the Lord Mayor and one Alderman; and at Guildhall by two Aldermen in rotation. } Daily, in the forenoon.

Coroners' Court. } To inquire into the causes of sudden deaths, when they arise.

Court of the Tower of London. } Held within the verge of the City by a Steward, appointed by the Constable of the Tower, before whom are tried actions of Debt, Trespasses, and Covenants.

Courts of Justice within the City and Liberty of Westminster.

Court of the Duchy of Lancaster. } A supreme Court of Record, held in Somerset Place, for deciding by the Chancellor of said Duchy, all matters of Law or Equity belonging to the County Palatine of Lancaster.

Quarter Sessions of the Peace. } A Court of Record, held by the Justices of the City and Liberty of Westminster, four times a year, at the Guildhall, Westminster, for all Trespasses, Petty Larcenies, and other small Offences, committed within the City and Liberty.

Westminster Court. } Or Court Leet, held by the Dean of Westminster, or his Steward, for choosing parochial Officers, preventing and removing Nuisances, &c.

Courts of Justice within the City and Liberty of Westminster.	Court of Requests Castle-str. Leicester-square.	}	Held by Commissioners, being respectable Housekeepers, for deciding without appeal, all Pleas for Debts under 40s. for the parishes of St. Margaret, St. John, St. Martin, St. Paul Covent Garden, St. Clement Danes, St. Mary le Strand; and that part of the Duchy of Lancaster, which joins Westminster.
	Court of Requests, Vine-street, Piccadilly.	}	Held in the same manner, and for the same purposes; for the Parishes of St. Anne, St. George, Hanover-square, and for St. James, Westminster.
	Petty Sessions or Police Court, held at Bow-street.	}	A Court of petty Sessions, held by two Magistrates every day (Sunday excepted,) morning and evening, for matters of Police, and various Offences, and Misdemeanors, &c.
	Police Court or petty Sess. Queen-sq. Westminster	}	A Court of Petty Sessions established by Act of Parliament, held every morning and evening (Sunday excepted,) by two Magistrates, for matters of Police and various Offences, Misdemeanors, &c.

Besides these courts in London and Westminster, there are no fewer than twenty-two courts more in that part of the metropolis situated in the county of Middlesex and the borough of Southwark. The following is a summary statement of the total number of courts of justice in the metropolis, and the number of officers attached to each court.

9 Supreme Courts; to which are attached	270 officers
4 Ecclesiastical Courts .....	54 ditto
18 Inferior Courts for small Debts .....	146 ditto
1 Court of Oyer and Terminer, and Gaol Delivery.....	27 ditto
4 Courts of General and Quarter Sessions of the Peace .....	46 ditto
10 Courts and Petty Sessions for purposes of Police .....	190 ditto
Coroners' Courts.....	20 ditto

753



*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

To this account may be added the following, and we shall have the total number of professional men in the metropolis:

King's Serjeants, Attorney and Solicitor General, and King's Advocate.....	8
Serjeants at Law .....	14
Doctors at Law .....	14
King's Counsel .....	25
Masters in Chancery.....	10
Barristers at Law .....	400
Special Pleaders .....	50
Proctors in Doctors' Commons .....	50
Conveyancers .....	40
Attorneys at Law in the different Courts....	1,900
Clerks, Assistants, and others, estimated at	3,700
Notaries Public .....	13½

Total about 6,342

This then is the state of the profession in London. From "Clarke's Law List," it appears there are in the country, including England and Wales, 3280 attorneys and conveyancers who have taken out certificates. The number of clerks and assistants attached to country attorneys, cannot be estimated at much less than near 7000; so that the number of persons in the country in the legal department is 10,280; and if we add 6342 for persons of a similar description in the metropolis, we have a total of 16,622 persons, whose sole employment is to render the laws intelligible, and justice attainable to the people in England and Wales.

This estimate we are persuaded is a great deal below the truth; many attorneys in town employ more than twenty clerks, and the majority of them employ three or four. Perhaps it would not be too much to estimate the total number of counsel, attorneys, clerks, assistants, &c. in England and Wales, at twenty thousand. In this enumeration is not included the judges in the different courts, justices of peace, the sheriffs, nor any portion of the magistracy, whose office it is to administer justice, and who employ an innumerable number of clerks and assistants. The classes we have mentioned, form only that branch of the profession who owe their origin in a great measure to defects in our legal system. It was the duty of the legislature to render the laws so clear, and the form of proceeding so simple, that any person of common understanding would be able to understand the one and pursue the other, without the assistance of either

counsel or attorney. Instead, however, of simplicity and intelligibility, obscurity and perplexity appear to have been the objects; and the government, as Mr. Bentham remarks, in pouring forth LAW, has been raining down SNARES among the people.

It is impossible to give a correct estimate of the immense sums drawn out of the pockets of the people by this rapacious profession. Mr. COLQUHOUN, we have seen, considers £7,600,000 as the total income of the legal classes; this sum divided among 20,000 persons, the supposed number in the profession, would make the average annual income of each individual £330. This, according to the data of the same authority, is more than treble the average incomes of the dissenting clergy, the farming-classes, and retail tradesmen.

However, this can be only considered an approximation. In our List of Places we gave an account of the emoluments and incomes of the Lord Chief Justice, the Lord Chancellor, the Judges, and several other well-known individuals; but the incomes of the profession generally, of counsellors, special pleaders, conveyancers, and attorneys, are so various that it is impossible to fix on any average amount. The late Sir Samuel Romilly, it is creditably reported, netted £15,000 annually from his professional avocations. There are other counsel who probably make ten or twelve thousand a year; others, a half, a third, a fourth, or twentieth part of that sum; and others, again, who make nothing. In the incomes of attorneys there are similar diversities. Some few in London, we believe, make ten or eleven thousand pounds a year; a great many more about three or four thousand pounds; and some poor practitioners who do not clear more than £100 a year. Their clerks experience the same variety of fortune. Some are starving on a paltry £50; others living comfortably on £200; and others riotously on a £500 salary.

The salaries of the judges are well known; and for a more particular account of the value of offices in the King's Bench and Court of Chancery, we must refer the reader to what we have said on Chief Justice Abbot and Lord Eldon. The emoluments of the law officers of the crown are enormous, and their salaries have been nearly doubled within these few years. It is related of the twelve judges, that at the time sixteen journeymen boot-closers were committed to Newgate for a conspiracy to raise their wages, they were sitting in their chambers in Clifford's Inn conspiring to raise their own salaries, in consequence of the rise of the necessaries of life. This anecdote reminds us of the fable of the Wolf and the Shepherd. A wolf, says Plutarch, happening to put his head into a hut, where some

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

shepherds were regaling on a leg of mutton, exclaimed "Ah! what a clamour you would have raised had you caught me at such a banquet." The conduct of the judges would be something similar; they would declaim very eloquently on the evils of combination when committed by workmen, though it might be done by themselves with impunity.

Having stated all the facts on which we could depend as to the number and incomes of the legal classes, we shall now speak of the delay and expense attendant on proceedings in courts of justice.

MAGNA CHARTA says, that justice should neither be denied, sold, nor delayed. Sir Francis Burdett, in his late speech on parliamentary reform, justly remarked, that it would be better to tax bread than proceedings in a court of justice. With the single exception of guarding the country from foreign aggression, the only object for which governments were instituted, is the administration of justice. It is to attain this end that all taxes and contributions from the people were originally intended. They were not meant to support useless placemen and pensioners, nor to maintain standing armies, nor to defray the interests of debts contracted in unnecessary wars; but to protect every individual in the community from oppression. Justice ought not only to be speedy, but, above all things, cheap. To render the expense of legal process exorbitant, is not delaying,—it is absolutely denying justice to all but the rich: it is affording the protection of the law to those who are least liable to injustice, and denying it those most exposed to oppression.

In England justice is not only shamefully delayed, but from its dearness in many cases, wholly unattainable. According to the present practice in the Court of Chancery, six years probably elapse before a cause is finally decided.\* The immense amount of property belonging to suitors, whose causes have not been decided in that court, almost exceeds belief. In the year 1756 the amount of suitors' effects fell short of three millions; in 1818, they had accumulated to nearly thirty-four millions. The following statement exhibits the progressive increase of the effects of chancery suitors from the year 1756 to the year 1818:

In the year 1756 the total amount of suitors' effects was ..	£2,864,975	16	1
In the year 1766 the total amount .....	4,019,004	19	4
In the year 1776 the total amount .....	6,602,229	8	6
In the year 1786 the total amount .....	8,848,535	7	11
In the year 1796 the total amount .....	14,550,397	2	0
In the year 1806 the total amount .....	21,922,754	12	8
In the year 1816 the total amount .....	31,953,890	9	5
In the year 1818 the total amount .....	33,534,520	0	10

\* Speech of Mr. Talyer on Delays in Chancery, 3d of May, 1819.

Of this enormous sum of £33,000,000, it has been stated that there is now £10,000,000 in the Bank, which, from the procrastinated delay of suits, should either have belonged to persons deceased without representatives, or of persons living, but ignorant, from the books not being open to them, of their claims altogether, or if acquainted with their claim, ignorant in what manner or names their property is vested. This is, no doubt, a prodigious evil; it is an evil not only to the parties who are thus withheld from the possession of their property, but it must be a serious loss to the country from such an immense amount of capital being locked up from active and productive employment.

The delay in chancery suits appears to be wholly unnecessary, and arises solely from a reluctance to abridge the enormous emoluments of the Lord Chancellor. The business of that officer has so increased of late, from the increase in bankruptcies and other causes, that it cannot possibly be discharged by an individual. An attempt was made last session to relieve his lordship of that part of his business which related to bankruptcies. This seemed more reasonable because his jurisdiction in these matters had only been conferred by a recent statute. This was opposed; and solely, we believe, because bankruptcies put annually into the pocket of his lordship five or six thousand pounds, and into the pocket of his clerk £1700 a year.

The enormous expense of proceedings in this court is well known; and an individual had generally better sacrifice his right altogether than attempt to obtain it through the medium of this court of equity, or more properly court of iniquity. Sir Francis Burdett, in the speech already referred to, mentions a suit then pending, in which the parties had demanded what is termed an office-copy of certain accounts, and for which office-copy the moderate sum of £29,000 was demanded.

Delay and expense, however, are not confined to courts of equity. In the King's Bench it seldom happens that all the causes set down for trial are got through; and in the sitting in London the arrear of special jury cases is usually very considerable. Justice is still more shamefully delayed in the northern and midland circuits. In the counties of Westmoreland, Cumberland, Northumberland, and Durham, the assizes are only held once a year; and persons committed to prison in those counties for crimes not falling under the jurisdiction of quarter sessions, have frequently been confined for seven, eight, nine, and, in many instances, for a much longer period before they were brought to trial. The delay in civil causes is equally injurious to the pockets, as such a mode of administering criminal justice is to the persons of individuals. Of five causes, for which

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

special juries had been summoned in Northumberland in 1816, three of them went over till the following assize, that is for the space of twelve months. In the following year, 32 actions were entered, only one of which was brought to trial. At the last Spring Assizes at York, six Special and three Common Jury causes were made *remanets*.\* The delay in these cases must be a source of the greatest anxiety and inconvenience to the parties, and from the assembling of witnesses, and the preparations for trial, they must have incurred exorbitant, and in some instances ruinous expense.

The next legal abuse to which we shall advert, is the expense and inconvenience attendant on the recovery of small debts.

The law in this case appears to have been most cunningly devised, not for the protection of the honest, but the dishonest part of the community. According to the present system, if the debt exceeds 40*s.* the action may be brought in a superior court, where, if contested or defended, the expense at the lowest computation must be upwards of fifty pounds. If the debtor wishes to avail himself of all the resources of the law, for ruining his creditor, he may put him to a far greater expense. The following receipt is usually given to debtors, who wish to be troublesome, and to weary out their creditors by an expensive process:—

When arrested and held to bail, and after being served with a declaration, you may plead the general issue, which puts you on for trial sooner than any other plea; but if you wish to vex your plaintiff and put him about, put in a special plea; if you are in custody, order your attorney to plead in person, this will cost you £1:1*s.* and run your plaintiff to £30 expense. If you do not intend to try the cause, you have no occasion to do any thing more till the plaintiff gets judgment against you, which he must do the term after you have put in a special plea. The plaintiff is obliged to send you a paper book, which you must return to his attorney with 7*s.* 6*d.* otherwise you will not put him to more than half the expense. When he proceeds and gets judgment against you, then order your attorney to search the Final Judgment Office in the Temple; when searched and found they have got final judgment signed against you, then give plaintiff's attorney notice for him and your attorney to be present with the Master, at the time the plaintiff taxes the costs; at which time your attorney must have a writ of error with him, to give to the plaintiff's attorney before the master, at the time the master taxes the costs: it will put the plaintiff to great expense, which he will have to pay or go the ground over again. The writ of error will

\* Report on the Administration of Justice upon the Northern Circuit, p. 3.

cost you £4: 4s. by a London attorney; but if you wish to be more troublesome, make the writ returnable in parliament, which will cost you £1: 1s. more, and your plaintiff £100. If he has the courage to follow you further, you may then file a bill in Chancery or Exchequer; if he does not then give his answer, your bill will get an injunction against him: you may then get an attachment from the court where your bill was filed, and take his body for contempt of court. The costs incurred by plaintiff and defendant respectively, will then be as follows:—

PLAINTIFF'S COSTS.				DEFENDANT'S COSTS.			
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Answer to Special Plea . . . .	30	0	0	Special Plea . . . . .	1	1	0
Ditto Writ of Error . . . . .	100	0	0	Paper Book . . . . .	0	7	6
Ditto Bill in Chancery . . . .	100	0	0	Writ of Error . . . . .	4	4	0
Ditto Bill in Exchequer . . . .	84	0	0	Returnable in Parliament . . .	1	1	0
				To Bill in Chancery . . . . .	12	0	0
	314	0	0	To Bill in Exchequer . . . . .	6	6	0
					24	19	6

It is calculated, that betwixt *six* and *seven thousand* persons are annually arrested in Middlesex alone, one half of whom are for debts under twenty pounds; and in the kingdom at large, the number arrested in the course of a year for trilling debts is not less than *Forty Thousand*. The expense of these arrests, on the lowest computation, is enormous; and not unfrequently sends both plaintiff and defendant to gaol for the payment of Attorneys' bills.

In settling the costs for actions, the rule is to allow the same costs for a debt of 40s. as for a debt of £10,000. Hence it follows, that large sums are recovered at a far less expense than smaller. In the county of Middlesex, in the year 1793, the number of writs, the cost of actions, and the amount of debts sued for, stood as follows:—

Class.	Value of Action.	Number of Writs	Bailable.	Executions.	Cost of Action undepended at £12 each.	Cost of Action defended at £50 each.	Amount of Debt sued for.
					£	£	£
1	From 10 to 20l.	5719	4966	755	68,72	285,950	81,791
2	20 to 30l.	2267	1878	589	21,090	113,350	85,675
3	30 to 40l.	4367	2492	1875	52,404	238,350	237,358
4	£100 & upw	2324	1769	555	27,160	116,200	1,010,379
		14,677	11,105	3572	169,382	753,850	1,415,203

From this statement, it appears, that in the first class, when the aggregate

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

of the debts amounts to £81,791, and theailable writs and executions to 5719, that the mere cost of the actions, though made up and not defended at all, would be £68,728. And if the actions were defended, the expense to recover £81,791 must be no less than £285,905; being considerably more than three times the amount of the debts sued for.

From the fourth class, it appears, that one million of money is recovered at considerably less than half the expense of £81,791 in the first class.

This statement exhibits "the perfection of human wisdom" in a beautiful point of view. Such an absurd system of jurisprudence, may be termed English law, but surely it would be a libel on the people to term it English justice.

We shall next speak of another description of legal abuse. We have already made some remarks on the multiplicity and inquisitorial nature of our Revenue Laws. Excise Informations, on which we are going to give some account, are the practical consequences of these laws.

These informations are filed in the Court of Exchequer for real or supposed frauds on the revenue. The prosecutions are almost invariably instituted, either on the testimony of hired spies or the Excise officers. They form a principal source of emolument to the law officers of the crown. Every prosecution costs the country about 50 guineas. Of this sum, 10 guineas are for a brief to the Attorney General; to the Solicitor General 10 guineas; to two counsel, 8 guineas each; to two other counsel, 4 guineas each. And to these sums must be added another item of £7 13s. 6d. for the court-crier. Let the case be ever so simple, this is the usual counsel which appears for the crown, and against which the accused has to contend. In one year there have been no less than 761 information under the Excise Laws, laid by the Attorney General; and the law expenses on each case were not less than £120, making an annual sum of more than £120,000. The nature of these proceedings will be best illustrated by a few examples, which we shall select from many others, which were brought forward during last Session of Parliament.

The first case we shall mention, is that of Jeremiah Abell, a small farmer, in Norfolk. This man was prosecuted by the Excise for penalties to the amount of £1000, on account of an alleged smuggling transaction. He was able to prove most distinctly by 17 witnesses, against the single testimony of the informer, that he was 30 miles from the place where the offence was sworn to have been committed. When the case was tried, his counsel most unaccountably consented to compromise the matter with the Board for £300, contrary to the express injunction of the defendant. Afterwards, the

matter slept for a year, when Mr. Abell was taken into custody; and at the time his case was mentioned in the House, he had been confined 16 months in Norwich gaol. Of his innocence there could not be the slightest doubt. He had the most satisfactory evidence to prove, that the informer was at Norwich at the very time he had sworn to have been 30 miles from that place, watching the defendant and six others engaged in smuggling.

Mr. Henty, another sufferer, and a most respectable gentleman of Sussex, had a very narrow escape from a gang of wretches, patronized and employed by the Excise. He was found guilty of an attempt to defraud the revenue, and sentenced to pay fines and costs to the amount of £2400. The evidence on which he was convicted was of the most infamous description, and such as none but the agents of the Borough System would ever think of employing. One of them was accused of the murder at Greenwich; others were afterwards convicted of perjury; some transported for robbery; and others (there being seven witnesses in all) we believe were hanged. The conduct of the Excise in this case was the more unjustifiable, because they had been apprised of the characters of these miscreants: nevertheless, the Solicitor of Excise commenced his prosecution against Mr. Henty, and on their evidence he was found guilty. When an indictment for perjury was preferred, the Excise came forward and offered bail for them; and no doubt they would have absconded, and Mr. Henty been deprived of all means of proving his innocence, had they not been committed to prison on a charge of felony.

A great number of informations were filed, apparently for no other motive than to obtain heavy costs from individuals, and add to the enormous emoluments of the law officers of the crown. A case of this description was brought forward by Mr. Harvey. An information was laid against a merchant for retailing a certain vegetable powder, the illegality of which the accused was wholly ignorant. The penalty was £100. The merchant memorialized the Board of Excise; admitted that such a powder had been sold, but protested his ignorance that the practice was unlawful; and prayed that the commissioners would investigate the case, and mete out such a punishment as the case deserved. In answer to this he received a private circular, which, among other things, said, that "the petition makes no offers, and as the Board has already ordered proceedings, it cannot now stay them, *there being no offer to pay fine or costs, or both.*" The merchant reiterated his memorial, offering £10, which was refused, but in lieu of which no other sum was suggested; he was merely told that it could not be accepted. He then made an offer of £20, which was also negatived, but with a *hint*



that £30, with an agreement to pay costs, would be accepted. On this intimation, the gentleman was induced to inquire of the Solicitor of Excise what would be the probable amount of costs. He was told £60 or £70; so that though there was no wilful violation of the law on the part of this individual, he was compelled either to pay the full penalty of £100, or, which amounted to exactly the same thing, £70 costs, and a composition of £30.

The Solicitor not condescending to give any explanation of the £60 or £70 costs, the party proceeded to try the case; and that being almost an admitted one, it might have been supposed that one counsel and one witness would have been sufficient. This, however, would not have answered the interest of the legal establishment of the crown. To conduct the prosecution five counsel were retained. These five counsel were an expense of £50 at least. There were other expenses attending the examination of witnesses, &c. but this was not enough: a Special Jury must needs be summoned to try a man for a crime he had acknowledged; a common jury might have done, but then only three counsel would have been requisite; a Special Jury rendered five necessary. It is in this way that tradesmen are frequently reduced to beggary, in order to enrich with fees the Crown lawyers. However simple the case may be, the Attorney and Solicitor General, two King's counsel, and a junior counsel, are always employed for the prosecution, and the costs in every case amount to not less than £150. The solicitor for the Excise, in these matters, has almost unlimited power, and exercises the function of both judge and jury. The petitions that are sent to the Board are referred to him, and which, for the sake of his own emolument, it is generally his interest to reject.

Frequently excise prosecutions originate in the conspiracies of base miscreants, who, for the sake of the reward, or to gratify their malice, unite to ruin particular individuals. As an instance of this sort we select the following: A man took a range of obscure and dilapidated buildings in London for the pretended purpose of becoming a brewer of ale, and immediately set to work to draw honest tradesmen into his snares. By an act of parliament a penalty is imposed on those who sell treacle or molasses to brewers. This miscreant, to accomplish his purpose, used to frequent those shops which were left under the superintendence of apprentices and children; he procured a small quantity of these articles to be sent to him, and then gave information that the parties had sold them to a licensed brewer. Another case of the same stamp. A respectable and industrious tradesman of Colchester, Mr. Underwood, had on some account or other incurred the hatred of a notorious smuggler, who made a vow that by some means or other he

would accomplish his destruction. This he thought could not be more effectually done than by putting him in the hands of the Excise. He accused Mr. Underwood of being engaged in a contraband trade. Two informations were filed in the Exchequer; one for the condemnation of Mr. Underwood's vessel; the other to recover the penalty of the bond, which all masters enter into not to be concerned in any smuggling transaction. When the case came on to be tried, the smuggler admitted that the information was false and malicious, and of course Mr. Underwood was acquitted. But he had incurred expenses to the amount of £327 in triumphing over the malice of his enemy. He had no redress for this loss, and his only resource was to commence an unprofitable prosecution against the smuggler for perjury. At the same place, a brewer, having lent a friend his copper, he was prosecuted for that friend's brewing a quarter of malt. The penalty for his *friendship* was £100, and the first intimation of it being incurred was an appalling bill of 40 or 50 folios in length. He applied to the Board of Excise, who consented to remit the penalty, provided he paid £30, and what *small* costs might have been incurred in the prosecution. Three months after he received a bill from a solicitor, in which these *trifling* expenses were charged £46.

Persons are frequently dragged into the Court of Exchequer without knowing for what offence, when it had been committed, nor who is the informer. In the case of Mr. Waithman, a handkerchief was brought into his house not worth 30s. by a person in his employ, at the solicitation of a friend in the country. An information was laid against him, and a penalty of £200 demanded, which was afterwards softened down to £100 as a particular favour to the worthy Alderman.

We will only mention one more case of Exchequer process, that of a Captain Bryan. This gentleman was called upon for a penalty of £200, two years after he thought the transaction had been entirely settled. On a petition to the Board, the penalty indeed was remitted, but a bill of costs was brought forward by the Solicitor to a nearly equal amount. The misfortune of this gentleman originated in mistake in the report of the ship's cargo. The error was explained to the Commissioners of Excise, who appeared perfectly satisfied, and the Captain concluded the matter was at an end. Two years were suffered to elapse, when the unsuspecting Captain was surprised with an Exchequer process, showing that an action had commenced against him to recover the penalty for the infraction of the Excise Laws. The Captain, as we have said, petitioned; the penalty was remitted; but the Solicitor brought in his bill of costs to the amount of £160:5; and his own Solicitor's costs amounted to £89:5:9 more.

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

These cases we think will enable the reader to form some idea of the nature of Excise Informations. The proceedings of the Court of Star Chamber, of the Inquisition in Spain, or of *Lettres de cachette* in France, were not more tyrannical and diabolical than what daily takes place in this country to uphold a remorseless system of taxation. The whole of the instances we have selected are taken from the statements of Mr. Harvey, Lord Howard, Mr. Waithman, and other members during last session; and from which we think three things may be clearly inferred: First, that the Board of Excise, on the evidence of the vilest and most unprincipled wretches in society, frequently commences prosecutions against individuals of the greatest respectability and undoubted character. *Secondly*, that these prosecutions are productive of great emolument to persons connected with the Excise, and to the law officers of the Crown; and that these emoluments appear the only motive, in many instances, for commencing prosecutions. *And lastly*, the readiness with which information on frauds of the revenue are listened to, and no regard being had to the characters of informers, individuals are left at the mercy of any perjured miscreant who seeks to gratify his interest or revenge.

Another evil resulting from the Excise System is the power vested in the Commissioners of Excise or Lords of the Treasury to mitigate penalties or stay proceedings against offenders at their discretion. This enables them to make the most odious distinction betwixt persons supposed to be friendly or hostile to the present system. We had a singular instance of this in the case of Mr. ABBOTT, brewer and magistrate of Canterbury. This man for a long time had been selling, according to Mr. Brougham's statement, *rank poison* in the beverage of the people. It appeared that this poisonous brewer had been selling a liquor resembling beer, manufactured from beer grounds, distillers' spent wash, quassia, opium, guinea pepper, vitriol, and other deleterious and poisonous ingredients. The officers of Excise having examined this worthy magistrate's premises, found 12 lbs. of prepared powder, and 14 lbs. of vitriol or copperas in boxes, which, if full, would have contained 56 lbs. Proceedings were instituted against Mr. Abbott by the Board of Excise. The penalties he had incurred amounted to £9000; and the case being notorious and most atrocious, the Commissioners appeared determined to levy them with rigour. Mr. Abbott however was a *loyal man* and an *active magistrate*, and he prevailed upon some other loyal men to write on his behalf to the Lords of the Treasury. Among other persons who stepped forward in behalf of this *virtuous magistrate*, were the very reverend the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Gerard Andrews, Mr. Baker, M.P.

Mr. Marryatt, M.P. and the great Sir William Curtis. All these were loyal men and true, and, in their letters to the Lords of the Treasury, speak in the highest terms of the public and private virtues of the good Mr. Abbott. Mr. Baker styles him "*my much esteemed and valued friend, Mr. Abbott.*" Sir William Curtis is still more eloquent and touching, stating that he was a very long acquaintance of fifty years, and a "*most honourable and virtuous old man.*" The reverend Dean went on in the same strain; stating that he was a *good neighbour* of his, and an *useful magistrate*, and that he should regret were his "*usefulness and respectability diminished by a matter that concerned ONLY ALE-DRINKERS!*"\*

Such testimonies from such quarters to the various excellencies of Mr. Abbott, were not to be neglected. The Treasury, without seeking any more evidence, but merely at the instigation of their political friends,

\* We verily believe there is no class which views with so much contempt and insolence the really useful classes of the community as the clergy. Here is a fellow, a Very Rev. Dean, who regrets that a *good neighbour of his* should be dragged before the public, merely for poisoning *ale-drinkers*. Had Mr. Abbott been poisoning *wine-drinkers*, we imagine his crime would have appeared very different in the eyes of the Rev. Dean. It is related of a Right Rev. Bishop, in the House of Lords, that he once remarked that he did not know what the people had to do with the laws but to obey them. One is at a loss to conceive where these notions have been taken up; they certainly appear to belong to another age, or at least to another country than England. For our part we can only ascribe the unfeeling insolence of the clergy to that undeserved respect which they have been accustomed to receive from the people, and which has begotten in them a feeling of superiority to which, above all men, they have the least claim, either on account of their knowledge or virtues, or any other qualification useful or ornamental. The views of many of them in respect of the people are very little more elevated than those of the nobles of Russia toward their boors. We remember an anecdote of a Russian officer travelling through Germany, who, on account of some trifling delay or provocation, shot his postillion. The circumstance exciting some noise, the officer was given to understand that though such things might do very well in Russia, they could not pass in Germany with impunity. The officer, apparently considering the interruption very impertinent, demanded the price of a German postillion, and said he would "*pay for him.*" This was not much worse than the Rev. Dr. Andrewes's notion of ale-drinkers. These things ought to be borne in mind; they show how one class may be degraded and trampled on by another, though both of the same species.

ordered the proceeding to be stayed, and penalties to the amount of £9000 were softened down to £500.

In Ireland the system of fiscal rapacity has been carried to a much more frightful extent than in England. The savage laws enacted for that country to prevent the illegal distillation of spirits, are not only a violation of the most sacred principles of society, but paralyse the industry of the people, who are afraid to cultivate their land from an apprehension that the produce will be seized by the Excise for still-fines. Some valuable details on this subject have recently been communicated to the public by Mr. CURCHER. As our object is to give as full an account as possible of the crimes, wickedness, and misery, resulting from the *Borough System* in every part of the empire, we shall state a few facts illustrative of the barbarous nature of the Irish Distillery Laws.

The offences against the Excise-Laws in Ireland originate, as in England, from excessive taxation; the exorbitant duties imposed on spirits have induced the inhabitants to establish unlicensed stills, in order to avoid their payment. The laws to prevent this mode of distillation are of the most unprincipled and atrocious description. It is not merely the person who establishes the still, but the whole parish, manor, or lordship, which is implicated in punishment. This will appear more clear from giving some account of the nature of these Distillery Laws.

The punishment inflicted on delinquents is seven years transportation. The parish or town lands, where any unlicensed still, part of or appendage to a still, or worm or utensil for distilling, or for wash or pot ale, or low wine, is found, is liable to a fine, for the first offence, of £25; for the second, £40; and for the third, £60. One half of these fines are given, by statute, to the excise officer informing, who is considered a sufficient witness. There is no defence against these fines, unless the defendant can either prove that the articles were not found, or left there for the purpose of subjecting him to the statute. The emoluments of the excise-officers from these *still-fines* are enormous. Their duty is to prevent illicit distillation, but their interest is to promote it; and there are instances of officers having only £60 salary, making betwixt £500 and £1000 a year by seizures and fines. During the course of seven years the fines imposed amounted to £356,925, or £50,989 a year. The half of this enormous sum went into the pockets of excise officers. Upon one county, that of Tyrone, the fines amounted to £26,825; and in two years the fines incurred in the county of Donegal amounted to £30,000. In 1816, the people were reduced to such despair by the remorseless levy of fines, that they ab-

stained from getting in their crops or digging their potatoes, from an apprehension they would be seized for still-fines; and the Board of Excise, dreading a famine, as the effect of their rapacity, were compelled to issue a proclamation "declaring that the collection of fines was suspended for a month, and that after that period they would not be levied from corn or potatoes." This promise, we believe, was not kept; but to what a horrible state for a brave people to be reduced, merely to support a profligate and execrable system of government! Ought not every effort be made to destroy such an infamous system, which, wherever its influence extends, spreads nothing but famine, wretchedness, and crime.

The way in which informations are tried, too, seems a little singular, and equals in despatch the mode of administering justice at Algiers. Sir John Stewart, in his evidence before the House of Commons, relates, that at the assize held at Lifford, there were 593 informations for still-fines to be tried. The judge tried them at the rate of *one a minute*. The words of a juryman were, "He knocked them off at the rate of one in a minute;" and the judge dashed on at this rate till he was told that the gaol would hold no more.

There is great difficulty, says Mr. Chichester, in taking defence against information for a still-fine. The purse of the nation pays the expenses of informers, but the poor Irish have no public purse on which they can draw. When they succeed in defeating the information, they are not enabled to recover their costs of the opposite party. The various expenses which they incur by defending themselves amount at least to seven pounds, which being far beyond the ability of many of these wretched people, they are compelled to let judgment go against them by default. In some cases compassionate landlords are induced to pay the fines for their tenants, rather than witness the plunder of so many innocent people. One gentleman, Mr. Young, became responsible for £2000, as the only means of sparing himself the distress of seeing the destruction of his tenants. His benevolence, however, was of little avail; for the excisemen soon demanded new contributions on new pretences; and he found that if his soil was of gold dust it would be unequal to satisfy these endless requisitions.

Owing to a very natural resistance from the people, the fines can only be levied with the aid of the military; and this is done with so much severity and violence, that were they not *legalized*, would be punishable with death. The following extracts from Mr. Chichester's Letters, will give some idea of the scenes transacting in Ireland in the execution of a barbarous system of revenue law:—

440 In September 1815, John Doherty, a very poor man, resident in Innishowen, was visited by the collector of still-fines, who was attended by a strong military force. They commenced by depriving the unhappy man of his cattle and household furniture; they next carried off his grain, which he had just shorn, and took from him even the smallest implements of industry belonging to his little farm. After this they seized the wearing apparel of his family, not excepting their shoes and stockings, and finished that act of the tragedy by robbing his little children of their clothes. After they had thus got possession of all the cottage contained, they tore its doors away, and burned them in presence of his weeping family, in order that they might cook their dinner, consisting of provisions forcibly obtained at their cottage: Some poultry, however, still remained, which had not been observed at first, and these the soldiers killed and put in their knapsacks, that they might feast upon them when they arrived at their quarters." — *Letter on the Oppressions of Irish Revenue Officers*, p. 46.

Here follow some further details of the distressing scenes resulting from the military execution of the Excise Laws.

"When cattle were seized for still-fines, they were usually driven by the Excisemen to a pound at the village of Cardonagh, in Innishowen: in that place they were stowed for some time, previous to their removal to Londonderry, a distance of twenty miles. While they were kept at Cardonagh, the owners frequently attended at the pound, in hopes of being permitted to feed them; and, on such occasions, many distressing scenes frequently took place. Mothers, with their perishing children in their arms, supplicating the sentinels to give them a little milk from their own cows: the infants also bewailing their unmerited sufferings, and importuning their distracted parents for sustenance, which it was impossible to give them. The military employed in this dreadful duty frequently appeared affected, and sometimes gave a part of their daily pay to mitigate the bitter sorrows which they witnessed. But such humanity was vain; for devastations extended over too wide a range to admit of individual assistance."—p. 6.

Such are the workings of the Borough System in Ireland. Wherever this system is pursued, it exhibits the same unvarying picture of misery, rapine, crime, and extortion. Government, instead of being a system of law, is an outrage on all law, a violation of every moral principle, social tie, and feeling of humanity. When we reflect on our horrid Revenue Laws, we always feel amazed they do not wake the unceasing animadversions of our professed philanthropists, moralists, and religionists. We allude to such men as Mr. Brougham and Wilberforce, and half a dozen more puritans, who indulge in

endless lamentations on the progress of infidelity, and the circulation of what they term "*blasphemous and immoral publications.*" What are all the evils resulting from this source; what, indeed, are all the evils of female prostitution, of intemperance, of sabbath-breakings, or any other evil, which excites such horror in the minds of these gentlemen, compared with the perjuries, crimes, devastations, and unutterable wretchedness, resulting from Revenue rapacity. This, however, excites in them little or no emotion; they contemplate these fiscal plunderings, and the misery they diffuse, with the same complacency with which men bow to the dispensations of Providence. If any thing more were needful to convince the people that these sanctified politicians could do no good, that they are little better than a set of maudling hypocrites, with whom is identified no principle of humanity, liberty, or happiness, it would be their tame acquiescence in the atrocities of the Borough System. We do not say they are wholly silent, but their occasional lamentations tend rather to encourage than restrain the fury of our oppressors; and they are invariably opposed to every radical measure likely to root out the sources of national misery.

It is necessary we should now think of drawing our observations on the Administration of Justice to a close. This article has extended to an unusual length, and for which the importance of the subject must be our apology. England is not less a law-ridden than a priest-ridden country. We have purposely abstained from saying any thing on the ferocity and absurdity of our Criminal Code; considering that subject, from recent discussions, to be pretty well understood. To us it appears that the abuses in our legal system, are tolerated and upheld solely from neither the reason nor the interests of the community being represented in the Legislature. In the few concluding observations we are going to offer, we shall mention those changes in our civil and criminal jurisprudence, which, we think, would immediately follow a radical change in the constitution of the House of Commons.

The celebrated JEREMY BENTHAM has truly remarked, that lawyers oppose improvement from the same motives that workmen oppose the introduction of machinery: they are apprehensive it would lessen their employment. Mr. Roscoe, in his *Life of Leo X.* relates an anecdote of that pontiff, which, we think, may be very well applied both to the law and



priestcraft of this country. Cardinal Bembo (*vide* vol. 4. p. 479,) having on one occasion quoted a passage from the Evangelists, he was interrupted by his Holiness, who said, "*It is well known to all ages how profitable this fable of Christ has been to us.*"—Yes, most holy father, we thank you for your honest declaration, the *Fable of Christ*, as you term it, has doubtless been very profitable to you, but very unprofitable to the people. Our lawyers may say the same: the cart-load of legendary rubbish they profess to expound, is doubtless very profitable to them, but a serious loss and inconvenience to their clients.

It does by no means follow that because there are laws there should also be lawyers. There is nothing in the nature of laws that ought to render them difficult and above the comprehension of ordinary men. If they are difficult to comprehend, the blame attaches rather to the law-maker than the law. The causes that render English laws so unintelligible and difficult are obvious, and which we have explained. It arises from their multiplicity, their contradiction, and the uncouth and nonsensical jargon in which they are expressed. Now, it is obvious, that these causes might be removed, that they are all susceptible of a remedy. It may be asked then why is it not done? Why is not the Statute-Book revised; its contradictions reconciled; its language rendered more simple and intelligible; and the immense number of local acts consolidated into more general laws? The answer is plain—it would destroy the emoluments of the profession; their "occupation would be gone;" there would be no need of a class of men to explain that which any one might understand.

Is it surprising, then, that judges, counsel, attorneys, and the whole fraternity, are opposed to Reform? Reform indeed would be ruin for them! They know that well. They'll stick to the "*venerable pile*" as to a freehold estate. Truly reform would do them no good. A government in which the intellect, the common sense, and interests of the community were represented, would not long suffer the people to be pillaged by fraudulent attorneys and rapacious lawyers. We should have the Statute-Book compressed into a pocket octavo, and so plain that a school-boy would understand it. Then away go their wigs and gowns, and all their learned lore would be as much out of date as the cocked-hat and ruffles of the last generation. Sad calamities these for gentlemen of the bar! They may well rail against and calumniate the people. They have a great stake—not in the country, but the law; and we may always expect to have them for our opponents; though it is rather too much, that they should accuse the Reform-

ers of being irrational and visionary, while their own mountebank profession is the reverse of both reason and common sense.

It is impossible that Courts of Justice can be looked on with reverence while the laws remain in their present state. The pleadings of lawyers resemble the unprofitable wranglings of the ancient sophists, whose object was to hide rather than discover the truth; and the emptying the pockets of suitors appear more the motive than the administration of justice. We shall now pass on to the attorneys, who also appear to have many good and substantial reasons for opposing reform.

It was the opinion of Lord Stanhope, that the employment of this branch of the profession might be very much lessened by the use of printed forms in many cases of legal proceedings. His lordship's views on this part of the subject will be best explained by an extract from his speech on the 1st of May, 1816.

After remarking on the great interest the profession had in the "*glorious uncertainty of the law*," his lordship said, "He did not mean to cast any general reflection on any department of the legal profession: there were no persons more useful when they chose, and none had more the power of being useful; but there were exceptions of which we heard almost every day in the instances of pettyfogging attorneys. He happened to be in company with a man the other day very eminent in the profession, and asked him whether forms of leases might not be attached by the way of schedule to acts of parliament, such as leases of land, leases of houses, leases of lands and houses together, and leases of coal mines, &c. ? To which he answered, he saw no objection to it, and he thought there would be much utility in adding forms of the most common conveyances. The advantage of this would be that parties themselves might copy these forms, inserting the proper names, descriptions, and sums; and in nine cases out of ten the assistance of attorneys and conveyancers would be unnecessary. He knew that the family of a noble Duke (the Duke of Bedford) kept printed forms and gave them to the tenant; and while the assistance of attorneys and conveyancers were thus rendered unnecessary, the tenant might see at a glance what were the conditions of his lease. The same thing might be done with respect to pleading, and printed forms might be scheduled of declarations in the most common actions, with the proper counts, and thus render the aid of the special pleader in a great measure unnecessary. A person in his neighbourhood having a dispute, he happened to see the declaration, and he found there was not one of the counts in which a verdict could be taken so as to

maintain it. He went with the attorney to the special pleader, an eminent man, and convinced him that his counts were worth nothing. Others were added, but these were no better than the former: and on pointing out the circumstance to the pleader, he struck them out and inserted two counts which were very good ones. Different counts were sometimes necessary, because the action consisted sometimes of different cases. For instance, suppose he employed an architect to build a house, and the architect covenanted to do it in a workmanlike manner, but did not, then he had his action for breach; but it might happen that there was a warranty, and if the evidence went to a warranty that would not do without a count to sustain it, as had been decided by the Court of Exchequer, because it would be taking the defendant by surprise.

“ Now, the more their lordships looked at the Statute-Book, the more clearly they would see that it was like the Augean stable, and required somewhat of a similar remedy. He recollected a curious debate in the other house on the subject of the India-Bill. There was a lawyer on one side who stoutly maintained that nothing could be better than a charter, because it had the great seal to it, and therefore it proved itself. On the other side there was a sturdy Yorkshire lawyer of the name of Jack Law, who had been attorney-general, and he asked, “ Pray what is a charter, but a piece of parchment with a great piece of wax dangling at the end of it?” A shrewd Scotchman followed up this by asking, “ And pray what is an attorney-general when he is honged, but a mon dongling at the end of a string?” But the object was to do as much as possible without the “ mon dongling at the end of the string.”

Lord Stanhope's speeches generally abound in just observations, and curious anecdotes; but he had such a pernicious habit of wandering from his subject, and dragging forward irrelevant matter, that it is rather hazardous attempting a quotation. Some part of the preceding extract we fear will not be intelligible to the whole of our readers; but we consider that in itself an argument against the present system; for we shall always contend that there never ought to be any thing either in law or its language otherwise than intelligible to every person of ordinary attainments. It is not a science which only belongs to a few individuals to be acquainted with, it is a profession which every one is presumed to understand; its language then ought to be as universal as its application; and its maxims intelligible to all who are amenable to them for their conduct. Besides, the mode in which laws are administered, implies that they should be simple and easy to be understood. Juries are the ultimate judges of the law: it is for their

guidance they were made ; and these men being taken from all classes, without regard to their education or intellectual endowments, it is clearly contrary to the theory of English jurisprudence, that they should be accompanied with any thing perplexed, subtle, or difficult. But the whole is a paradox and absurdity.

When his lordship remarks, that the object is to do as much as possible, without the "*man dangling at the end of the string*," he is perfectly intelligible. This is what we wish to see ; we wish to have as little of the wax and parchment of the profession as possible. It is, however, not merely in leases of land, but in wills, devises of land, assignments, bills of sale, bonds, articles of partnership, and in similar instruments, in which we imagine there is abundant room for improvement and simplification. We cannot see why these matters may not be drawn up by any rational individual, and when attested by one or two credible witnesses, be deemed as valid as when executed by an attorney or conveyancer. To be sure this would be making things vastly simple ; it would be introducing a little reason and common sense into these matters ; ingredients which we conceive are not less obnoxious to gentlemen of the bar than the priesthood.

Lord Stanhope says, no class of persons have so much power to be useful. This must be allowed, but then it can scarcely be denied there is hardly any class so pernicious. There are no doubt exceptions, but we think the general character of the profession is bad, servile, selfish, and rapacious. These qualities are rendered still more noxious, because accompanied with considerable knowledge, exhaustless malice, and amazing cunning. They are all sighing after chief justiceships, chancellorships, and attorney-generalship ; they long unceasingly for the emoluments of excise informations, and for the legal simony of bartering offices in courts of justice. Take the most eminent gentlemen of the bar, those who it might be supposed were emancipated from the trammels of their trade, and we shall find them completely blinded either by the prejudices or the interests of the profession ; in short, mere lawyers. For instance, there is Mr. Brougham, an enlightened man, and seemingly of good intentions, but bless us ! he would never do any substantial good were he to live a thousand years. He is wholly ignorant, or selfishly averse to every measure the least likely to rescue the country from its present calamities, and avert the still greater evils with which it is threatened. Again, there is Jeffray, the critic, conductor of the *Edinburgh Review*, and perhaps as clever and well-informed as any man in Europe, but ~~that~~ he is a LAWYER. He is palpably blind on the great question of Reform. He can see no good in a Reform of the House of Commons, which

*Expense of the Administration of Justice.*

eventually might lead to a reform of Scotch law and the Court of Session. This, no doubt, though possibly he may be insensible of it himself, is the source of all his apprehensions on the subject of Radical Reform.

Besides an immense reduction of lawyers and attorneys, reform would cut up by the roots the whole system of the Revenue Laws. These laws have arisen solely from excessive taxation, and must disappear with the causes which created them.

The GAME LAWS too are a source of endless cruelty and injustice, and we can never expect any rational law on this subject but from a Reformed Parliament. The best law in this case would be one which abrogates all other laws relating to Game, and suffer it, like the light or air of heaven, to be the general property of all who find it in their possession. These odious enactments are not only a disgraceful memento of a barbarous age and foreign subjugation, but are founded on the same feudal principles as our present Representation. Personal property gives no right to kill game. A man may have a hundred thousand pounds in the funds, or vested in broad cloth, and not have the privilege to shoot a hare or a partridge. In like manner, a person may be the owner of a copyhold estate worth £100,000 per annum, and not have the smallest influence in the making of those laws, by which both his property and his person are secured. These principles are alike absurd; belong to another age and state of society; and the restoration of the elective franchise to the people, would infallibly restore the *natural* and universal right to kill game.

We will only make one more remark, and then conclude. To us there appears some little absurdity in enacting any new laws while the old remain in their present state. No one knows what laws are already in force; it is impossible therefore to be certain whether any new enactment be an abrogation or repetition of some other already in existence. Besides, to add even good laws to the present mass of antiquated rubbish, would be something like the folly of patching a piece of new cloth on an old coat; it would be blending that which is pure and excellent in itself, with that which is rotten and corrupt. We leave this suggestion to the consideration of Mr. Bennett and Sir James Mackintosh, who appear more inclined to add to the old system of jurisprudence, and enact new laws, than to render intelligible those we have.

I N F L U E N C E

O F T H E

B A N K O F E N G L A N D .

---

THE proverb says,—

If a knave or a fool with Carus we see,  
A knave or a fool Carus we sentence thee.

It is certainly a just observation, that they may generally know a person by the company he keeps; and we think they may as certainly know whether any individual is a Reformist or Corruptionist, by ascertaining his profession and connexions. It hardly appears possible that any disinterested individual should be the advocate of the present system of pillage and injustice; and, therefore, we generally find those who come forward in its defence, are connected with it either in state, law, divinity, or some other way. As soon as we saw the name of JOHN WHITMORE affixed to a Declaration of London merchants, bankers, traders, and others, in defence of *property and social order*, we felt quite sure that JOHN WHITMORE would turn out to have some great stake in the sort of social order that Declaration was intended to support. Accordingly, we found, after a little inquiry, that this gentleman was the governor of the Bank of England, at the time of the famous Bullion Report in 1810, and that the same person is now a Bank director.

This circumstance alone will sufficiently explain Mr. Whitmore's meaning, when he declares his abhorrence of "*seditions and blasphemous publica-*

## CORRUPTION UNMASKED.

*Bank of England.*

tions," and his "full reliance on the efficacy of the laws, the purity of their administration, and the wisdom of the Legislature." This language is now well understood; and no one is so little informed as not to comprehend its meaning when proceeding from the mouths of sinecurists, placemen, judges, bishops, and Bank directors.

There is no establishment which has such a powerful interest in the continuance of the present system as the Bank of England. The policy of the last twenty-five years has been the source of all its wealth and influence. It is to the war against liberty and knowledge, the Bank owes all its greatness and inordinate gains. It is to the war the Bank is indebted for the *Restriction Act*, which enabled it to raise the circulation of its notes from 12 millions to 30 millions. It was the war which raised the unredeemed public debt from 220 to 850 millions. Of this debt the Bank has had the management, and for which it has received from the public about £300,000 per annum, whereas the receipt on account of the debt in 1792 was only £99,800.

It is to the war too, the Bank is indebted for the increase in the amount of public deposits. In 1792 the deposits were probably less than four millions. In and since 1806, they have generally exceeded eleven millions. From this source alone, Mr. Ricardo calculates, that, in the ten years from 1806 to 1816, the Bank gained £5,500,000.

It is to the war the Bank has been indebted for an annual dividend on its capital to the amount of 10, 12, and in some years as high as 17 per cent. Lastly, the Bank is indebted to the war for clear savings, from the year 1797 to the year 1816, to the enormous amount of £13,426,249. These savings are exclusive of the annual dividends and bonuses to the proprietors. It is a sum which yet remains in the hands of the Bank, and which has not been shared among the proprietors. It is a sum wrung from the wretchedness, the toil, and industry of the people. It is a sum which forms the unalloyed spoil of the last twenty years of blood and violence. It is a sum, which, we think, ought to be returned to those from whom it has been unjustly plundered; and applied to mitigate those unparalleled distresses, for which Mr. WHITMORE says, he cherishes "*sentiments of unfeigned commiseration.*"

These facts the reader must at present be content to take on credit; we assure him, however, that before this article is concluded, they will not only be made perfectly intelligible, but established on unquestionable authority.

*Bank of England.*

It is not merely the Bank of England, but nearly the whole banking-system of the country that is indebted for its origin and prosperity to the war. Before the Bank-stoppage, in 1797, there were only two hundred and thirty country bankers. At the time the Bullion-Committee made their Report, in 1810, the country banks had increased more than three-fold, and amounted to SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-ONE. In the year 1816, the number of banks in different parts of the empire, was as follows:—

## IN ENGLAND,—

The Bank of England .....	1
Private Banks in London .....	72
Banking Establishments in the country, where there are three and upwards in the principal towns .....	195
Banking Establishments, having one and two in the smaller towns .....	464
	<hr/> 732

## IN SCOTLAND,—

The Bank of Scotland .....	1
The Royal Bank .....	1
The British Linen Company ..	1
Banks where there are three and upwards in the principal towns.	43
Banks where there are one and two in the inferior towns ....	29
	<hr/> 75

## IN IRELAND,—

The National Bank of Ireland..	1
Banking Establishments in Dublin, Cork, Waterford, Belfast, and other large towns ..	30
Banking Establishments in the smaller towns.....	33
	<hr/> 64
Total.....	<hr/> 871



*Bank of England.*

From this statement we see that in London there are no fewer than 72 private banking houses. In each banking-house there are at least three partners, forming an aggregate of 216 individuals, who, for obvious reasons, would not decline signing any thing emanating from Threadneedle Street. But to the private bankers, may be added, the stock-brokers, loan-contractors, and speculators: a numerous race, who likewise owe their origin in great part to the war; intimately connected with the Bank, and ready to obey at all times the Directors. In short, we should suppose that there are at least 2000 individuals in the metropolis; who, from dependence on the Bank, as well as their own supposed interests, would be ready at any time to sign any Declaration to which JOHN WHITMORE might affix his signature.

The whole of these classes owe their origin to the Pitt System, or, to ascend a generation higher, to the Borough System. The Borough System begat the Pitt System; the Pitt System begat the war; the war begat the Restriction Act; the Restriction Act begat the Paper System; the Paper System begat the whole race of bankers, loan-contractors, and speculators; these again begat Pauperism; and lastly, Pauperism must eventually beget either Radical Reform or Military Despotism.

The country bankers have an interest and an influence of the same nature as the Bank of England. We always find them at Liverpool, Bristol, Glasgow, Leeds, and every part of the empire, ready to support the measures of Government. The wealth they have acquired, and the wealth they hope to acquire, depend on the continuance of the policy of the last twenty-five years. This is a point, however, which it may be proper to illustrate more particularly.

Next to an impartial administration of justice, the most important object to the people, is a safe and secure currency. It is a matter of so much moment, that it ought never to be abandoned to the caprice, ignorance, and avarice, of individuals; accordingly we find, that in all countries where knowledge had made any progress, the power of providing a suitable representative of value was vested in the government. This, for many centuries, was the case in England; but since every object for which governments were instituted has been abandoned, and justice, religion, and morality, become mere pretexts, for pillage and oppression, this important duty has likewise been neglected. The time when this change took place, may be dated from the passing of the Restriction Act, in 1797; that measure forced out of circulation what remained of the precious metals, and left the people wholly dependent on paper, issued at the discretion of private individuals.

*Bank of England.*

Hence arose a great part of the trade of banking. The bankers owe their origin to the policy which produced the Restriction Act: they will invariably support that policy: they will always oppose Reform, or any change likely to restore a genuine currency: a metallic currency would destroy their occupation: their profits arise from supplying the community with paper; and the extent of these profits will appear from the following considerations.

The gains of a banker do not arise from trading with his own capital, but from trading with the credit of individuals. His profits arise from the employment of a fictitious capital, which he can create at pleasure, and which only costs him the salaries of a few clerks, and a trifling expense in paper and engraving. With this he trades as real money; discounts bills; makes advances to speculators, merchants, traders, and others; and charges them four, five, or more per cent. for the use of his paper promises. His profits are in proportion to the quantity of paper he can force into circulation. The absence of a metallic currency; the increase in trade, commerce, and agriculture; the funding system, and the spirit of enterprise and speculation, have caused an immense demand for paper money. The total amount of paper in circulation at any period cannot be exactly estimated. The paper issued by the Bank of England is known, but the paper issued by the country banks cannot be ascertained. Mr. Lloyd, a banker in London, a partner in a banking-house at Manchester, and agent for several other country banks, in his evidence before the Bank Committee, supposes the amount of country bank notes in circulation to be from 40 to 50 millions. The Committee, in their Report, consider the estimate too great; and state, as their opinion, that the country paper does not exceed from 20 to 25 millions. The Committee of the House of Lords likewise gave an estimate from the statements of Mr. Sedgwick. Their estimate of the amount of Bank of England and Country Bank paper in circulation, from the year 1810 to the year 1818, is as follows:—

1810.	Bank of England,	£22,541,000
	Country Banks,	21,819,000
1811.	Bank of England,	23,282,000
	Country Banks,	21,543,000
1812.	Bank of England,	23,237,000
	Country Banks,	19,944,000
1813.	Bank of England,	24,023,000
	Country Banks,	22,537,000
1814.	Bank of England,	26,901,000
	Country Banks,	22,709,000

*Bank of England.*

1815.	Bank of England,	£26,866,000
	Country Banks,	19,011,000
1816.	Bank of England,	26,574,000
	Country Banks,	15,090,000
1817.	Bank of England,	28,274,000
	Country Banks,	15,898,300
1818.	Bank of England,	27,220,000
	Country Banks,	20,507,000

This statement does not include the unstamped small notes issued by the three Chartered Banks of Scotland, nor the paper circulation of Ireland. Allowing for these omissions, and supposing from the evidence of Mr. Lloyd, that the estimate is considerably below the truth, we may infer, that, for the last ten years, the circulation of paper has amounted on an average to sixty millions. On this sum the banking interest has been deriving a profit of 4, 5, or more, per cent. ; or about *three millions annually* ; which is the sum paid by the public, for the convenience of paper money in lieu of a genuine currency, of which they have been deprived by the policy of the Borough-mongers.

A Reformed Parliament would destroy in a great measure the system of private banking. A national currency would be issued under the control of the legislature. Private individuals, who offer no security to the public, would no longer be permitted to issue bits of paper as representatives of real property. Fluctuation in the currency would be guarded against, and the value of money rendered secure and uniform. But this is not all : an immense saving would accrue to the community. We have seen the bankers gain three millions annually by the issue of their notes. This sum clearly belongs to the state rather than individuals. If a paper currency be unavoidable, let the public have the benefit of it. There would be no greater difficulty in establishing a national bank than a national mint ; and it would be as easy for the legislature to exact 4 or 5 per cent. for the use of its paper, as levy a seignorage on the coin. This would form an important addition to the revenue : three millions is half the amount of the Assessed Taxes, and equal to the produce of the leather and salt tax.

This then is one of the advantages which would result from Reform—the insecurities and fluctuations from private banking would be avoided, and the public save about three millions annually. It is some such change as this that Mr. Whitmore and other Declarers, we imagine, apprehend. They are well aware that their calling had its origin, and depends for support, in a

corrupt representation. They care nothing about the progress of *seditions, blasphemous, and immoral publications*. These are mere pretexts, to increase the strength of their party, and alarm the timid and credulous part of the community. They dread a reform in parliament, because they dread a reform in our monetary system. Their importance in society, and the wealth they have amassed, and the wealth they hope to amass, are from a fictitious currency. Their fears, like the fears of other classes, originate in their selfishness. We see nothing more despicable in the conduct of the Bankers than in the conduct of the Whigs, the Bar, the Bench, the Clergy, or any other class arrayed against the people. The opposition of all these classes originates in the same principle—*SELFISM*. Let our hermaphrodite philosophers and patriots disguise it as they will; let Mackintosh, Brougham, and Jeffray, urge their schemes of human improvement, the whole of their philosophy and virtue amounts to this: they are either in the possession or the expectancy of a monopoly of the advantages of society, and they neither love liberty, humanity, nor justice sufficiently to wish to share them with the great mass of their fellow-creatures.

We shall only make one more remark on the general connexion of the Banking system with the government, and then begin our exposition of the Bank of England. The Bankers, both in London and the Country, derive their influence not so much from their numbers as their connexion with the commercial classes. And this again arises not only from the power they possess of refusing pecuniary accommodation to particular individuals, as from a reputation of superior respectability and intelligence. Hence it is that the Bankers in the principal towns, as well as Mr. Whitmore in London, have always sufficient influence to procure signatures to a Declaration—ostensibly in favour of the throne, the altar, social order, and so forth, but in reality nothing more than for the privilege of manufacturing old rags into money.

In treating of the Bank of England, there appear to be three objects particularly deserving of our attention. *First*, a brief outline of the origin and connexion of the Bank with Government. *Secondly*, the enormous profits it has derived, and the immense wealth it has accumulated from that connexion. *Thirdly*, its present state and influence. We will treat on each subject as briefly as possible, so as to put the reader in possession of the most important facts necessary to a knowledge of them.

The Bank had its origin in war and taxation; and was originally projected by one Paterson, a Scotchman. William III., who introduced standing

---

*Bank of England.*

---

armies, the Excise Laws, the funding system, and other grievous calamities, wanted money to carry on a *vigorous* war against the French. An act passed, inviting people to make voluntary advances to the amount of £1,500,000; and, for securing the payment of the interest, taxes were laid upon beer, ale, and other liquors. Upon condition of £1,200,000 of this sum being advanced within a certain time, the subscribers were to be incorporated; and this being done, the incorporation took place, and the subscribers were formed into a trading company, called "*The Governor and Company of the Bank of England.*" The charter of corporation was executed July 27, 1694; and directs, among other things, that a governor or deputy-governor, and twenty-four directors, shall be chosen for conducting the establishment. For the £1,200,000 lent to government, they were to receive yearly £100,000; £96,000, the interest at eight per cent. and £4000 for the charges of management. Their loan to government might be redeemed on a year's notice, and in that case the charter and company were to expire.

Such was the origin of the Bank, on which one or two remarks may be made. It is clear from the act of incorporation, the 5th and 6th of William and Mary, that nothing more than the establishment of a company of traders or pawnbrokers was intended; and that it never was surmised that they would ever form a part of, or have any dominant influence in the Government. The act specifies very particularly the sort of trade they were to carry on: they were not to trade in goods or merchandise, but to employ their capital in discounting bills of exchange, and the buying and selling of gold and silver bullion; with a permission, however, to sell such goods as were mortgaged or *pawned* to them, and not redeemed within three months after the expiration of the time of redemption.

But still further to confine these traders and pawnbrokers to their province, and prevent any further connexion with the Executive, of which the parliament of that day appears to have been somewhat apprehensive, the same law of William and Mary imposes a penalty upon the Directors if they purchase, on account of the Corporation, any crown lands, or if they advance to his Majesty any sum of money, by way of loan or anticipation on any branch of the public revenue, other than on such funds only on which a credit is or shall be granted by parliament. Contrary to this clause, and notwithstanding the penalty, the Directors continued to make advances from time to time, on treasury bills, to the year 1793. In that year, Mr. Bosanquet was Governor; he had some doubt of the legality of these

advances ; and applied for a bill of indemnity : the Bank having then become an essential part of the Government, this was easily obtained ; and an act was passed to protect the Governor and Company from any penalties they had incurred, or might incur in future, on account of any advances to Government.

Another peculiar circumstance connected with the early history of the Bank, is in the mode of issuing its notes. For above 60 years no notes were issued for a less sum than £20 ; and these were made payable, not to any particular person, but to the bearer, on *demand* ; and for the amount of which notes, in the legal coin of the realm, the Bank was liable to be sued and arrested. As the Bank enlarged its advances to Government, it became necessary to lower the denomination of its notes. A different reason has been assigned, but this no doubt is the true one. It is clear indeed, that the real capital of the Bank being a limited sum, it could only have money to lend to Government by increasing its fictitious capital ; in other words, by extending its issues of paper ; which again could only be done by lowering the denomination of its notes. While £20 notes alone were issued, their circulation, from their amount, being limited to the commercial and trading classes, no great quantity of paper could possibly be emitted ; but when notes of the value of 15, 10, 5, and 1 pound were issued, their circulation extending through all classes of the community, the issue of Bank paper would proportionately increase. Government, therefore, in order to obtain advances from the Bank, readily permitted the issuing of notes of smaller value. In the war of 1755, the Bank began to put out notes of the value of £15 ; and before the conclusion of that war, notes of the value of £10. At the commencement of the Anti-Jacobin war, in 1793, they were still further indulged, and allowed to issue £5 notes ; and, lastly, in the year 1797, came the £1 and £2 notes.\* Rents, wages, salaries, taxes, and every thing else, could now be paid in Bank paper ; and the Restriction Act having protected the Bank from the necessity of taking up their own notes, they were issued in prodigious quantities ; and in exactly the same proportion the Bank enlarged its advances to Government. The following statement, extracted from the Report of the Bank Committee, of the amount of Bank paper in circulation in different years ; and of the amount of the sums advanced to Government on exchequer bills, and other government securities, will show the connexion which has subsisted between the issue of paper and advances to Government :—

\* The act, allowing the Bank to issue notes under £5, passed on the 3d of March, only *five days* after the Stoppage.

*Bank of England.*

	<i>Bank Notes.</i>	<i>Advances.*</i>
1794....	£ 10,963,380.....	£ 8,786,514
1795.....	13,539,160.....	11,114,230
1796.....	11,030,110.....	11,718,730
1814.....	25,511,012.....	23,607,300
1815.....	27,155,824.....	27,156,000
1816.....	26,681,398.....	26,042,600
1817.....	27,339,768.....	25,399,510
1818.....	27,954,558.....	27,002,000

Having shown the causes which led to the issue of small notes, and the connexion betwixt the issue of Bank paper and advances to government, we shall now mention some other points connected with the history of this Company.

Without the assistance of the Bank the immense fabric of debt and taxation could not have been reared. Of this Government appears to have been soon sensible, from the numerous laws enacted for its encouragement and protection. To prevent competition, by the statute 6th of Queen Anne, it is enacted, that no other banking company of more than six persons, should issue notes payable in less than six months. Innumerable acts have passed, imposing the penalty of death for forging Bank notes; others, the punishment of transportation, on persons having them in their possession. The English code has been made the bloodiest in the world, in order to uphold the Bank, and its laws more savage than those of Draco. But of these, and also the Restriction Act, we will speak shortly; let us now only attend to those laws for upholding the credit of its paper.

After the Restriction Act, the Bank ceased to be an independent Com-

\* Perhaps it is unnecessary to inform any of our readers, that the term "*advances*" signifies no more than the amount of debt due from the Government to the Bank, arising from the money advanced by the latter, on the credit of the annual duties, exchequer bills, and other government paper. We may also remark here, that the increase in the Bank issues at different periods exactly corresponds with the times at which they lowered the denomination of their notes. From a statement, in the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica, it appears, that the Bank paper in circulation in the year 1718, twenty-four years after the establishment of the Bank, amounted only to £1,829,930. In the year 1754, it amounted to £3,836,890; in six years after, namely, in 1761, when the Bank put out £15 and £10 notes, it suddenly increased to £5,863,290; and lastly, after the £5 notes were issued, it amounted, in 1794, to more than £10,000,000.

*Bank of England.*

pany; it was a mere Government Office, of which the Governor and Directors had the management; and which issued a *forced* government paper. Paper issued under such circumstances would necessarily depreciate; and this was an evil which it was of importance to Government, as far as possible, to prevent. Having by *force* kept bank-notes in circulation, it seemed a slight extension of the same desperate principle to attempt also by *force* to maintain their credit. Various laws were passed for this purpose. After the Restriction Act, a law passed to protect debtors from arrest, who tendered payment in notes, though they still continued liable to a common action for debt, to compel payment in guineas. This was the first attempt of the Boroughmongers to render Bank paper a *legal tender*, and old rags equivalent to gold. In 1810, when paper had depreciated 30 per cent, and guineas sold for from 25*s.* to 28*s.* in bank notes, a law passed to punish persons pursuing this traffic, and imposing penalties on those who sold them for their *real* value in paper. Tenants, who offered notes for rent, were protected from distress, though liable to a common action of debt or ejectment. At length, in 1811, Lord King having given notice to his tenants to pay their rents in guineas, the legal coin of the realm, an act passed to protect persons, tendering payment in notes, from all further proceedings. This was the finish. Bank paper was now a *legal tender* to all intents and purposes, and by the *fat* of the Oligarchy linen rags were metamorphosed into gold.

Let us now revert to the capital part of Bank legislation—the *Restriction Act*. It is proper the Black Book should contain some record of that *black* and unprincipled transaction. It was truly a swindle on a “*broad scale*,” a national swindle. We shall merely, however, give the outline, and not enter into any minute details of this memorable fraud.

By turning to page 247, and observing the amount of the Bank advances to government in the year 1796, and reflecting on the various laws enacted in favour of the Company, it will appear that an intimate connexion and mutual dependence had been created betwixt the Bank and Government, before the Restriction Act, in 1797; that law, however, completely incorporated the Bank with Church and State. The causes which produced the Stoppage were briefly these: From the commencement of the year 1797, great apprehensions were entertained of a French invasion: the people were alarmed for the stability of the government, consequently for the stability of the Bank, which depended upon the government: a run upon the Bank ensued: the credit of the establishment was endangered; and *suspicion*, which PAINÉ justly



*Bank of England.*

denominates *credit* asleep, was now awakened. The run on the Bank continued hourly to increase, till Saturday, the 25th of February, 1797. This was the last day the Bank was compelled to pay their notes on demand, agreeably to the tenor of these notes, and the conditions on which they had been issued. The alarm not being likely to subside, and the run continuing to increase till the latest hour the Bank was open, on the next day, *Sunday*, an order was issued from the Privy Council, requiring the Bank to *forbear issuing any more cash*, till the sense of parliament could be taken on the subject. This order, as might be expected, was instantly obeyed. A few days more would have drawn out of the Bank coffers the last farthing of cash and bullion. The company wished anxiously to conceal the amount of specie in their possession at the time of the stoppage; but by an ingenious calculation of Mr. ALLARDYCE, this point was subsequently ascertained almost to a certainty. It appears, that, on the 25th of February, the last day of payment, the notes in circulation amounted to £8,640,250, and the total amount of cash and bullion in the Bank, to only *one million two hundred and seventy-two thousand pounds*.

The Bank, like true traders, has always manifested great anxiety about the credit of the house, and endeavoured to make it appear, that the stoppage did not originate in the necessities of the Bank, but the necessities of the government. In the Resolutions of a Court of Directors on the 25th March, 1819, affixed to the second Report of the Bank Committee, it is said, "*That the Restriction on Cash Payments was altogether a measure of STATE NECESSITY.*" Whether it originated in the necessities of the Bank, or the Boroughmongers, or both—the latter appears most probable—it is not very material to inquire: but it appears, that on the last day of payment the Bank had little more than a *million* of cash and bullion to pay more than *eight millions* of their notes; and how, under such circumstances, the Bank could have met their creditors, or what could have protected them from arrest for debt, but the interference of government, it is not easy to conceive.

But the fact is, the stoppage was concerted betwixt Mr. Pitt and the Directors. Sometime before the Order in Council was issued, Mr. Bosanquet and other Directors had had repeated interviews with that minister to consult how the run could be stayed; and the Company saved from impending bankruptcy. The last interview was on the 22d of February; the Directors were then in a terrible fright; they told the minister they

*Bank of England.*

were "*alarmed for the safety of the house;*" and asked him, when "*HE would think it necessary to interfere.*" Pitt interfered on the following Sunday: a singular day for the consummation of the most villainous transaction in history. Immediately after, the Bank had recourse to the vilest and most barefaced hypocrisy to disguise their disgraceful bankruptcy from the public. On the 2d of March, six days after the stoppage, a Court of Proprietors was called. Mr. Bosanquet, who waited on Pitt to express his fears for the "*safety of the house,*" and to know when ministers would interfere, was present. After expatiating on the THEN *prosperous state* of Bank affairs, this gentleman told the Proprietors that he *earnestly hoped* they would soon be *permitted* to pay their notes, as usual, in cash. Thanks were then voted to the Directors for *complying* with the Order in Council, which empowered them to violate their engagements to the public with impunity, and refuse payment for their notes. All this was excellent. Mr. Bosanquet *earnestly hoped* that they would be *permitted* to do that which he had earnestly petitioned Pitt they might be protected from doing; and the Proprietors gravely thanked the Directors for *complying* with their own earnest request!

This was more than Punic craft and Romish duplicity. The Bank showed itself worthy of being incorporated into a system of fraud and pillage. Its whole history is without a parallel, except in the Church of Rome. Blood, fraud, and duplicity,—these are its characteristics. The Reformers are unceasingly accused of immoral and disorganizing principles. What! more so than the Pitt System! Look at the history of the first-born of that system. Look at the history of the Bank of England. Here, indeed, are anti-social and immoral principles with a vengeance. Here are a company of traders, or pawn-brokers, or swindlers, or any other more appropriate name; they commence business, incur debts, and, unable to fulfil their engagements, a government of *social order and religion* interposes to protect them from the demands of their creditors. What right had Government to interfere at all? The Company had clearly become bankrupt; they were unable to pay their debts, they were mere traders; why not share the fate of other bankrupts; the establishment dissolved, and their effects sold for the benefit of their creditors? This, indeed, was as it ought to have been. It would have been fortunate for England, for Europe, and the world. It would have saved Europe from a desolating war of twenty years. It would have preserved a

---



---

*Bank of England.*


---



---

million of lives, and saved rivers of blood. It would have saved France from the bigoted and benumbing sway of the Bourbons; Spain from Ferdinand and the Inquisition; England from her paupers, and all that upstart wealth, that beggarly and insolent greatness, that splendid wretchedness, and perishable grandeur, neither accompanied with happiness, nor knowledge, nor honour, nor liberty, nor humanity, nor any other great and estimable quality in human nature.

Let us now resume our history of the Bank Stoppage.

The *Order in Council*, requiring the Bank to issue no more cash, was issued on Sunday the 26th of February. The *Restriction*, or Protection, or, more truly, the *Swindling Act*, received the royal assent on the 3d of May, and was to continue in force till the 24th of June, that is, only for *fifty-two days*. On the 22d of June, two days before the expiration of the original act, it was renewed till one month after the next Session of Parliament. This was the *first* renewal; the *second* renewal was in 1798, to continue till *one month* after the signing of a definitive treaty of peace. Peace came in 1801; but before the expiration of the month, the *third* renewal was passed, to continue till the 1st of March, 1803; before that time, notwithstanding peace continued, a *fourth* renewal passed to continue till six weeks after the next Session of Parliament. In the interim war broke out; the *fifth* renewal followed as a matter of course, and to continue till the signing of a definitive treaty of peace. In 1814, plaguy peace came again to put the faith of these deluders to the test; but before the expiration of the six months, the *sixth* renewal passed, to continue only *ONE YEAR*. In 1816, the country being at peace, every one expected the *swindling law* would expire; when, lo! it was renewed the *seventh* time, for *TWO YEARS*! In 1818, it was again renewed, for the *eighth* time, for *one year*; and in 1819, it was renewed for the *ninth* time; and the Bank protected from payment of its notes in statutable coin for *FOUR YEARS*.

Such is a brief history of the Restriction Act. It was foreseen at the time by Fox, Sheridan, Hobhouse, and others, that such a law, once enacted, would never be suffered to expire. Events have verified the prediction. Men are loath to part with power of any kind, and least of all the power of making money. Nothing could possibly be more dangerous and impolitic than to empower a company of traders, whose only object was gain, to issue paper not convertible at the will of the holder. Such a power was sure to be abused. The Bank had an interest in its abuse. Their interest was to

*Bank of England.*

inundate the country with paper, to expel the precious metals from circulation, and substitute, in place of the legal coin, their own ragged wealth. They have pursued their interest, and the evil is now incurable. Sixty millions of paper can never be converted into a metallic currency. While the system continues, England must always be cursed with—the greatest of all curses to a commercial country—an inconvertible paper money. There appear two points of view under which the resumption of cash-payments may be principally contemplated.—*First*, it appears necessary, that the Bank should be provided with a sufficient quantity of specie to take up the whole of its notes before the restriction on cash-payments can be safely removed. *Secondly*, is it possible that such a supply of the precious metals can, by any means, be obtained? Now, in our opinion, the first is an indispensable condition; and that the second is physically impossible. Let us endeavour to make these two points a little more clear.

Since the stoppage, bank-paper can be considered nothing more than a forced government paper, and of course its value depends upon the stability of the Government. Supposing the restriction removed, every note holder would be at liberty to demand payment, and the Bank liable to be called upon, at any moment, for the whole amount of paper in circulation. Would the Bank be so called upon? This must depend upon public opinion—upon the opinion entertained of the security of Government. What is the opinion entertained *now* of Government, or likely to be entertained, while the present system continues? Is there a single individual who feels any confidence in its permanency? Is any one so blind as not to see it is placed on the brink of destruction, ready either to be swallowed up in its own inextricable difficulties, or dashed to atoms by a suffering and indignant population? Can cash-payments be resumed under such circumstances? Is it not base delusion to pretend such a thing? The restriction removed, the only thing to maintain bank paper in circulation would be *faith* in Government—in the Oligarchy—the perpetuity of the borough system. Is such faith anywhere to be found? Does any one believe that the present system of mock-representation, profligate expenditure, sinecures, and a hundred more abuses, clear as the day, can now stand against the knowledge of the community?

We believe no one entertains such an opinion. Our position then is, that it is gross stupidity, base delusion, to talk about the resumption of cash-payments until Government is reformed. The grievances of the people re-

---

*Bank of England.*

---

dressed, their rights restored, justice administered, confidence inspired; in short, when a government is established, supported by the good wishes of the people, and not by the bayonet, the dungeon, and field-piece, it is possible the restriction might be removed. There would be nothing then to create a sudden run upon the Bank, except the unfavourable state of the exchanges, which the Bank, in a great measure, has the power to controul. From July 1816 to July 1817, the market price of gold did not exceed £3 : 19 per oz. ; and the exchanges with the Continent, for a considerable portion of that period, were in favour of this country. While this continued there was nothing to cause a run upon the Bank—there was nothing to induce the holders of notes to offer them for payment, but a want of *confidence*. A similar state may again occur; and, we believe, exists at this present time; but would any one say the restriction might be removed? Would not the whole of the Bank issues be returned in the present insecure and unsettled state of the Government? Must not this insecurity last while the Government is unreformed? We conclude then, that provided the restriction were removed, from a want of confidence in the present system, the Bank would be called upon to take up the whole of its notes; therefore it would be necessary to be prepared with a sufficiency of specie for that purpose. But we will now show, that to acquire such a quantity of specie, by any means, is utterly impossible.

A country not possessed of gold and silver mines, acquires possession of the precious metals very slowly. It can only acquire them by its exports exceeding its imports; in other words by the balance of trade being in its favour. When the balance of trade is in its favour, the exchange will also be in its favour, and the market price of gold will fall. The balance of trade, however, can never continue long in the favour of any country; its exports can never long continue to exceed its imports; nor, on the contrary, the imports of a country exceed its exports. A country which exports more than it imports, will be constantly receiving a new accession of the precious metals. But gold and silver, like labour and every other commodity, as they become more plentiful, also become cheaper; consequently increasing the supply of the precious metals lowers their value; or, which is the same thing, rises the prices of all other commodities. Hence it is, that the balance of trade can never continue in favour of any country; because it must enhance the price of its produce and manufactures; and consequently it will be undersold at the foreign market; and thus from being an exporting, it

most probably will become an importing country. In like manner it might be shown, how a country could never long continue to import more than it exported; for being drained of the precious metals in the payment of the balance of trade, all its produce would fall in price; so that it would be able to sell cheaper than in any other country.

To apply these principles to England. During the whole of Pitt's war the balance of trade was in her favour: the superior skill and industry of the people caused wealth to flow into the country in abundance; while, on the other hand, it was as regularly conveyed out again to promote ignorance and slavery in the libercide and Machiavelian projects of her rulers. But though her real wealth was squandered, the shadow or representative remained. Paper money became the substitute for gold and silver, and the commerce of the country suffered all the evil of excessive riches, in a state of absolute poverty. Hence it is, that though England is perhaps the poorest country in the world in respect of the precious metals, her foreign commerce is as much crippled by her imaginary wealth as though she were the richest. The paper has not only forced out of the country its intrinsic wealth, but by keeping up the price of its produce and manufactures, must continue an insuperable obstacle to its re-admission.

There is no likelihood, therefore, of England having the balance of trade in her favour, and of course it is not from this source the Bank can obtain a supply of specie. Indeed, to bring back the specie, would require England to have as great a commercial superiority over all the nations of the earth, for the forty years to come, as she has enjoyed during the forty years which are elapsed. Is this likely to happen with her debt of £40,000,000, her 40,000 lawyers and parsons, her 2,000,000 of paupers, and her 100,000 tax-gatherers?

But if we examine the subject in another point of view, we shall see how desperately foolish is every hope of the resumption of cash-payments. In the event of the Restriction being removed, it is not merely the paper of the Bank of England, but also a considerable portion of the country bank paper, which would be returned for payment. In the present state of alarm and incertitude, the Bank of England might daily expect to have nearly the whole of its paper returned, and the Country Banks at least one half; so that to prepare cash for such a run, at least £40,000,000 of specie would be needful. Where or how is such an enormous mass of specie to be obtained? Such a sum is more than five times

*Bank of England.*

the annual produce of all the gold and silver mines in the world.\* Supposing it absorbed from the circulations of other countries. But how is that to be done? To attempt to purchase it with more notes would be foolish enough; and to think of obtaining it by the balance of trade is nearly as ridiculous and impracticable. Indeed it must be clear, from what we have said, that were it possible, by any magical operation, so far to lessen the circulation of other countries, it would be ruinous to what remains of foreign trade. It must aggravate the difficulties under which trade now labours, by increasing the disproportion betwixt the prices of commodities in this and neighbouring states.

We shall now leave the Bank Restriction Act. But before we conclude we will make one more remark. The hirelings of abuse represent the present contest betwixt reform and corruption, as a contest betwixt *property* and *no-property*; betwixt those who have something and those who have nothing to lose. Stupid as this calumny is, it is gulped down by half the wealthy fools in England, and they really believe, that Reform only means a general plunder of the rich. The base slaves who prey upon the fears of these imbeciles, know well the falsity of the allegation. They know it is not a struggle betwixt property and no-property, but betwixt starvation and prodigality; betwixt right and usurpation; betwixt a government of law and a government of military violence; betwixt the happiness of a whole community and a plundering Oligarchy. But we would ask those panders

\* Mr. Allen, in his examination before the Bullion Committee, in 1810, gave in a statement, extracted from Brongniant, of the quantity of gold and silver yearly added to the commerce of Europe. His statement is as follows:—

	<i>Dollars.</i>
Value of gold and silver brought annually into circulation.	45,762,803
Of this sum, from the Old World.....	5,049,408
————— from the New World. ....	40,713,395
Of the produce of the New World, Spanish America	36,096,736
————— Portuguese America	4,439,040

From this statement it appears, that

1. The produce of gold from the New World is to its produce from the Old, as 3,5 to 1.
2. The produce of silver from the New World is to its produce from the Old, as 12 to 1.
3. The total annual produce of silver is to the total annual produce of gold, as 52 to 1.

---

*Bank of England.*

---

of abuse what respect *they* have shown for property in the Bank Restriction Act? Was that not an attack upon property? Was it not a violation of property to force thirty millions of paper into circulation, which they knew neither could nor ever would be repaid? which they knew must soon or late reduce thousands of persons to beggary, and their imaginary wealth vanish in the hands of its holders like thin air.

Intimately connected with the Restriction Act are the BANK HANGINGS. We should wish to lay before the reader, in a small compass, the most important facts connected with this sanguinary history. More blood has been shed to uphold the Paper System than to preserve life from the attacks of the murderer and assassin. The deprivation of property by the Restriction Act, and the sacrifice of life by the Forgery Laws, render the history of the Bank a record of blood and violence, only to be paralleled in the atrocities of the Spaniards in the conquest of the New World. These ferocious monsters hunted their victims with real blood hounds; while the sordid dealers in paper, in the use of spies and informers, have employed animals whose thirst for blood appears to have been hardly less rapacious and insatiable.

More than FOUR HUNDRED VICTIMS have been sacrificed to the Moloch of Paper credit. This stream of blood only began to flow at the period of the Stoppage. One crime prepared the way for another; and the attack upon property by the Restriction Act, prepared the way for an attack upon life. There were scarcely any executions for forgery prior to the suspension of Cash Payments, in 1797. From 1783 to 1797, there were only *four* prosecutions for forgery by the Bank of England. In the equal period from 1797 to 1811, they had swelled to the enormous number of 469. They multiplied more than a hundred fold. The following authentic document contains the whole history of this dreadful tragedy, and is the Bank's own calendar of the blood they have shed.



## Bank of England.

AN ACCOUNT of the Number of Persons prosecuted for Forging Notes of the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, and for knowingly uttering or possessing such Forged Notes, knowing them to be Forged, since the Suspension of Cash Payments by the Bank, in February 1797, to the 25th February 1818; distinguishing the Years, and the Number Convicted and Acquitted:—

YEAR.	CAPITAL CONVICTIONS.	CONVICTIONS for having forged Bank notes in possession.	ACQUITTALS.	Total Number prosecuted.
1797	1	—	1	2
1798	11	—	1	12
1799	12	—	3	15
1800	29	—	15	44
1801	32	1	21	54
1802	32	12	19	63
1803	7	1	1	9
1804	13	8	4	25
1805	10	14	4	28
1806	—	9	1	10
1807	16	24	5	45
1808	9	23	2	34
1809	23	29	16	68
1810	10	16	3	29
1811	5	19	9	33
1812	26	26	12	64
1813	9	49	7	65
1814	5	39	3	47
1815	7	51	5	63
1816	20	84	16	120
1817	32	95	15	142
1818	4	21	1	26
25Feb.				
Total 313				Total 998

21st April, 1818.

Joseph Kaye,  
Solicitor to the Bank of England.

Thus we see that 313 persons, in the last twenty-one years of compulsory paper-money, have suffered death for counterfeiting Bank-notes. In the eight years preceding the suspension of cash-payments, there was not a single prosecution for forgery; but in the eight years which followed that swindling transaction, there were no fewer than one hundred and forty-six capital

*Bank of England.*

executions for that offence ! Of the four persons prosecuted for forgery by the Bank in the fourteen years before the suspension, two were executed in the year 1784; one in the year 1788; and the fourth tried and acquitted in 1789.

These facts are all taken from returns made by the Bank to the House of Commons. We may safely infer then, that more than THREE HUNDRED of our fellow-creatures have been ignominiously slaughtered, solely from the Restriction-law. Before that event, scarcely a person was ever prosecuted for forgery; but after that time, twelve, twenty-nine, and more than thirty human beings were the regular annual sacrifice to the paper Moloch. But the Bank executions will appear still more horrible, when contrasted with the following account of the number of sufferers for other offences :—

*An Account of the Number of Persons Convicted and Executed for Forgery, and other Offences, in England and Wales, from 1805 to 1818, inclusive:—*

OFFENCES.	CONVICTED.	EXECUTED.
Burglary .....	1874.....	199
Larceny to the amount of £40.....	1119.....	17
Horse-stealing .....	852.....	85
House-breaking in the day-time and larceny	761.....	17
Robbery from the person, &c. ....	848.....	183
Sheep-stealing .....	896.....	43
Forgery .....	501.....	207*
Murder.....	229.....	202
Total.....	8340 .....	4035

From this statement, it is seen, that more persons have been executed for forgery than murder. We observe also, with what relentless ferocity offences against the Bank have been punished. Of 1874 burglars convicted, only about *one in nine* was executed; and of horse-stealers the proportion was still smaller; only about *one in ten*. Of 1119 convicted of larceny, the proportion suffering death is only about *one in sixty-six*. Of robberies, *one in seven* was thought sufficient; and for the crime of sheep-stealing, *one in twenty*. Of 761 convicted of house-breaking, the penalty of death was only inflicted upon about *one in forty-four*. But when we come to the

\* Of this number of 207, no fewer than 176 were the victims of Bank prosecutions.

*Bank of England.*

crime of forgery, justice seems to have been administered on a new principle. Of 501 persons convicted of that offence, *two hundred and one*, or nearly *ONE-HALF* were executed. Why should this crime be punished with such unequal severity? In what does its atrocity consist? It does not destroy life; and it can hardly be said to endanger real property. But it may be said it destroys *confidence*, and thus aims a dangerous blow at commerce. This argument sounds well from the supporters of an inconvertible paper-money. It sounds well from the authors of the Restriction Act. Was not that measure a blow at commercial confidence? Was it not aiming a deadly blow at commerce, to force an immense mass of paper into circulation, to double prices? But it is in vain to expect consistency or reason in these men. With them, imitating Bank-notes is an atrocious offence, not because it endangers commercial credit, or property, or the persons of individuals, but because it endangers the borough system. Their maxim is simply this, and it extends equally through the state, the church, and the bench: whatever endangers the outworks of corruption is *bad*, and whatever tends to their support is *good*.

Nothing can be more horrible than the obstinacy with which the Bank persevered in its bloody career. It will be seen from our statement, that every year brought an increase of victims, and the gallows was fairly gorged with the dreadful sacrifice. Yet they persisted in their sanguinary course, without remorse or abatement. Their appetite seemed to increase, and their thirst for blood rather sharpened than satiated by indulgence. We can imagine nothing more damnable than the Bank's own statement of their executions. In 1801, *thirty-two* unfortunate individuals were ignominiously sacrificed. In 1802, exactly the same number. It surely now was time to pause. It was time to think of some remedy. The waste of life was clearly useless. Even tigers would have been appalled at such carnage. But the Bank seemed insensible. They went on hanging and transporting for sixteen years more. In 1816, their victims had swelled to 104. In 1817, to 127! During all this time, we heard of no attempt to prevent the imitation of their notes. In the engraving, the printing, and signing of their notes, temptations were rather multiplied than diminished. The object appeared to be punishment rather than prevention. We may talk of the excesses of the French revolution, and of the guillotine butcheries of Robespierre, but do they afford a parallel to the *Bank hangings*, performed under a government of *social order*, and which boasts that the Christian religion is a part of its law and constitution?

Had not public indignation been at length roused, it is impossible to foresee the extent to which the Bank would have carried its inhuman traffic. Twenty years of blood sufficiently showed that nothing was to be expected from their humanity. The *Daily Press*, and all the mock advocates of humanity, religion, and law, were silent during this time. It is to the labours of the *Weekly Press*,\* acting on the humanity and good sense of an English Jury, that we must ascribe some pause in this cannibal feast. But though the vultures were scared, they were loth to abandon their prey. The execution of Cashman, Weller, and Driscoll, in December, was an unparalleled outrage on reason and public feeling. The acquittals of Juries, the fallibility of their inspectors and clerks, the impossibility of ascertaining forged from genuine notes—all which had been established beyond doubt, surely ought to have saved these unfortunate men. But the Bank was callous both to reason and humanity; and, like Shylock the Jew, obstinately insisted on the last pound of flesh awarded by the law.

Before we conclude this subject, we will insert two or three important returns made to the House of Commons, which will fully illustrate the absurdity of their attempts to prevent the imitation of their notes, and also the impossibility of distinguishing forged from genuine paper.

\* The great champion in the crusade against the Bank, was the *Black Dwarf*, whose unceasing attacks, and valuable expositions, first excited public attention to the Bank Hangings. In that paper it was fully demonstrated—

1. That the forgery of Bank notes is a matter of the easiest accomplishment.
2. That they may be imitated so correctly, as to prevent any person distinguishing betwixt *true* and *false* notes.
3. That the Bank servants were not only incompetent to distinguish genuine from forged paper, but had often *ignorantly* refused *good* notes.
4. That most of the evil was attributable to the slovenly manner the notes were executed, affording to their servants and the public no criterion to distinguish good from bad.
5. That the Judge, from a confidence in the Bank, had frequently admitted incompetent evidence, from a belief that the Bank was possessed of *demonstrative proof*.

Lastly, it was shown that the Bank had no *such proof*; and that their clerks and inspectors were all fallible, and unable to distinguish forged from genuine paper.

These positions were all supported by numberless instances, which left no doubt of their authenticity.



---



---

*Bank of England.*


---



---

Nearly a QUARTER OF A MILLION expended in prosecution. But the next list is still more curious. It is an account of the notes which were actually received at the Bank, and paid as *genuine*, but which afterwards proved to be *forged*.

## LIST III.

AN ACCOUNT of the Total Nominal Value of Forged Bank Notes presented to the Bank of England, from the 1st of January 1816, to the 10th April 1818, distinguishing each year, and distinguishing the amount of those of which payment was refused, from that of the Notes which were paid and which afterwards proved to be Forgeries.

	Amount of Notes of which payment was refused.	Notes paid, the nominal amount of which was afterwards recovered.	The total nominal value.
In 1816	£ 29,256	£ 26	£29,282
1817	35,054	44	35,098
To April 10, 1818	10,375	5	10,380

This list proves decisively the barbarous and inhuman principles on which the Bank have proceeded. Here is not one, but seventy-five pounds which the Bank paid as genuine, but which afterwards proved forged. This surely ought to have made them pause. They had their own experience of their inability to identify their notes. Yet they went on hanging and transporting without mercy, on the bare *suspicion* (for after these repeated blunders, they could deem it nothing else) that their paper was imitated.

We shall now conclude our history of the Bank. We have given some account of its origin,—the stoppage in 1797,—the most important laws relative to the establishment,—and, lastly, the Bank hangings. Our next object is to give an account of the BANK *profits*, and the enormous wealth it has acquired since the suspension of cash-payments.

The profits of the Bank arise from various sources. First, from the interest of their notes in circulation, which, in some years, as in 1817, amounted to more than twenty-nine millions. Secondly, from balances of public money. These balances arise from the produce of different taxes paid into the Bank, and which have not been drawn out for the service of government. On an average of ten years, from 1806 to 1816, the balance amounted

*Bank of England.*

to £11,000,000, on which the Bank gained an interest of five per cent. per annum.

The third source of profit is the interest on their capital and savings. The Bank's permanent capital amounts to £11,686,000, lent to government at an interest of 3 per cent. The fourth source of profit is from the management of the borough debt. From a late act for the management of the debt, the Bank is paid £340 per million per annum, when its amount shall be 400 millions, and not exceed 600 millions: and £300 per million on such part of the debt as exceeds 600 millions.

The fifth source of profit is from the management of lotteries; for issuing the tickets and paying the prizes, they have generally received £1000 for each lottery. Besides these sources of profit, the Bank derives a profit from its trade in bullion, the destruction of its notes, and the private deposits of individuals. It also has a profit, at the rate of £805:15:10 per million, for receiving subscriptions on loans contracted for by government.\* All these form the gross profits of the Bank; from which, in order to form an estimate of their annual gain, it is only necessary to deduct the amount of their expenses, the stamp duty on their notes, and the interest of their cash and bullion, which constitutes their unproductive capital.

First, as to the expenses of the Bank. The Committee of Public Expenditure stated, in their Report in 1807, "that the number of clerks employed in the Bank, exclusively or principally in the public business was,

In 1786.....	243
1796.....	313
1807.....	450

" whose salaries, it is presumed, may be calculated at an average  
 " between £120 and £170, for each clerk: taking them at £135, which  
 " exceeds the average of those employed in the South-Sea House, the  
 " sum is ..... £60,750  
 " at £150, the sum is ..... 67,500  
 " at £170, the sum is ..... 76,500  
 " either of which two last sums would be sufficient to provide a superannuation fund."

\* During the continuance of the income-tax, the Bank had an allowance of £1250 per million, or one eighth per cent. for receiving the produce of that inquisitorial impost.

*Bank of England.*

The total expense for managing the public business, the salaries of the governor, directors, &c. as stated by the same Report, are as follow:—

Salaries to governor, deputy-governor, and directors	£8,000
Incidental expenses, about.....	15,000
Additional buildings and repairs.....	10,000
Law expenses, and loss by frauds and forgeries, about	10,000
Largest estimate for clerks .....	76,500

Total....£119,500

Owing to the increase in the debt and other causes, Mr. Ricardo supposes, that the number of clerks employed in the public business had increased from four hundred and fifty to between five and six hundred. The expenses estimated by the Committee, in 1807, at £119,500, he calculates to have increased, in 1816, to £150,000. He states, on very good authority, the total number of clerks employed by the Bank, in the whole of their establishment, at one thousand. Half of this number is employed in the public business, and the other half in the private business of the Bank. The expenses of the Company may be supposed to bear some proportion to the whole number of clerks employed. And according to this rule, Mr. Ricardo says, that, “as £150,000 has been calculated to be the expense attending the employment of five hundred clerks in the public business, we may estimate a like expense to be incurred by the employment of the other five hundred, and, therefore, the whole expenses of the Bank, at the present time, about £300,000, including all charges whatsoever.”—*Secure and Economical Currency*, p. 71, 2.

This estimate includes every charge: the expense of managing the public business, the salaries of the governor, directors, and clerks; incidental expenses, additional buildings, and repairs; together with law expenses, loss by frauds, forgeries, and every other expense incurred in conducting the business of the establishment.

The next subject forming a part of the outgoings of the Bank is the Stamp Duty. The Bank, till lately, have always been particularly favoured in the composition which they paid for stamp duties. In 1791 they paid a composition of £12,000 per annum, in lieu of all stamps either on bills or notes. In 1799, on an increase of the stamp duty, this composition was advanced to £20,000; and an addition of £4000 for notes issued under £5, raised the whole to £24,000. In 1804, an addition of not less than 50 per cent. was made to the stamp duty; but, although the Bank circulation of notes under £5 had increased from one and a half to four and a half mil-



*Bank of England.*

lions, the whole composition was only raised from £24,000 to £32,000. In 1808, there was a further increase of 33 per cent. to the stamp duty, at which time the composition was raised from £32,000 to £42,000. In both these instances, the increase was not in proportion even to the increase of duty; and no allowance whatever was made for the increase in the amount of the Bank circulation.

It was not till the Session of 1815, on a further increase of the stamp duty, that the new principle was established, and the Bank compelled to pay a composition in some proportion to the amount of their circulation. The composition is now fixed as follows:—Upon the average circulation of the preceding year, the Bank is to pay at the rate of £3500 per million, on their aggregate circulation, without reference to the different classes and value of their notes. The establishment of this principle it is calculated caused a saving to the public, in the years 1815 and 1816, of £70,000. By the neglect of this principle, which ought to have been adopted in 1799, Mr. Ricardo estimates the public to have been *losers*, and the Bank consequently *gainers*, of no less a sum than *half a million*.

The last subject for which an allowance is to be deducted from the gross profits of the Bank, is for their unproductive capital, namely, their cash and bullion. At the Stoppage in 1797, the Bank stated in their accounts, laid before Parliament, that their cash and bullion, and their bills and notes discounted, together amounted to £4,196,080. They also gave a scale of discounts from 1782 to 1797, and a corresponding scale of the cash and bullion in the Bank for the same period. By comparing these numbers with each other, and some parts of the evidence; an ingenious calculator, Mr. Allardyce discovered the whole secret the Bank wished to conceal—namely, the amount of cash and bullion in their coffers. According to this gentleman's calculation, the cash and bullion of the Bank on the 26th February, 1797, was reduced as low as *one million two hundred and seventy-two thousand pounds*. Since that time the Bank has increased its stock of cash and bullion; and on the average of the eighteen years, from 1797 to 1815, Mr. Ricardo conjectures it has amounted to about three millions.

We have now mentioned all the circumstances necessary to form an estimate of the net profits of the Bank. We have mentioned all the sources whence the gross profits are derived, and also the different items of their disbursements. Proceeding on these principles, Mr. Ricardo has calculated the clear gains of the Bank from the time of the suspension of Cash Payments, in 1797, to the year 1816. The whole of the calculation for each

## Bank of England.

year is inserted at length in the appendix to his "*Proposals for a Secure and Economical Currency.*" We shall only insert his table of the results of his estimate; containing a statement of the surplus capital of the Bank, the yearly gains, and the amount of dividends and bonuses paid to the proprietors of Bank stock.

*Statement of the net Profits of the Bank, and the amount of Dividends and Bonuses paid to the Proprietors, from the time of the Stoppage in 1797 to 1816:—*

Year commencing in January.	Surplus capital.	Profits after paying dividends and bonuses.	Dividends and bonuses together.
1797	£3,826,890	£ 89,872	7 per cent.
1798	3,916,762	533,621	7 do.
1799	4,450,383	*	17 do.
1800	3,941,228	611,981	7 do.
1801	4,553,209	116,038	12 do.
1802	4,669,247	460,509	9½ do.
1803	5,129,756	765,859	7 do.
1804	5,895,615	306,794	12 do.
1805	6,202,409	346,335	12 do.
1806	6,548,744	368,008	12 do.
1807	6,916,752	581,274	10 do.
1808	7,498,026	385,865	10 do.
1809	7,883,891	470,760	10 do.
1810	8,354,651	651,483	10 do.
1811	9,006,134	722,188	10 do.
1812	9,728,322	739,867	10 do.
1813	10,468,189	809,786	10 do.
1814	11,279,975	1,081,649	10 do.
1815	12,359,624	1,066,625	10 do.
1816	13,426,249		

COLQUHOUN had some reason when he said the Bank was the richest establishment in the world. We here see the amount of its plunder during twenty years of blood, rapine, and injustice. The ability of the Bank to expend nearly a *quarter of a million* in hanging and transporting their fellow-creatures, can no longer excite surprise. We see that the whole of their savings amount to thirteen millions. This enormous surplus is exclusive of the regular dividend of 10, 12, and as high as 17 per cent. to the proprietors. It is the Bank prize-money, the spoil of war, the clear gains from the

\* There was this year a loss of £509,158.

*Bank of England.*

loans, lotteries, and taxation of the Pitt system. They may well love that system. They may well oppose its reform. They pretend to fear the progress of *sedition* and *blasphemy*; but their real fears, and they well become their Christian zeal, are, at the probable continuance of peace, and the reduction of the public burdens.

Mr. Ricardo, in calculating the above table, has not included all the sources of Bank profit. He has not included the profit the Bank derives from the destruction of its notes; nor from the private deposits; nor from exchequer bills. These would have swelled their savings still higher. Omitting, however, these items, we see what an enormous fund has been accumulated. This fund, it must be remembered, is clear gain, after the payment of all salaries and expenses. It forms an unappropriated sum, not yet divided among the proprietors. The Bank could now divide more than one hundred per cent. without encroaching on their permanent capital: in other words, they might grant £100 to every holder of bank-stock to the amount of £100, and yet not encroach on the original capital of the company. If they made a division of one hundred per cent. bonus, they would still have an unappropriated income of £542,000, which would enable them to increase their permanent dividend from ten to fourteen and a half per cent. If they divided only a bonus of seventy-five per cent. they would retain a surplus capital exceeding that of 1797, and an unappropriated income of £673,000, which would enable them to raise their dividend from ten to fifteen and a half per cent. If the profits of the Bank were to continue, and no addition were to be made to the present dividend of ten per cent. the accumulation of the surplus profit in forty years, would give to the Bank a disposable fund of more than *one hundred and twenty millions*.\*

According to law, all profits and advantages arising out of the management of the Bank ought to be divided, from time to time, among the proprietors, in proportion to each person's share and interest in the stock of the company. This law has never been observed by the directors; the concern has been carried on, and no statement of its affairs, nor the surplus savings, have ever been submitted to the proprietors. Mr. Allardyce, in 1801, and other proprietors, have attempted at different times to compel the governor and directors to make a declaration of the affairs of the Bank; but these gentlemen appear to have considered it more prudent policy to conceal, as far as possible, their immense gains from the public. As an enormous surplus

\* *Secure and Economical Currency*, p. 34.

capital remains undivided, we would suggest to the Bank, that it be employed as some atonement for the blood and injustice of which they are accused; that they endeavour to alleviate the calamities entailed upon the country by their avarice; and administer some compensation to the widows and orphans, created by their savage and relentless prosecutions.

In the Bank Report to the Committee of the House of Lords, there is also an estimate of the total profits of the Bank since the Restriction act. This estimate exhibits at one view the amount of bonuses and increase of dividends to the proprietors; the new stock created, and the increased value of the original capital. This statement we will insert. It is Mr. Ricardo who is interrogated.

“ Do you believe the following account to be an accurate account of the profits of the Bank since the Restriction? namely,

In bonuses and increase of dividends .....	£7,451,136
New Bank-stock (£2,910,600) divided among the proprietors	7,276,500
Increased value of capital of £11,642,000, (which on an average of 1797, was worth £125, and which is now worth £250,) that is .....	14,553,000

Making in all, on a capital of £11,642,000, a gain in 19 years of £29,280,626”

“ I have no reason to doubt it; I believe it is accurate as far I recollect.”—  
*Minutes of Evidence*, p. 191.

This statement we conceive needs no explanation. In bonuses and an increase of dividends, the Bank has gained £7,451,136. The new bank-stock created, at its present value of £250 per cent. is worth £7,276,500. The original capital of £11,642,000, has increased in value £14,553,000. The total gain of the Bank on a capital of *eleven millions*, is more than *twenty-nine millions*. The brief history of the Bank, for nineteen years after the stoppage in 1797, is this: *they have hanged and transported about EIGHT HUNDRED PERSONS, and in addition to their old dividend have made a profit of near THREE HUNDRED PER CENT!*

We have little more to add relative to this establishment. The subject of of Bank hangings and Bank profits, we conceive must be quite clear. The great influence of the Bank, and the great stake it has in the present system, must also be obvious. What has been said on the Restriction act, we think cannot be misapprehended. Betwixt the two questions of the ability of the Bank to resume payments in specie, and its ability to convert the present amount of paper in circulation into a metallic currency, there is a wide difference. Supposing a confidence in the stability of the government, on which the Bank depends, there is nothing but the paper being depreciated,

*Bank of England.*

in other words, the market price of gold being above the mint price, which could cause paper to be presented for payment. But the Bank, by the contraction of its issues, has always the power to maintain its paper on a par with gold, and preserve it from depreciation. According to Mr. Ricardo, (Min. of Evidence, p. 196—202) it would not be necessary for the Bank to diminish its issues more than £3,000,000, in order to maintain its paper on a par with gold; and this diminution of currency would not cause the prices of commodities to fall more than four per cent.; a variation in price which frequently occurs, and which would hardly be felt.

This, however, is all on the supposition that there would be no run upon the Bank, from a want of confidence, but merely from Bank paper being below par. So far, the proposition is true, and we believe on this principle the Bank might resume cash-payments to-morrow; but we contend that, in the present state of alarm and incertitude as to the permanency of the present corrupt system, the Bank might expect every day, provided the restriction was removed, to be called upon for the payment of the whole amount of paper in circulation; and this is a catastrophe for which they could only be prepared by being provided with specie equal to that amount, and which supply of specie, we conceive, it is wholly impossible to obtain; therefore the restriction act cannot be removed.

Besides the impossibility of the Bank being provided with specie to take up the whole of their notes, there are other reasons which must render the restriction co-existent with the present system. The profits of the Bank, as well as its ability to make advances to government, are in proportion to the amount of paper in circulation; it is clear, therefore, that both the government and the Bank, have a direct interest in the continuance of the restriction act.

In addition to all the evils we have mentioned as resulting from our present paper system, we shall mention one or two more, and then conclude. The power of the Bank to vary the price of commodities, is equal to the power of creating famine and plenty. By enlarging or contracting its issues, the Bank has an absolute power over the value of property, and the incomes of individuals; they may raise one part of the community into affluence, and reduce another to beggary; they may enrich the fundholder and the servants of government, while they reduce to distress and embarrassment all the tax-payers in the country; they may cause the quartern loaf to sell for 6d. or 12d. and feed or starve the working classes. This enormous power is vested in the Directors of the Bank; and it forms one of the greatest absurdities in the history of nations, that twenty-four individuals, traders,

*Bank of England.*

or pawnbrokers, who have not the smallest right to have the least influence over any person's property but their own, should have the property of every individual at their mercy; and our amazement is not diminished, when we reflect that this power has resulted from the profound policy of the "collective wisdom" and "great council," as the *Morning Chronicle* terms them, of the nation.

To illustrate the preceding account of the Bank, we shall insert two statements, extracted from the appendix to the Report of the Bank Committee of the House of Lords. The first statement will show the progressive increase of the Bank issues, and also the corresponding increase in the amount of the borough debt and of the Bank advances to government, from the stoppage in 1797 to the present time. The second statement will show the present state of the affairs of the Bank, the amount of its outstanding demands, and the funds the Bank possesses to discharge these demands. The first statement, to save room, is abridged from the statements at pages 309, 323, and 425 of the Appendix; and the second statement is inserted entire from page 316 of the Appendix.

*A STATEMENT of the Amount of Bank Paper in circulation in each Year, from 1797 to 1819; also a Statement of the Amount of the Bank Advances to Government, and the Increase of the Interest of the Borough Debt during the same Period.*

Year.	Bank Notes in Circulation.	Advances to Government.	Interest of the Debt.
1797	10,821,574	10,181,862	13,430,644
1798	12,954,685	9,807,814	17,795,160
1799	13,374,874	10,082,739	19,552,037
1800	15,009,457	13,201,639	20,311,304
1801	16,134,249	15,289,439	21,257,754
1802	16,284,052	14,284,239	23,753,280
1803	15,967,094	9,595,939	24,892,541
1804	17,623,680	14,715,239	25,588,769
1805	17,271,429	17,202,739	26,731,859
1806	16,941,887	14,663,339	28,413,629
1807	16,724,368	13,763,539	29,685,576
1808	16,953,787	14,364,939	30,703,792
1809	18,214,026	15,400,139	31,537,965
1810	20,894,441	15,017,839	32,870,608
1811	23,471,297	18,068,439	34,133,696
1812	23,123,140	22,551,739	35,608,615
1813	23,939,693	25,893,939	37,793,405
1814	25,511,012	24,484,039	39,337,216
1815	27,155,824	28,032,739	39,684,418
1816	26,468,283	19,863,039	42,149,850
1817	27,339,768	26,373,379	42,206,218
1818	27,954,558	28,035,523	42,349,464
Jan. to Mar. 1819	25,794,460	23,029,720	43,819,728



**EXPENSE**  
OF THE  
**ESTABLISHED CLERGY.**

---

THE Reformers are contending against the corruptions, not the principles of the English System. They are not at war with the theory, but the practice of the Constitution. They see nothing to dislike in the government of a king, an aristocracy, and a commons, when their powers are equitably distributed, and justly administered. They can look with respect to a sovereign who discharges the duties of the executive, protects his people from domestic oppression, and the country from foreign insult. They can view the aristocracy without envy, when they behold it the model of human excellence, the sanctuary of honour, virtue, and wisdom. They can look to the commons with confidence, when they behold them the organ of their sentiments, the faithful representatives of their interests, and the watchful guardians of their rights. They can look to the ministers of justice with reverence, when they behold them really independent, neither blinded by professional interest, corrupted by ambition, nor intimidated by power. Lastly, they can look to the clergy with respect, when they find them neither rapacious nor hypocritical, when their practice accords with their professions; when they are neither profligate nor proud; when they humbly discharge the duties of their calling, endeavouring to alleviate the distresses of their fellow creatures, and administering such consolation as religion affords to the afflicted and unfortunate.

It is the reverse, the counterfeit of this picture, at which they are indignant; and which they are labouring to reform. They are indignant at the mockery of sovereignty, aristocracy, representation, justice, and religion. They behold the sovereign the greatest slave, the veriest tool in his dominions; the aristocracy the refuge of exploded errors, the sanctuary of



---

*Established Clergy.*

---

ignorance, bigotry, and titled imbecility; the Commons the deciders of their sufferings, and the usurpers of their rights; the judges,—men from whose lips ought to be heard nothing but the accents of mercy and wisdom, become the oracles of delusion, the servile instruments of oppression, the propagators of unfounded alarm, the firebrands of civil strife, stimulating one part of society to violence and aggression on another; lastly, they behold the ministers of religion engaged in the same unhallowed pursuit—teaching peace—fomenting war; strengthening the iron hand of tyranny, exciting to murderous violence, stimulating one party of Christians to cut the throats of another, and with the accents and exterior of angels perpetrating the work of demons.

The Reformers revere the *Constitution*, but they abhor its corruptions. They will respect the laws and reverence religion, but under their names they will not tamely behold their liberties destroyed, their property violated, murder committed in open day, and England, from the freest and happiest nation of the earth, rendered the most degraded and miserable.

Our-opponents, defeated in argument, have long laboured to calumniate the motives of Reformers: abuses have been proved, the iron tyranny and glaring absurdity of the present system have been demonstrated. These things cannot be denied, but we are accused of meditating something beyond our professions. Under the specious name of Reform, it is said we design revolution; and under pretence of alleviating the pressure of intolerable burthens, we look to the dissolution of society and the plunder of the rich. What can the Reformers reply to such imputations? what ought they to reply? Men can only vindicate their motives by their conduct. Accusations at all times may be made, but not established. Every man is liable to be accused, but not convicted. Those who bring forward charges, ought also to bring proofs. Let the enemies of Reform establish their calumnies. Let them answer our arguments. Let them show that abuses do not exist; that the calamities of the country do not proceed from overwhelming taxation, originating in non-representation. Till then we must be silent; there would be no end of combating assertions advanced without proof.

We are now going to expose the corruption and expense of the *Established Church*; and no doubt in this likewise we shall be calumniated. When we attack the abuses of government, it is said we design the overthrow of all government; when we expose the abuses of Christianity, it will be said, we are sapping the foundations of religion and morality. We disclaim all such intentions. We are not going to attack Christianity, but its

corruptions. We reverence the founder of the Christian faith. We admire his blameless life, his pure morality, and above all we glory in him, as the great Radical Reformer of Israel—waging fearless war with the bloated hypocrites, who, under the mask of religion and holiness, devoured in idleness the rewards of virtuous industry.

No, reader, it is not Christ; but Anti-Christ, the Anti-Christian Church of England we are going to unmask. Tithes are not Christianity, nor bishops, nor archdeacons, nor prebendaries, nor canons, nor the catechism, nor the liturgy. These are all innovations—corruptions unknown and unordained by Christ: they have no more to do with his doctrine than seat-selling has to do with the Constitution. But it is these we are going to expose. We are going to expose that ulcerous concretion, that foul and unformed mass of rapacity, intolerance, absurdity, and wickedness, ostensibly formed on the doctrines of Jesus, but no more to do with his doctrines than with the creed of Mahomet or the maxims of Confucius.

It is time this second Anti-Christ was laid bare, when we behold her in the nineteenth century audaciously rear the bloody front of persecution. This too she may term Christianity, but Christ was too mild and gentle to combat arguments by force, or to endeavour to silence the voice of reason by fine and imprisonment. Surely if Christianity could force its way in opposition to the secular magistrate, it can maintain the power it has attained without his assistance. In the pure precepts of that religion, there is nothing to excite either indignation or abhorrence: it neither tramples on men by its pride, disgusts by its insolence, nor impoverishes by its rapacity. It is meek, charitable, unobtrusive, and, above all, *cheap*; it does good without ostentation, relieves distress, a real minister of peace, not the firebrand of civil strife, and the exciter to violence and blood. But we again say that this is not Church of Englandism, the innovation of tithes, of bishops, of clerical sinecurism, and non-residence. These indeed require all the power of the magistrate, the emoluments of the church, and the sophistry of her advocates, to defend. They require that reason should be combated by force, and men punished for *thinking*, and daring to publish their thoughts.

Well, the Church of England has obtained one victim to her intolerance; let us see whether she will punish like Christ or Anti-Christ. The judge has declared that Christianity was a part of his law; let us see if it forms a part of his practice. We know that Christ is a most merciful judge. When the woman caught in adultery was brought before him, he forgave the offence, and dismissed her, saying, *Go, and sin no more.* Will the judge

---



---

*Established Clergy.*


---



---

follow the example of the founder of his faith, or the practice of his prosecuting church? Granting that the victim of her Anti-Christian spirit has offended, will he say, in the merciful accents of Jesus, *Go, and offend no more*, or will he exclaim in the language of the unbelieving Jews, *Away with him! crucify him! crucify him!* One would be real Christianity, the other the intolerant howl of Church of Englandism. \*

\* It is curious to remark the slow progress of reason and philosophy, even in enlightened minds. We are led to this observation, from reading the comments of the daily prints on the late prosecution, on account of the re-publication of Paine's *Age of Reason*. The *Times* and *Morning Chronicle* affect to deprecate any further restrictions on the liberty of the press; but both seem to think, as well as Mr. *Brougham*, that there is no injustice or absurdity in penal laws, for what they term "*blasphemous publications*."

How pitiable it is to see these men, in this age, still floundering about in the confines of darkness and intolerance. They have not yet emancipated themselves from popish persecution and ignorance. What difference, we would ask, is there in the principle of a Protestant prosecution, instituted at this day for *blasphemy*, and a Popish prosecution, instituted in the reign of Queen Mary, on account of the *real presence*? In both cases, difference of opinion is combated by corporeal infliction; the Papists punished by fire, and the Church of England by fine and imprisonment. The difference in the punishment makes no difference in the principle; in both cases it is combating mind by physical force.

As to the term *blasphemy*, it is so vague and undefined in its meaning, that, were it generally acted upon, it would open a wider latitude for oppression than the cannibal doctrine of transubstantiation of the Papists. According to the original meaning of the word, it signifies to *degrade* or *injure* the reputation of a person. Hence its meaning is relative, and must be as varied as the opinion of men on the different subjects to which it is applied. To illustrate this point, let us compare the opinions of *Duns Scotus* and *Thomas Aquinas*. Both these men were Christians, but they differed widely in their opinions on the nature of the conception of the Virgin Mary. *Duns Scotus* contended for the immaculate conception, that the union of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost was purely spiritual. On the other hand, *Thomas Aquinas*, with equal sincerity and disinterestedness, said, that the union was carnal, and in a worldly manner. Now, in the opinion of *Scotus*, *Thomas Aquinas*, no doubt, was a *blasphemer*; for his doctrine of the carnal conception clearly tended to degrade the Deity of *Scotus*, who contended that he was conceived in a spiritual way.

Again, there are the *Unitarians*, who, with the exception of the Attorney-General, are a very enlightened and liberal sect. The Unitarians deny the *Divinity of Christ*.

From the principles of the Established Church, neither mercy, wisdom, nor liberality can be expected. Her doctrines are adverse to all the interests of humanity, and fraught with more evils than Pandora's box. In Mr. Bentham's "*Church of Englandism*" the pernicious tendency of this system is fully exposed. Hitherto we had only known the Episcopalian Establishment by its rapacity; but in this work we find her placed in quite a new point of view. From such a system we can neither have liberty, piety, morality, nor knowledge. With these she is entirely at variance: the human mind is subjected to intellectual servitude; hypocrisy, lying, imposture, popery, and fraud are the natural effects of the formularies she employs in her ceremonies and the public schools; and it is these principles that form the basis of the education of our judges, statesmen, and legislators. It is impossible to feel much surprise at the conjunct villany of Church and State, when we find that those who fill every department in both imbibe such doctrines as the foundation of their knowledge.

With the *Church Catechism* alone, Mr. Bentham has shown that at least twenty different vices are directly inculcated. We will here mention a few of the evils he has recapitulated, as flowing from the use of that pernicious part of the church formularies:—

- I. BAD GRAMMAR. To wit where it is said, "Because they promise them both by their sureties: which promise when they come to age, *themselves* are bound to perform."
- II. BAD LOGIC; namely, by inculcating matter useless, superfluous, and unintelligible. By inculcating contradictory propositions. By inculcating doctrines savouring of Popery, and matter repugnant

Clearly, therefore, their opinions tend to *degrade* or *blaspheme* that part of the God-head; and, in the opinion of all Christians who believe in the Divinity of Jesus, all Unitarians must be blasphemers. We could, in like manner, select other sects; and show, that each sect, by its differences, *degrades*, or, which is the same thing, *blasphemes*, the doctrines of others with which it is at variance. But this must suffice. We should wish to put down this new bugbear of *blasphemy*, under which the hag of prosecution has again protruded her Medusean front. And we should recommend Mr. Brougham, the Chronicle, and the Times, to retrace their steps; for we are quite sure that their notions on *blasphemy* are as remote from sound philosophy, and, on this point, they are as deeply immersed in the slough of Popery as Bishop Bonner, who laboured to convert the miserable victims of his cruelty, by a vigorous application of birch to the posteriors.

*Established Clergy.*

to the Thirty-nine Articles to which the whole body of the Clergy have subscribed, declaring their assent and approbation.

- III. Matter tending to INTELLECTUAL DEGRADATION. 1. Matter by which children are commanded to believe that it is in the power of two or three self-appointed persons, agreeing together, to oblige a young child to pursue to the end of his life, any course of conduct which at that time it may please them to prescribe. 2. Matter by which the mind is *debilitated* by groundless and useless terrors.
- IV. Matter tending to MORAL DEPRAVATION. 1. Matter by which *hypocrisy* is inculcated. 2. Matter by which *lying* is taught as a *duty*,—a duty which the child is forced to declare himself bound to persevere in the performance of. 3. Matter promoting *imposture*. 4. Matter by which *forgery* may be seen to be knowingly uttered. 5. Matter by which encouragement is given to *sin and wickedness in every shape*.

Such are a few of the vices of the Church Catechism, which, Mr. Bentham says, “are injected by the hand of power into the breasts of the great majority of the population, at the first dawn of the reasoning faculty.” In the schools of the National Society, this poisonous production has been substituted in the place of the Bible. Such an elementary book of instruction is well adapted to the system it is intended to support. Train up a child in intellectual servitude, to blind and implicit obedience, to lying, fraud, and every species of meanness and evasion, and when he becomes a man, he will be a fit tool both for religious and political knavery. Those who feel any interest in the rising generation ought to watch the machinations of the National Society, the Bible Societies, and every other society any way connected with or supported by the government. Their object is not to make men, but slaves,—not to promote knowledge, but ignorance. Every advantage reason has obtained, during the last three centuries, they would fain wrest from her grasp. Their deeds are evil, and they abhor the light. By their infernal publications, it is obvious they are not only labouring to extinguish independence of thought, and all love of liberty, but to destroy all genuine morality, and train children to a crooked and Jesuistical system, in which they are taught that nothing is vicious which tends to support the Oligarchy and the “*Holy Church*.”

We can only just allude to this subject. Those who are wishful to be fully acquainted with the anti-christian doctrines of the Church of England,

and the slavish and immoral principles taught in the schools under her influence, we must refer to the excellent work of Mr. Bentham. The design plainly is to introduce under a new name all the vices of popery; and it is only from the zeal, activity, and real piety of the Dissenters, we can hope that this atrocious project can be counteracted.

These preliminary remarks on the doctrines of the Church will prepare the reader for the practical commentary on these doctrines in the practices of the Clergy, and which we are now going to expose. In treating of the clergy, the following points appear most particularly entitled to attention: *First*, the origin of tithes, and the various revolutions the property of the church has undergone. *Secondly*, the present scandalous manner in which the clergy discharge the duties for which they receive their incomes. *Thirdly*, the patronage of the church. *Lastly*, the incomes of the clergy, and their rapacity and general character.

To begin with Tithes. It is generally thought that the right of the clergy, to tithes is as sacred as the rights of property. But a little examination of the subject will soon show the wide difference betwixt the claims of the proprietor of the soil and the receiver of tithes. Among the ancient Jews, tithes were considered of *divine origin*. But such a right, if it ever existed, certainly ceased with the Jewish theocracy. The Jews of this day pay no tithes for the support of their rabbies; nor indeed have any tithes been paid by this nation, since the destruction of the Temple and the consequent dispersion of the tribe of Levi.

For more than 300 years after the introduction of Christianity, no such thing as tithes were known.\* Christ had ordained no such thing; and in no part of his history is any compulsory provision, for the maintenance of the clergy, mentioned. During the first ages of the Christian church, its ministers were supported by charity, by oblations, and voluntary gifts. The period when tithes were introduced into this country, it is impossible to ascertain. According to Blackstone, the first mention of them, in any written English law, is in a constitutional decree made in a synod, held A.D. 786, wherein the payment of tithes is generally enjoined. But this was no law, merely a recommendation, and did not at first bind the laity.

The next mention of them is in the *Fædus Edwardi et Guthruni*, or the laws agreed upon between King Guthrun, the Dane, and Alfred, and his son Edward, the elder, successive kings of England, about the year 900. This was a kind of treaty betwixt those monarchs: Guthrun being a pagan,

\* Rees's Cyclopædia, article *Tithes*.

*Established Clergy.*

it was thought necessary to provide for the subsistence of the Christian clergy under his dominion; and accordingly the payment of tithes was enjoined, and a penalty imposed for the non-observance: which law is countenanced by the laws of Athelstan; and this, according to Blackstone's Commentaries, b. ii. ch. 3, is all that can be traced out with regard to their *legal* origin.

Thus far we may infer two things in their history: *First*, that the payment of tithes was not appointed by Christ, and forms no part of Christianity. *Secondly*, they form no part of the Constitution, the payment of tithes not being enacted by any constitutional law of king, lords, and commons.

We shall now speak of the objects for which tithes were originally intended. Upon their first introduction, though persons were in general obliged to pay tithes, yet they might give them to what priests they pleased; which was called *arbitrary consecrations* of tithes. When dioceses were divided into parishes, they were divided into four portions: one for the use of the bishop; another for maintaining the fabric of the church; a third portion for the poor; and the fourth to provide for the priest.\* Charlemagne, who established tithes in France, in the year 778, had made a similar division of them into four parts; and most probably this was the general practice in all Christian countries. When the sees of the bishops became by other means amply endowed, they were prohibited from demanding their share of the tithes, and the division was into three parts only. Thus we see, that the right of the poor to the tithes is equal to the right of the parson. It must also be remembered, that the parson's share of one-fourth was in lieu of all perquisites; he had no *surplice fees*, nothing for marriages, christenings, churchings, or burials. But more of this by and by.

The arbitrary consecration of tithes, though apparently an advantage, did, from the weakness and credulity of the people, become a source of evil. The monks, under various sanctimonious pretences of extraordinary purity of life, prevailed upon persons to pay their dues to them, and thus succeeded in drawing into the coffers of their own societies, nearly all the ecclesiastical profits of the kingdom. Their intrigues prospered so well, that, in process of time, the incomes of the poor laborious parish priests were so scandalously reduced, that the Pope, in the year 1200, was obliged to issue a decree, to enjoin every one to pay his tithe to the parson of the parish where he resided.

\* Black. Com. b. i. ch. 2.

To the arbitrary consecration of tithes, too, we may ascribe the wealth of monasteries and religious houses at this period, and the great number which, about that time, was founded. A layman, who was obliged to pay his tithes somewhere, thought it good policy to erect an abbey, and there pay them to his own monks; or to grant them to some abbey already erected; since for this donation, he might, according to the superstition of the age, have masses sung for ever for the peace of his soul.

Another great cause of the wealth of the Abbeyes was the appropriating the livings. The nature of appropriations it will be necessary to explain, in order to comprehend the present state of tithes in this country. A benefice or living is said to be appropriated, when it is in the hands of a corporation or individual, by whom the profits are received, and whose business it is to appoint some person to perform the service of the church. The corporation or individual is then the patron of the living, and has the appointment of its clergyman. It is from appropriations that lay-parsons and lay-proprietors of tithes have originated. The practice of appropriating benefices originated in the cunning and avarice of the monks. Finding that a very small portion of the income of the church would serve for the officiating priest, they begged and bought, for masses and obits,\* and sometimes for money, all the advowsons or right of presentation within their reach, and then appropriated the benefices to their own fraternity. They generally deputed one of their own body, allowing him a small stipend for his maintenance, to perform the service and administer the sacraments.

The practice was first introduced by the Normans; and within 300 years after the monks had become the appropriators of one-third of all the benefices in the kingdom, and these for the most part the richest. At the dissolution of the monasteries and religious houses by the 27th and 31st Henry VIII. these benefices, by the common law, would have been disappropriated, had not a clause been inserted in these statutes to give them to the King in as ample a manner as the abbots, &c. formerly held the same at the time of their dissolution. Having thus become the proprietor of one-third of the benefices, as well as all the plate, revenues, and wealth of the Abbeyes, the manner this monarch disposed of his plunder, accounts for the present state of ecclesiastical property. With a part of it he founded several new bishoprics and colleges, and the remainder was afterwards given to individ-

\* Services performed for the repose of the dead.



*Established Clergy.*

duals by the crown. Individuals, corporations, or colleges, who obtained these grants, obtained also all the rights annexed to them; and the present proprietors of the Abbey-lands are proprietors of the tithes and benefices formerly attached to these lands. Hence it is that so large a portion of the tithes are in the hands of laymen. It is calculated that there are 3845 impropriations in England; that is, benefices in the hands of persons not at all connected with religion, but who receive the tithes, allotting such a portion of them as they think proper for the maintenance of the priest.

The substitution of Episcopacy for Popery cannot be considered any great advantage to the mass of the people. In the revolutions of ecclesiastical property, the poor have been cheated out of their portion of the tithes. The plunder of the Abbeys was divided betwixt the crown, the aristocracy, and the church. Doubtless the monks were lazy, profligate, and corrupt enough, and well merited their fate; but have they been succeeded by a class of men less addicted to those vices? or is their property by its present possessors administered more to the advantage of the people? The monastic houses were all houses of hospitality. They fed the hungry, and clothed the naked. They were seminaries of education, where all classes were instructed: males were taught grammar and music, and females to read and work. To travellers they were places of refreshment; they were inns where no reckonings were to pay. What equivalent have the clergy of the Church of England provided for these advantages? Do they feed the hungry or clothe the naked? Do they instruct the ignorant or entertain the traveller? For answer to these questions, we may turn to the Robbery of Charitable Foundations, and to the National Schools, where they labour to instil ignorance rather than knowledge.

Besides the profligacy of the monks and Henry's want of money, the opposition of some of the friars to his divorce from Catharine, is one principal cause assigned for their dissolution. By the 27th Henry VIII. c. 28, only such houses as were enabled to spend £200 a year were dissolved. By this act the King obtained a revenue of 30 or £32,000, besides plate and jewels. The suppression of these houses caused great discontent among the people; when this had subsided, a new visitation was ordered, and the great monasteries were suppressed. This completed the work of dissolution. The suppression of the greater houses produced a revenue of £100,000 a year, besides an immense amount of plate and jewels. In *Rees's Cyclopaedia* (Art. Monasteries,) we find the following estimate of the revenues of part of these houses:—

*Established Clergy.*

	£	s.	d.
Of the greater monasteries .....	104,919	13	3½
Of all those of the lesser monasteries of which we have the valuation .....	29,702	1	10
Knights hospitallers, head house in London ....	2,385	12	8
We have the valuation of only twenty-five of their houses in the country .....	3,028	9	5
Friars houses of which we have the valuation..	751	2	0
Total	£ 140,784	19	3½

Many of the lesser monastical houses are not included in this estimate; and if we make an allowance for this omission, and for plate, &c. which came into the hands of the king by the dissolution, and for the change in the value of money, which was at least six times as much as the present, and consider also that this estimate was supposed to be greatly under their real worth, we may conclude their whole revenues to have been immense.

The number of persons connected with them has been estimated at 50,000, an immense number, considering the population of the country at that time. From the produce of the plunder, six new bishoprics, namely, Westminster, (afterwards changed into a deanery) Peterborough, Chester, Gloucester, Bristol, and Oxford, were created, and several new deaneries, chapters, and colleges, were founded. The remainder of the produce was given to individuals, principally the aristocracy. As to the poor, they lost their portion entirely.

Of the value of property at present in the hands of the clergy it is impossible to give a correct estimate. Of this, however, we shall speak more particularly when we come to treat of the Revenues of the Church. At present we shall give some account of *Church Discipline*, as respects the residence of, and the duties performed by the clergy. That this part of the subject may be the more intelligible, it will be necessary to give a short explanation of the different orders in our ecclesiastical establishment.

The king is considered the head of the church; but of his duties, and also his income, we have treated in another place. Let us come to the next in order—the archbishops. An archbishop is the chief of the clergy of a whole province, and has the inspection of the bishops and clergy of that province, and may deprive them for any notorious offence. The archbishop has his own diocese, wherein he exercises episcopal, as in his province he exercises archiepiscopal jurisdiction. By 25 Hen. VIII. c. 21, he has the power to

*Established Clergy.*

grant dispensations for holding two livings, and the like. He has authority to grant special licences to marry at any time or place; and he possesses the right of conferring degrees in prejudice of the universities.

Next to the archbishops are the bishops. The office of a bishop, according to Blackstone, besides the administration of certain holy ordinances, consists principally in inspecting and punishing by ecclesiastical censures the manners of the people and the clergy. This part his of duty we believe is very rarely performed, though he has several officers and courts under him for that purpose. It is the bishop's office to institute to all livings within his diocese. Both archbishops and bishops are elected by the dean and chapter. Formerly the laity participated in the election of an archbishop. The mode of election by the dean and chapter has some resemblance to the election of members of parliament in the rotten boroughs. The king, by his *coirgé d'elire*, directing them to elect not whom they choose, but the person whom he or his ministers has appointed. This is the sort of freedom of election exercised by the electors of Gatton, Malton, and Appleby.

The dean and chapter are the bishop's council, to assist him with their advice on spiritual and temporal affairs. It is their office also to perform service in the bishop's cathedral. The dean is the president, or head of the chapter. The chapter consists of either canons or prebendaries.\* Neither

\* In Mr. BENTHAM'S "*Church of England Catechism*," page 250, there is a letter from Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, containing some curious observations on the appointment of *prebendaries*, and their mode of living. The observations it contains are worth preserving, and are not less applicable to the clergy, generally, at this period, than they were to the prebendaries in the reign of Henry VIII.

"A letter of Thomas, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, to Cromwell, upon the new foundation of Canterbury."

## AN ORIGINAL.

"My very singular good Lord,

"After my most hearty commendations these shall be to advertise your Lordship, that I have received your letter, dated the 27th day of November, and therewith a bill concerning the devise for the new establishment, to be made in the Metropolitan church of Canterbury: By which your Lordship requireth our advice thereupon by writing, for our mutual consents. Surely my lord, as touching the books drawn and the order of the same, I think it will be a very substantial and godly foundation: Nevertheless, in my opinion the **PREBENDARIES**, which will be allowed £40 a piece yearly, might be altered to a more expedient use. And this is my consideration; for having experience, both in times past and also in our days, how the said

of these offices were known in the first ages of Christianity, and may be reckoned among the corruptions of Popery or Church of Englandism.

The archdeacon is the bishop's deputy, and has an authority subordinate to him, throughout the whole of his diocese, or some particular part of it. He visits the clergy, and has his separate court to punish offenders, and for the cognizance of all other ecclesiastical causes.

We come next to the subordinate classes; namely the parsons, rectors, vicars, and curates. All these are generally included under the name of *parsons*, though there is a material difference in their degrees and emoluments. A *parson*, is one that has full possession of all the rights of a parochial church. He is sometimes called the rector or governor, but Blackstone says, parson is the most *legal* as well as the most *honourable* title. During his life-time, the parson has the freehold in himself of the parsonage house, glebe, tithes, and dues.

Vicars are an inferior order to the parsons, and had their origin in the practice of *appropriation*. We have before remarked how abbeyes that had obtained possession of benefices, deputed one of their body to perform the

*sect of Prebendaries have not only spent their time much in idleness, and their substance in superfluous BELLY CHEER, I think it not a convenient state or degree to be maintained and established, considering first that commonly a prebendary is neither a learner nor a teacher, but a good VIANDER. Then by the same name they look to be chief, and bear all the whole rule and pre-eminence in the college where they be resident: By means whereof, the younger of their own nature, given more to pleasure and good cheer, or pastime, than to abstinence, study, and learning, shall easily be brought from their books, to follow the example and appetite of the same prebendaries, being their heads and rulers: And the state of prebendaries hath been so excessively abused, that when learned men have been admitted into such room, many time have they desisted from their good and godly studies, and all the virtuous exercises of preaching and teaching. Wherefore, if it may stand with the king's gracious pleasure, I would wish not only that the NAME of PREBENDARY were exiled his Grace's Foundation, but also the SUPERFLUOUS CONDITIONS OF SUCH PERSONS. I cannot deny that the beginning of prebendaries was no less proposed for the maintenance of good learning and good conversation of living than RELIGIOUS men were: But forasmuch as both be gone from their first estate and order, and the one is found like offender with the other, it maketh no great matter if they both perish together: For to say the truth, it is an estate, which St. PAUL, reckoning up the degrees and estates allowed in his time could not find in the CHURCH OF CHRIST."*

Notwithstanding Cranmer's opinion, delivered three hundred years ago, that prebendaries were a "SUPERFLUOUS CONDITION," they are still kept up in our Protestant establishment.

## Established Clergy.

service of the church. The parson so deputed was termed vicar, as being the deputy, curate, or vicegerent of the appropriator. His stipend was discretionary, and frequently so small, that it became necessary to secure him by law a suitable maintenance. Hence were enacted the 15 Ric. II. c. 6, and 4 Hen. IV. c. 12, which directed that the vicar shall be perpetual; canonically instituted and inducted, and sufficiently endowed, at the discretion of the ordinary, to perform the service, to inform the people, and to keep *hospitality*. The endowments, in consequence of these statutes, have usually been a portion of the glebe, and a particular share of the tithes, the most troublesome to collect, generally called the *small tithes*; the large tithes being still in the hands of the appropriator. The general distinction between parson and vicar is this: the parson has generally the whole right to all ecclesiastical dues in his parish; the vicar is, in effect, only curate to some appropriator, with a standing salary.

A rector enjoys all the ecclesiastical dues of a parson, but has no cure of souls; that being committed to his vicar: the rectory thus vested in him, is termed a *sinecure*, as having the emoluments of a benefice, without performing the duties.

A curate is now in the same state that a vicar was formerly, namely, an officiating temporary minister. Curates hold a similar situation in the Church which the underlings of office do in the State: they perform nearly all the duties of religion, and receive a very small portion of the emoluments. By 36 Geo. III. c. 83, the bishop or ordinary may appoint any stipend for any curate not exceeding seventy-five pounds per annum, over and above the use of the rectory or vicarage, for twelve months, with power to renew the grant.

It only now remains to explain the nature of *incumbency*, and the manner of entering into *holy orders*, and then the reader will be fully prepared to understand the remainder of this article. By statute 21 Henry VIII. c. 13, and other statutes of the same reign, persons wilfully absenting themselves from their benefices for one month together, or two months in the year, incur a penalty of five pounds to the King, and five pounds to any person suing for the same, except chaplains to the King, professors in the Universities, and a few more privileged persons. Legal residence is not only in the parish, but in the parsonage house, if there be one; residence being intended not only for serving the cure and hospitality, but also for maintaining the house in repair. On these statutes it is that every parochial minister in law

## Established Clergy.

is termed an *incumbent*; the law making it *incumbent* upon him to reside upon his benefice. It was the violation of the laws relative to residence that gave rise to the memorable "*Parson's Indemnity Bill*," of which we shall shortly speak.

It only now remains to explain the mode of entering into *holy orders*. No person can be admitted into any benefice unless he has been first ordained a priest; and then, in the language of the law, he is termed a clerk in orders. The manner of filling a person with the *Holy Ghost*, and empowering him to forgive sins, and to keep out of hell, and let drop into it whom he please, is thus described in the Liturgy of the Church of England: "The Bishop, with the priest present, shall lay their hands severally upon every one that receiveth the order of priesthood; the receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees, and the Bishop saying,

"*Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee By the imposition of our hands.— Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.*"

Truly this is marvellous in our eyes. Talk of miracles having ceased, why they are performing daily. Only think of 10,000 church parsons now scampering about the country all filled with the Holy Ghost. But the necromancy of this wonderful ceremony. The bishop only imposing his hands, saying, "*Receive the Holy Ghost*," and instantly, with the suddenness of the electric fluid, the Holy Ghost passes from the fingers of the bishop into the inside of — perhaps a Hay, an Ethelstone, or a Daniels. Filled with the Holy Spirit, he can then forgive or not forgive sins, save or damn whomsoever and whensoever he pleases.

Talk of popery, of indulgences, and absolutions. Talk of the poor, naked, godless, unenlightened Indian, who wanders on the banks of the Niger or the Orinoque. Talk of the Chinese, who cuts his Deity with scissars, or moulds him in paste. Talk of the wretched Hindoo, who immolates his victim to Juggernaut; or of the wild Tartar, who worships the invisible Lama. Talk of all or any of these, or go to what age or country we may for examples of stupidity, it is hardly possible to find a more gross and beastly absurdity than this part of the rites of the Established Religion. However much we may deplore the ignorance of savages, we pray God, they may be long preserved from being illumined with the Liturgy, and humanized by the *tolerant principles* of the Church of England.

*Established Clergy.*

This curious portion of the church service has in some measure drawn us from our subject. Whenever we behold a parson of the establishment, we shall always think of the Holy Ghost with which he is impregnated.

Among the different orders of our ecclesiastical polity, there is none, with the exception of the parsons, vicars, and curates, who appear to perform any religious duty: the rest of the episcopal establishment, including the archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, deans, canons, and prebendaries, being clerical sinecurists, filled with the Holy Ghost for no other purpose but to enjoy the loaves and fishes of the Church. In the first ages of Christianity, the deacons, an order of men answering to modern churchwardens, whose duty it was to take care of the poor, were alone known: the preachers of the Gospel were all volunteers, called, as they fancied, by the Spirit, and who received for their services what their followers thought proper to give. The canons and prebendaries were first introduced by Charlemagne in the eighth century. Of these men we have seen how Cranmer denounced them as superfluous under a *popish*—yet they are still maintained under a *protestant* establishment. As to the bishops, they are of rather a more ancient date; but they too are of *human* or state invention. Christ knew them not: they were a part of the corruption of the first ages, which crept into the Church along with the altar and other parts of Judaism, but form no part whatever of Christianity.

The Christian religion, in its purity, is the cheapest and least ostentatious religion that ever was promulgated; requiring no parade, altars, incense, sacrifice, nor expense of any kind. These are the inventions of state, craft, avarice, and pride. Church of Englandism, in one respect, appears an improvement on its original simplicity; and has rendered the whole a purely mechanical operation. All her service is written; no extempore preaching or praying; it requires no mind,—merely to be able to read or repeat: a child, or jackdaw, or well-taught parrot might perform the service for which individuals receive out of the pockets of the industrious, 10, 15, or £20,000 per annum.

To perform such a puerile and heartless ceremony, it can hardly excite surprise that the majority of the clergy conceive it unnecessary to reside on their benefices. Of the violation of the law in this respect, of the penalties they incurred by this violation, and of the law passed to screen the delinquents by our virtuous and consistent representatives we are now going to speak. We have already mentioned the statute of Henry VIII. in-

posing penalties on parocial ministers absenting themselves for one month together from their benefices.

The penalties of this act were repealed, and others substituted in their place, by 43 Geo. III. c. 84. This Act provides, that every spiritual person possessed of any archdeaconry, deanery, or other dignity, benefice, donative or perpetual curacy, &c. who shall (without some particular cause, specified in the statute of Henry VIII.), wilfully absent himself therefrom for *three months* together; or, at several times in any one year, and make his residence elsewhere, except at some other dignity, &c. whereof he is possessed, shall, if such absence exceed three and be under six months, forfeit *one third* of the annual value (clear of all outgoings except any stipend paid to a curate) of such dignity wherefrom he shall so absent himself; if the absence exceed six months, and be under eight, one half; if it exceed eight and be under twelve, two-thirds; and if it exceed twelve months, three-fourths of such annual value; *to be recovered by action of debt by ANY PERSON suing for the same.* There were some other clauses in this act respecting the power of archbishops and bishops in the granting of licences for non-residence, and also for procuring returns to be laid before the Privy Council, of persons availing themselves of the exemption of the statute of Henry VIII.

Such then was the law as introduced by Sir *William Scott*, and solemnly enacted in the year 1803 by King, Lords, and Commons. In the year 1811 Mr. WRIGHT commenced nearly 200 different actions against the incumbents in the dioceses of London, Ely, and Norwich, to recover the penalties under the act of the 43d. This gentleman had been secretary to four right reverend bishops—the bishops of London, Norwich, Ely, and some other prelate—and of course had enjoyed the most ample opportunities for procuring correct information of the conduct of the clergy. These opportunities appear not to have been thrown away on Mr. WRIGHT. In a series of letters published in the *Morning Chronicle*, betwixt the 6th Nov. 1813, and the 11th of March 1814, he favoured the public with many curious disclosures which had come to his knowledge during the discharge of his official duties.

In his letter of Nov. 20th, he says that he has selected from well-authenticated documents 10,801 benefices, on which there are only 4,490 incumbents, *even said to be resident*, so that there are 6,311 *confessedly non-resident incumbents*; to supply whose places 1523 resident curates are employed, which leaves 4788, which are acknowledged to have neither a resident curate nor incumbent. The whole number of curates, whether real-



*Established Clergy.*

dent or not, employed to supply the place of non-resident incumbents, is only 3730, and only 1793 of these are licensed; whereas, according to the canon and statute law, no person has a right to officiate until he is licensed.

In one diocese, he says, *one-third* of the livings have had duty reduced from *twice to once* on a Sunday; and in another diocese, *one-third* of the parsonage-houses were returned in *bad repair*, as an excuse for non-residence. Speaking of the *false pretences* made use of by the clergy, in order to avoid residing among their parishioners, and the scandalous lives they lead, he says,

“ Now ill-health of the incumbent himself, or his wife, or daughter, is a *common pretext*, when no other *legal cause* can be found of avoiding residence. Of *twenty-two* licences granted in one diocese for this reason, *three* only of the persons are in a state of health to warrant it, and the benefices from which they so absent themselves are very valuable. Whether the ministers whom I thus challenge as using *false pretences* deserve the imputation, will best appear by the mode of life they adopt. Some live in town during the winter; and although night air certainly cannot benefit a valetudinarian, they may be constantly seen at card parties, routs, or the theatre. In summer, enjoying the amusements of fashionable watering places; whilst, too often, their curates, by the parsimonious stipend they afford them, are with a numerous family in a state of the greatest poverty. Others have *beneficial schools* in the neighbourhood of London. Others are continually to be met with near their residence in more pleasant parts of the country, *enjoying the sports of the field, or vigorously endeavouring to detect some poor countryman who may have an unfortunate inclination to taste game!* Others may be seen most days driving their own carriage! Some are in debt, and some are Curates near the Fens! and all to observers seem *perfectly healthful*; yet a certificate from a medical man is deposited with the bishop that they are not so; probably it is six or eight years before when there might have existed a degree of temporary ill health, but after the cause ceases, the same plea is continued; and a licence once granted, is renewed as a matter of course.”— Lett. VI. January 6th, 1814.

Very good, Mr. Wright. Thus we see how these reverend gentlemen are employed; not in administering spiritual instruction to the ignorant, comfort to the afflicted, or clothing to the naked. Oh! no; these are ignoble pursuits, the mere theory of the profession. They pretend sickness, in order to obtain a licence for non-residence, that they may bowl at the card-table, frequent the playhouse, hunt, shoot, brandish the coachman's whip,

and bully at fashionable watering-places. Remember, these jovial spirits are all filled with the Holy Ghost,—empowered to forgive or not to forgive sins—have the cure of souls; that their poor curates are starving on a wretched stipend, and that, in the maintenance of both, the industrious are robbed of the fruits of their labour, and the necessary comforts of their families wasted in the profligate and dissipated lives of their parochial ministers.

In Letter V. Jan. 18th, 1814, Mr. Wright gives the following statement, collected, he says, with infinite pains, of the state of ecclesiastical discipline in the small diocese of Ely, in 1813, compared with the year 1728:—

## In 1728.

On 140 livings, 70 Resident Incumbents.

Thirty-four who resided near and performed the duty.

Thirty-one curates who resided in the parish or near it.

The population was 56,944 souls. The duty was performed 261 times every Sunday.

And their income £12,719 per annum.

## In 1813.

On the same 140 livings, 45 Resident Incumbents.\*

Seventeen who reside near and perform the duty.

Thirty-five curates, some of whom reside eight, ten, or twelve miles off.

The population is 82,176 souls. The service is performed about 185 times every Sunday.

And their income is now £61,474 per annum.

This is singular—duty neglected in proportion as it became more important and better paid. The population increased *one-half*, and the number of times service is performed diminished *one-third*. The revenues increased almost *fivefold*, and the number of resident incumbents decreased *one-third*. What grateful, sincere, and conscientious labourers in the vineyard, are Episcopalian Divines!

“The number of these (says Mr. Wright, Lett. II.) who have neglected their duty in contempt of the law, and in direct *violation of solemn oath*

\* Perhaps it is unnecessary to explain the difference betwixt Resident and Non-Resident Incumbents. The former are those who reside on their benefices, and at least perform some part of the duty for which they are paid; the latter do not reside on their benefices at all, and receive pay without performing any duty—they are clerical sinecurists, who perform the little duty that is performed by deputy.

*Established Clergy.*

*and bond*, are far more than can be contemplated without a considerable degree of alarm.”—One vicar obtained a licence from a bishop for non-residence on one living, stating that he was going to reside near another in a different part of the kingdom. On inquiring for him at the place where he was supposed to reside, he was gone to a more *fashionable part of the country*. On another, to ‘encourage him,’ the great tithes were settled, worth near £1200: when he was instituted *he took an oath to reside*, which he afterwards neglected to observe. A Rector, holding two valuable rectories worth £1200 per annum, to obtain which he gave bond to the archbishop that he would constantly reside on one, and keep a resident curate on the other, himself preaching on the benefice where he did not reside thirteen sermons every year: this worthy son of the Church contrived to evade these conditions, and got a poor devil of a curate to do the work of both livings for £84 a year. Another Rector holding two livings, one worth £500, the other £400—he lived 200 miles off, and had neither resident nor licensed curate.

On the subject of *pluralism* (parsons holding more than one living,) and of non-residence together, the Secretary to four Bishops says, (Lett. V.) “In one diocese there are about 216 clergymen, who each hold *two* livings; 40 who hold *three* each; 13 who hold *four* each; 1 who holds *five*; 1 who holds *six*; besides *dignities* and *offices*: and although many of these thus accounted *single* benefices are two, three, four, or five parishes *consolidated*, yet a great part of these Pluralists do not reside in any of their preferments.” In (Lett. VII.) he says, “I will prove that there are Pluralists holding more than *seven benefices* and dignities.”

These different statements of Mr. Wright are fully supported by the Diocesan Returns laid before the Privy Council, and ordered by the House of Commons to be printed. From these returns in the years 1809, 1810, and 1811, Mr. Bentham has inserted an abstract in his Church of Englandism. This abstract we will insert, and then a few explanations: it will show at once the state of Church discipline when the Diocesan Secretary was arrested in his attempt to bring the delinquents to justice.

*Established Clergy.*

	CASES OF NON-RESIDENTS in YEARS		
	1809.	1810.	1811.
1. Absent without Licence or Exemption .....	672	650	1033
2. Resident on other Benefices .....	1240	1846	2059
3. Exemptions not-notified .....	817	363	155
4. Infirmity of Incumbent or Family .....	465	389	396
5. Want or Unfitness of Parsonage-house .....	944	943	1068
6. Incumbents residing in the Neighbourhood, and doing Duty .....	565	348	301
7. Unenumerated cases confirmed by the Archb.	54	35	26
8. Dilapidated Churches .....	23	34	56
9. Sinécures and Dignities not requiring resi- dence .....	233	70	68
10. Livings held by Bishops .....	26	35	21
11. Recent Institutions .....	0	54	33
12. Miscellaneous Cases .....	1271	38	51
Total open to Connivance, viz. as towards Non- Notification and False Notification .....	6310	4903	5268
Total of Non-Residents .....	7358	5840	6311.
Total of Residents .....	3836	4421	4490
Total of Residents and Non-Residents together .	11,194	10,261	10,801

The first of these totals contains the twelve preceding classes, in each class of which Mr. Bentham thinks there is room for connivance on the part of the Bishops to whom the returns are made, and of falsehood and evasion on the part of the Incumbents. The second total exhibits the whole number of Non-Residents; and the fourth, the total number of Residents and Non-Residents together, in England and Wales. Hence it appears, that more than one-half of the whole number of Incumbents do not reside on their benefices; receive large salaries for nothing; and the little duty that is performed, is performed by their curates.

We shall only make a remark or two on a few of these classes. Class 3: Those who plead sickness or infirmity as an excuse for non-residence has been fully illustrated by an extract from Mr. Wright's Letter, page 289. According to Mr. Wright, "*Want or Unfitness of Parsonage-house,*" is a common pretence for obtaining a licence for non-residence. In Lett. II. he says, "In one diocese, *one-third* of the parsonage-houses are returned in bad repair." In 1811, more than one thousand, or about one-tenth of the whole number of parsonage-houses in the kingdom were returned, as an excuse for non-residence; or, in other words, to obtain a licence to desert their parishes, and roam about the country in quest of more lively amuse-

*Established Clergy.*

ments than christening, burying, and spiritually instructing their parishioners.

“*Sinecures and Dignities not requiring Residence.*” The name of this class seems sufficiently explanatory. They appear to be perfect clerical sinecures; yielding masses of pay, without any duty being performed by either deputy or principal.

“*Living held by Bishops.*” these too are returned among the cases of non-residence, and of course cases in which no duty is performed for whatever money is received. Here we see these Right Reverend Prelates committing the very offence which it is their duty to prevent being committed by the Clergy of their diocese.

Lastly, among the “*Miscellaneous Cases*” of non-residence, are included those livings held by *sequestration*. In these instances, the Incumbent being *insolvent*, possession, at the instance of some creditor or creditors, had been taken of the benefice, to raise money for the discharge of the debt. In 1810, the number of livings held by sequestration was 91; in 1811, 78.

Such then was the state of Church Discipline, as exhibited by official documents, and the averments of Mr. Wright, when that gentleman commenced his actions against the Clergy. We have stated, that the number of actions amounted to about 200; and had Mr. Wright been suffered to recover, the penalties would have amounted to £80,000. To this sum he had an indisputable claim; a claim as sacred as any person can have to an estate devised by will, or on a mortgage, or any other legal security: his claim had been guaranteed to him by a solemn act of the Legislature. Nay more, this claim appeared to be rendered still more sacred, by Sir *William Scott* being the author of the act of the 43d. Sir William, it is well known, is considered nearly infallible in matters relative to the Church, as his brother is in matters relative to the State: he is the corner-stone of the Temple, whom, if the Bishops have not filled with the Holy Ghost, have at least filled with the political piety of the Borough System; that is with that peculiar religion of the Church of England, which so perverts the intellectual vision, that it is impossible for those blinded by its influence, to see any vice in a system which loads individuals with wealth and a nation with misery.

It is not of much consequence what were the motives of Mr. Wright for coming forward in this business. It appears he had been very basely treated by the Right Reverend Bishops; and it was to indemnify himself for losses sustained in their service, that he endeavoured to recover the penalties to which

the Clergy had become liable by the criminal connivance and neglect of the Bishops. In Letter I. (*Morning Chronicle*, Nov. 13, 1813,) he says, "At a Committee of Bishops, after a *deliberation of nearly TWO YEARS*, it was decided that each Bishop should give his Secretary an annual sum of money. I have received it from *not one of them*, except my late lamented patron, the Bishop of London."—"Commiseration may have been given (Letter VII.) but it was all I ever received from any one, and that would have been unnecessary, if the sums had been paid which were acknowledged to be my due."—"Two Secretaries have, within the last ten years, fallen victims to depression of mind, arising from a want of sufficient income."

Most merciful Bishops! most Christian Bishops! What, not pay your poor Secretaries their stipends! drive two of them to despair by your barbarous avarice! Surely you might have spared them odd hundreds, out of your 10, 15, and 20,000 pounds per annum. But you are right reverend fathers, you can lisp about charity, turn up your eyes, talk about treasures in heaven, but *your* treasures are all in this world; there your hearts are fixed upon translations, pluralisms, fat livings, and church patronage.

These however are private anecdotes betwixt Mr. Wright and his right reverend employers. Let us speak to the public part of the question. It is clear, from what has been said, that Mr. Wright was in possession of valuable information; he had resided in the *Sanctum Sanctorum* of the Temple, and was intimately acquainted with the secret management of the Holy Church. The Clergy were terribly alarmed at his disclosures: they resorted to every artifice to avert the storm, and save their pockets: clubs were formed among the higher orders of ecclesiastics: lies and calumnies of every shape and description were vomited forth to blacken the character of Mr. Wright; he was stigmatized as an "*Informer*," who, availing himself of his official situation, was in part the cause of, and then the betrayer of their guilt. In short, he became exposed to the whole storm of priestly cunning, malignity, and fury. But facts are stubborn things; and this gentleman had secured too firm an hold of his object to lose his grasp by the wiles and malice of the Church. Their guilt was unquestionable; there was no chance of escape from the verdict of a Jury; but that protection which it was in vain to expect from an English Court of Justice, they found in the great sanctuary of delinquency, an English House of Commons.

On the 17th Nov. 1813, *Brage Bathurst* brought in a Bill to stay all legal proceedings against the Clergy on account of the penalties they had incurred under the Act of the 43d. This Bill shortly after passed into a

*Established Clergy.*

law, almost without opposition. The Whigs were silent. Mr. Whitbread and Mr. Brand indeed said something about the absurdity of enacting laws one day, and abrogating them the next; of the injustice of tempting people by rewards, and after they had earned them, interfering to prevent their being granted. But this was all. These gentlemen agreed it was necessary to protect the Clergy; and, with the exception of Lord Folkstone, we do not find, in Hansard's History of the Debates, a single individual who raised his voice against the principle of this nefarious transaction.

During the progress of the Bill, Mr. Wright presented several petitions in vindication of his claim to the penalties, and of his character and motives from the slanders of the Clergy. In his petition of the 21st April, (*Parl. Deb.* vol. xxvii. p. 462,) he declares, that the representations made by the Clergy of his having entrapped them, and nourished their offences, and of having kept back their licences and notifications, are wholly without foundation: so far from which, the petitioner had, at great trouble and expense, prepared abstracts of the different statutes in force relative to residence and license, and caused them to be printed and distributed, gratis, among the Clergy, that they might not be ignorant of the penalties they were liable to by their practices. He also complains of clubs and associations formed among the Clergy; of their having commenced friendly actions against themselves; and of having consulted counsel, whether they could not avoid the penalties to which they were liable by a sham resignation of their benefices, and then retaking them: all which the petitioner said were intended to abridge him of the legal rights vested in him by the legislature.

After this petition the public heard nothing more of Mr. Wright. In his last letter in the Morning Chronicle, he intimated that he had ulterior information of great importance to bring forward; but suddenly he became as silent as the grave. Whether this silence was obtained by a payment out of Secret-Service Money, by a pension, a sinecure, annuity, or some other holy management, it is impossible to say; but it is certain that Mr. Wright all at once ceased his communications to the public relative to the Clergy; the Parsons' Indemnity Bill passed into a law, and the Church received a complete white-washing from the State for all its manifold sins and transgressions.

After the passing of the Restriction Act, Gagging Bills, Seditious Meeting Bills, and of the Habeas Corpus Suspension Bills, it can hardly excite surprise that a Bill passed to indemnify the Clergy. In the latter case, however, there appears something more unprincipled and contemptible than in the former un-

*Established Clergy.*

constitutional measures. The law imposing the penalties which Mr. Wright attempted to recover had only been enacted in 1803: the professed object was to remedy the crying evil of non-residence; and to give greater encouragement to prosecutions, the Act provided that the whole of the penalties were to be given to the informer. Only eight years elapse, an informer comes forward, relying on the faith of Parliament; prosecutions are commenced; when the Legislature interferes—in utter contempt of justice and consistency—belying its former professions, violating its pledge, robbing an individual of his reward, and screens the delinquents which its own laws had made liable to punishment. It is impossible for the people to feel any thing but contempt for such a system of legislation. Laws, it is clear, are not made to principles, but to men, and are only terrible to the weak, and not to the wicked.

*Revenues of the Established Church.*

This forms the most important branch of this article, and it is that part on which we have found the greatest difficulty in obtaining correct and authentic information. The returns made to Parliament of the incomes of the parochial Clergy afford sufficient information on that part of the subject; but the incomes of the higher orders in the ecclesiastical establishment cannot be obtained with the same facility and correctness. After, however, considerable labour and difficulty, we now flatter ourselves that we have obtained sufficient data for laying before the reader a comprehensive account of the revenues, number, and influence of the Established Clergy.

The Revenues of the Church of England are derived from Tithes, reserved rents in corn or money, or both conjointly, fines on renewal of leases of church estates, glebe and augmentation lands, surplice fees, and some other inconsiderable sources of emolument.

The revenues derived from these sources are divided among three principal classes, namely, the Episcopal, Dignified, and Parochial Clergy. The Episcopal Clergy includes two archbishops and 24 bishops. The Dignified Clergy consists of 26 deans, 60 archdeacons, 544 cathedral dignitaries, namely, canons and prebendaries, in all 630. We may also add to this class, though not included among the dignitaries, a subordinate rank belonging to cathedral and collegiate churches, under the denomination of minor-canons, priest-vicars, vicars-choral, &c. with many others in still lower situations, all



*Established Clergy.*

in *holy orders*, and whose total number may amount to 300. Besides these there are an immense number of lay-officers in the capacities of organists, singing men, choristers, vergers, sextons, schoolmasters, free-scholars, almsmen, &c. &c. The total of all these classes, nominally employed in the service of cathedral and collegiate churches, but in fact nothing more than idlers and sinecurists, amounts, it is supposed, to not less than 2000 persons.

The Parochial Clergy are still more numerous, and constitute the basis of the ecclesiastical pyramid, of which the Episcopal Clergy form the apex. They form the great commonalty among the clerical body, including all rectors, vicars, curates, &c. amounting in round numbers to about 14,000.

The incomes of these great classes next remain to be considered. First, let us speak of the Episcopal Clergy. The revenues of this class have been variously estimated. Cove, in his *Essay on the Revenues of the Church of England*, (p. 106, 3d edit.) estimates them as low as £130,000 per annum. This writer, however, is not entitled to much credit; he participates himself largely in the loaves and fishes of the Church; he is a reverend gentleman, a rector, and a prebendary; his work is inscribed, "*To the Friends of our Excellent Constitution in Church and Estate.*" He contends that the Clergy have both a NATURAL and LEGAL right to tithes; and his object plainly is, throughout the whole of his publication, to show, by disguised and qualified statements, that the cumbrous, expensive, and useless establishment, of which he forms a part, is not so oppressive to the country as is generally supposed.

Upon the estimate then of the Rev. Mr. Cove it were unsafe to rely, Another calculation, inserted in Mr. Bentham's *Church of Englandism*, makes the total revenues of the Sees amount to £169,100. This statement probably is considerably below their real amount. Perhaps the only certain data we can proceed upon is to adopt the valuation in the "*King's Book*," and allow for the changes in the value of money and improvements in agriculture. The valuation in *Liber Regis*, or the *King's Book*, was made in the reign of Henry VIII. and contains the annual value of all ecclesiastical benefices then in the kingdom. But as the valuation was to be the foundation of the future payment of first fruits and tenths,\* it is probable the estimate of

\* First Fruits are the first year's whole profit or value of any spiritual preferment. The Tenths are the tenth part of the annual value of each living. Both first fruits and tenths were formerly paid to the Pope. The first fruits were paid to his Holiness on promotion to any new benefice, and the tenths were an annual income-tax, of ten per

*Established Clergy.*

that day was considerably below their real worth. However, it may be considered sufficiently near the truth, to enable us to form a tolerably correct idea of the present value of English bishoprics.

The valuation of sees, and the dignities and livings annexed to them in the King's Book, amounts to about £24,000 per annum. Allowing that ecclesiastical property has increased in value in the proportion of ten to one, the present revenues of the Bishops amount to £240,000. Mr. Cove admits that the incomes of the Parochial Clergy have increased in this proportion; but he endeavours to show that the revenues of the Episcopal and Dignified Clergy have not increased in the same ratio. We can, however, see no cogent reason for making any distinction. The sources, namely, land and certain fixed money payments, whence the incomes of these classes are derived, are of the same nature, and have undergone similar changes as to value, as other descriptions of ecclesiastical property; we shall therefore adopt the same proportion in calculating the value of the bishoprics, and the revenues of cathedral and collegiate churches.

The following statement will give some idea of the patronage, connexions, and revenues, of the Episcopal Clergy.

Canterbury. <i>Charles Manners Sutton</i> , value of see.....	£26,820
Cousin to the Duke of Rutland, and brother to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. The livings in the gift of the Archbishop about 140. He is stiled Primate of <i>all</i> England: the Archbishop of York Primate of England.	
York. <i>Venables Vernon</i> , value of see .....	16,100

cent. out of the revenues of the Clergy. In the reign of Henry VIII. it was computed that, in 50 years, 800,000 ducats had been sent to Rome for first fruits only. As the Clergy would, when it was contrary to law, persist in the payment of these foreign exactions, Henry determined, on the dissolution of the monasteries, to keep them to the yoke to which they had voluntarily subjected themselves, and annexed the revenue arising from first fruits and tenths to the crown: excepting however from the payment of first fruits all vicarages under ten pounds, and rectories under ten marks per annum.

In the reign of Queen Anne this part of the revenue of the crown, amounting to about £14,000, was formed into a fund, called Queen Anne's Bounty, and applied to the augmentation of poor livings. It has been subsequently greatly increased by an annual grant of £100,000 from parliament, and the benefactions of private individuals.

*Established Clergy.*

Brother of Lords Vernon and Harcourt. <i>Patronage</i> : about 80 livings, 50 prebends, besides precentorships, chancellorships, sub-deaneries, &c.		
London.	<i>William Howley</i> , value of see .....	£10,000
	Dean of the Chapel Royal .....	260
		—10,200
<i>Patronage</i> : 95 livings, 28 prebends, besides precentorships, chancellorships, &c.		
Durham.	<i>Shute Barrington</i> , value of see .....	18,210
	Uncle of Viscount Barrington. The Rev. George Barrington, prebend of Durham, £1000, is a relation. <i>Patronage</i> : 12 prebends in the cathedral of Durham, the archdeaconry of Durham, and about 80 rectories, vicarages, and curacies.	
Winchester.	<i>Brownlow North</i> , value of see .....	28,730
	Uncle to the Earl of Guildford. <i>Patronage</i> : the archdeaconries of Surrey and Winton; 12 prebends, 6 minor canonries, and 70 livings.	
Lichfield and Coventry.	<i>James Cornwallis</i> , value of see .....	£5590
	Dean of Durham, .....	4000
		— 9590
	Uncle to Marquis Cornwallis. <i>Patronage</i> : 26 prebends, 18 vicarages, 4 rectories, besides succentorships, precentorships, treasurer-ships, &c.	
Lincoln.	<i>George Prettyman Tomline</i> , value of see .....	£8280
	Dean of St. Paul's .....	7250
		— 15,530
	Secretary to the "heaven-born minister." <i>Patronage</i> : 2 archdeaconries, 26 prebends, 36 livings, besides sacrists, vicars-choral, &c.	
Bath and Wells.	<i>Richard Beadon</i> , value of see .....	5330
	Tutor to the Duke of Gloucester. <i>Patronage</i> : 27 livings, and a host of priest-vicars, vicars-choral, prebends, &c.	
Worcester.	<i>Folliott Herbert Walker Cornwall</i> , value of see .....	£9290
	Rector of Hartlebury .....	300
		— 9590
	<i>Patronage</i> : archdeaconry of Worcester, with rectory of Clarendon, and about 20 livings.	
Chichester.	<i>John Buckner</i> , value of see .....	6770
	Duke of Richmond's tutor. <i>Patronage</i> : 36 livings, and 20 prebends. The bishop is rector of St. Giles's.	

## Established Clergy.

Bangor.	<i>Henry William Majendie</i> , value of see .....	£1310
	Son of the late Queen's English master, archdeacon of Anglesea and Bangor, rector of Llandaff, Anglesea, and Denbigh. <i>Patronage</i> : about 80 livings, besides cathedral and collegiate appointments.	
Hereford.	<i>George Isaac Huntingford</i> , value of see .....	7680
	<i>Patronage</i> : 2 archdeaconies, 28 prebends, and 35 livings.	
Exeter.	<i>George Pelham</i> , value of see .....	£5000
	Archdeacon of Exeter .....	600
	Canon residentiary of Chichester .....	700
	Vicar of Wellington and Bexhill, .....	200
		6500
	Brother of the Earl of Chichester. His lordship's diocesan, cathedral, and collegiate <i>Patronage</i> , in the King's Book, is £412, besides about 48 livings.	
St. David's.	<i>Thomas Burgess</i> , value of see .....	£4260
	Prebend of Durham, .....	2000
		6260
	<i>Patronage</i> : about 100 livings, besides precentorships, prebends, &c.	
Salisbury.	<i>John Foster</i> , value of see .....	£13,850
	Chancellor of the Order of the Garter, .....	570
		14,420
	Tutor to the Princess Charlotte. <i>Patronage</i> : about 40 livings, 35 prebends, and very valuable cathedral and collegiate appointments.	
Norwich.	<i>Henry Bathurst</i> , value of see .....	8370
	Brother-in-law of Lord Castlecoot, and relation of the renowned BRAGGE BATHURST, who introduced the memorable " <i>Parsons' Indemnity Bill</i> ." <i>Patronage</i> : 4 archdeaconies, the hospital of Hilderlands, and about 40 livings.	
St. Asaph.	<i>John Luxmore</i> , value of see .....	1870
	Duke of Beaufort's tutor. <i>Patronage</i> , about 90 livings: the archdeaconry of St. Asaph held in commendam, with Diserth rectory annexed.	
Carlisle.	<i>Samuel Goodenough</i> , value of see .....	5310
	The lady of the Bishop's brother was sister to Viscount Sidmouth. <i>Patronage</i> : 4 prebends in the cathedral church of Carlisle, and 30 livings.	

*Established Clergy.*

Bristol.	<i>William Lord Mansel</i> , value of see.....	£2940	
	Rector of Barwick, in Yorkshire .....	330	
	Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.....	1200	
	Tutor to Mr. Percival. <i>Patronage</i> : archdeaconry of Dorset, with the rectory of Gussage annexed; livings in his gift, 14.		420
Rochester.	<i>Walker King</i> , value of see .....	£2900	
	Canon of Wells .....	400	
	Prebendary of Durham .....	2000	
	Late Duke of Portland's secretary. <i>Patronage</i> : archdeaconry of Rochester, with a prebend annexed; 16 rectories and 5 vicarages in his gift.		1400
Ely.	<i>Bowyer Edward Sparke</i> , value of see.....	21,000	
	Duke of Rutland's tutor. <i>Patronage</i> : archdeaconry of Ely, eight prebends, and about 100 livings.		
Chester.	<i>George Henry Law</i> , value of see.....	£4000	
	Prebendary of Carlisle .....	100	
	Brother of the late Lord Ellenborough. <i>Patronage</i> : archdeaconry of Richmond and Chester, 6 prebends in the cathedral church of Chester; 30 livings.		400
Peterborough.	<i>Herbert Marsh</i> , value of see.....	1100	
	<i>Patronage</i> : archdeaconry of Northampton; 6 prebends in the cathedral church of Peterborough; and 13 livings.		
Gloucester.	<i>Henry Ryder</i> , value of see.....	£1200	
	Dean of Wells .....	1000	
	Brother of the Earl of Harrowby. <i>Patronage</i> : archdeaconry of Gloucester, with the Rectory of Dussley annexed; and 24 livings.		2000
Oxford.	<i>Edward Legge</i> , value of see .....	2500	
	Uncle to the earl of Dartmouth. <i>Patronage</i> : archdeaconry of Oxford, with the impropriation of Islley; 11 livings.		
Landaff.	<i>William van Mildert</i> , value of see .....	1500	
	This is the present see in the hierarchy. The valuation of first		

*Established Clergy.*

fruits in the King's Book, the different prebends, precentorships, &c. is not more than £40. The bishop has the patronage of 16 livings.

Sodor and Man. *Rev. George Murray, D.D.*

We find no statement of the revenue of this prelate. With the exception of the Bishop of Man, all other prelates, in virtue of their benefices being converted into temporal baronies, by William the Conqueror, have votes in the House of Lords.

Here then are 26 individual right reverend sinecurists, who draw from the pockets of the industrious more than £220,000 per annum. The account of patronage is taken from the "Ecclesiastical Directory." There are, no doubt, many other sinecure livings, and other sources of emolument, which we have not been able to bring into this statement. Before we make any remarks on the revenue of the Episcopal Clergy, let us endeavour to ascertain the incomes of the other two great classes.

The revenues of the Dignified Clergy in the King's Book amount to £38,000 per annum; and, supposing them to have increased in the proportion of ten to one, their present value is £380,000. Mr. Cove (p. 109) supposes they have not increased in a higher proportion than seven to one, and that they do not exceed collectively £275,000 per annum.

There are no data for giving any particular account of the respective incomes of the Dignitaries, as they are called, and the different members of cathedral and collegiate churches. Many of the deaneries, as those of Westminster, Windsor, St. Paul's, Salisbury, Lincoln, Exeter, and Wells, are very valuable, and probably yield to their possessors incomes of £12,000, £10,000, £7000, £2000, £1900, and £1500, respectively. The prebendaries and canons, many of them have incomes of £400 a year. Some of the precentorships are worth not less than £900 a year; and many of the chancellorships, treasurerships, succentorships, and we know not how many other ships, afford snug incomes of £400, £500, and £800, per annum. The minor-canons, some of them have £150; the vicars-choral, £120; the priest-vicars, the chanters and sub-chanters, and a hundred more popish names and offices, are also very well paid, for doing nothing, out of the wages of industry.

We shall conclude our account of the Dignified Clergy, with the

*Established Clergy.*

names, present incomes, and value in the King's Book, of the archdeacons.

ARCHDEACONRY.	NAME.	VALUE in the King's Book.	Present Value about.
Canterbury	Hurst Radcliffe	£163 1 10	£1630
St. Asaph	Bishop of St. Asaph	74 15 7½	740
Anglesea	Bishop of Bangor	58 10 7½	580
Bangor	Ditto	48 6 3	480
Merioneth	John Jones, A.M.	13 3 4	130
Bath	Josiah Thomas, A.M.	25 15 0	250
Taunton	G. Trevely, A.M.	83 7 6	830
Wells	Charles Sandiford, A.M.	144 2 1	1440
Dorset	William England, D.D.	82 12 8½	820
Chichester	Charles Webber, A.M.	38 3 4	380
Lewes	Edward R. Raynes, A.M.	39 15 0	390
Brecon	Richard Davies, A.M.		
Cardigan	J. Benyon, A.M.		
Carmarthen	W. Crawford, D.D.		
St. David's	R. Church, A.M.	56 8 8	560
Ely	John Henry Browne, A.M.	97 5 2½	970
Barnstaple	Thomas Johnes, A.M.	49 0 0	490
Cornwall	William Short, D.D.	50 6 5½	500
Exeter	Bishop of Exeter	60 15 10	600
Totness	Ross Barnes	37 19 7	370
Gloucester	Thomas R. Rudge	41 17 11	410
Hereford	James Jones, D.D.		
Salop	Joseph Corbett, A.M.	32 10 10	320
Llandaff	John Probyn	38 12 8½	380
Coventry	C. Buckeridge	45 9 2	450
Derby			
Salop	J. C. Wodehouse, D.D.	19 0 0	190
Stafford	Robert Nares, A.M.	30 16 10½	300
Bedford	S. Vince, A.M.	60 12 3½	600
Bucks	Luke Heslop, D.D.	87 14 7	870
Huntingdon	J. Hook, LL.D.	64 14 2	640
Leicester	J. Parkman, D.D.	87 19 2	870
Lincoln	C. Goddard, A.M.	179 19 2	1790
Stow	Caley Illingworth, D.D.	26 17 8½	260

## Established Clergy.

ARCHDEACONRY.	NAME.	VALUE in the King's Book.	Present Value about 1800
Diocese, St. Alban's	E. F. H. Wollaston, B.D.	£52 0 0	520
St. Alban's	J. J. Watson, D.D.		520
Colchester	J. Jefferson, A.M.	50 0 0	500
London	H. Holden Pott, A.M.	23 13 4	250
Middlesex	G. O. Cambridge, A.M.	60 0 0	600
Norfolk	J. Oldershaw, B.D.	148 8 4	1480
Norwich	H. Bathurst, LL.D.	71 1 3	710
Sudbury	J. Gooch, A.M.	76 9 4½	760
Suffolk	J. Strachey, D.D.	89 2 1	890
Oxford	Phineas Pett, D.D.	71 6 0½	710
Northampton	William Strong, D.D.	112 7 1	1120
Reister	J. Law, D.D.	34 14 9	340
Berks	Arthur Onslow, D.D.	54 18 6½	540
Berks	Charles Daubeny, D.D.	70 11 8	700
Wilt	William Coxe, A.M.	64 18 9	640
Surrey	Hon. Thomas de Grey	91 3 6½	910
Winton	Hon. Augustus George Legge	67 15 2½	670
Worcester	Francis Onslow, A.M.	58 10 0	580
Cleveland	C. Baillie, A.M.	36 0 10	360
East York	R. D. Waddilove, D.D.	68 14 7	680
Nottingham	J. Eyre, A.M.	61 0 10	610
York	Robert Markham, B.D.	80 3 1½	800
Carlisle	Charles Anson, A.M.		800
Chester	Unwin Clarke, A.M.		800
Richmond	John Owen, A.M.		800
Durham	Richard Prosser, D.D.	100 0 0	1000
Northumberland	R. G. Bowyer, B.C.L.		1000
Sodor and Man	D. Milrea, A.M.		1000

The *Venerable Archdeacons* many of them hold other preferments, canonicries, prebends, &c. The incomes they derive from these benefices, in many cases, equal the value of their archdeaconries. The archdeacons, deans, prebendaries, and nearly the whole of the dignitaries, are members of the Beaufort, Bathurst, Harcourt, Brownlow, Law, and other aristocratical families.



*Established Clergy.*

The revenues of the Parochial Clergy next remain to be considered. In England and Wales there are 5098 rectories, 3687 vicarages, and 2970 churches, which are neither rectorial nor vicarial; in all, 11,755 churches.\* These churches are contained in between 10 and 11,000 parishes, and probably, after a due allowance for consolidation, form about 10,000 parochial benefices.†

Many of these rectories are highly valuable, some having incomes of £12,000 a year. The same may be said of the vicarages, being possessed of large glebes, or large endowments, and sometimes both. However, it must be allowed, there are some rectories, and in particular vicarages, whose tithes are in the hands of laymen, and without even a parsonage-house. In some instances, the deficiency of income has been so great, that it has been found necessary to unite the incomes of two or three parishes to produce an adequate maintenance to the officiating minister; who, in the care of so many churches, cannot have time to officiate at any of them properly; and thus, no doubt, are many souls lost which might be saved—some straying into the fold of sectarianism, become Jacobins and Dissenters, to the great injury of the Mother Church, and the eternal reproach of the Right Reverend Bishops, the Very Reverend Deans, the Venerable Archdeacons, and other Reverend Dignitaries, who waste in the pomp, vanities, and luxuries, of the world, the sums which ought to be appropriated to the augmentation of these poor livings.

The penury of one part of the Church is not less objectionable than the bloated and sinecure opulence of another. At the establishment of Queen Anne's Bounty, in the beginning of the last century, there were 5597 livings (considerably above one-half of the whole number) whose incomes did not exceed £50 per annum, and were thus classed:—

	£	LIVINGS.
Not exceeding 10	.....	1071
..... 20	.....	1467
..... 30	.....	1126
..... 40	.....	1049
..... 50	.....	884
		— 5597

\* Archdeacon Plymley's Charge to the Clergy of Salop.

† Cove on the Revenues of the Church of England, p. 112.

*Established Clergy.*

The value of these livings has been subsequently increased, not indeed out of the enormous incomes of the Bishops and Dignitaries, but out of the pockets of the people. Some still remain in a state of disgraceful poverty; disgraceful to those who have usurped the revenues of the Church, and deserted her duties. From an inquiry made by the Bishops in their respective dioceses in 1809, it appeared that 4000 livings still remained under £150,\* "which (says Mr. Cove, p. 117) being thrown into 15 classes, and calculating at the mean proportion of each class, that is, at £5, £15, and £25, will show, that the gross income of the whole 4000 livings does not exceed £318,790 or £80 per annum on the average."

Of the total income of the Parochial Clergy the same writer says, p. 124. "From an estimate formed on an approximation of the incomes of a very extended number of livings, whether of large or small value, situated in every part of the kingdom, and collected within the last seven years, the gross amount of the revenues of the Parochial Clergy from the before-mentioned 5098 rectories, and 3687 vicarages (all of which were originally included in the valuation of Henry VIII.) may be stated at £2,339,770; to

\* The Diocesan Returns in 1809 give the following classification of Poor Livings under £150 per annum:

	£	LIVINGS.
Not exceeding	10.	12
_____	20	72
_____	30	191
_____	40	353
_____	50	433
_____	60	407
_____	70	376
_____	80	319
_____	90	309
_____	100	315
_____	110	285
_____	120	307
_____	130	246
_____	140	205
_____	150	170

Total: 3998

*Established Clergy.*

which is to be added, from the Diocesan Returns, the amount of the income of the 1864 churches which are neither rectorial nor vicarial, and never in charge in the King's Book, at 117,432: making the total amount of the annual revenue of the parochial Clergy £2,557,202, and averaging between the three gradations of parochial benefices (taking them, with all consolidations included, at 10,000) an income of £255 each."

This statement relative to Poor Livings, and the total income of the Parochial Clergy, requires some observations.

Mr. Cove does not mention the livings on which he has formed his average. When we have had an opportunity of verifying the statements of this gentleman, we have generally found he has only doled out about half the truth. Instead of *two millions and a half*, we conjecture, the revenues of the parochial Clergy amount to not less than *five millions*. In his account, it does not appear that he has included the value of the glebe, parsonage-house, and surplice fees. But all these ought to be included in estimating the revenues of the parochial Clergy. The surplice fees alone, with a few voluntary gifts, form the only maintenance of the injured Catholic priesthood in Ireland; and in England, no doubt, they add greatly to the revenues of the Clergy. Again, as to the livings charged in the King's book, has he calculated them to have increased in value in a five-fold, seven-fold, or ten-fold proportion? We conjecture he has adopted the *first of these proportions*, the same as in his estimate of the revenues of the Episcopal Clergy, and that will sufficiently account for his estimate of two and a half, instead of five millions.

Then as to his £255 each for 10,000 parochial benefices; what does he mean his readers to understand? Would he have them believe, that to these 10,000 benefices, there belong as many individuals—rectors, vicars, &c. whose average income is the very moderate and unobjectionable sum of £255 each. Such a statement, if true, would render the amount of the revenues of the Clergy, and the distribution of these revenues, very little objectionable indeed. But we will soon show that this is all gammon and delusion.

The real state of the case is this: the 5098 rectories and 3687 vicarages are, probably, in the hands of half, or one-third that number of individuals; and the revenues of the parochial clergy actually possessed by 4 or 5000 persons. Let any one look into the "Ecclesiastical Directory," and he will find that nearly all the incumbents are pluralists. Some of them are rectors at one places, vicars at another, and curates at another. Some

hold three or four rectories, besides vicarages, curacies, &c. Some hold two vicarages, a curacy, and a rectory; in short, they are held in every possible combination. But what does the secretary to four bishops, the "Informer," as Bragge Bathurst termed him, say on this subject: in one diocese the majority of the clergy held *three* livings, some *five*, and some *six*, besides dignities, and "yet a great part of them did not reside upon any of their preferments."

This is exactly the way in which the property of the church is monopolized. Some persons imagine that there are as many rectors as rectories, vicars as vicarages, prebendaries as prebends, deans as deaneries, &c. No such thing: the 26 bishops, 700 dignitaries, and about 4000 non-resident incumbents, principally belonging to the aristocracy, enjoy nearly the whole ecclesiastical revenues, amounting to betwixt 5 and £6,000,000, and averaging about £5000 a year each.

And for what service? what duties do they perform? what benefit do the people derive from their labours? The bishops ordain the priests; sometimes visit their dioceses; sometimes preach; and this we believe is the extent of their performances, and which, in our opinion, amounts to nearly nothing. Then, as to the dignitaries, they perform still less. Let any one visit the cathedral or collegiate churches; go into St. Paul's, Westminster Abbey, or Yorkminster, for instance; and see what is doing in these places. No service is performed which interests the public. Persons may be found admiring the stone and mortar; but the vicars choral, the priest, vicars, the chanters, or sub-chanters, or fifth or sixth canons, are very little regarded: and as to the dignitaries themselves, why they are never to be seen; many of them probably reside some hundred miles off, in more pleasant parts of the country, enjoying the amusements of the chase, or whiling away their time at card-tables or watering places. Then, as to the non-resident incumbents, it must be admitted, at least, they are *sincurists*, whose duty is performed, and for which they receive the salary, by deputy. Thus, it appears, that these three classes, without performing any duties, absorb almost the entire revenue of the church. The only labouring bees in the establishment, are the curates, who receive a very small portion of its emoluments. In a parliamentary paper, ordered to be printed on the 16th May 1817, containing the diocesan returns relative to the number and stipends of curates, we find that for the year 1814, out of 4405 individuals of that class, there were 1657 with incomes only betwixt £40 and £60 per annum. Supposing their average income £100, which is higher than the bishops,

*Established Clergy.*

by the 36th of George III. had authority to raise them, their share of the revenue of the church only amounts to £440,500. Yet it is this class which performs nearly the whole service of the established church.

To the curates we may add the possessors of the poor livings, as a portion of the clergy who really perform some duties for their emoluments. These livings may be considered the mere *offal*, or waste land of the church, on which those who have neither rotten boroughs nor family influence, are allowed to graze. Their incomes not being sufficient to allow for the maintenance of a curate, many of the incumbents reside on their benefices and perform the duties of their parishes. But even this class is not in the indigent state described by Mr. Cove. The returns of the value of poor livings in 1809, were considered a gross imposition on the public and parliament. In consequence, however, of these returns, true or false, the incomes of the poor clergy, have subsequently been greatly augmented. Besides Queen Anne's bounty, £100,000 has been voted annually by parliament; the benefactions in money, by private individuals, amount to about £300,000; other benefactions, in houses for the residence of ministers, in lands, tithes, and rent charges, are very considerable: to which we may add the advantages small benefices have derived from being exonerated from the land tax, and the increase in the value of tithes from agricultural improvements.

Another consideration necessary to be borne in mind in considering the situation of the poor clergy, as they are called, is that they are, like the non-resident aristocratical incumbents, nearly all pluralists. Few, indeed, only hold one living; and probably the whole 4000 livings under £150, are held by 1500 or 2000 individuals. That this is the case, is evident, from the returns made to the Commissioners appointed to exonerate small livings from the land tax, and which are now lying before us. These returns, ordered to be printed 11th July, 1815, contain an account of the number of livings under £100, and the number of livings under £150, not held with other preferment. From this document, it appears, that out of all the poor livings in the kingdom, only 92 under £100 per annum, are held without other preferment; and of the livings returned under £150, only 66 are held without other preferment.

Hence we conclude, that the poor clergy, whose incomes Mr. Cove makes about £80, have, from the consolidation of small livings, and the great increase in their value from the causes we have mentioned, an average

*Established Clergy.*

income of about £250; and that in fact, unless it be the curates, there are really no *poor clergy* in England.

Having now treated of the respective incomes of the Episcopal, Dignified, and Parochial Clergy, let us collect the results under one head.

*Revenues of the Established Clergy.*

Class.	Individual Income.	Total Income.
<b>EPISCOPAL CLERGY.</b> 2 Archbishops .....	£21,000....	£ 42,000
24 Bishops .....	7600....	182,400
<b>DIGNIFIED CLERGY.</b> Archdeacons, Deans, Prebendaries, Canons, and other members of Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, about 700 .....	5500....	385,000
<b>PAROCHIAL CLERGY.</b> Aristocratical non-resident Incumbents, about 4000 .....	1000....	4,000,000
Resident Incumbents, about 2000 .....	250....	500,000
Curates, about 4000 .....	100....	400,000
	<b>Total</b> .....	<b>£5,059,400</b>

The Dissenters, it is supposed, form about one-fifth of the population; and of course, besides supporting their own Clergy, pay more than a millijoy annually to support a religion they do not profess.

From the preceding account, it appears, that the Bishops, Dignitaries, and non-resident Incumbents, amounting to 4726 individuals, do not discharge any essential duties in the Church; that their enormous revenue of £4,600,400 might be applied to alleviate the pressure of poor rates or taxes, or applied to some other public object; and that they must, from obvious reasons, on all occasions, be opposed to reform, the liberties and happiness of the people, and devoted to the support of a system of corruption and injustice, by which alone they can hope to be protected in the enjoyment of incomes, to which, from real services, they have no well-founded claim.

It also appears, that 2000 resident Incumbents and 4000 Curates discharge nearly the whole duties of the Established Religion; that their average in-

*Established Clergy.*

come is about £150, which is equal to the income of the Scotch Clergy, more than the income of the Dissenting Clergy in England, and the Catholic Clergy in Ireland; that therefore £900,000, the total revenue of these classes, is all the Established Religion requires for its maintenance, and the discharge of its duties.

The tithes possessed by the Lay Impropiators, not being in the hands of the Clergy, are not included in the above estimate of their revenues. The tithes in the hands of Laymen, principally the Aristocracy, are calculated by Mr. Cove to amount to £1,025,440.

The patronage of the Church is in the King, the Bishops, the two Universities, the Cathedrals, and the Aristocracy and Gentry. The King's patronage is the bishoprics, all the deaneries in England, 39 prebends, eight canonries, and about 1000 livings. The Lord Chancellor presents to all the livings under the value of £20 in the King's Book, which are about 780; the Ministers present to all the rest. Upwards of 1600 pieces of church preferment are in the gift of the Bishops; more than 600 in the presentation of the two Universities; 55 in the Colleges of Eton and Winchester; about 1000 in the gift of the Cathedrals and other clerical institutions; and the remaining 5700 in the nomination of the Aristocracy and Country Gentlemen.

Having given an account of the revenues and patronage of the English Church, let us now just look into the Irish Established Church, which is more oppressive and intolerable than the Established Church in England. There four millions, out of the five millions of which her population consists, are of the Roman catholic persuasion; and compelled, against their faith and conscience, to maintain a Protestant establishment.

The Clergy of the Established Church in Ireland consists of four Archbishops, 18 Bishops, 300 Dignitaries, and about 1200 Parochial Incumbents. Their revenues, from the prodigious extension of tillage within the last thirty years, have augmented enormously. In 1799 the tithe and church revenues were said to amount to £450,000.† At this time they are supposed to amount to £676,000 per annum.

The following statement of the incomes of the Irish Bishops and their connections is taken from Mr. Wakefield's valuable work on the Statistics of that country, vol. ii. p. 469 and 475:—

\* Carlisle's Topographical Dict. of Ireland.

† Colonel Keating's Defence of Ireland, 1799.

*Established Clergy.*

IRISH BISHOPRICS.		Per Ann.
Armagh, (the Primacy) <i>Marquis of Bute's</i> brother.....	£12,000	
Dublin .....	12,000	
Tuam, <i>Marquis of Waterford's</i> uncle * .....	7,700	
Cashel, <i>Lord Middleton's</i> brother, (the <i>Anti-Reformer</i> ) .....	7,000	
Clogher.....	7,000	
Dromore .....	4,500	
Down and Connor, <i>Earl Caledon's</i> first cousin .....	5,000	
Derry, <i>Lord Northland's</i> son .....	12,500	
Kilmore, <i>Marquis of Waterford's</i> first cousin .....	5,000	
Meath .....	6,000	
Raphoe, <i>Marquis of Waterford's</i> brother.....	8,000	
Ferns and Leighlin, <i>Earl Roden's</i> brother .....	6,000	
Kildare .....	6,000	
Ossory .....	4,000	
Cloyne .....	5,000	
Cork and Ross, <i>Earl Hoath's</i> brother .....	4,500	
Killala and Kilfenora, <i>Marquis of Ely's</i> brother .....	5,000	
Limerick, Ardfert, and Aghadoe .....	6,000	
Waterford and Lismore .....	6,000	
Clonfert and Kilmacduagh .....	3,500	
Elphin, <i>Earl Clancarty's</i> brother .....	10,000	
Killala and Achonry.....	3,500	
		£ 146,000 †.....

These enormous incomes arise partly from tithe, but generally from land. The present value of the estates belonging to the bishoprics, if they were now out of lease, would be immense. Mr. Wakefield, from the estimate of well-informed persons, has given the value of a few as follows:—

The Primacy .....	£ 140,000
Derry .....	120,000

\* The Marquis is the head of the Beresford family, which has three mitres. The Beresfords and their connexions are supposed to fill one-fourth of all the places in Ireland. In our List of Places they are down as *wine-tasters, purse-bearers, &c.* for considerable sums.

† Mr. Wakefield makes it only £125,000, but the sums oppositè to each See amount to £146,000.



*Established Clergy.*

Kilmore .....	£ 100,000
Waterford .....	70,000
Clogher .....	100,000

Vol. ii. p. 470.

The livings in the gift of the Archbishop of Cashel are worth £35,000 per annum; those in the gift of the Bishop of Cloyne, £50,000; of Cork, £30,000; and of Fern, £30,000. Killaloe has 109 benefices, many worth £1500 per annum. In the Bishopric of Cloyne one living is worth £3000, one worth £2000, and three worth £1500 each. The Deanery of Down, in the year 1790, was worth only £2000 per annum; it now lets for £3700. The Rectory of Middleton, in the county of Cork, in 1785, yielded scarcely £800 per annum; at present it produces upwards of £2800. "A living of £500," says Mr. Wakefield, "is but a middling one in Ireland, and any thing beneath it is considered very low."—P. 469.

Notwithstanding these enormous revenues, a large proportion of the Bishops, Dignitaries, and Incumbents, are absentees, expending the immense incomes wrung from the soil and labour of Ireland, in the dissipated and fashionable circles of Bath and London. The families of many of the prelates, reside constantly in England, and the only duty performed by the absentee Bishop is to cross the water during the summer months, just take a look at the metropolitan palace, and then return to spend the remainder of the year in this country. Mr. Ensor, in his work on Ecclesiastical Establishments, says, "The Primate of all Ireland, though in the summer of 1807 he enforced the duty of residence to his clergy, almost immediately after his charge quitted the island." The late Earl of Bristol, Bishop of Derry, resided twenty years abroad; and during that time received the revenue of his rich diocese, amounting to £240,000. The great primate, Rokeby, resided several years at Bath, and never visited Ireland. Many of the prelates, it appears, are young men, indebted for their valuable dignities solely to family connexion. But what is more extraordinary, some have been in the army and navy, and apparently not intended for the Church: "One archbishop," says Mr. Wakefield, "was, I believe, before his appointment, a lieutenant in the navy; the Dean of Clogher was a member of the Imperial Parliament; and the rector of a valuable benefice was lately an *aid-de-camp at the Castle*."—Vol. ii. p. 476.

The tithes by which this spiritual sinecurism is supported, are levied almost entirely on the cattle, pigs, poultry, and potatoes of the Irish cotters.

*Established Clergy.*

Since the abolition of tithes of agistment, tillage lands alone pay this odious impost. While tithes of agistment were paid, the burden, in part, fell upon the opulent grazier—the landed aristocracy of Ireland; but now the burden lies almost entirely upon the cotter tenants, the poor cultivators of the soil. Owing to the increase in the numbers, skill, and industry of this class, the agricultural produce of the kingdom has been augmented an hundred fold, and in the same proportion has augmented the revenue of the Church. While the Irish cultivator has been adding to his income by industry, by the sacrifice of health, strength, and ease, by the abridgement of the innocent comforts and enjoyments of his family, he has been constrained also to add proportionately to the income of the protestant priest, whose religion he does not profess, and whose intolerant dogmas withhold from him his civil immunities.

In England, where, in many parts, a man cannot cut a cabbage, pull a carrot, or gather a bunch of grapes, without giving notice to the spiritual locust, the system is sufficiently intolerable; but in Ireland, from the mode of collecting tithes, those evils are aggravated tenfold. The Irish Clergy generally employ an agent, called a Proctor, who, immediately before harvest, estimates the barrels of corn, tons of hay, or hundred weight of potatoes, he supposes are on the ground, and charging the market price, ascertains the amount to be paid by the owner. The Parson sometimes leases the tithes out to the Proctor, at a fixed rent, like a farm; while the latter, who, in that case, is called the middle Proctor, not unfrequently relets them to another. In the south, Mr. Wakefield says, the tithe is set out and sold by public auction on the premises. And in Connaught, the same writer found it was customary to call a sale before the harvest, at which the tithe is sold to any person who chooses to collect it.

Under such a system, it is easy to conceive what the Irish must endure. From the Proctors and middle Proctors, they cannot expect either lenity or indulgence. These men, probably strangers in the parish, have no motives for cultivating the friendship of the people; and having farmed the tithe for a stipulated sum, it is to be expected they will collect it with the utmost rigour, in order to realize the greatest profit from their bargain. The most distressing scenes are sometimes witnessed from their relentless proceedings. The half-famished cotter, surrounded by a wretched family, clamorous for food, frequently beholds his favourite cow, or the tenth part of the produce of his potatoe garden, carried off to fill the insatiable maw of clerical rapacity. "I have seen (says Mr. Wakefield) the cow, the favourite cow, driven away, accompanied by the sighs, the tears, and the imprecations of a whole family, who were paddling after, through wet and dirt, to take their last

*Established Clergy.*

affectionate farewell of this their only benefactor at the pound gate. I have heard, with emotions which I can scarcely describe, deep curses repeated from village to village, as the cavalcade proceeded. I have witnessed the group pass the domain walls of the opulent grazier, whose numerous herds were cropping the most luxuriant pastures, whilst he was secure from any demand for the tithe of their food, looking on with the utmost indifference."—  
Vol. ii. p. 466.

To spare the rich and plunder the poor, is certainly not Christianity; it is more like Church of Englandism, which, by the monstrous union of Church and State, has perverted the pure, simple, and charitable faith of Christ into a tremendous engine of political guilt and spiritual extortion. There is, we are assured, plenty of law in Ireland, as well as in this country: there is no wrong, we are told, without a remedy there; the Courts of Justice are open, as the hypocrites say in England, for the punishment of either magisterial or clerical delinquents. All this sounds well on paper, in a Regent's speech, or in a speech of Castlereagh; but it is mere mockery and insult when offered to the victims of legal violence. Law, in both countries, is for those who can pay for it—the rich and not the poor. The poor cotter, oppressed or defrauded by the exaction of the tithe Proctor, to the value of £10, cannot buy a chance of redress in the lottery of the law for less than £60. By victory or defeat he is equally and irremediably ruined. What resource then have men whose possessions probably do not amount to half that sum? None: the way to Courts of Justice, through the impassible barrier of attorneys and lawyers' fees, is over a bridge of gold; and to point out these tribunals for redress either to English or Irish poor, or even to those moderately endowed with this world's wealth, is, in other words, to point out to a man the shortest way by which he may bring himself to the jail, and his family to the workhouse.

At page 311, we stated the incomes of the Irish Established Church at £676,000 per annum. The Catholics pay about four-fifths of this sum, besides maintaining their own clergy; who are supported by voluntary gifts, collections made at weddings, Christmas and Easter offerings, fees at marriages, christenings, and burials. Impoverished by the support of the protestant church, the Catholics cannot afford very liberal incomes for their own pastors. Many of the Catholic bishops have not more than £150, and the parish priest not more than £60 a year. Miserable stipends, when contrasted with the immense revenues of the sinecure Protestant bishops and incumbents.

The total amount of all the sums contributed for the maintenance of the Catholic priesthood, Mr. Wakefield estimates at £500,000 per annum. This added to more than £500,000 paid for the Protestant establishment, makes the total burden imposed on the Catholic population, amount to more than one million per annum. An immense sum, equal to half the revenue of Ireland before the Union, and must form, when the number of inhabitants and poverty of the kingdom are considered, an almost insurmountable obstacle to the prosperity of Ireland.

At the time of the Union, the Irish Established Church was united to the English Established Church, and they now form one establishment, under the name of the "*United Church of England and Ireland.*" The absurd system of exclusion which prevails under this state contrivance, may be instanced in this: Dissenters in Ireland are admitted to all offices, civil and military, even to that of lord chancellor. In England, by the Corporation and Test Laws, they are considered unfit for any municipal or civil employment. What can be more absurd? Surely English as well as Irish Dissenters may be trusted with their rights. But this is exactly the nature of the system through all its ramifications—capricious, absurd, and wicked. What more unjust than the representative system, founded on no equitable principle of property, population, or intelligence? What more wicked than a government that corrupts and loads with exclusive privileges the minority, that it may tyrannise over and oppress the majority of the community? The Church rendered a persecutor; justice an extortioner; government a violator rather than a preserver of rights; and the whole system, from its capricious absurdity and injustice, looks more like the creation of chance, united with the agency of some malignant demon, than the perfection of human wisdom, or an enlightened and benevolent fabric of social happiness and security.

Though Irish Dissenters are admitted to the rights of citizens, the Roman Catholics of both countries are still denied the benefits of that constitution which they have poured out their blood and treasure to defend. In a full toleration for religious differences, England is behind many countries reputed only half civilized. China contains 333 millions of inhabitants, and her government is the oldest in the world, yet she had never any established religion; and such, we are told, is the wisdom of her institutions, that they require not the aid of superstition for their support. In Tartary and Turkey, though the followers of Mahomet and the Grand Lama are divided into an hundred sects, no pains and penalties are inflicted on account of these diver-

*Established Clergy.*

sities : and in Russia, Greeks, Pagans, Papists, Protestants, are all alike admissible to civil and military offices. What a contrast do these countries offer to England, where one-fourth part of the population is proscribed, because forsooth, though agreeing in the fundamentals, they dissent from some the minor doctrines of the Established Church !

It is not, however, the people, but the government we accuse of intolerance. The principles of the latter are alike opposed to religious and political liberty, and an usurping Oligarchy have the same interest in opposing religious as political freedom.

Looking back to the history of the Dissenters, we see with what difficulty freedom of thought has been wrung from the prosecuting grasp of a Protestant Establishment. It was not till the Revolution of 1688, that the public worship of the Dissenters was tolerated ; and the Act, of Toleration at that period, require them to take certain oaths and subscribe to the doctrinal articles of the Church of England. The same act, so much extolled, requires the places of worship to be registered, and the doors kept unlocked during the time of service. Even liberty of worship, under these suspicious, and odious restrictions, it has subsequently been attempted to abridge. In the latter end of Queen Anne's reign, an act passed, called the *Occasional Conformity Bill*, making it a crime in any person, in any office under government, entering a meeting-house. Another bill, denominated the *Schism Bill*, passed in 1714, suffered no Dissenter to educate their *own children*, but required them to be put into the hand of a Church of Englandist, and forbad all tutors and schoolmasters being present at any dissenting place of worship.

The last attempt upon this body was the memorable bill of Lord Sidmouth in 1810. This meditated encroachment upon their liberties was worthy of the insidious bigot from whom it emanated. The Dissenters, to their immortal honour, rushed forward at once to repel this aggression on their rights. Had they suffered their ministers to be placed at the mercy of the *Quarter Sessions*, the magistrates, no doubt, would not only have judged of their fitness for the ministry of the Gospel, but also of their fitness for the ministry of the Boroughmongers.

The most recent and singular instance of Church of England intolerance, we remember, is instanced in Mr. BENTHAM's Church of Englandism, relative to Dr. *Kipling*, Dean of Peterborough. A Rev. Mr. Lingard, a Roman Catholic, in his strictures on Professor Marsh's *Comparative View*, had unluckily used the words " *new Church of England* " once, and

oftener "the *modern* church of England." To consider the church of England "*new*," or "*modern*," appears to have been a mortal offence in the eyes of *Dean Kipling*. He wrote a furious letter to Mr. Lingard ; quoted a passage from Hawkins ; and threatened to prosecute him if he did not, within a limited time, prove what the Dean intimated it was impossible for him to prove. Whether the Dean afterwards relented, or whether Mr. Lingard proved that the church of England as being the offspring or daughter of the church of Rome, which in many respects she so much resembles, was "*new*," we are ignorant. We should wish to preserve the Right Rev. Dean's loving epistle. It would show what a meek, gentle, Christian spirit still rankles in the heart of some of our church dignitaries. It would show to what expedients these worthies would resort to uphold their faith, or more correctly their temporalities, were they not restrained by the march of philosophy and the public mind. It is impossible to read *Dean Kipling's* letter without feeling persuaded, that had Mr. Lingard no better barrier for his personal safety than the tolerant spirit of the writer, he might still be liable to be hung up by the middle, with an iron chain, and roasted before a slow fire, according to the orthodox piety of *olden time*.

Men ought always to set their faces against persecution, whether instituted under pretence of heresy, sectarianism, or even blasphemy. Under any of these forms, it is the same mischievous and dogmatical principle. It is not Papists only, but all religionists have been persecutors when they had the power. Hume justly remarks, that *toleration* is not the virtue of priests of any denomination ; and this is sufficiently confirmed by the history of the Scottish, Romish, and English Churches. They have all shed blood, tortured, and punished, when circumstances gave them an ascendancy. The reason is obvious. Religion is more the result of feeling than the understanding ; and we may expect that its most eminent professors should be more prone so use the vulgar weapons suggested by passion and violence, than listen to the dictates of justice, reason, and humanity. But again there is something so egregiously absurd and presumptuous in maintaining opinions by force : to say that any class of opinions shall not be impugned, that their truth shall not be called in question, is at once to declare that these opinions are infallible, and that their authors cannot err. Is not this intolerable presumption ? Is it not fixing bounds to human knowledge, and saying, that men cannot learn by experience, that they can never be wiser in future than they are today ? The vanity and folly of this is sufficiently evinced by the history

*Established Clergy.*

of religion and philosophy. Great changes have taken place in both; and what our ancestors considered indisputable truths, their posterity discovered to be gross errors. To continue the work of improvement, no dogmas, however plausible, ought to be protected from investigation; and the only security of the present generation against the errors of their progenitors, is modestly to admit, that, in some things, they may possibly yet be mistaken.

We abhor persecution, because it at once sets bounds to human inquiry and improvement. If opinions, absurd or mischievous, are promulgated, there is sufficient intelligence and discernment in the community to put them down, without the aid of the magistrate. We pray God, that none of our readers may be persecutors; for we verily believe that none are such, but either fools or knaves; principally the latter, who cry out "*Blasphemy*," "*No Popery*," or "*The Church is in Danger*," that they may divert public attention from their own inordinate emoluments, or that they may thrust their hands deeper into the pockets of the dupes of their hypocritical clamour.

To return to our subject.—Having spoken of the English and Irish Established Churches, we will just say a word or two about the Scotch non-established Church. In the Kirk of Scotland there are no Bishops, nor Dignitaries, nor tithes. The revenue of the Scottish Church was estimated, in 1755, at about £68,500 per annum; which being divided among 944 ministers, afforded, on the average, to each of them an income of £72, including the value of their mansions and glebes. The incomes of the Clergy are fixed stipends, paid by the Court of Session, out of a fund formed from the ancient tithes of the country. Being considered too small, they were augmented out of the unappropriated tithe. Notwithstanding this augmentation, in 1810, there were still 172 benefices with incomes under £100. On a representation to Parliament, an Act passed, granting £10,000 per annum; which raised these poor livings, on the average, to £150 per annum; and thus made a considerable portion of the Clergy pensioners on Government.

According to this account none of the Scottish Clergy have incomes of less than £150 per annum; and the incomes of some of the Clergy are considerably more, amounting to 3 or £400. These sums cannot however be considered very extravagant; and upon the whole, there are many things to admire in the Kirk of Scotland. The Scots do not pay a *quarter of a million for lawn sleeves*; nor nearly half a million for cathedral and collegiate sinecurists. There are no non-resident incumbents; and what is

*Established Clergy.*

the consequence of that non-residence?—no curates. The parochial clergy reside upon their benefices; exhorting, catechising, instructing, and performing all those duties to their parishioners, for which they receive their incomes. This is as it ought to be. The Scotch Church, though it cannot now be termed poor, yet its wealth is not so exorbitant as to corrupt its ministry. The wealth of the English Church is the source of all its vices—sinecurism, pride, insolence, ignorance, luxury, and dissipation.

The patronage of the Kirk of Scotland, from a statement in Mr. Bentham's Church of Englandism, appears to be as follows:—

In the gift of	Livings.
1. Individuals .....	£590
2. The Crown .....	250
3. Individuals and the Crown alternately .....	30
4. Town Councils of various Towns .....	41
5. Parishioners at large .....	18
6. University of St. Andrew .....	7
7. University of Glasgow .....	1
8. The University of St. Andrew and an Individual alternately .....	1
9. The University of St. Andrew and the Crown alternately .....	1
10. The Town Council of Edinburgh (the parishes being out-lying) .....	3
11. The Town Council of Glasgow (the parish out-lying) .....	1
12. The Directors (quere, of what?) .....	2
13. The Heritors (land-owners) of the respective parishes .....	2
14. Kirk Session (governing body corresponding to the Vestry of the Parish) ..	1
15. In litigation .....	1
	£ 949

Mr. BENTHAM remarks an important difference in the ordeal undergone by an English and Scottish minister after his nomination. In the former case he is only examined by an individual chosen by himself; therefore the test of his ability for his office is a mere pretence. Under the Scottish regimen, though a person is nominated by the king, or other patron, he is examined as to his competency by the presbytery belonging to the district where his benefice is situated.

We shall now add a few particulars relative to the situation of the *London Clergy*, and then we shall have laid before the reader all the details necessary to form some general conclusions relative to the clergy throughout the empire.



*Established Clergy.*

The situation of the London Clergy is different from that of the clergy in other parts of the kingdom. In the reign of Henry VIII. continual quarrels were carried on between the citizens and the clergy, relative to their tithes, fees, and other emoluments. To put an end to these disorders, the Act of the 37th Henry VIII. established a commission, with full power to give to their decisions the force of law, if they were enrolled in the Court of Chancery before the 1st of March, 1545. The same act made their decisions a dead letter if they were not enrolled in the specified manner. Somehow it happened the enrolment never took place; consequently, the decree of the commissioners never was in force.\* The clergy of the metropolis, however, found their claim for 2s. 9d. in the pound on this decree. The London *Fire-Act Clergy*, with all the impudence imaginable, commenced their petition of last February, with the following allegation:—"That before the fire of London, in 1666, the incumbents of livings in the city, and the liberties thereof, were entitled, under a decree of commissioners made pursuant to the 37th Henry VIII, to payment, in lieu of tithes, at the rate of 2s. 9d. in the pound on the rents of the houses, shops, warehouses, and other buildings in their respective parishes."

This is what the London Clergy modestly term their "*ancient rights*." These "*ancient rights*," however, have no foundation; the decree on which it is pretended they are founded, never having been enrolled. Two shillings and nine-pence in the pound no doubt would yield a very handsome revenue; and the Clergy have looked to this claim with extreme longing, and beheld the increasing wealth and population of the city, with feelings something similar to those ascribed by Milton to Satan, when contemplating with malign eye the happiness of our first parents in the garden of Eden. An assessment of 1s. in the pound, as stated by the City Tithe Committee, would, in the smallest and poorest parishes, yield an income of £500 a year, and an assessment of 2s. 9d. would raise the lowest living to £1400 a year.

\* Respecting the non-enrolment of this decree there is the following notice in Tomlin and Raithby's edition of the Statutes at Large:—"N.B. This decree is not enrolled in the Court of Chancery, nor in any roll belonging to any other court; neither is it annexed to the roll of the act in the Parliament rolls; neither is it to be found in any of the old editions of the Statutes themselves: it first appeared in Rustell's *Abridgement of the Statutes*, printed in 1555; that decree then had never been possessed of any validity because it had not complied with the provisions of the act from which it emanated."

*Established Clergy.*

Though the decree emanating from the 37th Henry VIII. had never any validity, it has formed the principle on which the assessment has been raised for the maintenance of the metropolitan clergy. The clergy, indeed, in no instance exact the 2s. 9d. but generally content themselves with 2s. 1s. 9d. or 1s. or, in short, any thing they can obtain,—insisting, however, at the same time, on their extreme forbearance in thus generously foregoing their “*ancient rights,*” which never existed. Even the 37th Henry never intended to vest in the clergy the 2s. 9d. for their exclusive maintenance, but also for relieving the *poor* and repairing the edifice of the church. This they have always kept out of sight; the parishioners apparently acquiesced in their pretended rights; and it was only owing to the ill-timed rapacity of the *Fire-Act Clergy* which led to the notable discovery, that there was, in fact, no legal provision for the maintenance of the London clergy. Of the proceedings of the *Fire-Act Clergy* and their rapacious claims it may be worth while to give some account.

After the 37th Henry it appears, without any legal right, the clergy throughout the metropolis, were maintained by a certain pound-rate levied on the rental of buildings in their respective parishes. This practice continued till the dreadful fire in 1666 laid the greater part of the city in ashes, burning down or damaging eighty-five parish-churches. After this catastrophe, the legislature enacted that some of the parishes destroyed should be united; that only fifty-one churches should be rebuilt; and that the ministers of those churches should, in lieu of their former allowance, receive certain fixed sums, levied by an equal pound-rate on the houses. This was the 22d and 23d Charles II. termed the *Fire-Act*. The clergy subject to the provisions of this act appear to have been perfectly satisfied, till the effects of the fire began to disappear, the rents of the houses to rise, and the city to get rich again. Then it was our reverend gentlemen became discontented: they saw, with grudging eyes, the increasing wealth of the city, of which their fixed stipends would not allow them to participate; they talked unceasingly of their former pound-rate, of their “*ancient rights,*” and at length determined, in good earnest, to apply to parliament.

In consequence of this application, parliament made valuable additions to their salaries; the lowest incomes were raised to £200 a year, and many of the larger parishes, nearly, if not quite, to £600 a year, exclusive of surplice-fees and other valuable emoluments. This augmentation, to all reasonable men, appeared quite sufficient: not so to the clergy. In 1817 they applied for a further augmentation. This application was refused. In

*Established Clergy.*

1818 they came forward a third time, with their famous petition of the 4th February, filled with grievous lamentations about the loss of their "*ancient rights*." The bubble now burst. Parliament, disgusted with the rapacity of these "sturdy beggars," determined to refer their petition to a committee. It was soon discovered their "*ancient rights*" had no foundation; that they never were entitled to 2s. 9d. on the rental, or any part of it; that with the 37th Henry VIII. which they had foisted into their petition, they had nothing to do, "except it were to exhibit the craving and rapacious spirit which actuated them."

Various other disclosures were made. Of the thirty-five *poor clergymen* who had signed the petition, none of them, on an average, was receiving less than £500 a year. Twenty-five out of the number were pluralists, and not a few of them the fattest pluralists of the profession. Some of the incumbents received annually £1200, £1500, and even £2000, while they did not pay their curates more than £60, £70, or £80 a year.\* Instead of residing in the parsonage-house, among the parishioners, the parsonage-houses of many were let to the merchants and manufacturers for counting-houses and warehouses, for which they received exorbitant rents of £200 or £300 a year. Some of them were canons at St. Paul's, some were precentors, prebendaries, and held other dignified situations in cathedral and collegiate churches. The following statement, however, of the manifold functions of a few of these craving incumbents may enable the reader to form some idea of their necessities:—

\* The incumbents in London, we are told, are careful to select curates whose abilities are not likely to eclipse their own. Some, it is said, do not stop here, but actually make *personal appearance* an object of consideration, always taking care to choose a curate of a less imposing figure than themselves. Hence many parishes, in order to have a tolerable discourse once on a Sunday, and a decent looking man in the rostrum, go to the expense of paying an evening lecturer of their own choice; but here again it is said they are sometimes foiled by the reverend rector, *alias* the reverend vicar, refusing to let him preach in his pulpit. A Reverend Mr. GUNN, a man well remembered by many in London, was once placed in this predicament: he mentioned the circumstance to the Bishop of London; on which his Lordship replied, alluding to the rector in question, "Ah, Mr. Gunn, you can shoot too well for him." The lecturers are paid by voluntary subscription; the lecturer going round with his book among the butchers, bakers, and publicans, humbly requesting "Mr. Such-a-one to put down his name for so-and-so. Such is the degraded state of *church-discipline* in the metropolis, where the revenues are more than ten times sufficient, if properly distributed, to pay for the services of men of first-rate talents, independence, and character.

*Established Clergy.*

**BÉCKWITH**, Rev. E. I. rector of St. Alban's, Wood-street; ditto St. Olave, Silver-street; and vicar of Tillingham.

**MÓRRICE**, Dr. rector of Allhallows, Bread-street; ditto St. John the Evangelist; ditto of Tackley, Oxon.

**FLY**, Dr. rector of St. Austin's, Watling-street; ditto Trinity, Minorics; and holds two situations at the Royal Chapel, St. James's.

**SAUNDERS**, Rev. I. rector of St. Andrew, Wardrobe, and St. Ann, Blackfriars.

**ANTROBUS**, Rev. W. rector of St. Mary Undershaft; ditto St. Mary Axe; ditto West Acton, Middlesex.

**GASKIN**, Dr. rector of St. Benedict, Gracechurch-street; ditto St. Leonard, Eastcheap; ditto Stoke Newington.

**LONDON**, Rev. RICHARD, rector of St. Edmund the King; ditto St. Nicholas Aconis.

**OWEN**, the Venerable Mr. rector of Bennett, Paul's Wharf; ditto St. Peter; and archdeacon of Richmond.

**HOBART**, Hon. and very Rev. H. L. rector of St. Dionis Backchurch; ditto Haseley; vicar of Nocton; the very reverend the Dean of Windsor and Wolverhampton; and registrar of the Noble Order of the Garter, &c. &c. &c.

**PRIDDEN**, Rev. J. rector of St. George, Botolph-lane; vicar of Caddington; minor canon of St. Paul's; and a priest of the Royal Chapel.

**MÓORE**, Rev. J. rector of St. Michael Bassishaw; ditto Langdon-hills, Essex; priest of the Royal Chapel; canon of St. Paul's; and evening lecturer of St. Sepulchre's. N.B. This reverend Pluralist kindly undertook to draw up a "Statement of the Case" of himself and poor brethren.

**WEBB**, Rev. R. rector of St. Margaret; vicar of Kenilworth; canon both of St. Paul's and Westminster-Abbey; and one of the priests at the Royal Chapel, St. James's.

**DAKINS**, Dr. rector of St. Michael, Crooked-lane; minor canon and précentor of Westminster-Abbey; assistant chaplain-general to the army; chaplain to the London district, and librarian to the Duke of York.

**JONES**, Dr. rector of St. Mary, Somerset; ditto St. Mary, Mountshaw; and archdeacon of Merioneth.

**VAN MILDERT**, Dr. rector of St. Mary le Bow cum St. Pancras; ditto Allhallows, Honey-lane; holds a valuable professorship at Oxford; and is a preacher at Lincoln's Inn.

*Established Clergy.*

ROBERTS, Rev. T. rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill; and vicar of Tottenham, Middlesex.

WALMSLEY, Rev. T. T. rector of St. Vedast, Foster-lane; ditto St. Martin, Ludgate; ditto St. Michael le Quern; and holds the valuable living of Hanwell, Middlesex.

COOMBS, Dr. rector of St. Michael, Queenhithe; ditto Trinity the Less; minister of Curzon-street Chapel, and prebendary of Canterbury.

Had not the *Fire Act Clergy* been the most unreasonable and rapacious men breathing, there is little doubt but they would have considered the emoluments arising from these numerous preferments sufficient. But the wealth of India would not satisfy the cravings of this profession. Some of them, it is said, were base enough to lay in wait for the Members going to the House while their petition was pending, and beseech them to support their claims for an increase in their stipends. It reminds us of the monks of St. Swithin's. These gluttons had thirteen meals a day. Hume relates, that they threw themselves prostrate in the mire before Henry II. and with doleful lamentations complained that the Bishop of Winchester had cut off three meals a day. "How many has he left?" said the King. "Ten," replied the disconsolate monks. "I myself," said Henry, "have only three, and I enjoin the Bishop to reduce you to the same number."

The emoluments of the London Clergy are far greater than those of the Clergy in the country. Some of the livings we know are very valuable. For instance, there is the rectory of St. George's, Hanover-square, held by Dr. Hodgson, and in the gift of the Bishop of London, worth about £4000 per annum. There is the living of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate-street, held by the Rev. Dr. Mant, probably worth £3000. The rectory of St. Andrew's, Holborn, in the gift of the Duke of Buccleugh, and held by the Rev. Mr. Clare, is nearly as valuable. The living of St. Giles's, held by the Right Rev. Bishop of Chichester, is another valuable rectory. We could enumerate others, but these must suffice.

In considering the incomes of the metropolitan Clergy, it must be remembered, that they have many other sources of emolument besides their benefices. St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey have many valuable dignities, equal in value to good fat livings, and which are shared among the London ecclesiastics. Then there are the appointments in the Royal Chapels, public libraries and museums, and the salaries they receive as ushers, masters, &c. in the numerous and wealthy charitable foundations, and which altogether must make their incomes immense.

*General Reflections.*

Having now laid before the reader, all the details necessary to illustrate the situation of the clergy, we shall be able to form some general conclusions on the subject: and that our few remaining observations may be as brief and intelligible as possible, we shall range them under distinct heads. First, of the

**TITHES SYSTEM.**—The tithe may be termed a spiritual income-tax. It is a tax on the produce of land, animals, and industry, and is the most greivous and impolitic impost that could be devised to burden property and check improvement. Mr. ENSOR, speaking on this subject, says: "It is a rent uncertain and inequitable; for the tithe may be the whole profit of the crop; it is a rent in advance; a tax on labour and capital; a penalty on agriculture; a prohibition to improve inferior lands, for lands will pay one rent which cannot pay both proprietor and priest; and lands will return a profit to the proprietor, which cannot pay either rent or tithe. All these lands by tithing are condemned to barrenness. Few can imagine the ruin of this vexatious and barbarous impost on population and tillage. Observe the effect of an inconsiderable impost. Mathison says, in his notes on Jamaica, that in 1810, the tillage of 87,000 acres was suspended, in order to escape the payment of three-pence an acre. What then must be the effect of tithes in the present state of this country?"—*Inquiry concerning Population*, p. 454.

Paley said, tithes were most pernicious. Malthus admits they form a great obstacle to tillage, and wonders that no commutation, after the manner of the land-tax, had been adopted. That they discourage cultivation and industry is evident from this: whatever a man lays out in his land, whatever he may expend in manure or labour; how much soever he may add to its value, by skill and economy, by the labour of himself and family; one tenth of his capital so laid out, and of his industry goes to the parson; to a man, perhaps, whom he despises for his hypocrisy, pride, insolence, and rapacity. How can men be enterprising and industrious under such a system?

Tithe, next to high rent, is the principal cause of the *corn-laws*. To enable the farmer to pay both his priest and his landlord, he must sell his produce at an exorbitant price. This can only be done by preventing compe-

*Established Clergy.*

tion. A corn bill, which excludes the foreign grower, empowers the English farmer, to fix his own price on his produce, and which the consumer is compelled either to pay or starve.

We have seen, at the commencement of this article, that the tithe had no legal origin; that it was an abuse that gradually got footing through connivance; but that, to this day it has no constitutional authority. In the reign of Henry VIII. the tithes, and other church property, were seized by the state; the poor robbed of their portion; a large share of the revenues of the church, given to laymen and laywomen, and the remainder made the foundation of a new establishment. This forms an important precedent. From this revolution in church property, we may infer, that the property of the church has always been considered the property of the state, and that it may be applied to any object the state may deem expedient. According to this principle, the clergy hold offices which might be legally abolished, and their salaries applied to alleviate the pressure of taxation, or any other national object. This we take to be law—common-law, according to Blackstone.

Will the tithe ever be reformed or abolished? Never under the present government. It has been justly remarked, that the present system is like a house of cards: touch any part, and the whole tumbles down. Law, church, and state,—these three are one,—that is the system: none of these can be molested without endangering the rest. Some men think that abuses might be reformed; but they forget that abuse is the strength, cement, and support of the system. Abuse destroyed, government could only exist by its justice. But to render the government just would destroy the emoluments of those who are now fattening on the vitals of the country. Unquestionably this is the interest of the people, but not the interest of their oppressors. However, a reformed parliament would not depend on such a sinister principle. To such an assemblage fifty expedients would offer for the abolition of tithes, without violence either to religion, justice, or humanity. A commutation on the principle of the land-tax would be a good thing. But the great principle of reform in the church is the abolition of some of the useless classes of spiritual sinecurists, and a nearer equalization of a portion of its immense revenues, and the appropriation of the remainder to the wants of the community. This we take to be reason, according to common sense.

**SURPLICE FEES.**—In *Popish times* it was usual for the rich to make donations to the priest, to be distributed among the poor on all public festivals: at marriages and births donations were made for this purpose; at deaths a donation was made to awaken the devotion, and call forth the blessings of the poor in

behalf of the deceased. This was the origin of *surplice fees*. In *Protestant times*, what before was a voluntary gift, has been converted into a *demand*; and instead of being distributed among the poor, surplice fees are pocketed by the parson. In London the surplice fees are supposed to be equal to one third of the priest's salary. On the burial of a *respectable* person, besides fees, it is usual to get a guinea or two for hat-band and gloves; at a marriage five guineas; at a christening, particularly a private christening, a guinea. The poor instead of receiving these gifts, are now compelled to pay also at churchings, marriages, &c. They have been termed "*fornication compelling fees*," inasmuch as by imposing a tax upon marriages, they compel many to live in sin and pollution. The wickedness of men in ermine and lawn is truly astonishing. The temples of justice, and the temples of religion, surrounded by extortioners. Religion a trade, justice a trade, government a trade,—all for money; nothing for the public good. The source of the evil is the *borough system*, which is the fountain-head, whence the stream of corruption, through ten thousand channels, spreads through all the departments of the state, the church, the magistracy, and of jurisprudence.

Mr. Cove, (page 212) estimates the annual value of the glebe and surplice fees of each parish, on an average, at £40; making, according to his account, a tax upon the population of nearly half a million per annum.

REVENUE OF THE CHURCH.—The church clearly needs reforming: as much as the state; similar absurdity in its principles; and similar injustice and prodigality in the expenditure of its revenues; pay without service, service without pay; for preferment, talents, and integrity nothing; influence and connexion every thing. Ireland, with a Catholic population, compelled to support a Protestant establishment, and English Dissenters compelled to a similar sacrifice of faith, conscience, and interest. Under a reformed parliament, the revenues of the church would offer a noble field for investigation and improvement. Millions might be saved without depriving of his income one useful member of the establishment. The incomes of the bishops, dignitaries, and non-resident incumbents, amount to betwixt four and five millions per annum. These classes are all *sincurists*;\* their incomes would form a tolerable fair composition to the public

\* The great extent of *spiritual sincurism* is evident from the number of preferments held by single individuals, and of which we have given some idea in our account of the *poor clergy* of London. Mr. GORDON, in the debate on the "Curates' Residency Bill," said, he knew a clergyman who was dignitary in no fewer than six cathedrals.



*Established Clergy.*

creditors; and thus, with this resource, might the debt all, or in great part, be cancelled. Again, there is the plunder of charitable foundations, amounting to about TWO MILLIONS, a large part of which is in the hands of the clergy. This would form a substitute for the poor rates, or at least for that portion of the poor rate, which would remain after the reduction of the Debt.

In short, it is clear, that with the surplus revenues of the church,—the income of public charities,—the savings that might be made by the abolition of sinecures, pensions, and places,—by economy in every department in the public expenditure,—by the reduction of our military establishment,—England contains abundant resources for extricating herself from all her difficulties, and again becoming a great, prosperous, and happy country. But again, we say, that these changes will never be made under the present system. Government depends upon these abuses for its support; their reform would be a sort of political suicide in our present rulers; and would require such a devotion to the common weal as no one expects in the present race of ecclesiastics, judges, and such statesmen as Castlereagh, Sidmouth, Canning, Eldon, and Lord Grenville.

CHARACTER OF THE ESTABLISHED CLERGY.—“For who does not see that these men are more *ministers of the government than ministers of the gospel*; and that by flattering the authorities and favouring the dominion of princes and men in authority, they endeavour with all their might to *promote tyranny in the commonwealth*, which otherwise they should not be able to establish in the church. This is the unhappy agreement we see betwixt the church and the state.”—*Locke's Works*, 8vo. edit. vol. vi. p. 54.

“That the clergy should *paupe'ize the laity* is not strange, considering that they have no bowels for their own profession. Year after year bills were brought into parliament by Sir W. Scott and Mr. Percival, in 1805 and 1808, to relieve the curates, and they failed by the opposition of the ecclesiastics. Thus they forced their body to apply to parliament for £100,000 a year. Begging is also customary in the rich diocese of Durham. There the revenue of the clergy amounts to about £200,000 a year; yet every year, there is a general begging for the poor clergy and their families.”—*Essay on Population*, in a note, p. 472.

How could a man discharge the duties of so many different offices, in so many different places, perhaps at the distance of some hundred miles from each other, if there were any duties to perform?

*Established Clergy.*

“ They are not in trouble like other men, neither are they plagued like other men. Their eyes stand out with fatness, they have more than heart could wish. They are corrupt and speak wickedly, concerning oppression they speak softly. They oppress a man’s house, even a man’s heritage.”—  
Anon.

The character of the clergy has not improved since the days of Mr. Locke: we still find them more the *ministers of the government* than the *ministers of the gospel*. Perhaps the two greatest extremes in nature are a real *gospel minister* and a church of England priest; there is scarcely one point of resemblance: the former an humble inoffensive character, despising wealth, and wholly absorbed in his spiritual duties; the latter, a furious political demon, rapacious, insolent, and luxurious; having no fear of God before his eyes; neglectful of his spiritual concerns; waging unceasing war against liberty, knowledge, and humanity; exerting all his influence to promote tyranny, and enslave and debase his fellow creatures.

This, we believe, with a few exceptions, is the general character of the established clergy. Late events have tended still more to lower this body in the estimation of the people. They have beheld them the most violent assailants of their liberties, and foremost in every measure of severity, blood, and violence. It were useless to quote instances now, when so many are fresh in the public mind, of spiritual tyranny, ferocity, and turbulence. We allude, of course, to what has occurred at Manchester, where men in *holy orders*, who had sworn they had felt themselves called by the *Holy Ghost to the cure of souls*, directed the barbarous outrage. This, it may be said, is a particular instance, and that the Rev. Mr. Hay, and the Rev. Mr. Ethelstone, are not fair samples of their brethren. We wish to God it were not so, but unfortunately the same blood-thirsty spirit seems to pervade the whole body. They are all for *coercion*; no attempt to alleviate distress,—to sympathise or diminish the burdens of the people. They are all for the bayonet, the sabre, the dungeon, and the field-piece. In the county of Chester, in the list of subscribers to raise an armed force, one-tenth of the number are clergymen. At the Staffordshire meeting, the Rev. Mr. Hadon, in addition to a troop of yeomanry, recommended that they should also raise a regiment of infantry. It were useless to ask if this be Christianity?

We shall now leave the Established Clergy. Among the different classes opposed to the welfare of the community, we consider them by far the most iniquitous: while they render the least service to society, they devour the largest proportion of the produce of industry. They are ungrateful to those who

---

*Aristocracy.*

---

feed and clothe them, and prostitute the religion they profess, but the precepts of which they never practise, to support a political system by which they are protected in vice and indolence.

Our next article is the ARISTOCRACY. Before we enter upon this subject, we shall devote a page or two to the consideration of the measures about to be adapted to stop the progress of Reform, and the exposition of abuse. Five bills have been introduced, all of which, at the period we are writing, seem likely soon to form a part of the law of the land, or more correctly the law of the Oligarchy. Two objects appear principally in view by these coercive enactments: First, to prevent the diffusion of knowledge; secondly, to deprive the people of all means of effectual resistance to oppression. Our observations will be confined to the *Seditious Meeting Bill*, and the *Press Restriction Bills*. The former destroys the oldest, and the latter the most invaluable right of the people.

Before the right of meeting to deliberate on public grievances is destroyed, it seems fair that some great abuse should be proved to have resulted from its exercise. Nothing of the kind, however, has been attempted; and, apparently, for this reason, because no such position could be established. The people have met, deliberated, and resolved, but they met legally and separated peaceably; no tumult, violence, nor outrage, of any kind. Under what pretence then, we may ask, is this right to be annihilated? It has not been abused; it has been constitutionally exercised, and for a constitutional object. It is no objection against public meetings, that they are numerous attended, provided they are not tumultuous. Lord Eldon indeed says, that numbers constitute force, force terror, and terror illegality. But we will tell his Lordship of another climax quite as good: taxation produces discontent, discontent sedition, and sedition illegality: therefore, according to such logic, both *taxation* and *numbers* are illegal.

A great deal has been said about the terror caused by the meetings of the people. Now, according to our conception, this is the very effect intended,

and which it is desirable to produce. What is the use of meeting to resolve and deliberate, unless our resolutions and deliberations inspire some degree of terror? How are bad measures to be prevented, or how are wicked ministers to be acted upon except by terror? Experience has shown, that reason, justice, and humanity, might plead in vain; and that it was only by the numbers, unanimity, and spirited proceedings at public meetings, that the Machiavelian projects of our Rulers could be stayed; that a salutary feeling could be impressed, that the voice of the people ere long must be too loud and general to be disregarded; and that an opposition must be ultimately organized, that would be irresistible.

This we submit is the only advantage that can accrue from public assemblies. Against bad men, resolutions, speeches, and declarations are unavailing, unless accompanied by such indications as denote, that they are supported, not only by the *opinion*, but the *strength* of the community. Had the meetings of the Reformers been neither numerous nor energetic, they would have been despised, and deservedly so: but now, when their immense multitudes appal the hearts of the corruptionists; when they show a firmness and perseverance which nothing can subdue; a wisdom in their proceedings, which shows they are qualified for the exercise of their rights, and a patience under their privations, which is unparalleled; a wretched Oligarchy, instead of timely yielding to their demands, which policy no less than justice dictates, resort to the pitiable expedient of putting them down.

What advantage, we may ask, will they derive from this unconstitutional measure? Will it revive trade? Will it reduce the debt or the poor rates? Will it relieve the distresses of the agriculturist, or fill the coffers of the Chancellor of the Exchequer? Unless it will accomplish some of these, it will do nothing. **IT WILL NOT STOP THE PROGRESS OF REFORM.** That cause must and will triumph. The truths disseminated cannot be rooted out by the hand of power. It is not now a problematical, but a demonstrated truth, that the calamities of the country flow from overwhelming taxation, originating in non-representation; that they are the effect of a shameless waste of the public money, participated in, and supported by a corrupt representation. This is the conviction of at least nine-tenths of the population; and it will not be destroyed by the prevention of public meetings.

Instead of retarding, ministers most assuredly will accelerate reform. The Reformers themselves will now redouble their efforts. Why not?

*Aristocracy.*

Clearly their labours have not been in vain. They have stricken their enemies with terror. Why else, this dreadful note of preparation? Why these coercion bills? Why throw up new bulwarks? Why add 10,000 men to the army, and build new barracks? Plainly, because they are afraid; plainly, because they find that they are getting **WEAK**, and the people **STRONG**. They see Reform gathering like an avalanche; its truths spreading through all ranks; and in their cowardly fears, they can see no safety but in further injustice, and in placing the abuses, which they cannot defend, behind the bayonets of the military. Driven into their last intrenchments, it were folly indeed of the **REFORMERS** not to follow up their blows, and complete the destruction of the enemy which they have fairly forced from the field. This we are persuaded they will do; they will not relax in their efforts; but they will go on exposing abuse, enlightening the people, and demonstrating to all who are not wilfully blind, that there can be neither peace, prosperity, nor security for England without a radical Reform in the representation.

Had not the injustice of our enemies been without bounds, instead of depriving the people of the right of assembling in public, they would have rendered the exercise of that right unnecessary by extending the elective franchise. The necessity of public meetings originates solely in the want of an adequate representation. Without representatives, the people have no other means of expressing their grievances, and are compelled to do that without the House of Commons, which no doubt would be better performed by representatives chosen by themselves within its walls.

We now come to the *Press Restriction Bill*. According to the proposed measure, the writing of a libel is to be considered a *felony*, subjecting the offender to transportation for **SEVEN YEARS**. We will not attempt to speak of this law as it deserves. Draco's laws, written in blood, or the enactments of the Roman tyrant, who placed them so high that they were illegible, were nothing to this. Libel is an offence which no one can define; it may be unknowingly committed, and the author, according to this savage law, banished from his country and friends, and doomed to herd with burglars and cut-throats. Without, however, expatiating on the sanguinary character of this law, let us examine the pretences on which this attack upon the press has been made.\*

\* With the exception of the transportation law, the penalty of which there is no likelihood they will incur, the *daily journals*, or as Lord Castlereagh terms them,

The principal charge against the weekly publications is their supposed *blasphemous* and *irreligious* tendency. The charge of blasphemy has been as serviceable to ministers as the famous "*No Popery*" cry, and, perhaps, with as little foundation: it has enabled them to destroy the liberty of the press with impunity. Supposing, however, there was some foundation for this imputation, it cannot now be urged as a pretence, after what has happened, for any further restrictions on the press. The supposed blasphemer has been tried, fined, and imprisoned; the law has been found sufficient for the punishment of such offenders. No one, knowingly, we imagine, will again write or publish any thing which a jury is likely to deem blasphemous. We conclude, therefore, that new laws for the purpose of checking publications of this description are wholly unnecessary.

Another accusation against the cheap publications, is their *immoral tendency*. We will not reply to this charge by alluding to the morality taught in the church catechism, nor to the kind of morality which is actually practised in the Universities and Public Schools; but we will mention some of the benefits which we think it must be allowed have resulted from the labours of the *Weekly Press*.

Among the first of these we shall mention is the change on the subject of *Catholic Emancipation*. Some years ago the "*mob*," as they are called, were the great opponents of this salutary measure, but now they are decidedly in its favour. To what we ask is this change to be ascribed? Certainly not to the effusions of the *Edinburgh Review*, nor the "*respectable Press*," for they never read them; but solely we think to the calumniated writers and vendors of "*sedition and blasphemy*." It is this class alone, by diffusing the principles of liberty and justice, that have achieved this great victory over bigotry and intolerance.

The "*respectable press*," will not be affected by the new regulations. His lordship feels no apprehension, we dare say, from the labours of these gentlemen. Corruption may be supported, but not endangered, by the mock battles of the *Times*, the *Chronicle*, and the *Courier*. When poor Sir Manasseh Lopez was sentenced to two years imprisonment, and to pay a fine of £10,000 for an offence which a minister of state could do with impunity, and which had been declared to be as "*notorious as the sun at noon-day*," not one of the *respectable scribes* had honesty enough to comment on the hypocrisy and injustice of the transaction. Sir F. Burdett, in the House of Commons, contrasted the punishment of this gentleman with the best-judging practices of *Castlereagh*, but that was the only public notice this impudent mockery of justice received.

*Aristocracy.*

There is another important consideration in which we think the *weekly press* has almost the exclusive merit. Every one must have remarked the prodigious change in the character of the people: we never hear now of any riot or tumult; no senseless outrage against the butchers, bakers, or farmers. To what is this to be ascribed? But for a more striking instance, let us look to the county of Lancaster. There sedition, blasphemy, and all the horrors, have been read with the greatest avidity. And what has been the result? The noble spectacles exhibited in that county have astonished Europe. Fifty, sixty, and perhaps one hundred thousand people, composed entirely of the working classes, have assembled, made speeches, deliberated, passed resolutions, and separated, without causing the slightest tumult or committing the least outrage. To what are these extraordinary scenes to be attributed? What has produced this wonderful improvement in the intellectual character of this brave people? What has caused them to endure patiently for years, and without violence, the most unmerited and unparalleled privations? We really think these wonders have been wrought by the CHEAP PUBLICATIONS. We know, that before these calumniated publications began to circulate, one hundred persons could not assemble without committing some of those excesses, perhaps not quite so atrocious as are now perpetrated exclusively by the magistrates and "higher orders" of that county.

Let us now bring the scene nearer home, and look to the change that has been produced by CHEAP PUBLICATIONS on the "rabble" of Westminster. A great revolution has been effected there. The obscene jests, the pot-house jokes, the balderdash stories, with which it was attempted to delude and amuse the "swinish multitude," in this days of Fox and Sheridan, would not now be tolerated. The "mob" of this day would turn from them with contempt and abhorrence, and deem the authors of such wretched contrivances more worthy to be pelted from the hustings than honoured with their votes.

The scenes of outrage too, that occurred during the struggles of the two Aristocratical factions for the representation of that city, were of the most dreadful description. Murders were sometimes committed by the hired gangs of the contending parties. An eye-witness of these scenes, says, "I remember several Westminster elections—I remember the profligate proceedings—the deep and dire atrocities with which they were accompanied—the canvassing—the compulsions—the threats—the penalties—the enormous corruption—and the sanguinary conflicts with which the struggles of the two

ARISTOCRATICAL parties were attended; when the Irish chairmen, on the one hand, with their broken poles converted into bludgeons, and the butchers, on the other hand, with their marrow bones and cleavers, ready both of them for the alarm and the execution of factious slaughter, knocked down the electors in proceeding to the hustings or departing from them, and sought to decide, by open violence, the contest which their respective employers could dispute no longer, by reason of their abused and exhausted purses—I remember many of these circumstances well; and every old inhabitant of Covent-garden will remember facts enough of this description; at a time when Reformers were NOT, and Family-influence was all-in-all." *Narrative of the Westminster Election of 1819*, p. 40, 50.

Two hundred thousand pounds, it is said, were sometimes expended in these contests,—in the corruption of morals—in the subversion of all integrity—in the encouragement of drunkenness, riot, and tumult, and debauchery—in the eradication of truth and the subornation of perjury.

Such were the practices which prevailed before Radicalism was known, and before the establishment of cheap publications. We do not, however, adduce these arguments for the conviction of the two aristocratical factions. Instead of these classes considering the intellectual improvement of the people as a subject of congratulation, it is the very thing they contemplate with alarm, and against which they are now legislating; having usurped the rights of the people, they vainly attempt to fortify the injustice by their intellectual degradation. They wish to behold in them what the Bishop of London terms an "humble docility," a "prostration of the understanding," that may fit them for either religious or political knavery. But this is not the object desired by liberal minds, free from the corruption of the

\* It was in the charge to the clergy of his diocese, where this Right Reverend prelate lamented the want of this humble docility and prostration of understanding in the people. Commenting on this subject Mr. Bentham makes the following admirable observations: "A mind in which the understanding and the will are prostrate—no matter before what—is a mind in the lowest state of debility, which, without correspondent debility of body, can have place. Not more than the corporeal can the mental part of man's frame be in a state of weakness and in a state of strength. If to "question" any thing that is set before it is regarded as a sin,—if to "learn" without questioning any thing that is set before it is regarded as a duty,—set before it, with the customary threats in the back ground, the Catholic Catechism, it is a catholic mind;—set before it the Koran, it is a Mahometan mind."—*Church of Englandism*, p. 89.



---

*New Bills for the Restriction of the Press, &c.*

---

system, and who look to the dissemination of knowledge among the working classes, as the only means of promoting either the liberties or happiness of mankind.

Besides the diffusion of political knowledge and the principles of religious toleration, other advantages, tending to the security of property and the commercial prosperity of the country, have resulted from the circulation of cheap pamphlets. We allude to the introduction of MACHINERY. This, for obvious reasons, was opposed by the mass of the people. It was impossible they should at first be reconciled to inventions, which, though tending to the general advantage, by the multiplication of commodities at a cheaper rate, yet, if they did not deprive some classes of the means of subsistence, degraded them for ever into lower stations. It was natural, therefore, they should resist this innovation; and in so doing, we believe, they did no more than the legal, ecclesiastical, or any other class would have done, had their interests been sacrificed, though that sacrifice were made for the general good. It was necessary, however, the principle should triumph. The people resisted; severer laws were made against frame-breakers, and a terrible sacrifice was made at York; but all this would have been ineffectual, had not another cause interfered. This cause we think may be attributed to Mr. Cobbett's *Weekly Register*. It was this writer, in his letter to the *Luddites*, who demonstrated that however injurious the employment of machinery might be to particular branches of industry; yet, inasmuch as it augmented the supply of food and clothing, consequently rendered them cheaper to all classes, it must be ultimately beneficial. Here then was another advantage resulting from pamphlet writing. This advantage, too, has been derived by men of property; especially by that class to whom the freedom of the press appears now the most obnoxious.

Another remark may be made on this subject. It has been unceasingly represented that the weekly writers were solely occupied on those subjects most likely to *inflamm* and *delude* their readers: had this been their only object, it is mighty strange they did not more frequently allude to the subject of *machinery*. Here indeed was a fine field both for inflaming and deluding the people. Thousands of unhappy men it is possible might have been found in the manufacturing districts, whose passions it were easy to inflame, and whose vengeance it were easy to direct to the destruction of machinery, as the cause of their sufferings. But among the cloud of publications issuing from the press, not one contained the least allusion to this popular topic of discontent; among all the incendiary, inflammatory, and de-

signing writers, as they have been called, there was not one base enough, whose love of mischief, whose desire to avail himself of distress, to inflame the discontents of the people, were such, as to induce him to resort to the expedient of representing machinery as the cause of, or its destruction the means whereby their sufferings might be alleviated.

Much has been said about the pernicious, dangerous, and absurd doctrines which have been propagated. Possibly this might be the case; possibly, with many important truths, error also might be inculcated; possibly, ideas beneficial to society might be accompanied with others of a contrary tendency. This, however, is mere matter of opinion, and was a more proper subject for discussion than coercion. Admitting that cheap publications were injurious as well as beneficial, it affords no argument whatever for their suppression. The same objection might be made to plays, novels, romances, and almost every other publication; the same objection might be urged against the amusements of the theatre; all these, no doubt, are productive of evil as well as good to the community; but who ever, on that account, thought that they should be suppressed? Who ever expects to see any thing which is not accompanied with some portion of evil? The only principle in this, as in every other case, is to balance the good against the bad; and it was on this principle, the fate of the cheap publications ought to have been determined.

Against any thing violent or dangerous in the effusions of the weekly writers, it is fair to contrast them with the productions of the ministerial press. Here, indeed, we might find principles inculcated of the most violent and atrocious character. Within the last three months, the *New Times*, the *Conrier*, the *Morning Post*, and other venal prints, have contained doctrines subversive of every principle of morality, justice, liberty, and humanity. Assassination has not been merely recommended in theory, but its perpetration applauded; treason not merely against the crown, but against the Constitution, has been openly defended; liberty, justice, and every other principle of the least importance to the interest and welfare of society, have been assailed with ridicule, abuse, and falsehood, by these hireling scribes. But all this is nothing. They are suffered to run their course with impunity; no punishment, no attempt to restrain the diffusion of their really treasonable, demoralizing, and dangerous doctrines. Their excess and violence are on the side of the oppressors, not the oppressed; their zeal is excited, not by the sufferings or privations of the people, but the wages of corruption; and, as the price of their prostitution, they give a carte

*New Bills for the Restriction of the Press, &c.*

*blanche*, to their employers for every species of moral guilt and political turpitude.

It is unnecessary, we think, to say any thing more in defence of the cheap publications. We were anxious to undeceive many well-meaning persons, whose fears have been artfully excited, and who have been taught to look upon this portion of the press, as an unmixed source of blasphemy and immorality: Important advantages, however, it is clear have resulted from its labours; not merely have valuable truths in political economy been disseminated; the prejudices of bigotry, and intolerance rooted out, but property has also been secured, and a prodigious change wrought in the moral and intellectual character of the people. On our revilers and slanderers we are aware these arguments will make little impression; we shall have rather excited their fears than conciliated their esteem; their security is in the slavery and ignorance of the people; and they look to the diffusion of the principles of liberty and knowledge through the great mass of society, with the same horror the damned await the day of judgment and retribution.

These calumniators represent the present struggle as one betwixt property and no-property, whereas it is a struggle betwixt that importance the people are acquiring, and which they ought to acquire, and the unprincipled usurpations of their rulers. The people have become much too enlightened for the present system. They have discovered its abuses, defects, and injustice. Their resistance to government is not a mere feverish excitement; it is not a transitory burst of enthusiasm, resulting from some brutal outrage of arbitrary power, but a permanent feeling, originating in a deliberate investigation of the causes of their privations. Such being the nature of the present discontents, they are not likely to subside. Time will rather increase than abate their force. To attempt to stifle them is chimerical. Coercion, while it irritates and prejudices men against its authors, invariably strengthens and confirms them in their opinions. Ministers may narrow the channel of information, but they cannot recall that stream of light which has been shed into every village, hamlet, and workshop of the kingdom. The people have little more to learn in respect of the present government. There is now scarcely an individual any way connected with its abuses, whose name is not familiarly known in every part of the country. No factious juggle; no pretended zeal for religion and morality can now deceive. All the different classes—legal or ecclesiastical, their motives, interests, and hypocritical professions, have been

fully exposed. But this is not all: the people are not only acquainted with the vices of the system, but also the most safe and effectual remedies. Formerly, they were the victims of spies and informers; they were deluded into abortive attempts against a system still too strong in its corruptions, in the fears of some, and the venality of others, to be pulled down by open disorganized violence; but caution, perseverance, an indestructible hatred to boroughmongering, an unceasing hostility to every thing tending to its support, are now the maxims of Reformers.

With a people so enlightened and determined, there can be no doubt of ultimate triumph. They have strength, unity, and justice, all on their side. While the present system continues, they know it is in vain to look for either happiness or security. Ministers may pass bills; but unless they can destroy this conviction, unless they can blot out the knowledge communicated during the last four years; unless they can do that which Paine says is impossible to do, unless they make men unlearn what they have once learnt, they cannot arrest the progress of reform. Even fools, it is said, learn by experience, but the English Oligarchy seems blind to her admonitions. France before her revolution, exhibited the same principles in operation which are now observable in this country. Her population had become too enlightened to tolerate the abuses and injustice of government. The rapacity of her clergy—the oppression and disgusting privileges of her nobility—the decay and corruption of her institutions—a long period of extravagance and mis-rule—were the principal causes which led to that terrible convulsion. Timely reform, no doubt, would have averted that catastrophe; but the clergy were loth to relinquish their tithes and the aristocracy their odious privileges. They would make no concession to the wants and intelligence of the people; they vainly endeavoured to maintain, by force, a corrupt and antiquated system, which had no identity with the opinions, the interest, or the welfare of the community; and the result was, that the church, the monarchy, and the aristocracy, were swept away in the whirlwind which followed; and those generous, enlightened, and liberal spirits, who had long lamented in secret the misery and bondage of the great mass of the people, were at length constrained to join in the annihilation of a system, which the bigoted obstinacy of its defenders would not suffer to be repaired.

Reform may be delayed for a time by the apathy of the middling classes. Something may be said in extenuation of the culpable neutrality of this part of the community. Many of them, in a great measure, have un-

quired their wealth and importance under what is denominated the Pitt System, and they look to that system with a sort of filial gratitude as the author of their being. But it is an egregious error to suppose that they are indebted for their wealth and property to the policy of Mr. Pitt. To that minister England owes nothing but her wars, her debt, her taxes, and poor rates. These were the distinguishing features of his system, and they cannot be considered very conducive to commercial prosperity. In fact, it is to the people, not to the government,—it is to the discoveries of Watt, Arkwright, and Wedgewood, that the merchants and manufacturers are indebted for their wealth; and that they have been enabled, in spite of stamp duties, taxes, and imposts, to maintain an ascendancy in every market in the world.

To church and state the people owe little but their calamities. Even for their religious and moral character, they are indebted solely to themselves. Certainly it is not to the formularies, the ostentation, and the principles of the established church—the spaw of the church of Rome—that they would look for either the forms or precepts of Christianity; and as little would they expect to find examples of morality in the licentious lives of non-resident incumbents, or in the bribery, drunkenness, and perjury of our representative system.

While we think the middling classes are not in the least indebted for their prosperity to the policy of government, we think they will be still less benefited by the aristocratical military despotism about to be established. England would then be what France was before the revolution. There would then be only two classes in the state—the noblesse and the commonalty. The middle classes would be merged in the mobility; and the only privilege they would enjoy would be that of contributing exclusively to the maintenance of a government, in the honours and emoluments of which they would not be allowed to participate.

We shall now conclude our observations on the *Press Restriction Bills*. The attempt to prevent the diffusion of political information among the people, is merely the continuance of the war against liberty and knowledge which commenced with the French Revolution. Knowledge is the great instrument by which the rights of the people are to be acquired, and of course it is against this powerful engine all the efforts of tyranny are directed. The new stamp duties are by no means the first effort that has been made to fetter the operations of the press. The laws already in force for this purpose, and of recent date, are almost innumerable, and which were

intended by the joint operations of fear and vexatious restrictions, to narrow the circulation of political information. According to the laws now in force, every printer is compelled to print his name, and place of abode at the bottom of every thing he prints; he is compelled to keep a copy in order to its being produced, if called for, to the Secretary of State; the printers or proprietors of a newspaper, are compelled to go to the stamp office, and swear that they are so; they are obliged also to make oath to their several places of abode; and the publisher is obliged to deposit one copy of every number of the paper in the stamp office, where it is ready to be produced against all the parties, in case of any prosecution for a libel.

To these impediments in the way of political publications, may be added the arbitrary and tyrannical powers of the Attorney-General. This officer can at any time file an information; he can bring a man to trial, or put the trial off, and may thus keep a prosecution hanging over a man as long as he lives.\* When a man is brought into court, he can stop the proceedings, or go on with them. If two men are prosecuted and convicted for the same thing, he may bring one up for punishment, and suffer the other to escape without any punishment at all. In 1809, Sir Vicary Gibbs introduced the dangerous practice of holding to bail, or sending to prison in default of bail, immediately an *ex-officio* information is filed, and this may be done without bringing, or having any intention to bring the party to trial.

These powers one would have thought sufficient to restrain the abuses of the press; but, odious as these powers are, they are nothing compared to those about to be enforced against pamphlet writing. The proprietors of newspapers are only compelled to find securities for the payment of the stamp duties. The proprietors of pamphlets, under two sheets, will be compelled to find securities, not only for the payment of the stamp duties, but also for the payment of any fine the court may impose in consequence of being convicted of a libel. Lord Castlereagh, however, modestly terms this

\* By the new Traverse Bill, some alteration has been made in the powers of the Attorney-General, in this respect. According to this law, unless a person be brought to trial within a twelvemonth, the information is to be discharged, on the payment of the expenses. But the condition of paying the expenses renders the whole a nullity. In our account of Excise Informations, we have seen what the expenses of Crown Lawyers amount to; probably £100 or more. Few can, and none will, we imagine, pay this sum, for what it is obvious, from the delay of a twelvemonth, the Attorney-General is afraid to submit to a Jury.

*New Bills for the Restriction of the Press, &c.*

attack upon the *Freedom of the Press*. He says it imposes no restraint *previous* to publication; it allows every man to lay what sentiments he pleases before the public. To many, no doubt, this doctrine will appear wholly incomprehensible. For our part we can see little difference betwixt the proposed measure and the establishment of a  *censorship* . Government has marked out a certain class of publications for suppression; they have not put them down by name to be sure, and said that this and that paper shall not be circulated, but they have done what amounts to the same thing. Their regulations apply exclusively to one class of publications, and the condition imposed upon them being such as by many cannot be performed, it is exactly the same as if they were prohibited by the fiat of a *Censor*.

The distinction which is made betwixt the newspaper and the weekly press, shows clearly the object. Ministers find that too much knowledge diffused among the people is incompatible with their system, so they have determined to lay a tax upon it. All their efforts will prove abortive. An appetite has been created for information, which must and will be satisfied. Those who cannot have a single paper, will subscribe and have a part of one; thus the diffusion of information will continue to the same extent. No valuable ideas, no principle, no useful hint or suggestion will be lost. This, however, does not alter the baseness of the intention; which equals all wickedness the endeavour of the papists to prevent the people reading the Bible in a language they understood. The papists dreaded their craft should be exposed. They knew their emoluments, their influence, and the ridiculous veneration in which they were held, depended entirely on maintaining the mass of the people in ignorance of their real merit and pretensions. But the truth was at length discovered, and then followed a terrible reformation, which is exactly the result we anticipate from similar exertions on the part of our political monks. Their efforts to prevent the exposition of abuses, will do more to confirm men in a belief of their existence, and the unprincipled nature of the system, than could have been done by cheap publications in a century, and they admit their criminality in thus shrinking from investigation.

# INFLUENCE

OF THE

## EAST INDIA COMPANY.

THE Bank of England and the East India Company form the two strong outworks of the Government; and, by their various connexions and interests, add greatly to that mass of influence by which the latter is supported. Both these powerful associations have become more like petty states, acknowledging a sort of feudatory dependence on the sovereign chief, than companies of traders, originally incorporated for commercial purposes. Both have risen from very humble beginnings, and perhaps it would not be easy to strike the balance of fraud and iniquity by which their power has been respectively acquired. Both have been nurtured under the fostering care of the Borough Government, to which, under particular emergencies, they have been indebted for assistance; and probably it is from a knowledge of this dependence, that these two chartered bodies feel such a lively interest in the safety of the state, and that whenever any popular movement indicates any thing hostile to the government, they are instantly alarmed, and the Bank and the India House immediately placed in an attitude of defence.

Before we give any account of the revenue and influence of the East India Company, it may be proper to give a brief outline of the history of this powerful association, and just indicate those extraordinary events by which a few traders in mace, nutmegs, and ginger, have been able to extend their sway over sixty millions of inhabitants, whose happiness depends on their wisdom and justice. In giving this history, we shall enter into no detail of Asiatic triumphs, of battles and sieges. We have no taste for those things at best, but still less when the combatants are unequally matched, while we should have to exhibit the conflicts of wolves and sheep, and show how

• Our intention was to have treated on the income of the Aristocracy in this part; but it is unavoidably deferred.



*East India Company.*

a handful of crafty, hardy, and unprincipled Europeans wrested a mighty empire from the feeble grasp of the timid, artless, and effeminate Hindoos. Leaving out, therefore, all military details, which in justice ought never to have formed a part of the history of the East India Company, we shall confine ourselves principally to the civil transactions of this association.

The first attention to the India trade appears to have been attracted by the success of the Dutch merchants. These rapacious traders, having supplanted the Portuguese, in that part of the world, had an entire monopoly of the trade, and availing themselves of the exclusive possession of the market, exacted exorbitant prices for the pepper and other productions of the East. To frustrate their avarice, and obtain some share in this lucrative traffic, the merchants of London despatched a mission to the Great Mogul, to obtain from him a grant of commercial privileges to the English. The success of this mission was not known till the year 1606; but, in the meantime, the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and other principal merchants of that city, to the number of 191, assembled on the 22d of September, at St. Dunstons, hall, and established an association for trading to India, for which they subscribed a capital of £33,133. 6s. 8d. This may be considered the first germ of our Indian empire. On the 31st of December, Thomas Smith, alderman, and a great number of other merchants, were incorporated by Queen Elizabeth, under the name of the Governor and Company of Merchants trading to the East-Indies, with the usual privileges to trade exclusively to all parts of Asia, Africa, and America, for 15 years. The capital of this Company amounted to about £70,000. They fitted out four ships, the best in England, of the burden of 240, 260, 300, and 600 tons. The value of the ships' stores and provisions, of the merchandize forming the cargoes, and of the bullion, was estimated at £468,378.

This expedition appears to have been tolerably successful, brought home valuable cargoes of nutmegs, pepper, and mace, and succeeded in establishing several factories at Bantany, and on the Molucca Islands. But, notwithstanding the success of this undertaking, no great effort appears to have been made to follow it up, and for several years after, the trade and capital of the Company gradually declined. In 1606, only three ships were sent out. In 1608, the Company having subscribed a capital of £33,000, for a fourth voyage, the whole of their ships were either wrecked in India or on their voyage home. Next year they were more fortunate, and their

ships bringing home a valuable cargo of mace and nutmegs, they divided a profit of 211 per cent. Encouraged by this success, the Company solicited the renewal of their charter, and seemed resolved to push the trade with spirit. They built the largest ship that had ever been constructed in England for commercial purposes, being no less than 1000 tons burden. King James and his court attended the launch, and named her *The Trade's Increase*.

Unfortunately, this vessel was lost, and Sir Henry Middleton, her commander, soon after died of grief. The next voyage was undertaken with a capital of only £15,364. The eleventh voyage was limited to a single ship, and a capital of £10,689. The twelfth voyage was limited to a single ship of 240 tons, and employed only a capital of £7,142. This was the last voyage as a separate concern. It yielded a profit of £138 18s. 4d. for every £100 capital.

Various causes may be assigned for this declension in the Company's affairs. Their rivals, the Dutch and Portuguese, made use of every expedient their malice and treachery could suggest, to impede their success; besides which we may add the erroneous principles on which the different voyages we have mentioned were undertaken. Instead of the trade being conducted upon a joint-stock, on account of the whole company, every individual was privileged by the charter, to subscribe as much or as little as he pleased, or nothing at all, for every voyage. The inconvenience and absurdity of this principle had become obvious; and, in 1613, it was determined to have no more separate voyages, but to open a subscription for a joint capital, to continue for four years. Under this system the affairs of the Company soon assumed a new aspect; and in a very short time they had established more than twenty factories, in different parts of the Mogul's dominions, and the islands in the Indian seas.

In 1616, when they proposed to raise a new capital, all ranks crowded into the subscription, which, at the time of closing it, amounted to £1,629,040, being the largest capital that had ever been subscribed in any part of Europe, for a joint-stock trade. Among the subscribers were 15 dukes and earls, 13 countesses, 82 knights, including judges and privy counsellors, 18 widows and maiden ladies, besides clergymen, physicians, merchants, tradesmen, and others without any denomination; in the whole 954 subscribers. The stock of the Company sold for 203 per cent. The total value of their property, at this time, was estimated at £400,000.

*East India Company.*

And it was stated by the deputy-governor, that they gave employment to 10,000 tons of shipping, 2500 seamen, 500 ship carpenters, and 120 factors in India.

Owing to a variety of untoward circumstances their affairs again declined, and at the time of the protectorship of Cromwell, their stock was so low as £80 per cent. The civil war which broke out in the reign of Charles the First, and the subsequent unsettled state of the government, had entirely disorganized their affairs. Private individuals were permitted to trade to India, which caused much confusion. Cromwell granted them a new charter, but very little capital was subscribed; and it was not till the reign of Charles the Second the Company's affairs assumed a more settled appearance. That monarch renewed their charter; and the King having obtained the island of Bombay, from Portugal, as part of the Queen's marriage portion, he granted it to the Company, on condition of paying him a fee-farm rent of ten pounds, at the Custom-house, on the 30th of September in each year for ever.

In 1669 the Company received two canisters containing 143½ pounds of tea, which is supposed to have been the first importation of this article from any part of the Indies. It was partly given away in presents, and partly expended in the India House for the refreshment of the committees.

In 1676, the trade of the Company having been very successful for many years, they were enabled, out of their accumulated profits, to double their capital to £739,782 : 10 : 0; upon which the market price of their stock, which had been under par, immediately rose to £245 per cent. The ships in their employ amounted to from 30 to 35, of from 300 to 600 tons, and carrying from 40 to 70 guns. In the year 1680, the Company sent a ship to trade with China. The whole of that trade had heretofore been monopolized by the Dutch and Portuguese. About this time they acquired the privilege to coin money, not resembling British money, at Bombay and other places in India. The Company consisted of 600 members, who were entitled to votes in proportion to their shares; hence it happened that some had to the amount of sixty votes:—every member moreover had liberty to carry on trade on his own private account, to the extent of one-fifth of his stock in the Company's capital. The stock of the Company, clear of all debts, amounted to £1,700,000. The expense of the Company's forts in India was estimated at £100,000 a year.

In 1698, the English factory obtained permission to purchase three small

villages, extending in all about three miles along the east bank of the Ganges, and about one mile back from it, for which they agreed to pay annually to the Nabob 1195 rupees. This paltry acquisition was the commencement of the territorial aggrandizement of the Company, and by which they were afterwards enabled, assisted by fraud and force, to extend themselves over the whole Mogul empire. The ground on which these villages stood forms the site of the great city of Calcutta, containing 800,000 inhabitants.

Some jealousy about this time began to be entertained at the increasing power of the Company; and in 1698 the government intimated to the Company, that a large sum would be expected for the public service, in consideration of a parliamentary confirmation of their privileges. The Company offered to advance £700,000 at an interest of 4 per cent. provided their charter were fully confirmed by parliament. Meanwhile several opulent individuals offered to advance £3,000,000, provided they were invested with all the privileges of the India trade, as heretofore enjoyed by the Company. Parliament accepted the larger sum, though at double interest, and a bill was ordered to be prepared for incorporating the subscribers. The Company, not to be outdone by their opponents, then proposed a loan of £2,000,000, but this availed them nothing. The government was favourable to the opposing interest, and they prevailed. On the 5th of July the royal assent was given to an act incorporating the new subscribers with powers and privileges similar to the chartered Company. So great were the advantages anticipated by the nation from the new association, that the subscription of two millions was filled up within a few days after the books were opened. The greatest part of this sum was subscribed by foreigners. The King himself was an adventurer to the extent of £10,000.

The charter of the original Company had not yet expired; and almost a ruinous contest ensued betwixt the rival associations. More than sixty ships are said to have been employed by the contending interests in the India trade. The glut of India goods, joined to other causes, produced by this rivalship, reduced the value of the stock of the old Company, which had been as high as 500 per cent., to 39 per cent. Both parties at length seem to have discovered the ruinous tendency of this contest, and an union was effected in 1702, by a tripartite indenture, wherein Queen Anne, the old Company, and the new Company, were partners. According to this instrument, the two Companies bind themselves to have at least one-tenth of their exports in English manufactures, and after the expiration of seven years they are to be called *The United Company of Merchants of England and*

*East India Company.*

trading to the East Indies, which is the present designation of the Company, of being yet to be seen.

After this union, there are not many facts in the history of the Company, till the middle of the eighteenth century, deserving of notice. The Company about this period began to be as actively engaged in making territorial acquisitions as in the pursuits of commerce. Among the various expedients by which our Indian empire has been acquired, we may mention the adventure of Mr. Hamilton. This gentleman, a surgeon in the service of the honourable Company, being sent to the coast of Delhi, obtained some valuable cessions from the Great Mogul, by curing him of an obstinate venereal complaint, which had long baffled the skill of his physicians.

In 1766, the Company, in consequence of their territorial acquisitions, raised their dividends from 6 to 10 per cent, and shortly after to 12 per cent. In 1779, the time for the renewal of the charter approaching, the Company prudently prepared for that event, by a present to the public of three seventy-four gun ships, besides a large sum of money in bounties to 6000 seamen. Notwithstanding this bonus, in 1780 notice was given to the Company by government, that on the expiration of their charter their exclusive privileges should cease, unless they would agree to pay £1,000,000 into the Exchequer, restrict their future dividends to 8 per cent, and pay three-fourths of the surplus profits, over and above that dividend, into the Exchequer. After much discussion, the demand for the renewal of their charter was reduced to £600,000. This renewal was to continue till the 1st day of March 1791, when, on the payment of the debt due by government to the Company, their exclusive privileges should expire.

The affairs of the East India Company, and the transactions in Hindostan, began deeply to interest the public, and every session of parliament produced some new investigation on this important subject. From merchants the Company had risen into sovereign princes, and, instead of being occupied with the ginger and pepper trade, they were wholly absorbed in schemes of territorial aggrandisement. Occupied unceasingly in war—buying and exchanging territory—making treaties of partition—hiring troops to the native princes—establishing monopolies—and fomenting wars among the nabobs and subahdars, that these short-sighted princes, after weakening each other by their mutual animosities, might fall an easy prey to the superior policy of the common invader. These avocations ill-comported with the commercial character, and it was a little inconceivable how men, whose knowledge, it may be supposed, was principally confined to making out an

*East India Company.*

invoices, bills of lading, or book-keeping by double-entry, could discharge these royal functions.

To relieve the Company of the burden of these important duties, Mr. Fox, then one of the Secretaries of State, in 1783, introduced his famous India-bill. According to this sweeping measure, the Company were to be entirely divested of the management of their affairs, and the administration of the whole of their commercial and territorial transactions was to be vested in the hands of seven noblemen and gentlemen, as directors, assisted by nine others, who should be proprietors of East India stock to at least the amount of £2000 each. The new directors were named in the bill, and were not removable except by an address to his Majesty by either House of Parliament, and their successors were to be named by the King. The assistant-directors were removable at the pleasure of any five of the principal directors; so that, virtually, the constitution of this high tribunal would be vested in ministers, placing at their disposal the whole of the Indian patronage, and adding thereby enormously to the influence of the crown.

Another bill was also introduced by Mr. Fox, for defining the powers of the governor-general, presidents, and council, and for preventing arbitrary and despotic proceedings in the East. The Company's governors were not to make war but in self defence, and were prohibited from making treaties of partition, hiring troops to the native princes, and every illegal present was to be recoverable by any person for his own benefit. This bill also contained regulations for securing the property of the princes of India, and for terminating the disputes fomented among them.

The provisions of these bills sufficiently show the nature of the abuses prevailing in India. They were both violently opposed by Mr. Pitt, then out of place, and an oppositionist and reformer. The question agitated the whole nation; and such was the outcry raised by the Company against the pretended violation of their charter—representing such a precedent as endangering the security of all the corporations in the kingdom,—that they finally prevailed, and the bills, though passed in the Commons, were rejected by the Lords:

Next year a dissolution of parliament and change of ministers having taken place, Mr. Pitt introduced a new bill for the better government of India. Many of the provisions of this bill were similar to those of Mr. Fox. The most important difference related to the appointment of the Board of Controul. The commercial affairs and territorial possessions of

the Company, were to continue in their hands, subject to the control and superintendence of a board of commissioners appointed by the crown.

The next subject of any interest is the trial of Warren Hastings. This gentleman had presided over India thirteen years, and arrived in England on the 16th of June, 1785. On the 26th of the same month, Mr. Burke, who had brought heavy accusations against him in the preceding session, gave notice of his intention to impeach him for high crimes and misdemeanors, alleged to have been committed in India. After long debates in this and succeeding sessions, the prosecution was sanctioned by the Commons, and in 1787 articles of impeachment were sent to the Lords. The trial was protracted from year to year, till 23d of April, 1795, when the accused was acquitted, on the payment of his fees, of all the charges preferred against him. The Company in consideration of the services of this officer discharged the expenses he incurred by the prosecution, amounting to upwards of £70,000, and settled upon him an annuity of £5000.

The house of Commons must have degenerated very much in its love of justice since 1785. At that period, it devoted eight years to the investigation of crimes alleged to have been committed on the other side the globe; while at the present day, it refuses to devote a single day to the investigation of crimes, certainly not less atrocious, committed almost within view of its walls.

In 1793 the charter of the Company was renewed, and their exclusive privileges continued to them until the first day of March, 1814. In this act a clause was inserted to restrain the belligerent propensities of the Company's servants, but it appears not to have been much regarded. In 1792 Tippoo Saib was despoiled of half his dominions, and compelled to deliver two of his sons into the hands of the Marquis Cornwallis, as hostages for the performance of a treaty by which he engaged to pay £1,600,000 in money to the Company. In 1799 this prince was again attacked by Lord Mornington, now Marquis Wellesley, under pretext of having entered into negotiations with the French, and some of the native princes, for the entire expulsion of the English from India. This war completed the destruction of the sultan. His capital of Seringapatam was taken by assault, himself slain in its defence, and his dominions dismembered. His children and relatives are now supported by pensions from the *ci-devant* dealers in mace and gloves.

The Company having obtained possession of the different members of the Mogul empire, in 1803, completed their conquests by attacking the Mogul

himself in his capital of Delhi. This monarch and his family were also placed upon the pension-list of the Company.

We shall only mention a few more facts connected with the Company's history till the opening of the trade in 1814. By the 29 Geo. III. c. 65, they were authorized to add one million to their capital stock. The new stock being subscribed at 174 per cent. produced £1,740,000, which raised their joint stock to five millions. In 1793, they were authorized to add another million to their capital by subscription. This additional stock produced £2,000,000, being subscribed at 200 per cent.

In 1797, valuable concessions were made to the Americans, with regard to the India trade. They were permitted to carry on trade with the Company's territories in India, in articles not prohibited by law, on paying only the same duties paid by British vessels, and paying such port charges as are paid in the ports of the United States by British vessels. These advantages were not neglected by the Americans. In a few years the trade of the United States in India, equalled nearly one half the trade of the Company. It was singular policy to admit a foreign state to the participation of the India trade when our own merchants were excluded.

In August, 1803, during the alarm of an invasion, the Company, at a general court, came to a resolution to present to government 10,000 tons of shipping to guard the coast, and to be maintained at their own expense. In the years 1808 and 1809, the Company lost four outward-bound and six homeward-bound ships. The value of the ships and cargoes was estimated at two millions.

We have now mentioned the most important facts in the history of the East India Company till the year 1813, when the exclusive privileges of this association were in part abolished. Prior to that time, private traders were not wholly excluded from the India trade. By the 17th clause of the act of 1793, the Company were obliged to appropriate 3000 tons of shipping for carrying out goods belonging to private merchants and manufacturers. The act of 1813 continues to the Company the exclusive monopoly of the China trade for twenty years, but the trade to India, subject to certain restriction and regulations, is thrown open to the enterprise of individuals. The territorial acquisitions in India are also to remain in the government of the Company for twenty years, from April, 1814.

The clauses of this act amount to 125, and are far too numerous to be here particularised. We shall now speak of the revenue and other sources of influence of the Company.



*East India Company.*

The principal source of emolument and influence to the East India Company, is the immense amount of patronage, affording the most lucrative appointments for their children and relations. The naval, military, and civil patronage of the Company exceeds the patronage of the crown before the revolutionary war. Of the extent of this patronage the following statement of the number of persons in the Company's service will give some idea:

Civil Service.	}	Persons either in the service of the Company, or connected with, and employed in their affairs in England.....	2,146
		Persons in India employed in the judicial, clerical, diplomatic, commercial, and revenue departments .....	1,056
		Seamen employed and reared in the Company's service in 115 ships; about ..	25,000
Military and Naval Service.	}	British military officers in the Company's service commanding European troops ..	1,000
		British officers and cadets in the Company's service commanding native troops.....	3,000
		British non-commissioned officers and soldiers in the service of the Company ...	16,000
		British officers in the Company's naval department in India .....	113
Natives in the Service of the Company.	}	Natives employed in various departments in the civil service of the Company ....	12,362
		Natives employed in the Indian armies....	140,000
		Natives employed in the naval service estimated at about .....	800
Total .....			201,477

Mr. COLQUHOUN, from whom this statement is taken, says, that out of the 201,477 persons in the service of the Company, at least 6000 in the civil and military departments at home and abroad, enjoy emoluments from £200 to £10,000 a year, exclusive of the Governor General. On the appointment of the first Governor General of Bengal, in 1773, his salary was £25,000 a year, and four counsellors with a salary of £10,000 a year each. The salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Judicature at Calcutta, is £8000 a year, with three other judges at £6000 a year each. By the act of 1813, the salary of a bishop in India was to be £5000 a year, and

*East India Company.*

of three archdeacons £2000 a year each. The expense of outfit, &c. of different officers was fixed by the same act, as follows :

Governor General of Fort William, in Bengal.....	£5000
Each of the members of council there.....	1200
Commander in Chief of all the Forces in India.....	2500
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at Fort William.....	1500
Each of the Puisne Judges there.....	1000
Governor of Fort St. George.....	3000
Each of the members of council there.....	1000
Commander in Chief there.....	2000
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court there.....	1200
Each of the Puisne Judges there.....	1000
Governor of Bombay.....	2500
Each of the members of council there.....	1000
Commander in Chief there.....	1500
Recorder there.....	1500
Governor of Prince of Wales's Island.....	1200
Recorder there.....	1000
Bishop.....	1200
Each of the Archdeacons.....	500

The allowance for the outfit, &c. of these officers, is about one-fourth the amount of their salaries, exclusive of other emoluments. According to the statement in the *East India Register*, the allowance per month to general and regimental officers when in the field, on the Bengal establishment, is as follows :

	£	s.	d.
General officer on the staff.....	662	10	0
Colonel not on the staff.....	156	5	0
Lieutenant Colonel.....	123	15	0
Major.....	93	15	0
Captain.....	51	7	6
Captain Lieutenant.....	43	17	6
Lieutenant.....	31	15	0
Ensign.....	25	0	0
Adjutant.....	28	7	6
Quarter-Master.....	14	12	6
Surgeon.....	51	7	6
Assistant ditto.....	31	15	0

*East-India Company.*

The allowance to officers on the Fort St. George and Bombay Establishment, are nearly the same as the above. The sums granted by way of superannuation allowance to officers and servants of the Company are very considerable. They are fixed according to the following scale, by the 53d Geo. III. c. 155.

	Proportion of salary.
If an officer or servant shall have served with diligence and fidelity in the Company's service for 10 years, and being under 60 years of age, shall be incapable, from infirmity of mind or body, to discharge the duties of his office .....	} One-third.
If above 10 years and less than 20 .....	} One-half.
If above 20 years .....	} Two-thirds.
If such officer or servant shall be above 60 years of age, and he shall have served 15 years or upwards, without infirmity of mind or body .....	} Two-thirds.
If 65 years of age, or upwards, and he shall have served 40 years or upwards .....	} Three-fourths.
If 65 years of age, and he shall have served 50 years or upwards .....	} The whole.

From the preceding details, some idea may be formed of the immense value of India patronage, and the wide field it opens for providing for children, relatives, and dependants. The trade of the Company has never been an object of so much importance as the military appointments to an army of 150,000 men, the filling up of vacancies in the judicial and police departments, and the numerous situations in the collection and expenditure of a revenue of 15 millions per annum. It is the annual value of these different situations which constitutes the real profit of the Company.

Though the appointment of the officers and servants of the Company is vested in the Directors, yet, indirectly, his Majesty's Ministers have great influence in these appointments. This will be better understood by considering the nature of the system under which Indian affairs are administered. The territorial possessions are divided into three presidencies, namely, Bengal, (which is the chief, and to which the others are subordinate,) Madras, and Bombay. To each of these Presidencies are attached a Governor and Council, Commander in Chief, Court of Judicature, Police, &c. The appointment of these officers, as well as all others in the navy, and the revenue department, is vested, under certain regulations, in the Court of

*East India Company.*

**Directors.** Subordinate to the Board of Control, the Court of Directors have the entire management of Indian affairs. They are 24 in number, chosen by proprietors of not less than £1000 of the Company's stock. Till the year 1773, they were chosen annually; but the 13 Geo. III. c. 63, enacts, That they are to continue in office four years, six new ones being elected every year.

The Board of Control consists of twelve members, being the King's Ministers, and some of their particular adherents. Each member has a salary of £1500 a year. The salary of the president, Mr. Canning, is £6000 a year. This Board has a general control over the proceedings of the Directors, and over the administration of the revenues and the civil and military government of India. All the books of the Company, exhibiting a statement of their political, territorial, and commercial transactions, are to be submitted to the inspection of the Board when required, and copies of the proceedings of the Court of Proprietors or Court of Directors, and copies of all despatches received from all parts within the limits of the Company's charter are to be transmitted to the Board.

Such are the nominal powers of this Board, but in reality it is little more than a sinecure establishment. What services are performed, we imagine, are discharged by the secretaries and clerks. It is pretty plain, however, the president is not a very essential officer; for, during last summer, he was making a tour in Italy, most probably occupied in collecting a new stock of red-taffeta phrases, for the amusement of the dupes and knaves who in a few short weeks have trampled down every remaining vestige of English freedom. In 1793 the expenses of the Board were limited to £16,000 per annum. In 1813 they were raised to £26,000 per annum.

It is through the medium of the Board of Control, Ministers indirectly participate in the patronage of India. They have a negative on the appointment of some of their principal servants, and besides which the general control they possess over the affairs of the Company, it is not likely the Directors would neglect to provide for any individual backed by a ministerial recommendation. As the subject of India patronage is of considerable importance, it may be more satisfactory to insert an abstract of the clauses of the Act of the fifty-third, which relate to this subject.

80.—All vacancies of governors and commanders-in-chief of the forces in India, provincial and otherwise, shall be filled up by the Court of Directors, subject to his Majesty's approbation. Such governor and commander-in-chief shall be removable at the will and pleasure of the Court of Directors.

*East India Company.*

81.—The Court of Directors shall not appoint any person to any employment or office in the civil and military establishments in India without the approbation of the Board of Controul, other than and except as aforesaid. The said Court of Directors shall however appoint such persons as they may think fit to the office of member of council, general officers on the staff, advocate and attorney-general-at-law of the said Company, or chaplain, or any office or employment in the civil and marine establishments, including writers, cadets, or assistant-surgeons, in such manner as they have been accustomed to do.\*

82.—Any office or employment, the emoluments of which shall exceed £1500 per annum, may be granted to any of the Company's servants who shall have been resident in India four years antecedent to such vacancy, And any office or employment, whose emoluments exceed £3000 per annum, may be conferred upon any of the said servants who shall have been resident in India seven years. And any office or employment in India exceeding £4000 per annum, such office including that of the council may be conferred upon any of the said servants who shall have resided ten years in India.

83.—No restoration of any civil or military servant of the said Company to his station or employment by the Court of Directors shall be valid or effectual without the approbation and consent of the Board of Controul.

84.—The Court of Directors, with the approbation of the Board of Controul, may permit any general officer, or colonel commanding a regiment, or lieutenant-colonel commandant of a regiment, who have been absent from India five years, to have his rank and be again capable of serving in India.

The 86th clause provides that the governor-general or governor in council, may appoint any civil servant to be a member of any court, board, or other establishment in India.

According to the 86th clause, no gratuity exceeding £600 shall be granted by the Court of Directors to any person, unless sanctioned by the Court of Proprietors, and approved by the Board of Controul.

From some statements of Mr. Hume on the 16th of last March, it would seem that the administration of justice is the most lucrative trade in India, as well as in this country, and the judicial system quite as defective.

By the Act of 1793, the Directors are prohibited from sending out more writers and clerks than there are vacancies for, and no person can be appointed whose age is under fifteen or above seventy-two years.

Suitors are obliged to pay to government on the sum sued for, from 50 to 7 and 6 per cent. and a fine is levied on all debts sued for, decreasing as the amount increases! Every document requisite to the progress of a suit, the citations, examinations, and depositions of witnesses are all to be written on stamped paper; thereby increasing the expenses to an enormous total. These expenses amount to a virtual denial of justice; and it appeared from documents before the House, that in the course of a long life, a man could scarcely expect to see any termination of suits commenced in India. The system of police, too, seems entirely on the Sidmouth system. Spies form a principal part of the establishment, every police-office having a regular and organized band, who share the reward with the chief of the decoits, (a species of robbers). Persons were frequently taken up, and months elapsed before any information was exhibited against them. In the interval they were confined in crowded and unhealthy prisons, where death not unfrequently overtook them; or after enduring the aggravated misery of imprisonment, nothing whatever appeared against them, and they were liberated. Such is the nature of justice and police in India. For these blessings, the Hindoos pay annually about £1,785,000, which is a greater expense than all the law-officers in Europe.

We shall now lay before the reader some details of the revenue and trade of India, before the abolition of the exclusive privileges of the Company. It will enable him to form some idea of the immense importance and extent of the Indian Empire. The details are collected from the appendix to Mr. Colquhoun's work on the Resources of the British Empire.

## REVENUES.

Bengal and its subordinates.....	£ 11,782,055
Madras and its subordinates .....	5,376,881
Bombay and its subordinates.....	802,179
Fort Malbro' and its dependencies.....	13,755
Prince of Wales's Island .....	75,406
Island of St. Helena .....	1,202
Total .....	£ 18,051,478

## EXPENDITURE.

Bengal and its subordinates .....	£ 9,511,956
Madras and its subordinates .....	5,211,957
Bombay and its subordinates.....	1,932,582
Fort Marlbro' and its dependencies .....	77,005

*East India Company.*

Prince of Wales's Island .....	£ 166,084
Island of St. Helena .....	84,687
<b>Total</b>	<b>£ 16,984,271</b>

The different items of the enormous expenditure on the Bengal Establishment are thus enumerated:—

Mint charges .....	£ 40,126
Post Office .....	40,296
Charges, Collections, &c. in Benares .....	176,251
Charges of the ceded provinces, &c. ....	445,923
Other charges of the Civil Establishment .....	739,543
Supreme Court of Judicature and Law charges .....	64,917
Charges of the Police Establishment, Court of Appeal, &c. ....	580,154
Military charges .....	3,882,438
Marine charges .....	88,021
Buildings and Fortifications .....	79,935
Revenue charges, including stipends .....	471,172
Customs—charges of collection .....	39,417
Salt—advances and charges .....	470,271
Opium—idem .....	100,867
Stamp-office charges .....	10,429
Charges, collection, &c. in the conquered provinces .....	890,703
Annual interest on loans .....	1,411,505
<b>Total</b>	<b>£9,511,956</b>

Of the exports and imports from India Mr. Colquhoun gives the following account:—

EXPORTS.	
From India,	
To Great Britain .....	2,621,606
Foreign Europe .....	442,697
America .....	346,445
Different parts of British Asia .....	3,657,315
Arabian Gulph, Persian Gulph, and other parts of Asia and Africa .....	4,106,391
<b>Total</b>	<b>£11,674,454</b>

*East India Company.*

## IMPORTS.

Into India,

From Great Britain.....	£2,717,802
Foreign Europe.....	564,384
America.....	908,362
Different parts of Asia.....	4,060,490
Arabian Gulph, Persian Gulph, China, and other parts of Asia and Africa.....	3,686,409
Total	<u>£11,943,447</u>

The shipping of the Company, in 1812, according to Mr. Colquhoun, amounted to 100,000 tons, navigated by about 25,000 seamen, including Lascars. The duties paid to Government, in Customs and Excise, in the year ended January, 1811, amounted to £4,213,425. In the same year the number of King's troops in India amounted to 20,000. The native army amounted to 140,000, commanded by 3000 European officers. Of the population of the Company's settlements, various estimates have been given, from 40 millions to 100 millions. Marquis Wellesley, whose long residence in India entitles him to considerable credit on this subject, in his speech on the East India question, in the House of Lords, in the month of April, 1813, supposes the number of inhabitants to amount to 40,000,000. This number is distributed through the different settlements in the following proportion:—

Bengal .....	29,085,209
Madras .....	10,862,322
Bombay.....	86,673
Fort Marlborough.....	563
Prince of Wales's Island .....	18,802
Canton .....	23
St. Helena.....	4,816
Total	<u>40,058,408</u>

It is a curious fact, that, under the wise administration of the borough system, the government, and every association under its influence, has become deeply in debt. The debt of the government amounts to about 800 millions. The debt of Ireland, if we are not mistaken, amounts to about 30 millions. The debt of the Bank of England, reckoning the amount of



*East India Company.*

promissory notes in circulation, amounts to about 25 millions. The debt of the East India Company is still more enormous, amounting to more than 40 millions. The amount of the debts of the Company in India and this country, are thus stated by COLQUHOUN:

The total debts of the East India Company, payable in England, including bonds, bills, debts, and open accounts, appear at this time, from their own public documents, to amount to.....	£13,686,431
The total debts of every description in India, appear from the same document to amount to.....	32,227,862
Total....	<u>£46,114,293</u>

The same impassable calculator, estimates the value of the credits and assets of the Company in England and India as follows:

Debts and assets of the Company in England .....	£5,369,420
Goods unsold, and cash in the treasury, March 1, 1812.....	5,795,535
Balance of quick stock (floating capital) in India, according to an adjustment of accounts, April 30, 1811 .....	13,786,610
Outstanding debts due to the Company in India .....	10,158,105
Value of cargoes arrived in India from England at the date of this account	1,876,872
Value of Company's dead stock in England, vested in houses, warehouses, furniture, sloops, and other craft .....	1,208,020
Dead stock in India, constituting property invested in fortifications, buildings, plate, furniture, plantations, farms, stores, sloops, vessels, &c....	10,870,132
Total assets....	<u>£49,064,694</u>

This estimate, no doubt, can be considered little better than an approximation, but probably it is as near an approximation as the subject is capable of. Without relying implicitly on every item, it may be considered valuable as exhibiting in one view a general statement of the Company's affairs.

### *General Reflections.*

Having now given the necessary details relative to the revenue, commerce, and population of India, it remains to consider the connexion of this mighty empire with the interests of the Government and the interests of the country. These interests unquestionably ought to be identified; but,

unfortunately, Government has long since departed from those principles of justice on which it was originally founded, and depended for support, on the maintenance of an interest in opposition to the interests of the people. We shall, therefore, in the following remarks consider these interests distinct, and show to what an immense extent the acquisitions in India have contributed to that mass of corrupt influence by which Government is maintained, and how little to the commercial prosperity and liberties of the community.

In our narrative of the commercial progress of the Company, we forbore to enter into the black page of Indian wars and politics. Unparalleled crime, violated treaties, blood, treachery, and devastation, form the chief materials of Indian history:—crimes, abhorrent even to a nation of barbarians, disgraceful to a civilized state, and horrible when perpetrated by the agents of a Christian country. There was not a single state, we are assured by Burke, prince, or potentate, with whom the Company had come in contact, that they had not sold; not a single treaty they had ever made, that they had not broken; not a single prince or state, who ever put any trust in the Company, who was not utterly ruined; and that none were, in any degree, secure or flourishing, but in the exact proportion to their settled distrust and irreconcilable enmity to this nation.

Indeed, Indian delinquency is of no grovelling kind, it soars far above all precedent of ancient or European villainy. Faith, justice, and humanity, were mere pretexts for rapine and violence. When these would not serve for the spoliation of the native powers, imaginary crimes were laid to their charge. Plots and rebellion, which in England have been the pretexts for destroying the liberties of the people, in India were the pretexts for plunder and devastation. These, when no other offered, were the standing resources of the Company. When money had been thought to be heaped up any where, its owners were invariably accused of rebellion, and the only security for their allegiance was sought in reducing them to indigence. In England poverty is considered the sign of a traitorous disposition, in India it was riches; and the native prince had no chance of living free from the endless accusations and exactions of his oppressors, till he had stripped himself of the sordid wealth which excited their cupidity.

The most profitable merchandize of the Company was the Nabobs and Soubahdars. These princes, the rightful sovereigns of Hindostan, were sold and resold like "cattle in a fair." Even the Great Mogul himself, the descendant of Tamerlane, was included in the general sale. This potentate, venerable for his years, respectable for his piety, according to his

*East India Company.*

mode, and accomplished in all the oriental literature, was sold to his own minister. He was knocked down for the revenue of two provinces. Some princes were sold to their own children: the Company, exciting the children to a partricial war against their parents, put them in possession of their dominions, on condition of hereafter being tributary and dependant on the Company. We could mention several instances of this mode of carrying on the royal slave-trade, but we will pass them by, in order to relate a more sweeping sale of Governor Hastings.

This man was the great salesman of Indian territory. We have seen that all the expenses of his prosecution were paid, and he was rewarded with an annuity of £5000 per annum, for his *faithful services* in India. The province of Bengal, over which he presided, and the territory annexed to it, is larger and more populous than France, and formerly contained a landed interest, composed of a numerous nobility and gentry, of freeholders, lower tenants, religious communities, and public foundations. Under the English administration, these provinces had fallen into great decay, and a strong representation was made of its causes. Mr. Hastings, instead of administering any remedy to the disorders, determined, at one blow, to dispossess all the ancient proprietors. The incredible fact is, he set up the whole landed interest of a kingdom larger than France to public auction. He set up, says Burke, the whole nobility, gentry, and freeholders to the highest bidder. No preference was given to the Zemindars, the ancient proprietors. They were compelled to bid for their own property against every usurer, jobber, speculator, or European servant; or they were obliged to content themselves, in lieu of their extensive domains, with their house and such a pension as the state auctioneer thought fit to assign. Several of them, in lieu of their hereditary lands, contented themselves with a pension, of which, under a new stretch of rapacity, they were subsequently deprived.\*

The conquest of India by the English, has been one of the bitterest curses to the natives that avarice or ambition ever inflicted on mankind. The Arabs, Tartars, and Persians, had conquered Hindostan with vast effusion of blood; but the conquests of the English were achieved by fraud and delusion, by taking advantage of the senseless and incurable animosities which the several country powers bore towards each other. The Asiatic conquerors had soon abated of their ferocity, and the short

\* See Burke's Works, vol. iv. p. 85. where there is an account of the wholesale confiscation.

life of man was sufficient to repair the waste they had occasioned. But with the English, as observed by Burke, the case had been widely different. Their conquests were still in the same state that they had been in twenty years ago. They had no more society with the people than if they still resided in England; but with the view of making fortunes rolled in one after another, wave after wave; so that there was nothing before the eyes of the natives but an endless prospect of new flights of birds of prey and passage, with appetites continually renewing for a food that was continually wasting. Every rupee gained by an Englishman in India was forever lost to that country. With us there was no retributory superstition, by which a foundation of charity compensated for ages to the poor for the injustice and rapine of a day. With us no pride had erected stately monuments which repaired the mischief pride had occasioned, and adorned a country out of its own spoils? "England (says Burke) had erected no churches, no hospitals, no palaces, no schools (the paltry foundation of Calcutta excepted); England had built no bridges, made no high roads, cut no navigations, dug no reservoirs. Every other conqueror of every other description had left some monument of either state or beneficence behind him; but were we to be driven out of India this day, nothing would remain to tell that it had been possessed, during the inglorious period of our dominion, by any thing better than the ourang-outing of the tiger."—Burke's Works, vol. iv. p. 40.

Such is the general outline of the Indian history, and the nature of our dominion in that country. We have been a source of impoverishment and destruction to the natives. We have passed through the country like a famine or a pestilence; and the only atonement we have made to the population of these immense regions, for the poverty, desolation, and misery we have occasioned, is to allow them to contribute by their industry to the wealth and greatness of a country which has inflicted on them all the horrors of war, and every calamity and degradation which power and wickedness could devise.

Having given some idea of the benefits conferred on the Hindoos, let us now consider the advantages England has derived from our Indian acquisitions.

India has never afforded any surplus revenue to this country. We have seen that the East India Company is greatly in debt; and notwithstanding the enormous revenue levied in India, it is entirely expended in defraying the salaries of their servants, in the maintenance of a numerous army, and other establishments necessary to the preservation of their power. It is

*East India Company.*

not therefore from the remittance of any portion of the territorial revenue that the capital of the country can have been increased, and thereby the commerce, manufactures, and agriculture of the country extended.

There remain, then only two other sources whence it has even been pretended England has derived any benefit: first, either from a commercial intercourse, or, secondly, from the numerous appointments in India, affording an opportunity to individuals to realize immense fortunes, which they afterwards transmitted to this country. In other words, it is only either the commerce or patronage of India that can have been beneficial. We will say a word or two on each.

After the Company became sovereigns they ceased to be traders, and the calico and ginger trade was abandoned for the more profitable traffic in the princes and territory of India. In an account of the exports and imports of India, we find that they did not amount to three millions: little more than one fourth of our trade to the United States. Whatever may be the amount of profit the country derives from a commercial intercourse to this extent, it cannot be ascribed to the territorial acquisitions of the Company. Had the Company never erected a fort, nor possessed an acre in Hindostan, but the whole country remained under the dominion of the native powers, provided the trade had been always open to the enterprise of individuals, there is little doubt but our commerce in that quarter would have been much more extensive: The territorial aggrandizement of the Company, has been the ruin of the India trade. This is evident from the progress of the Americans. They were only admitted to trade within the limits of the Company's charter in 1797. They traded on no exclusive principles; they had no share in the sovereignty of the country; yet in a few years the trade of the Americans to India amounted to one-third of the trade of the Company. What would have been the result had our intercourse been conducted on the same principles? What would have been the result had no conquest been made—no blood shed—no crimes perpetrated—no provinces laid waste—the sceptre of Hindostan remained in the hands of the descendants of Tamerlane—commerce, unfettered by the exclusive privileges of a rapacious junto, cultivated only by the skill and enterprise of the English merchant? We think the result would have been beneficial to the commerce of this country; we think the trade to India would have been carried to a far greater extent; and consequently all the blood and violence by which the Indian empire has been acquired have not benefited the country by extending its commerce; on the contrary, they may be considered

*East India Company.*

injurious, inasmuch as they prevented our commerce reaching the amount otherwise would have obtained.

Then, as to the duties paid by the Company, which have been adduced as one of the advantages resulting to the country from their acquisitions, it must be remembered that these duties are paid by the consumers of Indian produce. The duties paid on the importation of tea are paid by the consumers of that article, and not by the East India Company. Besides, if the revenue realized on Indian produce be considered an advantage, it is evident this advantage would be greater as the produce imported were greater; and we have shown that the exports and imports of India would have been far more, had the Company preserved their commercial character, and not aspired to the rank of sovereigns.

We conclude then that commerce has been injured, rather than benefited, by our possessions in India, and that the intercourse with that country would have been much more advantageous, had it continued under the sway of its ancient sovereigns.

The next point to be considered is the advantages arising from India patronage, and the fortunes made and transmitted to this country. The natives of India scarcely know what it is to see the grey head of an Englishman. Principally young men, almost boys, govern there, without society and without sympathy with the natives. Their residence in India is considered a sort of banishment, to which they have submitted, not for the attainment of honour, or to promote the happiness of the people, but solely for the speedy acquisition of a fortune, which they may afterwards enjoy in the luxuries and refinements of this country. According to Burke, English youth in India drink the intoxicating draught of authority before their heads are able to bear it, and they are full grown in fortune long before they are ripe in principle. The consequences of their excesses, which might produce penitence or atonement, are lost in the rapidity of their flight. Their prey is lodged in England; and the cries of those whom they have plundered or oppressed are given to the seas and winds, to be blown about, on every breaking up of the monsoon, over a remote and unhearing ocean.

It is impossible to ascertain exactly the amount of the fortunes acquired in India and annually transmitted to this country. Mr. DUNDAS, in his speech on the 23d April, 1793, estimates them at a million a year. Owing to the increase in the Company's possessions and establishments since 1793, and the consequent employment of a greater number of individuals, proba-

bly the savings of the Company's servants annually sent home, do not amount to less than three millions sterling.

Such an enormous sum annually added to the wealth of the country, no doubt has tended greatly to its prosperity;—invested in agriculture and manufactures, it would contribute to their advancement and create employment for the people. But while these advantages are admitted, it is impossible to shut our eyes to the evil of creating a powerful interest wholly devoted to Government. All appointments in India may be considered, either directly or indirectly derived from ministers. Ostensibly the Court of Directors have the appointment of the Company's servants, but this in reality is nothing more than a delegated authority. The territories of the Company unquestionably appertain to the Crown; and the power which ministers, (or, which is the same thing, the Parliament, the latter in all cases being the foot of the former,) possessed on the renewal of the Company's charter, of abolishing or confirming their privileges; it is clear they had always the Company at their mercy, and might have deprived them of the right of appointing a single officer civil or military in India. The India House indeed may be considered a branch of the administration, where a part of the business of Government is transacted, and with which it is as much connected as the Home-office or the Treasury-department.

Now such being the connexion and dependence of the Company on Government, it is evident that their servants will always in fact consider themselves the servants of the Crown, and individuals acquiring fortunes in India, will of course be invariably devoted to the Government, to whose favour they are indebted for their wealth. Thus is an immense mass of property accumulated, and a powerful interest created, which, whenever the interests of the people and the interests of the Crown are in collision, will be invariably subservient to the views of the latter. This is the most dangerous point of view in which our acquisitions in India can be contemplated. They have added a tremendous power to the already overwhelming influence of the Crown, and rendered a considerable proportion of the property of the Kingdom, and an immense number of individuals, wholly devoted to its interests.

But it is not merely a feeling of gratitude which attaches Indian adventurers to Government; impunity for atrocious crimes has frequently been purchased by a prostitution to ministers. Paul Benfield, whose official Burke said ought have fed the region kites, was a memorable instance of this kind. The history of this criminal can stand in no place so appropriate as the

BLACK BOOK. Benfield at one time had no fewer than eight members in the Honourable House, and he attempted to bring in one of his agents for the city of London. These faithful representatives of the people were returned at Benfield's expense to support the Pitt ministry; and as a return for this support, that virtuous minister remunerated Benfield out of the spoils of India. We cannot afford room for a detailed account of this transaction, but we will endeavour, by a brief outline, to make it infellegant. It will cast some light on Indian affairs, and will tend to illustrate the matchless virtues of that minister, for whose "MERITS" on "PUBLIC GROUNDS" the immaculate Whigs voted for the payment of his debts.

Every one has heard of the debts of the Nabob of Arcot, which have been in a train of investigation for more than half a century, and still continue in the hands of we know not how many commissioners. This prince was highly favoured by the Company, and owed the establishment of his government, in opposition to the claims of his elder brother, to their arms and influence. He was put in possession of extensive territories, several large cities and castles. In his character he appears to have been weak, restless, and ambitious. Instead of residing in his own dominions, he purchased a house in the suburbs of Madras, where he kept up a constant intrigue with the Company's servants, high and low. His object was to obtain a further extension of territory, and effect some change in the interior of his own country. This could only be done with the assistance of the Company, and which assistance he had been taught could be obtained by no means more effectually, than by distributing large sums of money among the Company's servants at home and abroad.

Now the Nabob seems to have been as silly a gentleman as Roderigo in the play, and the Company's servants to have acted the part of Iagoes, the chief of whom was Paul Benfield. Through a long course of years the Nabob lavished immense sums among the Company's servants in order to procure their assistance in his chimerical projects. Besides these payments in ready money, enormous debts to the amount of several millions were acknowledged to these gentlemen. There was every reason to believe that the whole or the greatest part of these debts were fictitious, and never created by money *bonâ fide* lent, but obtained under the fraudulent pretext of assisting the Nabob. The principal of these imaginary creditors was Benfield, who claimed about half a million of money.

Great disorders prevailed in the British government in India, owing to these transactions, and by an Act of Parliament the Court of Directors



*East India Company.*

were enjoined to investigate their origin and extent. The Directors drew up an order conformable to the act, and directed the president and council of Madras to enter into a full examination of the Nabob's debts. A copy of this order was communicated to the Board of his Majesty's Ministers, and other servants instituted under Mr. Pitt's East India Bill. These ministers, who had just carried through Parliament a bill ordering a specific inquiry, immediately drew up another order for the Madras government, on a principle directly opposite to that prescribed by the Act of Parliament, and followed by the Directors. According to this second order, all inquiry into the justice and origin of these pretended debts is abandoned; they are all admitted, without any investigation whatever, and a fund for their discharge is directed to be set apart out of the revenues of the Nabob's dominions.

Now this second order on the part of ministers, originated in a tender regard to the interests of Benfield. We have seen that this virtuous man was the principal of these imaginary creditors; that he had filled the benches of the House of Commons with ministerial creatures; and it was in order to reward those great and important services to his country, that Mr. Pitt directed that the deluded Nabob should be compelled to pay the whole of his imaginary debts, and no inquiry admitted into their fraudulent origin.

Such is a short account of the origin of the debts of the Nabob of Arcot, and of the transactions of "*the heaven-born minister*" with Paul Benfield. It would be easy to select more flagrant instances of corruption in the administration of Indian affairs. We shall, however, content ourselves with just alluding to the abuses which prevailed in the disposal of India patronage.

It is evident that the excellence of our administration in India will depend upon the employment of individuals recommended only by their virtues and their talents. In theory this principle appears to have been admitted by the Directors in 1793, when, by one of their bye laws, it was enacted that each Director, ten days after his election, should take oath to receive no emolument, perquisite, or pecuniary gratification, for any appointment in India. Little regard was paid to this obligation, and so early as 1793, it was notorious that a very extensive and systematic traffic was carried on for places in India. Several attempts were made, real or pretended, by Committees of the House of Commons, also by committees appointed by the Court of Directors, to discover the individuals implicated in these

practices. On one occasion it was proposed that each Director should take oath he had not received any reward for any appointment he had made; but this was rejected by a large majority, and the sale in offices continued by public advertisement and otherwise, till at last an office was openly established for the sale and purchase of India patronage.

The practice was shameless and notorious; but it does not appear to have been completely laid bare, till the memorable disclosures in 1809, relative to Mrs. Clarke and the Duke of York. In that year it was discovered, that the corrupt disposal of India patronage had not been confined to the honourable Directors, but extended even to the right honourable President of the Board of Control. The then president was that great statesman, patriot, and friend to the Liberty of the Press, the right of petitioning, and every other right of the people, Lord Castlereagh. This virtuous minister, by the agency of a common place-broker, attempted to purchase for a writership in India, a seat in the Honourable House for his friend Lord Clancarty. Here was corruption three deep. It was a dereliction of his duty as a minister of the Crown; a shameless abuse of his trust as President of the Board of Control; and a glaring attack on the *purity* (bah!) of the Commons' House of Parliament. So said Lord A. Hamilton; whose motion to this effect, was got rid of by moving the order of the day, and the noble lord escaped the punishment due to his complicated and aggravated crime.

His Lordship was defended on the notoriety of the practice. Some of the honourable members said, that selling seats in the House of Commons was as NOTORIOUS AS THE SUN AT NOON-DAY: this could not be denied; for it is well known that the Secretary of the Treasury is in the constant practice of buying seats for the adherents of ministers. Such being the case, there appeared some injustice in making an example of Lord Castlereagh. We by no means complain of their lenity, but we complain of the occasional inconsistency of this assembly. The members themselves having admitted that seats are obtained by purchase, it deprives them of all claim to the character of representatives of the people; they can have no more claim to that character than the frequenters of a debating society, or the spectators at the theatre, who pay a shilling or half-a-crown for their admission.

Degraded, however, as the House is by the confession of its members, yet it occasionally manifests the most laughable indignation at any attack upon its imaginary purity and dignity. For instance, there is Mr. Hobhouse

*East India Company.*

committed to Newgate merely for asserting that it was not from any respect to these mock representatives that the people did not go down to St. Stephen's Chapel, pull out the honourable members by the ears, lock up the door of the tabernacle, and throw the key into the Thames. Then again, in this land of equal law and justice, there is that bungling trader in corruption; Sir Massey Lopez. This gentleman has been sentenced to THREE YEARS imprisonment, and to pay a fine of £10,000, for a practice as "NOTORIOUS AS THE SUN AT NOON-DAY;" for a practice which a minister of the crown had been guilty of with impunity. Nay, the offence of Sir Massey Lopez was infinitely more venial than that of Lord Castlereagh;—the former purchased a seat with his own money, but the latter attempted to purchase a seat with the property of the public—the patronage of his office.

We shall now leave the subject of the East India Company. Whatever advantages this association has conferred on the country, we think, have been more than counterbalanced by the evils which have attended its progress. Its history is a record of fraud, rapine, and desolation, without parallel, unless in the crimes and devastation of the Spaniards in the New World. If the whole of our acquisitions in India were relinquished to-morrow, the abandonment would be beneficial rather than injurious to this country. The only way that our real interests could be benefited was by a commercial intercourse with the natives; but commerce has been impeded rather than extended by the ambition and exclusive privileges of the Company. We esteem as nothing the territorial acquisitions of the Company; the immense revenue of Hindostan; their numerous establishments; the fortunes transmitted to Europe; and the whole patronage of India. These are all worth nothing to real English interests: they only add to an influence already too powerful, and which is opposed to the rights and liberties of the people; and the great obstacle to the prosperity and happiness of the country.

When speaking of the patronage and influence of the Company, and the support it affords to Government, we omitted saying any thing about the influence arising from their different establishments at home. The great mass of their influence arises from their appointments in India; but their political influence is very considerable from the great number of individuals employed in their different warehouses and establishments in London. The way in which this influence is exerted over their servants may be known from one very strong fact, mentioned in vol. 76 of the Monthly Review, p. 407:

Whenever a labourer comes into the service of the Company he is required to state for what place he has a vote for a member of parliament: his name is then registered with this specification; and on an election he is told that he will be spared from his situation to give his suffrage, if he will vote according to orders: disobedience being supposed to be punished by dismissal from his office. The number of individuals thus kept in political subjection to the Company is about four thousand.

This fact needs no comment. It sufficiently identifies the East India Company with Government, and we may consider the revenue of Hindostan, as well as the revenue of England, as forming a part of that immense expenditure by which the *Borough-System* is supported.

#### END OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY.

## Lottery System.

## INFLUENCE

OF THE

## LOTTERY SYSTEM.

IT WAS WYNDHAM, we think, who used to say that society was corrupt not from top to bottom but from bottom to top, and that corruption ascended upwards, and not downwards. Perhaps both ends may be vicious, but there is a considerable difference between the two extremes. If the lower end plunder each other by short weights, short measures, adulterations, and other impositions, the gain and loss is among themselves; but the case is widely different with the upper end. The depredations of the *higher orders* are entirely at the expense of the *lower orders* of the community. They do not prey upon each other, but, in general, procure a disgraceful livelihood by fraud and injustice practised towards the most useful classes of society.

Among the various frauds practised on ignorance and folly, we know none more detestable than the Lottery System. As an expedient for raising the public taxes, it is as erroneous in principle as the policy of the boy who ripped up the goose which laid golden eggs. Any thing which destroys the morals and industrious habits of the people must lessen their ability to contribute to the necessities of the state; and what can be more destructive to morality than lotteries? No person can be made a more useful member of society by engaging in this gambling pursuit. Human nature does not easily accommodate itself to sudden vicissitudes, and they are generally injurious. Lotteries, according to the present scheme of high prizes, know no medium. They make the adventurer either suddenly poor or suddenly rich. In either case the result is pernicious. If successful in the Lottery, his suc-

*Lottery System.*

cess, most probably, will be accompanied with all the vices of sudden prosperity, and he will become a prodigal, an insolent upstart, or a hair-brained speculator. If unfortunate, most probably he is driven to despair, becomes an idler or a drunkard, and a slave to all those vices which despair usually generates. In either case he is ruined. The only parties benefited are the contractors and their agents. To the state they are ultimately pernicious, as destroying the sources of revenue. To adventurers, whether they win or lose, they are generally ruinous, and render them miserable to themselves, useless to society.

So much as to the principle: now let us look to the *dignity* of this mountebank scheme of revenue. It is impossible to conceive any thing more disgraceful than the minister of a great nation being engaged in this vagabond profession, endeavouring to bring a few thousands into his coffers by preying on the ignorant and unwary. The Reformers are accused of deluding the people; but what delusion more gross and mischievous than the Lottery, patronized by their accusers? The more a man adventures in the Lottery, the more he is likely to lose; yet his false hopes are continually excited by the most fraudulent statements, and he is taught that a speculation which must inevitably plunge him deeper in poverty is an infallible expedient for making him rich.

The whole is a wretched system of fraud and quackery, from the moment the Chancellor of the Exchequer submits his Scheme of blanks and prizes to the Contractors, to the final drawing. The avocations of this gentleman in the Lottery hardly appear more honest and respectable than the pursuits of some other celebrated empirics, and we can see little superiority in the labours of Dr. Vansittart in this department, over the engagements of the renowned Dr. Eady or Dr. Solomon. All three prey upon the needy and ignorant, and their respective nostrums are alike infallible. The walls are covered with their alluring statements, inviting the afflicted to adventure on their sovereign specifics; while the agents of the State Doctor find the columns of "*the respectable press*," a ready vehicle for puffing off his redoubtable cures for indigence and poverty.

We have, however, no hope of curing Dr. Vansittart of the Lottery *mania*. The Lottery is a source of revenue; and although Mr. Vansittart is a very moral and religious man, he appears determined not to sacrifice, for the advancement of either religion or morality, the interests of the Exchequer. In this article, therefore, we shall endeavour to benefit another description of readers. The Reformers are now at open war with the

*Lottery System.*

Revenue; and there is certainly no branch of it more completely at their mercy, than that which depends on the Lottery. Conformably to our usual custom, before we show the influence and support Government derives from the Lottery, we will give a short history of these establishments in this country.

The first English Lottery we find mentioned in history was drawn in the year 1569. It consisted of 40,000 lots at 10s. each lot: the prizes were plate; and the profits were to go toward repairing the havens of the kingdom. It was drawn at the west door of St. Paul's Cathedral. The drawing began on the 11th January, and continued incessantly drawing, *day and night*, till the 6th of May following. In the year 1612 James I. granted permission also for a Lottery to be held at the west end of St. Paul's, of which one Sharply, a tailor of London, had the chief prize of 4000 crowns in fair plate: this Lottery was for the assistance of the Virginia Company, who were licensed to open Lottery-offices in any part of England, by which means they raised £29,000.

These Lotteries at length began to be considered public evils, and attracted the attention of Parliament: they were represented by the Commons as a grievance, and suppressed by an order in Council. In 1630, they were again revived by Charles I. who granted a special licence for a Lottery, to defray the expense of conveying water to London.

It was not till the glorious Whig revolution of 1688, that Lotteries formed one of the standing resources of Government; and that they were introduced, along with the Stamp Duties and other vexatious and unconstitutional expedients, as the means of raising the annual supplies for the public service. Before then they had only been resorted to for the purpose of aiding some work of public utility or commercial speculation, and never to supply the exigencies of state. Under the protection of Government they spread rapidly, and such was the ardour for this species of gambling, that private Lotteries formed on the most delusive and fraudulent principles became so general, not only in London but in all the principal towns of the kingdom, that Parliament found it necessary in 1698 to pass an Act for suppressing them, by imposing a penalty of £500 on the proprietors of any such Lotteries, and £20 upon any adventurer in them. This law was ineffectual; the disposition to knavery on one hand, and adventure on another, continued to prevail, and small Lotteries were carried on under the denomination of sales for gloves, fans, cards, plate, &c. This was also attempted to be check-

ed, but only gave rise to a new mode of gambling. Government lotteries not being affected by the new regulations, the adventure was made to depend upon the drawing of them; and the buying and selling of chances and parts of chances of tickets in the State Lotteries, became the general practice, till in 1716, when all undertakings resembling Lotteries, or dependent on the State Lottery, were prohibited under the penalty of £100 over and above all penalties incurred by former Acts of Parliament against private Lotteries.

During this period the principle of the State Lotteries was much less objectionable than at present. They were generally either for life or terminable annuities, to which both blanks and prizes were entitled at different rates. Thus in 1710, in Queen Ann's reign, the Lottery consisted of 150,000 tickets, valued at £10 each; every ticket being entitled to an annuity for 32 years, the blanks at 14s. per annum; the prizes to greater annuities, from £5 to £1000 per annum.

According to the Lottery plans which prevailed from the administration of Sir Robert Walpole to that of the Duke of Grafton, the tickets were issued at £10 each, and occasionally the subscription was open to the public at large. The highest prize was generally £10,000 and the lowest £20. There were from four to six blanks to a prize, and the blanks entitled the bearers to from £5 to £6 stock in the 3 or 4 per cent. Bank Annuities: the value of the blanks and prizes being generally funded. The tickets, according to the advantage or disadvantage of the scheme, generally sold from £11 to £12 before the drawing. When the tickets sold for £11, and the blanks were entitled to £6 in the 3 per cent. stock, as the blank might be sold for £5 8s. ready money, the adventurer only gambled at a risk of £5 12s.; and at the highest calculation, when the tickets were worth £13, he never staked more than £7 12s. before the drawing.

About the commencement of the present reign, many pernicious alterations were introduced into the Lottery System. The chief prizes became as high as £20,000; the allowance to blanks was discontinued, which, while it rendered the adventure more hazardous, increased the number and value of the prizes. While Lord North was Chancellor of the Exchequer, some further alterations were made in the schemes; such as paying the prizes in money instead of stock, and making the first drawn ticket, for several successive days, a prize of £1000 or more. These alterations were



---

 Lottery System.
 

---

highly advantageous to the Lottery-office Keepers, by enhancing the value of tickets, and tended greatly to increase the spirit of gaming, by inducing those who had drawn blanks to buy again.

During the profligate administration of Mr. Pitt, when "*social order*" and "*the blessed comforts of religion*" were the pretexts for wasting the public money, various expedients were adopted, by raising the price of tickets, and keeping up the price during the drawing, to render this unprincipled source of revenue more productive. The number and amount of the highest prizes were increased, some schemes containing four prizes of £20,000 each; others two prizes of £30,000; others with a prize as high as £40,000: while for the purpose of disposing of a greater number of tickets, during the year, the Lottery was divided into two or three smaller ones drawn at different times.

In 1796 the vices of the Lottery system appear to have reached their utmost height. With the Lottery of that year, it is supposed, there were more than 10,000 individuals in London alone connected. Of this number there were no fewer than 2000 agents and clerks, and nearly 7500 Morocco men, besides armed bludgeon men, whose office was to overawe the police. These men were paid by a general subscription of the proprietors of the *little goes*, or small Lotteries, which then swarmed in the metropolis. The Morocco men were so called from the colour of their book, which they carried about from different public houses to register the names of those wishful to insure.

In 1802 an attempt was made to put down the *little goes*, but no attempt was made to restrain the *great go* of government. By the 42 Geo. III. c. 119, all Lotteries called *little goes* are declared to be *public nuisances*; and if any one shall keep an office or place to exercise or expose to be played any such Lottery, or any Lottery whatever not authorized by Parliament, or shall knowingly suffer it to be exercised at or played at in his house, he shall forfeit £500, and be deemed a *rogue* and *vagabond*. And if any person shall promise to pay any money or goods on any contingency relative to such Lottery, or publish any proposal respecting it, he shall forfeit £100; and, lastly, if any editor of a newspaper shall advertise any illegal scheme of gaming in the Lottery, he is subject to a penalty of £50.

Such a mode of legislation was ridiculous enough. There is no attack upon the principle of the evil. The only object appears to have been to secure to Government a monopoly of the vice. Why tolerate a practice,

acknowledged to be productive of infinite mischief, in Government, and deny it to individuals? The *great go* of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is not less a fraud upon the public than the *little goes*. More than a century ago Lotteries were declared a *public nuisance*, and subsequent Acts of Parliament have repeatedly designated individuals engaged in this species of gambling as "*rogues and vagabonds*." Yet, branded as *Mr. Vansittart* is with these opprobrious epithets, and degraded as *his calling is*, he still persists in this wretched branch of finance, and is supported by Parliament in utter inconsistency with its former declarations.

In 1808 a committee was appointed to investigate the abuses of the Lottery. From the evidence then adduced, some idea may be formed of the gross fraud sustained by adventurers. Mr. Sherwell informed the committee, that the general advance put upon the tickets by the Contractor was about £3 per ticket, not varying much under or over. This is in consideration of any loss on such tickets as the Contractor is not able to sell, and the expense he is put to for the sale of his Lottery. The Lottery is supposed to sell well if four-fifths of the tickets are disposed of: at the time of this inquiry not more than 17,000 out of 25,000 tickets, of which the Lottery consisted, were sold. The tickets were sold for £17 and a fraction. According to the proportion betwixt blanks and prizes, the tickets were not worth more than £10 each. The Contractor sold the tickets to the licensed Lottery-office-keeper for £20: 19: 0 per ticket, being £3 or £4 more than he gave for it. The Lottery-office-keeper puts on another profit, which in those numbers divided into eighths, sixteenths, &c. amounts to about £1 more; whence it is evident that the adventurer gambles at a disadvantage of £100 per cent. Of this sum Government receives £70 per cent. besides about 20 per cent. in stamp-duties.

Mr. Colquhoun also presented an estimate of the loss to the public and the gain to the Government in three Lotteries of 25,000 tickets each. In his statement some of the items, especially the Contractor's profit, appear too low. His calculation is as follows:

Suppose three annual Lotteries each of 25,000 tickets.

Government receives .....	£ 600,000
Contractor's profit at £1 per ticket .....	75,000
Lottery-office-keepers' profit .....	100,000
Insurers' profit 33½ per cent on 1,000,000 .....	333,000
Total.....	<u>£1,108,100</u>

## Lottery System.

The public are supposed to pay for 75,000 tickets, including the additional advance on halves, quarters, &c.....	£1,275,000
The lower class who insure are supposed to pay .....	1,000,000
	<u>£2,275,000</u>
Deduct prizes.....	£750,000
Deduct prizes obtained by insurers .....	250,000
	<u>£1,000,000</u>
Loss to the public, to gain £600,000 to the revenue yearly .....	<u>£1,275,000</u>

The following is an account of the price of tickets, and the immediate profit derived from them by Government, during six years, from 1802 to 1807 :—

Years.	Tickets.	Price.	Profit.
1802, .....	100,000 .....	£14 11 0 .....	£555,000
1803, .....	80,000 .....	13 13 1 .....	352,333
1804, .....	1 .. 25,000 .....	14 15 6 .....	119,375
.....	2 .. 25,000 .....	15 16 0 .....	145,000
.....	3 .. 30,000 .....	15 13 6 .....	170,250
			<u>£434,625</u>
1805, .....	1 .. 25,000 .....	£17 2 9 .....	£178,475
.....	2 .. 25,000 .....	18 3 0 .....	203,750
.....	3 .. 25,000 .....	17 18 9 .....	198,437
			<u>£580,660</u>
1806, .....	1 .. 20,000 .....	£16 12 0 .....	£132,000
.....	2 .. 25,000 .....	16 14 3 .....	167,812
.....	3 .. 25,000 .....	16 10 0 .....	162,500
.....	4 .. 20,000 .....	16 19 0 .....	139,000
			<u>£601,312</u>
1807, .....	1 .. 20,000 .....	£17 13 6 .....	£153,000
.....	2 .. 25,000 .....	17 4 0 .....	180,000
.....	3 .. 25,000 .....	16 10 6 .....	163,125
			<u>£426,125</u>

To these sums are to be added the advantages derived from postages.

*Lottery System.*

stamps, &c. which are generally estimated at £2 per ticket, making the mean annual profits to Government about £750,000.

The Committee in their Report state, in case it should be necessary to continue the Lottery, the number each year should not be more than two of 30,000 tickets; that the number of days allowed for drawing, instead of 10, should be brought down to eight for each Lottery, the number fixed in 1802; that the number of tickets drawn on each day should be uncertain, and left to the Commissioners of Stamp Duties; that every Lottery-office-keeper, in addition to his own licence, should take out a number of licences for his agents; and that the laws which fixed the number of hours for the sale of tickets, namely, from 8 in the morning to 8 in the evening, should be renewed, without the exception of Saturday night.

In 1816 an attempt was made in the House of Commons to abolish Lotteries entirely. From the debates on that occasion it appears that there are three lotteries in each year, determined at six different drawings. The net proceeds to the Treasury about £558,240. The individuals employed by Government in this department—

Three Comptrollers, salaries each.....	£600
Five Certificate Commissioners, ditto .....	350
Twenty-one Commissioners .....	200

The contract selling price of tickets from 1804 to 1816, was from £14 to £19, and the price of a sixteenth from 28s. to 40s.\* Mr. COLQUHOUN states in his *Police of the Metropolis*, page 142, that one contractor acquired no less than £60,000 during one Lottery. The same writer, page 144, affirms, that the gambling and Lottery transactions of one individual in the metropolis, produces FIFTEEN SUICIDES ANNUALLY!

In May, 1819, Mr. LYTTLETON again brought this murderous and moun-  
tebank calling before the House of Commons. Among other frauds resorted to by the contractors, he stated, that it was their constant practice to hold out to the public that a greater proportion of tickets were drawn on the first day than actually were drawn. After the first day's drawing they spread large placards over the town, stating in large letters, "*Capital wheel, only one prize drawn,*" which raises the price of the tickets considerably. After a second day's drawing, a similar farce is acted; so that the public suppose that two-thirds of the tickets are drawn when not more than one-fifth is actually drawn. In one lottery of 8000 tickets, only 350 had

\* *Monthly Magazine*, October, 1816. Mr. Goodman on Lotteries.

---

*Lottery System.*

---

been drawn on the first day, when puffs were circulated, stating, that *one-third* were actually drawn. In consequence of these puffs, after the first day's drawing, the price of a ticket rose from £19:10s. to £21:10s. an advance greatly disproportionate to the diminished number of tickets, and a gross imposition on the public.

The lottery drawn in November, 1818, consisted of 14,000 tickets, of which 2865 were prizes, and consequently 11,135 blanks. Of the number of prizes, 2810 only were £10 prizes; so that, in reality, out of the 14,000 tickets, there were only 55 prizes deserving of the name. The contractors, however, held out the delusion that the prizes were as numerous as the blanks, although the odds against the holder of a ticket were no less than 253 to 1. The profits of the contractors were most enormous. In the year's lotteries where 60,000 tickets were sold, £300,000 was produced to the Government, and £400,000 to the contractors; so that, between the two, a contribution of £700,000 was levied on the folly and credulity of the people.

During the debate, various instances were related of the mischievous effects of the Lottery, and of the infatuation which blinded the dupes of this species of gambling. A prize frequently was the ruin of a whole town or village, by exciting among the inhabitants a propensity to engage in this losing game. Mr. Buxton related a curious instance of a village, where there was a benefit society for the support of the sick and the aged. In a town in the neighbourhood, there was an association of a different kind, formed for speculating in the lottery; a prize was gained of two or three thousand pounds, which immediately brought the poor benefit society into contempt, and a *Lottery Club*, at which both old and young subscribed, was substituted in its place. In a few years both the Lottery Club and the benefit society failed; Mr. Buxton, on inquiring the cause of the bankruptcy of these establishments, was told by one of the members, that somehow they had been singularly unlucky, that they had gained but few prizes, and unaccountable as it might seem, these prizes were no better than blanks. The fall of the *Lottery Club* had dragged down with it the ruin of the benefit society.

Various baits are used by the Lottery-office-keepers to attract their prey. Sometimes it is declared that the winners of certain tickets shall be paid in tons of wine, sometimes in guineas; and Mr. Buxton mentioned one contractor who, among other particulars in his scheme, conferred extraordinary privileges upon Englishmen! Of this mountebank's scheme, the grand

*Lottery System.*

total was 40,000 guineas; there were prizes some of a large and others of a smaller amount; and there were 10,200 blanks, including some prizes of a very small denomination. It was supposed, on a fair calculation, that these 10,000 blanks were held by 100,000 persons. One ticket was held by no less than 28 persons, and from an account which had been kept of their employment and circumstances, it appeared that they were all extremely poor, and of that unfortunate class most likely to be led astray by the fraudulent allurements of the Lottery. The infatuation, indeed, of having recourse to this delusive scheme of bettering their condition, extends even to the workhouse. It was proved in evidence before the House, that in the workhouse in the parish of Spitalfields, the poorest spot in London, the paupers actually subscribed together to buy a Lottery-ticket. The money was raised by these wretched people by instalments of from one halfpenny to sixpence each.

From the statement of Mr. Alderman WOOD, it appears that *little goes* are by no means suppressed in London; on the contrary, they have greatly increased in number within the last three years, chiefly from the continuance of the State Lottery. The practice also of the fraudulent insurance of numbers still continues to be carried on. In the house of one man who existed by these nefarious means, and who had accumulated, from the credulity of his dupes, 100 guineas in gold, £70 in silver, and a large hoard of copper, was found a paper containing a list of the names of the insurers; they were of various classes,—clerks in public offices, merchants, and tradesmen. One infatuated woman, the wife of an industrious man, who earned at his employment two guineas a week, had carried her conviction of the efficacy of these insurances and her certainty of obtaining a prize so far, that she completely ruined him, and he died amidst want, disease, and wretchedness, of a broken heart.

Such are a few of the frauds and evils proved to result from the Lottery system. We will insert the resolutions moved by Mr. Lyttleton for the abolition of this nuisance, and which was the last attempt to accomplish this salutary measure. The resolutions were,—

1st.—That, by the establishment of State-Lotteries, a spirit of gambling, injurious in the highest degree to the morals of the people, is encouraged and provoked.

2d.—That such a spirit, manifestly weakening the habits of industry, must diminish the sources of the public revenue.

3d.—That the said Lotteries have given rise to other systems of gambling,

*Lottery System.*

which have been but partially suppressed by laws, whose provisions are extremely arbitrary, and their enforcement liable to the greatest abuse.

4th.—That this House, therefore, will no longer authorise the establishment of State Lotteries under any system of regulation whatever.

These resolutions, the allegations of which it were impossible to deny, were negatived by a very large majority: the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the president of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and who, next to Mr. Wilberforce, is the most moral and religious man in the kingdom, being the principal defender of the Lottery system. Some of the arguments of this gentleman are singular. After adverting to the gain of the revenue by the Lottery, which he stated at about £300,000, he continued as follows:

"In fact, every man, without abandoning his duty to his family or risking any large sum, might venture without disgrace into this species of *innocent speculation*. It was most unfair and unfounded to argue that a spirit of gambling arose out of the Lotteries; on the contrary, it was *checked and controuled by them*. If it were not for the large establishments kept up by those concerned in Lotteries, to put down *little goes*, all kinds of *low gambling* would be carried on: if Lotteries were withdrawn from operation, something much worse would be substituted. As to the prizes in wine, of which so much had been said, they were merely gifts and boons by the Contractors—no part of the sums to which the tickets were entitled, but thrown in as a *sort of bounty to enterprise*. If habits of industry were established, and a better system of domestic economy were introduced, by which the permanent revenue would be augmented, and the sale of Lottery-Tickets diminished, no man would be more delighted than himself: he feared, however, that these objects would not soon be attained, though improved education might do much, and until they were, he was anxious to retain the Lottery, as a *sort of LEGAL drain for money, which otherwise would be wasted in the gratification of some of the lowest vices.*"

We consider this extract a precious morsel, and a fair specimen of the moral logic of *Church and State*. It is really amusing to see with what specious sophistry our *social order men* can smear over any darling and profitable vice of their own. Here is the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose mind is a living abstract of all the deleterious elements by which the *Borough System* is supported, contending that gambling in the Lottery is an *innocent speculation*, and the knavish offerings of the Contractors, by which they defraud their dupes, are mere *bounties to enterprise*. Surely,

*Lottery System.*

Mr. Chancellor, you do not deem that an *innocent speculation*, which the Report of the Committee of 1809, of which Mr. Whitbread was Chairman, declared to be productive of "*idleness, dissipation, and madness*;" and which Mr. COLQUHOUN affirms to be productive of self-murder to an almost incredible extent?

As to the assertion that the State Lottery *controuls and checks the spirit of gambling*, it is obviously erroneous. The spirit of adventure excited by the State Lottery, naturally creates other species of gambling; and we have the testimony of Alderman Wood, that it is principally to the State Lottery that the *little goes*, and fraudulent insurances are to be ascribed. But the last part of the argument is the most amusing, where the Chancellor contends that his Lottery is a "*sort of LEGAL drain for money which otherwise would be wasted in some of the lowest vices*;"—In other words, there are, according to the opinion of the Chancellor, some persons who have a certain quantity of money to throw away, and if they do not throw it away in his Lottery, they will throw it away in something worse. This position is false both in fact and principle. It does not appear that speculators in the Lottery are of that class who have any superfluous money to waste upon any object; they are generally the most destitute portion of the community—not remarkable so much for their dissipated habits, as for their credulity and weakness, which render them a prey to the fraudulent representations of the Lottery Contractors. Again, as to the Lottery being a preventive of worse vices. To admit such a principle of defence, would open a door to every species of vice and licentiousness. Even the keeper of a brothel might contend his establishment was a preventive of worse evils. In short, there is hardly any species of crime or iniquity which on such grounds might not be defended and extenuated.

In persisting in this mountebank scheme of raising the revenue of a great nation, the financial talents of Mr. Vansittart, do not shine more than his morality. Leaving out of consideration the injury to the industrious habits of the people, and the increase of the poor rates, the present mode of raising the revenue by the Lottery is contrary to the first principles of political economy. The first object of a financier ought to be to bring as large a sum as possible into the public treasury, by taking the smallest possible sum out of the pockets of the people. Adam Smith says, "*Every tax ought to be so contrived as both to take out and keep out of the pockets of the people as little as possible, over and above what it brings into the public treasury of the state.*" Further on, he continues, "All nations



*Lottery System.*

have endeavoured, to the best of their judgment; to render their taxes as equal as they could contrive; as certain as convenient to the contributor, both in the time and the mode of payment and *in proportion to the revenue which they brought to the prince as little burdensome to the people.*"—*Wealth of Nations*, Book V. chap. ii. p. 262, 3.

Mr. Vansittart's Lottery schemes of finance are wholly at variance with this doctrine. He takes large sums out of the pockets of the people, and brings little or nothing into the public treasury. The Lottery tax is the most unproductive and unprincipled tax imaginable. Half the sum which is levied on the people only arrives at the Treasury; the remaining half is expended in demoralizing and defrauding the people, and enriching the most unprincipled characters in society.

*Summary Reflections.*

FOLLOWING the order we have treated this article, the first, subject that demands attention, is the history of the Lottery. At first we have seen, it was a contrivance solely to aid commercial speculation, or promote some work of public utility; and it was not till the Revolution of 1688, that it was resorted to as a source of public revenue. But for many years after its application to this object, it was conducted on principles much less objectionable than the present: the prizes were more numerous, and adventurers gambled at a smaller risk; besides which, the prizes being for life and terminable annuities, the Lottery answered the purpose of a benefit society, and to the successful speculator was a provision for infirmity and old age.

At the commencement of the present reign, various pernicious alterations were introduced by Lord NORTH: but it was not till the profligate administration of Mr. PITT, especially during the war for *social order* and *religion*, that the Lottery attained the climax of mischief and wickedness. From that time to this, it has virtually continued with little improvement. Government, in its various legislative enactments, instead of attacking the principle, appears only, by its endeavours to abolish private Lotteries, to have been wishful to secure the monopoly of the nuisance. It is now continued, after Lotteries by Act of Parliament have been declared "*public nuisances*," and the owners of them "*rogues and vagabonds*." It is continued in defiance of the principles of political economy; inasmuch as it is an expensive and unproductive tax, bringing into the public treasury only about *seven*

*Lottery System.*

*shillings* for every *twenty shillings* it takes out of the pockets of the people. Lastly, it is continued contrary to all the principles of morality and humanity; defrauding and demoralizing the people, and by the basest and most unjustifiable artifices, taking advantage of the necessities and credulity of the most unfortunate classes of the community.

After the account we have given of the profits of Lottery Contractors, and the revenue raised by Government on every scheme, it is hardly necessary to say any thing farther to prove the folly of any person seeking to obtain riches in this speculation. ADAM SMITH makes some very just observations on this subject. He says, "The world never saw, nor ever will see, a perfectly fair Lottery, or one in which the whole gain compensated the whole loss; because the undertaker could make nothing by it. In the State Lotteries, the tickets are really not worth the price which is paid by the original subscribers, and yet commonly sell in the market for twenty, thirty, and sometimes for forty per cent. advance. *The vain hope of gaining some of the great prizes is the sole cause of this demand.* The soberest people scarcely look upon it as a folly to pay a small sum for the chance of gaining ten or twenty thousand pounds, though they know that even that small sum is ten or twenty per cent. more than the chance is worth. In a Lottery in which no prize exceeded twenty pounds, though in other respects it approached much nearer to a perfectly fair one, than the common State Lottery, there would not be the same demand for tickets. In order to have a better chance for some of the great prizes, some people purchase several tickets, and others small shares in a still greater number. There is not, however, a MORE CERTAIN PROPOSITION IN MATHEMATICS, THAN THAT THE MORE TICKETS YOU ADVENTURE UPON, THE MORE LIKELY YOU ARE TO BE A LOSER. *Adventure upon all the tickets in the Lottery, and you lose for certain; and the greater the number of tickets, the nearer you approach to this certainty.*"—Wealth of Nations, B. I. ch. x. p. 146.

Gambling in the Lottery, like every other vice, increases with indulgence. Persons who have been long engaged in the foolish hope of obtaining a fortune in this way, find some difficulty in abandoning the pursuit. Their losses, instead of convincing them of their folly, only render them more impatient to try again. Many flatter themselves, after repeated failures, the chances of success are multiplied, and that fortune, or some other imaginary deity, which these credulous devotees conceive is their enemy, will at length be weary of persecuting them. This, however, is a

*Lottery System.*

mistaken notion. Every new adventure is a new speculation. There is no connection between former losses, and subsequent success. He who adventures for the first time, has an equal chance for a prize, with the person who has made fifty unsuccessful adventures before him. Against both the chances are equal. The same frightful odds of 200 or 250 to 1. It is trading with fortune at a disadvantage of 100 per cent. and voluntarily giving half of our money to support a government we abhor and a race of men we despise.

It is not easy to reason with dabblers in the Lottery. Gambling of all kinds is more a passion than a rational pursuit; and it is only with the understanding, and not with the feelings, we can argue. Nothing can be more clear than the position of Smith, that the more tickets you purchase in the Lottery, the more you are likely to lose. If you were to purchase the whole Lottery, you would then have all the blanks and all the prizes; and the loss on such a speculation, according to present schemes, would be about one-half. If you purchase only a ticket, an eighth, or a sixteenth, the loss is in the same proportion, and not less certain.

But then there is the bewildering chance of a £30,000 or £40,000 prize. Smith observes, that if the prizes were smaller, though the Lottery was much fairer, there would not be the same demand for tickets. Doubtless this would be the case; but it is extremely irrational on the part of adventurers. Men ought not to stake more for the chance of a £40,000 prize, than the chance is worth. It is folly to risk a pound for the chance of gaining £40,000, if the odds are 80,000 to 1 against you. This is not the wisdom which governs men in the ordinary affairs of life. Every pursuit, in some measure, is a lottery; and before we embark in it, we generally estimate the value of what we are likely to gain, with what we are likely to lose. We calculate the value of the chance; and this is the principle which ought to determine adventurers in the Lottery. It is not the remote chance of gaining a great prize, but the value of the chance we ought to estimate. Even the chance of winning an empire, might be too dearly purchased by a China orange, if the chances were many millions against you.

Mankind have generally a strange confidence in their own good fortune, and the failure of others seldom operates either as a warning or example. They rush into the army and navy, and all the great Lotteries of life, where the prizes are few, and the blanks almost innumerable. The thousand unfortunate adventurers who have preceded them, do not in the least abate their ardour, and they obstinately continue the hopeless pursuit, vainly imagining they alone are the favourite objects for whom fortune has reserved

the glittering prize. Now all this madness in human nature arises from one principle. Strange as it may appear, mankind still continue little better than Pagans. They still continue the blind worshippers of the goddess of Fortune, and it is to the smiles or frowns of this imaginary divinity they ascribe the disappointment or confirmation of their hopes. Were all belief in the influence of this goddess, and those foolish notions entertained about good and bad fortune destroyed, and were men taught that wisdom and folly, industry and indolence, were the chief causes of the diversities in human affairs, we should have few adventurers in the Lottery, or any other losing and hazardous speculation. But most men have some lurking faith in a good and ill luck, in the business of life, and this induces them to abandon the sure and legitimate road to wealth, to speculate in a pursuit where they know the chances are against them, but where they have an overweening conceit that their own fate will be an exception, and that they will be selected by Fortune—their visionary god, from the crowd of less successful adventurers.

Before we conclude this article, it is hardly necessary to say any thing to the Reformers on the policy of abstaining from gambling in the Lottery. We have seen that the Lottery produces about a million annually, for the support of a system by which they are oppressed and withheld from their rights. About one half this sum flows directly into the Treasury; the remaining half goes to the Lottery Contractors, their agents, and individuals who flourish on the abuses and defects of government.

# INFLUENCE

OF THE

# ARISTOCRACY.

ONE peculiar feature may be remarked in every branch of our civil and ecclesiastical polity: in each branch there is an entire departure from the original object of its institution. In the ecclesiastical state, no such thing as clerical sinecurists was formerly known; every order had some duties to discharge, for which they received their incomes; but now we find that the episcopal, dignified, and one half the parochial clergy, receive FOUR or FIVE MILLIONS annually, for which it is hard to say any service whatever is rendered to society. The House of Commons, originally intended to represent the property, intelligence, and population of the state, has become the mere organ of the Aristocracy; who, according to the constitution, ought not to have the least influence over its deliberations. The executive exhibits a similar dereliction, from its civil and military duties; and, lastly, in the Aristocracy we find a similar revolution; the Dukes, Earls, Barons, and different classes of which this order consists, had all formerly, as their names imply, important duties to discharge in the commonwealth.

The object of reform is not to destroy the established church, pull down the two houses of parliament, nor invade the rights of the crown; but to restore, as far as the altered state of society will allow, those different orders to the exercise of their ancient and legitimate authority.

Of the different innovations on the ancient system, there is none more flagrant than that of the Aristocracy: it has swallowed up not only the rights of the people, and the prerogatives of the crown, but also the immunities of the church. At no former period of history was the power of the Aristocracy so absolute. During the Norman Kings, and the first Kings of the House of

Plantagenet, down to the passing of *Magna Charta*, though the power of the crown, in many instances, proved but a feeble barrier to the encroachments of the barons, yet when united with the influence of the clergy, it was at all times able to set some bounds to their authority. After the passing of the *Great Charter*, the growth of manufactures, and the diffusion of knowledge among the people, gave rise to the Commons. This order, unknown to the preceding period, gradually rose into great importance, and ultimately became able not only to prescribe bounds to the Aristocracy, but also to the Crown. Under the tyranny of the Stuarts, the Commons brought one monarch to the block, and abolished the House of Peers. But its ascendancy was of short duration. The return of Charles II.—the restoration of the rotten boroughs, which had been struck out of the representation during the protectorship of Cromwell, to the right of returning members of Parliament,—the introduction of parliamentary corruption in the reign of Charles II.—more systematically and openly practised under William III. and perfected under the administration of Walpole, in the reign of George II.—completely annihilated the powers of the Commons, and gave to the Aristocracy its present ascendancy.

Having obtained the power, the Aristocracy has exercised it as uncontrolled power usually is exercised, namely, solely for their own advantage: they have rid themselves of what duties were anciently annexed to their order, and monopolized nearly all the honours and emoluments of society.

The ancient nobility had not only to provide a sufficient military force for the defence of the kingdom, but they had also the administration of justice, the coining of money, and, in short, the whole internal government of the country committed to their care.\* On these conditions their estates were originally granted. Their estates continue in their hands, but as to the duties annexed, they have placed them on the shoulders of another class of society. It is the Commons now, who either discharge, or pay for being discharged, all the duties of the state. If we only look over the list of taxes, we shall find that the Aristocracy have exempted themselves almost entirely from impost, while the burden falls exclusively on the people. The duties imposed by the *Corn Laws*, are a tax paid directly for the support of this order; while, with the exception of the land tax, a trading impost, all other duties, the assessed taxes, excise, customs, stamps, post

\* Blackstone's Comment. B. IV. ch. iv. and v. and Smith's Wealth of Nations, B. III. ch. iv. where the nature of the ancient tenures is investigated.

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

office duties, fall almost entirely on the middling and working classes, and scarcely touch the incomes of the nobility.

This is one of the greatest evils resulting from the usurpation of the Aristocracy. Instead of bearing the whole burden of taxation, which, in fact, is the tenure on which they hold their property, they have laid it entirely on the people. Nothing can be more unjust and oppressive. The comforts of one class ought never to be abridged by taxation, while another class remains in the enjoyment of luxuries. It is the legitimate object of good government to prevent the extremes of luxury and indigence, and spread equally through all classes the bounties of nature. But the borough-mongers' system is the reverse of these principles. It presses only on the weak points; it tramples only on those that are fallen; and crushes even to annihilation the most useful classes, by the weight of its imposts.

It is not our business to inquire into the utility and origin of an hereditary privileged class. It is, no doubt, an absurd supposition,—not supported, at least, by the example of many of the families ennobled during the present reign,—that wisdom and talents for government run in the blood. Besides which, men seldom take pains to cultivate unnecessary talents; consequently it is a strong objection to hereditary honours, that those born to them have no necessity for cultivating the virtues by which, perhaps, they were originally acquired. But we leave these subjects, to consider the present influence of the Aristocracy.

The influence of the Aristocracy is derived from four principal sources. *First*, church patronage; *secondly*, the rotten-boroughs; *thirdly*, their territorial possessions; and, *lastly*, from occupying the principal offices in the army, revenue, and navy, and almost in every department of the government. There are only two descriptions of offices,—namely, those requiring talents and industry, or those the duties of which cannot be discharged by deputy, that the borough-mongers deny themselves. Unfit for the higher stations in courts of law, they condescend to fill the lucrative situations of clerk, registrar, messenger, usher, or receiver, and carry bags and wands at the tail of those whose ability alone has made them their superiors, and to whom they are compelled to pay this homage, as a penalty for their own imbecility.

About 6000 church livings are in the gift of the aristocracy and gentry. The Aristocracy alone return about one-half the members of the House of Commons, which places at their mercy both the property and persons of the whole community.

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

The incomes of this class, from their landed property, may be best estimated from the returns under the Income Tax. By returns to the House, made up to the 5th July, 1815, it appears, that the whole taxable income was £140,000,000, and that it arose from—

1.—Rental and profits of tithes, manors, mines, houses, &c. ....	£57,129,047
2.—Trade, professions, offices, &c. ....	34,383,632
	91,512,679
From this was deducted, from various causes and } allowances under the Act .....	4,490,548
	87,022,131
3.—Dividends on funded property, &c. ....	52,977,869
	£140,000,000

Probably, in the first of these items, the income from tithes, mines, houses, &c. may be taken at about £17,000,000, which would leave £40,000,000 as the income of the landed interest. Mr. Colquhoun estimates the income of the nobility, knights, baronets, and country gentlemen, at 58 millions a-year. We think there can be little doubt but the income of the Aristocracy, from rent, amounts to 36 millions a-year. This enormous sum, according to the above returns, is more than the income arising from trade, and all other professions together. If we add to this sum, derived from their landed property, the incomes received by different members of their families, from filling nearly all places in the church, army, navy, revenue, and government, we shall be able to form some idea of the share enjoyed by about 400 families, of the produce, honours, and emoluments of the country.

The total number of Peers, who sit in the House of Lords, is 372, and are as follow :—

English Archbishops.....	2
Irish ditto .....	1
	— 3
English Bishops.....	24
Irish ditto .....	3
	— 27
Dukes of the Royal Family	7
Dukes not of the Royal Family	18
Marquises .....	17
Earls .....	99
Viscounts .....	22
Barons .....	135
Peers of Scotland .....	16
Peers of Ireland .....	28
	372



*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

The title of Duke was first conferred by Edward III.; that of Marquis by Richard II.; and that of Viscount by Henry VI. The last is the only title originally merely *honorary*, and to which no duties were annexed.

An increase in the peerage has generally taken place on the accession of a new family, or when some unpopular measure was to be carried. On the death of Elizabeth the peers only amounted to 56. James, being the first of a new dynasty, raised the number to 105; and Charles I. to 135; Charles II. created 15 dukes, 6 of whom were his natural children, 1 marquis, 37 earls, 3 countesses, 2 viscounts, and 29 barons. At the Revolution of 1688, William III. to ingratiate himself with the great families, raised 8 powerful earls to dukedoms; created 18 earls, 3 viscounts, and 9 barons. Anne increased the peerage to 170. The accession of the Hanover Family rendered new creations necessary; George I. either created or elevated no fewer than 49 peers. George II. left 184. It is evident that the great increase in the peerage has been in the present reign; being more than doubled. In 1777 a batch of peers was drafted from the Commons into the Lords, to effect a ministerial majority. This expedient was frequently resorted to by Mr. Pitt. In 1797 ten peers were made. He nearly created the order of marquises; he made ten marquises in England where there was but one, and nine in Ireland where there were none—all men eminent of course for their *services*. Knighthood was still more profusely lavished. In short, he was as prodigal in wasting the honours of the Crown as the money of the people, and for a similar purpose.

We shall now subjoin to this article a correct List of the House of Peers; particularizing their family connexions; their parliamentary influence; the places held by themselves or relations; distinguishing also those opposed to Catholic Emancipation, and those who voted for the late bills for destroying the remaining liberties of the people. The last distinction is important; it will enable the reader, at one glance, to know the enemies, both of religious and political freedom.

It is proper to preserve the names and circumstances of such an assemblage, were it on no other account than because the memorable bill passed the Peers, for transporting to Botany-Bay those convicted of the indefinable offence of libel. Such a measure would have disgraced a Turkish divan, and rivals in Gothic barbarity, and contempt for literature, the conduct of Omar, the Saracen caliph, who ordered the magnificent library of Alexandria to be destroyed, because, forsooth, the barbarian was insensible to its utility.

# LIST

OF THE

## ARISTOCRACY,

With an account of their family connexions; parliamentary influence; the Places and Pensions held by themselves or relations; distinguishing also those opposed to Catholic Emancipation; and those who voted for the *Seditious Meeting and Press Restriction Bills*.

Those with a \* voted for the *New Bills*.

Those with a † voted against the Catholic Claims, May 17th, 1819.

### Peers of the Blood Royal.

GEORGE Augustus Frederick, Prince Regent of Great Britain and Hanover, and guardian of the duchy of Brunswick Lunenburgh, duke of Cornwall and Rothsay, earl of Chester and Carrick, baron of Renfrew, lord of the Isles, great steward of Scotland, high steward of Plymouth, colonel of the 10th regiment of dragoons, and captain-general of the Hon. Artillery Company, K.G. F.R.S. &c.

The income of the Prince Regent, to defray his personal expenses and for the support of his household, is about £500,000 a year.  
Parliamentary influence: patron of the borough of Plymouth.

† Prince Frederick, Duke of York and Albany, earl of Ulster in Ireland, bishop of Osnaburgh, a field-marshal, commander-in-chief of all the land-forces, colonel of the 1st foot guards, of the 60th regiment, and of the royal Dublin regiment of infantry, keeper and lieutenant of his majesty's forests, parks, and warrens at Windsor, keeper of the king at Windsor, grand master of the Order of the Bath, K.G. D.C.L. F.R.S. &c.

Income of his royal highness about £100,000 per annum.

Prince William Henry, Duke of Clarence and St. Andrews, earl of Munster in Ireland, admiral of the fleet, and ranger of Bushy Park, K.G. D.C.L. and F.S.A.

Income £25,298 9s. 8d.

Prince Edward, Duke of Kent and Strathearn, earl of Dublin, a field-marshal, governor of Gibraltar, keeper and paler of Hampton Court, &c.

Income £31,205 4s. 2d.

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

Prince Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland and Tiviotdale, earl of Ar-  
magh, a field-marshal, president of the board of general officers and  
of the Royal Naval Asylum, chancellor of the University of Dublin,  
K.G. F.S.A. &c.

Income £19,008 10s. 10d.

Prince Augustus Frederick, Duke of Sussex, earl of Inverness, baron of  
Arklow, president of the Society of Arts, K.G.

Income £18,000.

Prince Adolphus Frederick, Duke of Cambridge, earl of Tipperary in Ire-  
land, baron of Culloden, governor of Hanover, chancellor of the Uni-  
versity of St. Andrews.

Income £24,000.

Prince William Frederick, (nephew to the king,) duke of Gloucester and  
Edinburgh, earl of Connaught in Ireland, chancellor of the University  
of Cambridge, ranger of Bagshot park, K.G. G.C.B. F.R.S.

Income £14,000. The duchess of Gloucester a pension of £9000.

**Dukes.**

**ARGYLE**, George William Campbell, Duke of, hereditary master of the  
king's household in Scotland, lord-lieutenant of Argyleshire.

His brother, lord Frederick Campbell, is lord clerk register in  
Scotland. Parliamentary influence: 1 member Argyle  
county; 1 ditto Ayr district.

\*†**Athol**, John Murray, Duke of, lord lieutenant of Perthshire, president  
of the Highland society.

Pension of £4059. For pensions to relations, see *List of Places*,  
Catherine, Louisa, Emily, and Lady George Murray.

\*†**Beaufort**, Henry Charles Somerset, Duke of, lord-lieutenant of the  
counties of Gloucester, Monmouth, and Brecon, receiver of rents for  
Monmouthshire in the duchy court of Lancaster, half brother to the  
marquis of Stafford. Parliamentary influence: Monmouth, Glouces-  
tershire, and Monmouthshire, 1 member each.

**Bedford**, John Russell, Duke of, recorder of Bedford, son-in-law of the  
duke of Gordon. Parliamentary influence: Bedfordshire, 1; Bedford,  
1; Tavistock, 2 members.

\***Buccleugh**, Charles William Henry Scott, Duke of, lord-lieutenant of  
Edinburghshire. Parliamentary influence: his grace and Mr. Dun-  
das of Arriston, return 1 member for the county of Edinburgh, and 1  
for the city of Edinburgh.

**Devonshire**, William Spencer Cavendish, Duke of: Parliamentary influ-  
ence: Knaresborough, 2; Derbyshire, 1; Derby, 1, member.

\***Dorset**, Charles Sackville Germaine, Duke of. Parliamentary influence:  
proprietor of East Grimstead.

\***Gordon**, Alexander Gordon, Duke of, hereditary keeper of Inverness  
Castle, father to the marquis of Huntly, and father-in-law to the Dukes.

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

- of Richmond, Manchester, and Bedford; keeper of the great seal in Scotland, £3000. Lady William Gordon, daughter of the duke, a pension of £200, and lord William Gordon is deputy-ranger of Hyde and St. James's Parks, £700.
- Griffin, George Henry Fitzroy, Duke of, recorder of Thetford, pension of £6670, seal-officer King's Bench and Common Pleas, £2886. Lord Henry Fitzroy, brother to the duke, prebendary of Westminster, £400. Parliamentary influence: Thetford and Bury St. Edmunds, 1 member each.
- Hamilton, Archibald Hamilton, Duke of, premier peer of Scotland, keeper of Holyrood-house.
- Leeds, George William Frederick Osborne, Duke of, governor of the Scilly Islands, ranger of Richmond forest, brother-in-law to the marquis Townshend. Parliamentary influence: the borough of Helstone.
- Leinster, Augustus Frederick Fitzgerald, Duke of, premier peer of Ireland.
- Manchester, William Montagu, Duke of, captain-general and governor of Jamaica, £14000. Parliamentary influence: 1 member for Huntingdonshire. Lord Frederick Montagu, brother to his grace, is collector outwards of the customs in the port of London, £2780.
- \*† Marlborough, George Spencer, Duke of, F.S.A.  
 Lord Charles Spencer, uncle to the duke, pension, dated 1807, £1205; a lord of the bedchamber, £1000. John Spencer, esq. a relation, is accountant-general of the post-office, £700. The Rev. Robert Nares, another relation, is archdeacon of Stafford, and canon of Lichfield, 600. Parliamentary influence of his grace: Woodstock, 2 members; Oxford city, 1 member.
- \*† Montrose, James Graham, Duke of, master of the horse to the king, £1266, lord justice general of Scotland, £2000.
- † Newcastle, Henry Pelham Clinton, Duke of, steward of the forest of Sherwood, and high steward of Retford. Duchess Dowager of Newcastle, pension, dated March 1803, £1000. Parliamentary influence: proprietor of Aldborough and Boroughbridge, 2 members each; Retford, Nottinghamshire, and Newark, 1 member each.
- Norfolk, Bernard Edward Howard, Duke of, hereditary earl marshal, premier duke, earl and baron of England, son-in-law of the marquis of Stafford, a Roman Catholic. Parliamentary influence: proprietor of Steyning, Arundel, and Horsham, 6 members; patron of Hereford, Gloster, Carlisle, and Shoreham, 5 members.
- \*† Northumberland, Hugh Percy, Duke of, brother to the earl of Beverley, brother-in-law to lord Gwydir, and father to baron Percy. Parliamentary influence: proprietor of Newport, and patron of Launceston.
- \* Portland, William Henry Cavendish Scott Bentinck, Duke of, lord-lieut. of Middlesex, Parliamentary influence: Nottinghamshire and Buckinghamshire, 1 member each. For the relations to his grace, holding profitable pensions and places, see the Bentincks in our *List of Places, &c.*

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

- \* **Richmond, Charles Lennox, Duke of, son-in-law of the marquis of Anglessey.** In lieu of the duty on coals, the duke receives an annuity of £19,000. Parliamentary influence: Sussex, Chichester, and Seaford, 1 member each.
- \* † **Rutland, John Henry Manners, Duke of, son-in-law to the earl of Carlisle, and cousin to the archbishop of Canterbury.** Parliamentary influence: Grantham, Cambridgeshire, and Scarborough, 1 member each.
- St Alban's, William Beauclerk, Duke of, grand falconer of England, and hereditary register of the Court of Chancery, £2012. Relations, J. Beauclerk, commissioner of bankrupts, £250; and lord A. Beauclerk, rear-admiral.
- Somerset, Edward Adolphus Seymour, Duke of, son-in-law to the duke of Hamilton.
- \* † **Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of, marquis of Douro, grandee of Spain, prince of Waterloo, colonel of the royal regiment of horse guards, and 33d regiment of foot; master-general of the ordnance, K. G. G. C. B. D. C. L. &c.** The income of his grace is about £30,000.

**Marquises.**

- ABERGORN, John James Hamilton, Marquis of.**
- \* **Anglesey, Henry William Paget, Marquis of, a general in the army, ranger of Snowdon forest, father-in-law to the earl of March, brother-in-law to earl Cadogan.** Parliamentary influence: Anglesey and Carnarvon, and 1 member at Milbourne-port. For relations, see *Paget in the List of Places.*
- \* † **Bath, Thomas Thynne, Marquis of, brother-in-law to viscount Torrington.** Parliamentary influence: Bath city, 1 member and proprietor of Weobly. Marchioness of Bath, mistress of the robes to the late queen, £500. Lord George Thynne, brother to the marquis, comptroller to the king's household, £1200. Lady Isabella Thynne, lady of the bedchamber to the younger Princesses.
- \* **Buckingham, Richard Grenville Chandos Temple, Marquis of, brother of lord Nugent, nephew to lord Grenville.** Parliamentary influence: proprietor of Buckingham, patron of St. Mawes; Aylesbury 1, and Buckinghamshire 1 member.
- Bute, John Crichton Stuart, Marquis of, hereditary coroner of the island of Bute, keeper of Rothsay castle, nephew to the archbishop of Armagh.** Parliamentary influence: patron of Cardiff. The late marquis, who died in 1814, had a pension of £7000.
- \* **Camden, John Jeffries Pratt, Marquis of, recorder of Bath.** The marquis, in lieu of his enormous salary as teller of the exchequer, accepted the regulated sum of £2500.

- \*†Cholmondeley, George James Cholmondeley, Marquis of, judge of the Marshalsea and Palace-Court, chamberlain of Chester, lord steward of the household, £1540. Returns 1 member for Castle-Rising. R. C. Cholmondeley, esq. cousin to the above, receiver-general of the excise, £3000.
- \*Conyngham, Henry Barton Conyngham, Marquis of.
- \*†Cornwallis, Charles Cornwallis, Marquis of, son-in-law to the duke of Gordon, master of the king's stag-hounds, £2000.
- Donegall, George Augustus Chichester, Marquis of, privy counsellor in Ireland.
- Douglas, Alexander Hamilton, Marquis, son of the duke of Hamilton.
- Downshire, Arthur Blundell Sandys Trumbull-Hill, Marquis of, brother-in-law to the earl of Plymouth, hereditary constable of Hilsborough-fort, £243.
- O'Drogheda, Charles Moore, Marquis of. For relations of the marquis, see Moore in the *List of Places*.
- \*†Ely, John Loftus, Marquis of. Lord R. T. Loftus, brother to the marquis, is bishop of Killaloe and Kilfenora, £4000.
- \*†Exeter, Brownlow Cecil, Marquis of, hereditary almoner to the king in fee, recorder of Stamford. Returns 2 members for Stamford.
- Hastings, Francis Rawdon Hastings, Marquis of, governor-general of India, £24,000, constable of the Tower, £1000.
- \*Headfort, Thomas Tylour, Marquis of, lord of the bedchamber, £1000.
- \*†Hertford, Francis Ingram Conway Seymour, Marquis of, brother-in-law to the marquis of Drogheda and the marquis of Londonderry, lord chamberlain of the household, £3000. For an account of the immense sums received by this family, see Seymour in the *List*.
- †Huntley, George Gordon Huntley, Marquis of, son of the duke of Gordon.
- Lansdowne, Henry Petty, marquis of, F. R. S. brother-in-law to the earl of Hchester. Returns 2 members for Calne.
- \*Londonderry, Robert Stewart, Marquis of, brother-in-law to earl Camden and father of lord Castlereagh.
- †Northampton, Charles Compton, Marquis of, recorder of Northampton. Parliamentary influence: Northamptonshire and Northampton 1 member each.
- \*Ormonde, Walter Butler, Marquis of, honorary butler of Ireland,
- Queensberry, Charles Douglas, Marquis of.
- \*†Salisbury, James Cecil, Marquis of, joint post-master-general, £2500.
- \*Sligo, Howe Peter Browne, Marquis of.
- \*Stafford, George Grenville Levison Gower, Marquis of, father-in-law to the duke of Norfolk, hereditary sheriff of Sutherlandshire. Returns 1 member for Staffordshire and 1 member for Lichfield.
- \*†Thomond, William O'Brien, Marquis of.

- Townshend, George Ferrers Townshend, Marquis of. Patron of Yarmouth.
- \*Waterford, Henry de la Poer Beresford, Marquis of. For a full account of the connexions of this powerful family, see Beresford in *List of Places*, and at page 312 of our account of the Irish bishoprics.
- \*Wellesley, Richard Colley Wellesley, Marquis of, brother to the duke of Wellington and the hon. W. W. Pole. The marquis and W. W. Pole are joint-remembrancers of the exchequer in Ireland, £4200.
- \*†Winchester, Charles Ingoldsby Paulet, Premier Marquis of England, groom of the stole to the king, £2000.

### Earls.

- †ABERGAVENTY, Henry Neville, Earl of, recorder of Harwich, inspector of prosecutions at the Custom-house, £2000.
- \*†Abingdon, Montague Bertie, Earl of. Returns for Wallingford and Oxford city 1 member each.
- Albemarle, William Charles Keppel, Earl of.
- \*Ashburnham, George Ashburnham, Earl of, son-in-law of the earl of Beverley.
- \*Aylesford, Henry Finch, Earl of. His uncle, lieutenant Edward Finch, governor of the bedchamber, £500.
- \*Aylesbury, Charles Bruce Brudenell Bruce, Earl of, joint postmaster-general, £2500. Proprietor of Great Bedwin, and returns two members for Marlborough.
- \*Balcarras, Alexander Lindsay, Earl of, general in the army and a pension. For relatives, see the Lindsays and Fordyces in the *List of Places*.
- Bandon, Francis Bernard, Earl of, son-in-law of the earl of Shannon.
- \*†Bathurst, Henry Bathurst, Earl of, secretary of state for the colonial department, £6000, commissioner of India affairs, £1500, teller of the exchequer, (deputy and clerks paid out of it,) £23,117, joint clerk of the crown, £805. Total, £31,422.
- \*†Beauchamp, William Beauchamp Lygon, Earl of.
- Berkeley, Thomas Moreton Fitzhardinge Berkeley, Earl of. Returns 1 member for Gloucestershire.
- Besborough, Frederick Ponsonby, Earl of, brother-in-law to earl Spencer.
- Beverley, Algernon Percy, Earl of, brother to the duke of Northumberland, and father to lord Lovaine, proprietor of the borough of Beeralston.
- Blessington, Charles John Gardiner.
- Bradford, Orlando Bridgeman, Earl of.
- \*Breadalbane, John Campbell, Earl of, lieutenant-general, F.R.S.
- \*†Bridgewater, John William Egerton, Earl of, general in the army, steward of the estates to the Prince Regent, in Hertfordshire, master

- of Gresham hospital, Durham. Returns 2 members for Brackley. Relations, see Egerton in the *List of Places*.
- Bristol, Frederick William Hervey, Earl of, hereditary steward of St. Edmondsbury.
- \*Buckinghamshire, George Robert Hobart, Earl of. His father, who died in 1816, was president of the board of controul, £6000.
- Cadogan, Charles Henry, Earl of.
- \*Caledon, Dupree Alexander, Earl of, son-in-law to the earl of Hardwicke. Returns 2 members for Old Sarum. His cousin receives from the compensation-list of Ireland, as chairman of the committee of supply, £500 per annum. The bishop of Down and Connor, £5500, is a relation to the earl.
- \*Cardigan, Robert Brudenell, Earl of. The late earl was governor of Windsor castle, £1118.
- Carlisle, Frederick Howard, Earl of, brother-in-law to the marquis of Stafford. Returns 2 members for Morpeth, for Cumberland 1.
- Carnarvon, Henry George Herbert, Earl of. The countess is lady of the bedchamber to the Princess of Wales.
- Carysfort, John Joshua Proby, Earl of. From the Irish compensation list, as commissioner of the custody of the rolls, £1307.
- Cathcart, William Shaw Cathcart, Earl of. From his different employments his lordship's income is immense. See *List of Places*.
- Charlemont, Francis William Caulfield, Earl of.
- \*Chatham, John Pitt, Earl of, governor of Jersey, £800, pension £4000, besides other emoluments. See Chatham in the *List of Places*.
- Chesterfield, George Augustus Frederick Stanhope, hereditary keeper of Thorney-wood-chase, Nottinghamshire; a minor.
- \*†Chichester, Thomas Pelham, Earl of, brother to the bishop of Exeter, joint post-master-general in Ireland. Returns 1 member for Lewes.
- Clarendon, Thomas Villiers, Earl of. Returns 1 member for Wootton-Bassett. For relations, see Villiers in the *List of Places*.
- \*Clare, John Fitzgibbon, Earl of. Countess of Clare, mother to the earl, pension £1000. R. H. Fitzgibbon, usher in Court of Chancery, Ireland, £2940.
- Cork, Edmund Boyle, Earl of, a lieutenant-general.
- \*†Coventry, George William Coventry, Earl of, recorder of Worcester.
- \*†Courtown, Jos. George Stopford, Earl of, captain of the band of gentlemen pensioners. For relations, see the Stopfords in the *List of Places*.
- Cowper, Peter Leopold Louis Francis Cowper, Earl, pension, £2000.
- \*Craven, William Craven, Earl of, lieutenant in the army, recorder of Coventry.
- Dalhousie, George Ramsay, Earl of, general in the army, lieutenant-governor of Nova Scotia.



*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

- Darlington, William Harvey Vane, Earl of. Returns Durham 1, Winchester 1, and Camelford 2 members.
- Darnley, John Bligh, Earl of, high-steward of Gravesend and Milton.
- Dartmouth, William Legge, Earl of. Relations, see Legge in *List of Places*.
- \*Delaware, George John West, Earl of, son-in-law to the duke of Dorset, lord of the bedchamber.
- Denbigh, Basil Percy Fielding, Earl of: *a minor*.
- Derby, Edward Smith Stanley, Earl of, lord-lieutenant of Lancashire. Returns one member for Preston.
- \*†Digby, Edward Digby, Earl of. Rev. Charles Digby, canon of Windsor, £600; ditto of Wells, £400.
- Donoughmore, Richard Hely Hutchinson, Earl of. As searcher, packer, gauger, &c. £3127. Vide Hutchinson, *List of Places*.
- Egmont, John James Percival, Earl of.
- \*Egremont, George O'Brien Wyndham, Earl of. For relations, see Wyndham in *List of Places*.
- \*†Enniskillen, John Willoughby Cole, Earl of.
- Erne, John Creighton, Earl of. Relation to the earl of Bristol.
- Essex, George Capel Coningsby, Earl of. The Capels hold several places in the royal household, and the hon. J. T. Capel is receiver at Berbice.
- Farnham, John Joseph Maxwell, Earl of.
- Ferrers, Robert Shirley, Earl of. His uncle is on the superannuated list as rear-admiral.
- Fitzwilliam, William Wentworth Fitzwilliam, Earl of, father to lord Milton. Parliamentary influence: Higham-Ferrars 1, Malton 2 members, patron of Peterborough city, 2 members.
- Fortescue, Hugh Fortescue, Earl of, uncle-in-law to the marquis of Buckingham, and father-in-law to lord King. For the numerous places held by relations, see Fortescue in the *List of Places*.
- \*†Galloway, George Stuart, Earl of, brother-in-law to the marquis of Anglesey. Lady Lucy Stuart, pension dated 1800, £300.
- \*Gronard, George Forbes, Earl of, brother-in-law to the marquis of Hastings, father-in-law to lord Roncliffe, and father to lord Forbes.
- Grey, Charles Grey, Earl of, brother-in-law to lord Ponsonby and the late Mr. Whitbread, and father-in-law to Mr. Lambton, 1 member for Durham.
- \*Grosvenor, Robert Grosvenor, Earl of, father of the earl of Wilton and viscount Belgrave.
- \*Guildford, Francis North, Earl of: patron of Banbury. For relations, see the Norths in the *List of Places*.
- Harborough, Philip Sberard, Earl of: *a minor*.

- \*†Harcourt, William Harcourt, Earl of: as ranger of Windsor great park, master of the robes, &c. £6100.
- Hardwicke, Philip Yorke, Earl of. Returns for Cambridgeshire 1 member, and joint proprietor of Ryegate. For relations, see the Yorkes, in the *List of Places*.
- †Harewood, Edward Lascelles, Earl of, father of earl Lascelles, lord-lieutenant of the West-Riding of Yorkshire. Returns 1 member for Northallerton.
- Harrington, Charles Stanhope, Earl of, governor of Windsor-castle £182. The sons and relatives of the earl hold places in the king's household.
- \*†Harrowby, Dudley Ryder, Earl of, lord president of the council, £4000. Returns 2 members for Tiverton. See Ryders in *List of Places*.
- \*Hopetoun, John Hope, Earl of.
- Ilchester, Henry Stephen Fox Strangways, Earl of, related to lord Holland and the marquis of Lansdowne.
- Jersey, George Villiers, Earl of, son-in-law of the earl of Westmorland.
- Kingston, George King, Earl of, brother-in-law to the earl of Mountcashel.
- \*†Kinnoul, Thomas Robert Haye Drummond, Earl of. Pension £1000, king at arms £578. Relations, rector of Hadleigh, in Suffolk, £900, and prebendary of York and Southwell.
- Landerdale, Joseph Maitland, Earl of. For relations to the earl, see the Maitlands in the *List of Places*.
- \*Limerick, Edmund Henry Percy, Earl of, clerk of the crown and hanger in Ireland, £405.
- Lindsay, Albemarle Bertie, Earl of, a general in the army, and governor of Blackness-castle.
- \*†Liverpool, Robert Banks Jenkinson, Earl of. See *List of Places*.
- Longford, Thomas Pakenham, Earl of, cousin to the hon. Thomas Pakenham, master-general of the ordnance in Ireland, £1200.
- \*†Lonsdale, William Lowther, Earl of, lieutenant-colonel in the army, father of lord Lowther, and father-in-law of right hon. John Bекетт, judge-advocate. Parliamentary influence: Cockermonth 2; Ciffisle 1, Cumberland 1, and Westmorland 2; proprietor of the borough of Haslemere, and joint proprietor of Appleby.
- \*†Macclesfield, George Parker, Earl of, captain of the yeomen of the guard £1200, father-in-law to lord Binning.
- \*†Malmesbury, James Harris, Earl of: pension as late ambassador, £2300. See Fitzharris, *List of Places*.
- \*Mansfield, William Murray, Earl of, heritable keeper of Stoon palace. The earl's mother deputy-ranger of Richmond-park; and the reverend son of auditor of the exchequer in Scotland is in the earl's second son.
- \*Manvers, Charles Herbert Pierrepont, Earl of, captain in the navy. His brother as late foreign minister, £1200.
- Minto, Gilbert Elliot, Earl of, pension £1200.

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

- Morley, John Parker, Earl of.
- Moray, Francis Stuart, Earl of, brother-in-law to lord Grey.
- †Morton, George Douglas, Earl of, chamberlain of the late queen's household; £1300.
- Mountcashel, Stephen Moore, Earl of, general in the army.
- \*†Mount Edgcombe, Richard Edgcombe, Earl of, father of lord Valtort, captain of the band of gentlemen pensioners, £1000. Returns for Lastwithiel 2, Bossiney 1, and Plympton 2 members.
- \*Mulgrave, Henry Phipps, Earl of, general in the army. Returns 1 member for Scarborough. Brother to the hon. E. Phipps, commissioner of excise, £1400, and the hon. Aug. Phipps, deputy-paymaster at Gibraltar, £547.
- \*†Nelson, William Nelson, Earl of, D. D. brother to the late lord Nelson, prebendary of Canterbury, £700; pension by act of parliament, £7000.
- \*†O'Neil, Charles Henry St. John, Earl of, joint postmaster-general in Ireland. Sir John Lee, a relation, is comptroller of the port of Cork, £896, and searcher, packer, and gauger of the port of Wexford, £360, exclusive of fees.
- Onslow, Thomas Onslow, Earl of, out-ranger of Windsor great park. Relations; see *List of Places*.
- \*Orford, Horatio Walpole, Earl of. Returns 2 members for Lynn-Regis. The hon. Robert, as late foreign minister, £2000. Thomas Walpole, ditto, £800.
- Oxford, Edward Harley, Earl of.
- \*†Pembroke, George Augustus Herbert, Earl of, governor of Guernsey, a general. Returns 2 members for Wilton. Countess of Pembroke, one of the ladies of the late queen's bedchamber.
- \*†Plymouth, Other Archer Windsor, Earl of, son-in-law of Lord Amberst.
- \*†Pomfret, George Fermor, Earl of, D. C. L.
- Portsmouth, John Charles Wallop, Earl of, brother-in-law to lord Grantley.
- \*†Poulett, John Poulett, Earl of, a lord of the king's bedchamber. Returns 2 members for Bridgewater.
- \*Powis, Edward Clive, Earl of, father-in-law of the duke of Northumberland. Proprietor of the borough of Bishop's Castle and Montgomery; patron of Ludlow and Montgomeryshire.
- Radnor, Jacob Pleydell Bouverie, father of lord Folkstone. Proprietor of the borough of Downton, and returns 1 for Salisbury. Relations, see Bouverie *List of Places*.
- \*Rockford, William Henry Nassau, Earl of, pension £1200.
- †Roden, Robert Jocelyn, Earl of, searcher of the port of Galway, &c. £2389, father of viscount Jocelyn. See *List of Places*.
- †Romney, Charles Marsham, Earl of. The hon. J. Marsham, canon of Windsor, £600, and prebendary of Rochester, £400, is a relation.

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

- Rosslyn, James St. Clair Erskine, Earl of, a general, director of the court of chancery in Scotland, £1712. His children clerk to the court, £925. His sisters' pensions, £600 per annum.
- Rothes, George William, Earl of, brother-in-law of the earl of Chichester.
- \*St. Germain, John Cragg Elliot, Earl of, M.A.
- St. Vincent, John Jervis, Earl of. Pension, by act of parliament, £1000; from the Irish compensation list, £1083. See the Ricketts' relations, in the *List of Places*.
- Sandwich, George Montagu, Earl of. Returns Huntingdonshire 1, and Huntingdon 2 members.
- \*Shaftesbury, Cropley Ashley Cooper, Earl of. Returns for Dorchester 1 member.
- \*Shannon, Henry Boyle, Earl of, clerk of the pells in Ireland.
- \*†Sheffield, John Baker Holroyd, Earl of. Lady Sheffield is lady of the bed-chamber to the princess of Wales. Lady Glenbervie, sister to lady Sheffield, mistress of the robes to the princess of Wales.
- Shrewsbury, Charles Talbot, Earl of. *A Roman catholic*.
- Spencer, George John Spencer, Earl of, father to viscount Althorpe. Parliamentary influence: Northamptonshire 1, and St. Alban's 2 members.
- Stamford, George Harry Grey, Earl of. The hon. E. Grey, son of the earl, is prebend of Durham.
- \*†Stanhope, Philip Henry, Earl of, son-in-law of lord Carrington, surveyor of green wax, keeper of the records, &c. £1131. See *List of Places*.
- \*Strathmore, John Lyon Bowes, Earl of.
- Talbot, Charles Chetwynd Talbot Chetwynd, Earl, lord lieutenant of Ireland, £30,000. See *List of Places*.
- Tankerville, Charles Bennet, Earl of, father of lord Ossulston.
- Thanet, Sackville Tufton, Earl of; hereditary sheriff of Westmoreland, joint proprietor of Appleby.
- \*†Verulam, Joseph Walter Grimstone, Earl of.
- Upper Ossory, John Fitzpatrick, Earl of.
- Waldegrave, John James Waldegrave, Earl of.
- \*Warwick, Henry Richard Greville, Earl of. Returns 2 members for Warwick. William Fulke Greville, superannuated captain in the navy, £219. Charles Greville, secretary of the island of Tobago, £400, and naval officer at Demerara, £350. C. C. F. Greville, clerk extraordinary to the privy council, £419.
- \*†Westmorland, John Fane, Earl of, lord privy seal, £3000. Returns for Lyme Regis 1 member.
- \*†Whitworth, Charles Whitworth, Earl of. Pension as late foreign minister, £2300.
- Wilton, Thomas Grosvenor, Earl of, second son of earl Grosvenor; a minor.
- \*Winchelsea, George Finch, Earl of, comptroller of the king's household.

**Viscounts.**

- ANSON, Thomas Anson, Viscount. Returns for Litchfield 1 member.
- \*†Arbuthnot, John Arbuthnot, Viscount, lord-lieutenant of Kincardine.
- Bolingbrooke, George Richard St. John, Viscount. Wootton Bassett, 1 member.
- Bulkeley, Thomas Joseph Warren Bulkeley, Viscount. Influences the return of members for Beaumaris and Carnarvonshire.
- \*†Carleton, Hugh Carleton, Viscount, privy counsellor in Ireland, pension, £2700.
- Clifden, Henry Welbore Ellis Agar, Viscount, clerk of the privy council in Ireland, £2161.
- Courtenay, William Courtenay, Viscount.
- \*†Curzon, Asheton Curzon, Viscount. Returns 1 member for Clitheroe.
- Downe, John Christopher Burton Downay, Viscount.
- \*Dudley and Ward, William Ward, recorder of Kidderminster, father of John Ward, M.P.
- Duncan, Robert Duncan, Viscount. Pension, £2000, and from the Irish compensation list, £1083.
- \*†Exmouth, Edward Pellew, Viscount, pension £2000.
- \*†Falmouth, Edward Boscawen, Viscount, recorder of Christchurch. William Aug. Boscawen, commissioner of salt duties; William Boscawen, commissioner of bankrupts, £300.
- Gage, Henry Hall Gage, Viscount,
- Gardener, Allen Hyde Gardner, Viscount, pension, £2000.
- \*Granville, Granville Granville Leveson Gower, Viscount, half-brother of the marquis of Stafford.
- \*Hampden, Thomas Trevor Hampden, Viscount. Thomas Trevor Trevor, prebend of Chester, a relation to the peer.
- Hereford, Henry Devereux, Viscount. Pension to himself and lady, £1200.
- \*†Hood, Henry Hood, Viscount, pension £1700.
- \*†Keith, George Keith Elphinstone, Viscount, secretary and keeper of the signet in Cornwall to the Prince Regent, and comptroller of the household to the duke of Clarence.
- \*†Lake, Francis Gerard Lake, Viscount, keeper of the bed-chamber, £1000; pension for his father's services, £2000; another, £10,649. Total, £13,649.
- \*†Maynard, Charles Maynard, Viscount.
- \*Melbourne, Peniston Lamb, Viscount, lord of the king's bed-chamber, £1000; pension, £1500; father of the hon. George Lamb, M. P. for Westminster, and the hon. J. Lamb, M. P. for Peterborough.

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

- \*Melville, Robert Saunders Dundas, Viscount, first lord of the Admiralty, £5000; lord privy, £3000; register of seisins, £2269. Total, £10,269. See Dundas, *List of Places*.
- \*Middleton, George Broderick, Viscount. The archbishop of Cashel, in Ireland, and the hon. John Broderick, a general, are brothers to the earl.
- Northland, Thomas Knox, Viscount. Relations, see Knox, in the *List of Places*.
- \*†Sidmouth, Henry Addington, Viscount, secretary of state for the home department, £6000; commissioner for the affairs of India, £1500. The hon. Henry Addington, clerk of the pells, £3000, son of the peer.
- \*†Sydney, John Thomas Townsend, Viscount, ranger of St. James's and Hyde-parks, £1732.
- Torrington, George Byng, Viscount. Pension as late foreign minister, £1084.

**Barons.**

- ALVANLEY, William Arden, Lord, captain in the army.
- \*Amherst, William Pitt Amherst, Lord, late ambassador to the emperor of China, pension, £3000.
- \*†Arden, Charles George Perceval, Lord, half-brother to the earl of Egremont, brother to the late Mr. Perceval. Net salary from different offices, £13,562.
- Arundel, Joseph Everard Arundel, Lord: a Roman Catholic.
- Ashburton, Richard Barre Dunning, Lord.
- Auckland, George Eden, Lord, auditor and director of Greenwich hospital, £100. His father, who died in 1814, had pensions and appointments to the amount of £4200, exclusive of pensions to lady Auckland, of £1296, which she now enjoys.
- Audley, George Thicknesse Tuchet, Lord, a pension, £500.
- \*†Bagot, William Bagot, Lord. Returns for Staffordshire, 1 member. The hon. C. Bagot, ambassador to the United States, £6500.
- \*†Bayning, Charles Frederick Poulett Townshend, Lord.
- \*†Berwick, Thomas Noel Hill, Lord. The hon. William Hill, the peer's brother, envoy at Sardinia, £5200.
- \*†Bolton, William Orde Poulett, Lord, examiner, register, and clerk of the county palatine of Lancaster.
- \*†Boston, Frederick Irby, Lord, lord of the bed-chamber, £1000.
- Braybrooke, Richard Aldworth Neville Griffin, Lord, brother-in-law of the marquis of Buckingham and lord Grenville; provost marshal in Jamaica, £2100. The duties of this office are discharged by deputy;

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

- lord Braybrooke's appointment is dated October, 1702, consequently he must have drawn from his sinecure £119,700, principal money. Another account makes the value of this sinecure £5960 per annum.
- Byron, George Gordon, Lord: *abroad*. Catherine Gordon Byron, a pension dated October, 1799, £300.
- \*Calthorpe, George Gough Calthorpe, Lord, joint proprietor of Hindon, and joint proprietor of Bramber.
- Carrington, Robert Smith Carrington, Lord, brother to John and R. Smith, M.P.
- Carteret, Henry Frederick Carteret, Lord.
- Cawdor, John Campbell Cawdor, Lord, son-in-law of the earl of Carlisle.
- \*Churchill, Francis Almeric Spencer, Lord, next brother to the duke of Marlborough, and brother to the duke of Grafton. Ranger of Whichwood forest.
- Clifford, Charles Clifford, Lord. *A Roman Catholic*.
- \*Clinton, Robert; Cotton St. John Trefusis, Lord, colonel in the army. Callington 2 members, and Ashburton 1 member.
- \*†Colchester, Charles Abbot, Lord, late speaker of the house of Commons. Pension, £4000; keeper of the signet in Ireland, (*sinecure*) £1500.
- Combermere, Stapleton Cotton, Lord, brother-in-law to the duke of Newcastle.
- Crewe, John Crewe, Lord. R. H. Crewe, secretary to the board of Ordnance, £2500, a near relation.
- †De Clifford, Edward Southwell, Lord.
- \*†De Dunstanville, Francis Basset, Lord, recorder of Penryn. Returns 2 members for Penryn.
- Dorchester, Arthur Henry Carleton, Lord: *a minor*. Lady Dorchester, Guy, Carleton, and Thomas Carleton, and the survivors, a pension of £10,000.
- Dormer, Charles Dormer, Lord. *A Roman Catholic*.
- \*Douglas, Archibald Douglas, Lord, hereditary sheriff of Forfarshire, and brother-in-law to the Duke of Montrose.
- Ducie, Thomas Reynolds Moreton, Lord.
- Dundas, Thomas Dundas, Lord.
- \*Dynevor, George Talbot de Cardonnel, Lord, lord-lieutenant of Carmarthenshire; brother-in-law to viscount Sydney.
- \*†Eldon, John Scott, Lord, speaker of the house of Peers. For an account of this bigoted and avaricious Tory, see the *List of Places*.
- \*Ellenborough, Edward Law, Lord, brother-in-law of lord Castlereagh; son of the late chief justice of the king's bench, clerk of the plea side of the king's bench, with an enormous salary. This upstart lord is reported to have said, this session, the country does not want "*Philo-*

sophers from the loom," nor "Statesmen from the spinning jenny." The country is glad of philosophers and statesmen from any quarter, but it is disgusted with observing men like his lordship condescend to perform the duties of clerks, packers, gaugers, storekeepers, wine-tasters, and searchers, solely for a share of the public spoil.

Erskine, Thomas Erskine, Lord, brother of the earl of Buchan; pension, £4000.

Foley, Thomas Foley, Lord, brother-in-law of the duke of Leinster.

Forbes, Thomas Foley, Lord, a general in the army.

\*† Gambier, James Gambier, Lord, admiral of the red.

Glastonbury, James Grenville, Lord.

Grantham, Thomas Phillip Weddell Robinson, Lord, son-in-law of the earl of Enniskillen, and brother to the hon. F. Robinson, treasurer of the navy, £2000. Catherine Gertrude Robinson, a relation, and sister to lord Malmesbury, pension, £600.

\* Grantley, William Norton, Lord. F. Norton, brother to the peer, baron of the exchequer in Scotland, £2895. J. C. Norton, another brother, a general, and colonel 56th regiment.

\* Grenville, William Wyndham Grenville, Lord, uncle to the marquis of Buckingham, lord Nugent, and Mr. Wynne, M.P. auditor of the exchequer, £4000. Lady Grenville, a pension of £1500 for life, to commence on the death of lord Grenville.

Gwydir, Peter Burrell, Lord, brother-in-law to the duchess of Northumberland; great chamberlain of England, £3000. Boston 1 member.

\*† Harris, George Harris, Lord, a general, and colonel of the 73d regiment.

Hawke, Edward Harvey Hawke, Lord.

\*† Hill, Rowland Hill, Lord, a general; colonel of the 73d regiment; governor of Hull; and a pension of £2000.

Holland, Henry Richard Vassal Fox, Lord, nephew of the late Mr. Fox.

Howard de Waldon, Charles Augustus Ellis, Lord: a minor.

Hutchinson, John Hely Hutchinson, Lord, brother of Lord Donoughmore; a general; a pension of £2000.

\*† Kenyon, George Kenyon, Lord, joint custos brevium in the king's bench, £930. Hon. R. S. Kenyon clerk of the outlawries in the king's bench, £4986.

\*† Le Despencer, Thomas Stapleton, Lord, father-in-law of lord Jocelyn.

\*† Lilford, Thomas Powis, Lord.

Lynedoch, Thomas Graham, Lord, brother-in-law to lord Cathcart; pension, £2000.

Lyttefton, George Folke Lytteleton, Lord.

Manners, Thomas Manners Sutton, Lord, brother to the Archbishop of Canterbury; lord chancellor of Ireland, £12,000.

\*† Middleton, Henry Willoughby, Lord, high steward of Sutton Coldfield; brother-in-law of the earl of Scarborough. Joint proprietor of the borough of Whitelchurch.



- Monson, John George Monson, Lord, nearly related to the earl of Melbrough: *a minor*. Pension, £2000.
- † Montague, Henry James Montague Scott, Lord, brother of the duke of Buccleugh; keeper of Geddington Chase.
- Monford, Henry Bromley, Lord. Pension, October, 1800, £600; another, March, 1803, £200.
- \*† Napier, Francis Napier, Lord, brother-in-law to sir J. B. Warren; commissioner of the general assembly, Scotland, £1000. For a host of pensions, see the Napiers, *List of Places*.
- \*† Northwick, John Rushout, Lord, one of Mr. Pitt's new batch of peers, in 1797.
- Petre, William Francis Henry Petre, Lord: *a Roman Catholic*. Thetford, 1 member.
- Ponsonby, John Ponsonby, Lord, brother-in-law to earl Grey.
- \* Prudhoe, Algernon Percy, Lord, second son of the duke of Northumberland; a captain in the navy.
- \*† Redesdale, John Freeman Mitford, Lord, brother-in-law of the earl of Egremont; a pension of £4000.
- \*† Ribblesdale, Thomas Lister, Lord, another of Mr. Pitt's peers of 1797. Returns one member for Clithero.
- \* Rivers, George Pitt, Lord, a lord of the bed-chamber, £1000. Dame Mary Pitt, a pension, dated March, 1805, £600; another, granted August, 1806, £150. Lord Rivers' parliamentary influence: 2 members for Dorsetshire.
- \*† Rodney, George Rodney, Lord. Two pensions, £2923.
- \*† Rolle, John Rolle, Lord, recorder of Torrington.
- \*† Rous, John Rous, Lord.
- \*† St. Helens, Alleyne Fitzherbert, Lord, a lord of the bed-chamber, £1000; a pension, as late foreign minister, £2300.
- St. John, St. Andrew St. John, Lord.
- \* Saltoun, Alexander George Fraser, Lord, colonel and captain in the 1st foot guards. C. H. Fraser, a pension of £800; and C. H. Fraser's children, a pension of £500, to commence on the death of their father.
- Say and Sele, Gregory William Twisselton, Lord, son-in-law to lord Eardley.
- \* Scarsdale, Nathaniel Curzon, Lord, father-in-law to lord Tanworth, son of lord Ferrers.
- \*† Selsey, Henry John Peachy, Lord, captain in the navy.
- Sherborne, James Dutton, Lord.
- \* Sinclair, Charles St. Clair, Lord: *a Scotch peer*. Scotsman is synonymous with servility; 15 out of the 16 peers of that slavish country, voted for the new bills. See pensions to the Sinclairs, *List of Places*.
- \* Somers, John Somers Cocks, Lord, recorder of Gloucester; high steward of Thetford; and joint proprietor of Ryegate.

Sondes, Lewis Richard Watson, Lord; related to the Monson, Newcastle, and Fitzwilliam families.

\*Stewart, Charles William Stewart, Lord; second son of the marquis of Londonderry; brother to lord Castlereagh; and brother-in-law to lord Ellenborough; a general; ambassador at Vienna; colonel of the 26th dragoons; lord of the bed-chamber. The salaries of his different appointments, about £16,000

Stourton, William Stourton, Lord: *a Roman Catholic*.

\*Suffield, William Asheton Harbord, Lord, a cousin of Lord Castlereagh; lord-lieutenant of Norfolk.

Teynham, John Roper, Lord.

Thurlow, Edward Howell Thurlow, Lord. His lordship is clerk, registrar, prothonotary, custos of idiots, &c. in the court of chancery, £6000 per annum. E. S. Thurlow, prebend of Norwich, £400; and rector of Houghton-le-Spring, £800.

Tyrwly, James Cuff, Lord.

Vernon, Henry Venables Vernon, Lord, brother to the Archbishop of York. See *List of Places*.

\*†Walsingham, Thomas de Grey, Lord, comptroller of first fruits, £150-Pension, £2000.

Willoughby de Broke, John Petro de Verney, Lord, D.C.L.

\*†Wodehouse, John Wodehouse, lord, recorder of Falmouth. Very Rev. L. C. Wodehouse, dean of Lichfield. Hon. and Rev. A. Wodehouse, holds 3 rectories, and 1 vicarage. Two more Wodehouses are pluralists; another Wodehouse is rector of Woolverton. *Clerical Guide*, p. 276.

Yarborough, Charles Anderson Pelham, Lord, F.R.S.

Zouch, Cecil Bishopp, Lord, F.R.S. D.C.L.

### Archbishops and Bishops.\*

<i>Archbishops.</i>	*St. Asaph.	*Salisbury.	Rochester.
*Ganterbury.	*Bath and Wells.	*†Hereford.	_____
*York.	Norwich.†	*Carlisle.	<i>Irish Archbishop.</i>
<i>Bishops.</i>	*†Bristol.	*Ely.	Cashel.
*London.	*Worcester.	*†Chester.	
*†Durham.	*†Chichester.	*Peterborough.	<i>Bishops.</i>
*†Winchester.	*Bangor.	*†Gloster.	Waterford.
*Lichfield & Coventry.	*Exeter.	*Oxford.	Elphin.
	*St. David's.	*Llandaff.	Down.

\* For an account of the relationships and incomes of the bishops, the reader is referred to the article on the Established Clergy. It seems all the Irish, being peers, voted for the *New Bill*.

† Both the bishop of Norwich and the bishop of Rochester voted with the minority in favour of *Catholic Emancipation*.

*Influence of the Aristocracy.*

Such is a list and analysis of the House of Peers. We have not much room for observations, but we will subjoin a few.

1. It is evident, from the preceding list, that a vast proportion of the peers are either pensioners or placemen, or both; and that there is hardly a single family, some of whose members, in addition to their private incomes, are not in the receipt of a large portion of the public money.

2. It is observable from the \* being generally accompanied with the †, that those who voted against political freedom, voted also against religious toleration; therefore, we may infer, that the enemies of one are also the enemies of the other, and that the cause of religious and political freedom are identified.

3. That almost without a single exception, every individual that composed the majority which passed the *Seditious Meeting* and *Press Restriction Bills*, is either a pensioner or placeman, or both; or has some relation who is either a pensioner or placeman, or both.

4. That it is the most natural thing in the world, that those who are in the receipt of enormous sums of the public money, many of whom neither do, nor ever did, render the slightest service to the country, should make laws to arrest the progress of reform, and prevent the exposition of abuse by the press, and by discussion at public meetings.

5. It is evident, from the Eldons, Castlereaghs, Ardens, Grenvilles, with their relations, the Surties, Willmots, Seymours, Percevals, Braybrookes, &c. being in the receipt of the largest portion of the public money, and being the most strenuous in the support of the present corrupt system, that the zeal of its defenders is in exact proportion to their share of the public spoil.

6. It will be impossible, we think, after perusing the above exposition of the House of Peers, for all the hirelings of the press, or all the state, ecclesiastical, judicial, and magisterial calumniators of the people, to convince any thinking man, that the majority who passed the *New Bills*, were actuated by an horror of *blasphemy, sedition, and a love of the constitution*, rather than a wish to preserve their own inordinate emoluments, wrung from a country sunk to the lowest pitch of misery, by overwhelming taxation.

Lastly, we beseech the reader again to look over the preceding list, and see what these men are, who have destroyed the liberties of Englishmen, and who still withhold from their civil rights, on account of their religious faith, one-fourth of the population of the Empire.

## STATE

OF THE

## REPRESENTATION.

"Taxation and representation are inseparable."—LORD CAMDEN.

"To be taxed without being represented is contrary to the maxims of law and the first principles of the constitution."—LORD CHATHAM.

"The people of England have a right to an ANNUAL ELECTION of their representatives, and an equal representation, founded upon a higher authority than any act or acts of Parliament can confer."—The late MARQUIS OF LANSDOWN'S Letter to the People of Wiltshire.

"In a free state, EVERY MAN who is a free agent ought to be, in some measure, his own governor, and, therefore, a branch, at least, of the representative power should reside in the great body of the people."—Blackstone, Book I. ch. 9.

That it is a high infringement upon the liberties and privileges of the Commons of Great Britain for any LORD OF PARLIAMENT, or any Lord-lieutenant of any County, to concern themselves in the election of members to serve for the Commons in Parliament.—Resolution of the Commons entered on the Journals at the commencement of every Session.

"That government alone is strong that has the hearts of the people; and will any man pretend that we should not be likely to add strength to the state if we were to extend the basis of popular representation? Would not a House of Commons, freely no less, and that was, in truth, the representative of the people, in supporting the administration of the Crown, be more likely to conciliate and to ensure the support of the people? If this be true in the abstract, it is certainly our peculiar duty to look for this support in this hour of difficulty."—Charles James Fox, 1797.

"No HONEST MAN can, according to the present system, continue Minister."—William Pitt, 1782.

*State of the Representation.*

"No person who has an office or place of profit under the king, or who receives a pension from the crown, should be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons."—Act of Settlement, 12th and 13th William and Mary, Sect. 7.

"The congregation of hypocrites shall be desolate, and fire shall consume the tabernacles of bribery: they conceive mischief, and bring forth vanity, and their belly prepareth deceit."—Job, chap. xv. ver. 34 and 35.

WE come now to the root of all evil—the corrupt state of the representation. The fatal prediction that the liberties of the people could only be destroyed by a corrupt House of Commons has been fully verified, and we now behold, in the calamitous state of the country—in the ruin of industry—in the extreme indigence of one class and the bloated opulence of another—in weak men, recommended only by their servility and wickedness, directing the affairs of a great nation—all the evils resulting from a government, founded neither on the virtue, talents, opinion, nor property of the community.

So much has been urged to show the absurdity of the present system of representation and its ruinous tendency, that it seems almost a work of supererogation to add any thing further on the subject. We will, however, before giving an analysis of the present assemblage in St. Stephen's Chapel, make a few remarks on three leading positions on which, we think, the Reformers are unanswerable. These positions are,—*First*, That the House of Commons, as at present constituted, is unconstitutional and absurd. *Secondly*, That it has been productive of all the calamities under which the country now labours; and, *lastly*, that it is utterly impossible any measure of retrenchment, or any other measure beneficial to the country, can be carried, while it remains as at present constituted. These points established, every one, not interested in the abuses of government, must see the paramount necessity of reform; that all other projects are "shadows vain," and that this is the only measure by which the horrors of despotism can be averted, and the condition of the people ameliorated:

To prove that the House of Commons is unconstitutional, it is sufficient to revert to the authorities placed at the head of this article. But it is not only unconstitutional, it is glaringly absurd and ridiculous: it is founded on no rational principle of either population, intelligence, or property. There is Old Sarum, for instance. Of this borough nothing remains but a *thorn-bush*, yet it has a nominal bailiff and burgesses, and returns two members to

*State of the Representation.*

parliament. Appleby is another burgage tenure-borough; here the right of voting is vested in some pigsties, and it is these magnificent abodes which are represented in the "Great Council of the Nation," while Manchester, Leeds, and Birmingham, are excluded. Gatton consists of only six houses, has but *one voter*; this voter unites in his own person the various functions of magistrate, churchwarden, surveyor of the highways, collector of taxes, appoints at his court leet the constable, and returns two members to represent him in parliament. At Midhurst there is neither freeholder, property, nor inhabitant; and the whole business of returning two members is performed by the attorney of Lord Egremont. These would be no end of enumerating similar incongruities; but these must suffice to show the absurdity of the system in respect of population.\*

As to property it is not less ridiculous. At Weymouth and Melcombe Regis, voters possessing only the thirteen hundredth part of a sixpenny freehold have been deemed eligible. At Horsham, voters possessing a house or part of a house, paying only two-pence a-year, are entitled to vote for a member of parliament. But why in returning county members should the elective franchise attach only to freehold property? Copyhold property, since the abolition of the feudal tenures, is as much real property as freehold. But if property be the proper basis of representation, why not admit funded and personal property? or why not admit property vested in manufactures, navigation, and shipping? But the whole is an unanswerable absurdity. The crowning absurdity, however, still remains. *One hundred and forty-four peers*, persons whom we have seen from a part of our mottos, have no right to interfere nor concern themselves in elections, do actually nominate 300 members; and that 187 more members, forming a majority, are nominated by government, and 123 private individuals.

Absurd as such a system is, the *Edinburgh Review* and the notorious George Canning have attempted its defence. They contend that, notwithstanding its revolting incongruities, it produces much *practical good*, and that men of talent and virtue find their way into the house even under the present defective system. This is the only argument with which we are

\* Those who wish to see a more particular account of the *rotten boroughs* must consult Mr. Oldfield's "*Key to the House of Commons*," which is full of interesting information on this subject.

acquainted that has ever been advanced in its defence, and we will soon show that it is the most weak and puerile imaginable.

Granting that some four or half-dozen honest and clever men obtain seats in the house; we ask, is this as it ought to be? Is it right that an assemblage, which ought to be a congregation of the wisdom and virtue of the community, should only contain about one-hundredth part of men of real ability and good intentions? Persons of this description ought not merely to form an extremely small *minority*, they ought to form a *majority*; nay, the whole ought to be of this class. Certainly an assemblage where the legislative power resides ought to be composed of men above the average talent and virtue of society; it ought to be a filtration from the gross mass, and a concentration of all that is eminent in wisdom, virtue, and patriotism.

But of what service are half a dozen, a score, or even a hundred unexceptionable characters in an assembly of more than six hundred? They can neither prevent bad nor carry good measures. Power there is neither in eloquence nor strength of reasoning, but in strength of voting; and unless they be superior in the number of votes, as well as in probity and intellect, they can render little service to the country. We conclude, therefore, that a few meritorious men being in the house can really be of no advantage, unless the majority were of that class; and this, we think, can only be obtained by extending the elective franchise to the great body of the people.

Let us now come to the second position—namely, that the calamities of the country have resulted from non-representation. Some have been hardy enough to assert that the same measures would have been pursued and the situation of the country would have been nearly similar had the government resided in the people. They contend that the war—the fruitful source of all our woes—in its commencement was *popular*. Granting, for a moment, that the people were favourable to the war at the beginning, and continued so for some time afterward, yet we contend that even this originated in the state of the representation. The voice of reason and truth were stifled by the power of corruption. A panic was raised about property; the most ridiculous fears were excited about French liberty and French principles: truth could no where make herself heard: all the outlets of information—the daily press, the periodical press, the bar, the pulpit, the senate-house—all were devoted to the Oligarchy: delusion and corruption triumphed; and the friends of truth, who vainly endeavoured to expose

the million of lies which inundated the country, were either banished, imprisoned, or expatriated.

Hence arose the pretended popularity of the revolutionary war. The exclusion of the people from the government afforded their rulers the means of silencing truth, and deluding and moulding the nation to their own ruinous purposes. On no other supposition is it possible to account for the system so long tolerated in this country ; for the accumulation of a debt of 800 millions—the degradation of one-fourth of the community into paupers—the expulsion of a genuine currency from circulation—and the growth of a population for which there is neither food nor employment. These evils are not the offspring of a day ; they are the bitter fruit of years of misrule ; and that government has been able to persist in its fatal career, can only be ascribed to its power of delusion, which prevented an energetic resistance to measures in their commencement, that, on the most obvious principles, contained the seeds of national misery and embarrassment.

We come now to our last position—namely, without a reform no salutary measure can be carried, nor the condition of the people in the least ameliorated. This is almost a self-evident proposition, and scarcely needs proving. The House of Commons itself is the great grievance of the people, and the interests of a vast majority of its members are directly opposed to the measure by which their sufferings might be alleviated. Like those of the physician, their interests are not in effecting a speedy cure, but in protracting the disease of the patient. They have usurped the rights and thrive on the miseries of the people : to restore the former or alleviate the latter would make the honourable members poor indeed.

But how utterly destitute this assemblage is of all principle, justice, and sympathy with the sufferings of the people, it is only necessary to call to mind a few of their leading measures. After the impunity granted to Lord Castlereagh, when convicted of an attempt to purchase a seat with India patronage, and the bill of indemnity to the clergy, no sane person could have the least confidence either in the justice or constitutional principles of the House of Commons. The desire of the house to alleviate the sufferings of the people, by retrenchment, were sufficiently evinced last session, by keeping up the junior lords of the admiralty and the memorable grant to the Duke of York. The present session has evinced, still more decisively, its hopeless character. The country was writhing in agony from its privations : an unparalleled and wanton outrage had been committed on the laws : the



parliament met and separated, but instead of bringing the delinquents of the 16th of August to justice, they were rewarded; and, instead of any attempt to alleviate their sufferings, they were not even alluded to; but new laws were enacted, subversive of every ancient right, and the object of which was not only to prevent the people being made acquainted with the causes of their privations, but to deprive them of the liberty of assembling to petition for their removal.

We shall now conclude these observations on the subject of reform. We have said nothing about any specific plan of reform. Our opinion is, that a "Radical Reform" of the House of Commons is the only species of Reform commensurate with the evil. But, while we shall continue to insist that this is the only just and efficient reform, we think that any other plan of Reform, though it come short of what the people have a right to expect, and what is necessary to the salvation of the country, ought to be supported. The great object of Reformers is to obtain as extensive an union as possible among all those who think that a reform, of some sort at least, is the only *panacea*. The only thing that can delay the triumph of the people, is by their suffering any differences of opinion to divide their force before they come in contact with the common enemy of ALL reform, and the supporters of every description of abuse.

We shall now give a summary of the most important changes which have taken place in the representative system, from the time of the Saxons to the present period. Under the Saxons it has been satisfactorily established, that not only the *Wittena-gemote*, or legislative body, but every executive officer, from the tithingman to the elderman, or chief magistrate of a county, was elected by the respective hundreds, annually assembled in the county court. In like manner all ecclesiastical offices were derived from the people, and the dignities of bishops and abbots conferred by the great council of the nation.\*

The commons continued to retain some portion of its ancient power even under the tyranny of the Norman kings. The Conqueror assembled a parliament in the year 1070, composed of twelve representatives returned out of every county. This parliament confirmed the laws of Edward the Confessor, which the king bound himself to keep, but neglected his engagement. Writs, dated the 49th Henry III. summoning knights, citizens, and burgesses to parliament, are still extant. As to the right of suffrage, it

\* See Omitfield's Representative History of Great Britain, vol. i. p. 87.

*State of the Representation.*

appears to have been *general* in all housekeepers paying taxes, or as it is now termed scot and lot ; this right continued till the disfranchising statute of Henry VI. when the right of voting for the county members was limited to electors possessing freehold property of forty shillings annual value.

In the reign of Edward I. commenced the practice of discontinuing, restoring, and omitting different boroughs in the representation ; by which means many large towns and populous places have been deprived of the right of returning members altogether. The following tables, principally extracted from the Appendix to the last volume of Mr. Oldfield's *Representative History*, will show the changes that have taken place in this respect ; also, the number of parliaments held in each reign, and the duration of each parliament.

*A List of those Places which formerly sent Members to Parliament and now do not.*

Alresford.	Dunstable.	Kingston-on-Thames.	Ross.
Aulton.	Dunster.	Ledford.	South-Molton.
Axbridge.	Dudley.	Langport.	Sherborne.
Bamborough.	Doncaster.	Lidbury.	Spalding.
Basingstoke.	Dedington.	Leeds.*	Stoke.
Berkhamstead.	Egremont.	Mere.	Tickhill.
Blandford.	Exmouth.	Montacute.	Tonbridge.
Bishops-Stortford.	Ely.	Manchester.	Teignmouth.
Bradnesham.	Fareham.	Melton-Mowbray.	Torrington.
Bradford.	Farnham.	Medbury.	Wainfleet.
Bromyard.	Fremington.	Newbury.	Wisbeach.
Barford.	Glastonbury.	Odyham.	Whitney.
Chelmsford.	Greenwich.	Overton.	Whitby.
Conebrig.	Halifax.	Poligreen.	Ware.
Crediton.	Highworth.	Pershore.	Watchet.
Chard.	Jarvell.	Pickering.	
Chipping-Norton.	Kidderminster.	Raveners.	

\* Both Leeds and Manchester returned members during the commonwealth. The representative for Leeds was *Adam Bayns, Esq.* ; the representative for Manchester, *Charles Worsley, Esq.* All the rotten boroughs were omitted in the representation during the protectorship of Cromwell. As ministers have intimated an intention of extending the elective franchise to some populous town in preference to Gramponnd, and as Leeds has been mentioned as the place on which this mighty boon is to be bestowed, it seems that town may claim the gift from ancient usage.

*State of the Representation.*

In all *sixty-eight* boroughs, which sent members to parliament in different reigns, and which are now deprived of that right. Besides these, *Mr. Oldfield* has given a list of *ninety-seven* other boroughs which have charters, and most probably sent members at some former period since the reign of Edward I. but which are now disfranchised. From the reign of Edward I. to that of Charles II. boroughs have been created and annihilated at the caprice of each successive monarch. The boroughmongers are ever and anon declaiming on the perils of *change* and *innovation*; in the borough-representation there has been *innovation* and *change* with a vengeance; and we may ask the enemies of reform, whether the constitution would receive a greater injury from the disfranchisement of Old Sarum, Gatton, and Midhurst, than it has sustained from the disqualification of Leeds or Manchester? It surely becomes necessary to abolish the existing rotten boroughs; or, according to the argument of our opponents, to make the constitution complete, by restoring the *one-hundred-and-sixty-four* which have been discontinued.

*The following Table shows the Number of Parliaments held in each Reign, from 27th Edward I. A.D. 1299, to the end of the Reign of George II. showing also the respective length of each Reign.*

	No. of Parliaments.	Length of Reign.
Edward I. from 1299, . . . . .	8	8 years.
Edward II. . . . .	15	20
Edward III. . . . .	37	50
Richard II. . . . .	26	22
Henry IV. . . . .	10	14
Henry V. . . . .	11	9
Henry VI. . . . .	23	39
Edward IV. . . . .	5	22
Richard III. . . . .	1	2
Henry VII. . . . .	9	24
Henry VIII. . . . .	3	38
Edward VI. . . . .	2	6
Mary . . . . .	5	5
Elizabeth . . . . .	10	45
James I. . . . .	4	22
Charles I. . . . .	4	24
Charles II. . . . .	8	36

*State of the Representation.*

	No. of Parliaments.	Length of Reign.
James II. ....	3	4 years.
William III. ....	6	13
Anne ....	6	12
George I. ....	2	13
George II. ....	6	33

From this table it appears that in the 461 years preceding the reign of George III. there were 202 parliaments, whose average duration was  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years; and that in 210 years preceding the reign of Henry VIII. there were 143 parliaments, averaging rather less than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  year each.

A TABLE of the DURATION of the several PARLIAMENTS, from the beginning of the Reign of Henry VIII. to the present Time.

Monarchs.	When met.	When dissolved.	Duration.		
			Y.	M.	D.
Henry VIII. ....	21 Jan. 1509	23 Feb. 1509	0	1	2
	4 Feb. 1511	4 March, 1513	2	1	0
	5 Feb. 1514	22 Dec. 1515	1	10	17
	15 April, 1523	13 Aug. 1523	0	3	29
	3 Nov. 1530	4 April, 1536	5	5	1
	8 June, 1531	18 July, 1536	0	1	10
	8 April, 1539	24 July, 1540	1	2	26
	16 Jan. 1541	29 March, 1544	3	2	13
	23 Nov. 1545	31 Jan. 1547	1	2	8
	4 Nov. 1547	15 April, 1552	4	5	11
Edward VI.....	4 March, 1553	31 March, 1553	0	1	0
	5 Oct. 1553	6 Dec. 1553	0	2	1
Mary .....	2 April, 1554	5 May, 1554	0	1	3
	12 Nov. 1554	16 Jan. 1555	0	2	4
	21 Oct. 1555	9 Dec. 1555	0	0	8
	26 Jan. 1557	17 Nov. 1557	0	9	28
Elizabeth .....	23 Jan. 1558	8 May, 1588	0	3	16
	11 Jan. 1562	2 Jan. 1567	4	11	22
	2 April, 1571	29 May, 1571	0	1	27
	8 May. 1572	18 March, 1580	7	10	10
	23 Nov. 1585	14 Sept. 1586	0	9	21
	29 Oct. 1586	23 March, 1587	0	4	23
	4 Feb. 1588	29 March, 1588	0	1	25
	19 Nov. 1592	10 April, 1593	0	4	22
	24 Oct. 1597	9 Feb. 1598	0	3	16
	7 Oct. 1601	29 Dec. 1601	0	2	22
James I. ....	19 March, 1603	9 Feb. 1611	7	10	21
	5 April, 1614	7 June, 1614	0	2	2
	30 Jan. 1620	8 Feb. 1621	1	0	9
	19 Feb. 1623	24 March, 1625	2	1	5

*State of the Representation.*

Monarchs.	When met.	When dissolved.	Duration.
			Y. M. D.
Charles I.....	17 May, 1625	12 Aug. 1625	0 2 26
	6 Feb. 1626	15 June, 1626	0 4 9
	17 March, 1627	10 March, 1628	0 11 23
	13 April, 1640	3 May, 1640	0 0 22
	3 Nov. 1640	20 April, 1653	12 5 17
Charles II. ....	25 April, 1660	29 Dec. 1660	0 8 4
	8 May 1661	24 Jan. 1678	16 8 16
	6 March, 1797	12 July, 1679	0 4 6
	17 Oct. 1679	18 Jan. 1681	1 3 1
	21 March, 1681	28 March, 1681	0 0 7
James II.....	12 March, 1685	28 July, 1687	2 4 16
	22 Jan. 1688	26 Feb. 1689	1 1 4
William III. ....	20 March, 1689	11 Oct. 1695	6 6 22
	27 Nov. 1695	7 July, 1698	2 7 10
	24 Aug. 1698	19 Dec. 1700	2 3 26
	26 Feb. 1700	11 Nov. 1701	1 8 5
	30 Dec. 1701	7 July, 1702	0 6 2
Anne .....	20 Aug. 1702	5 April, 1705	2 7 16
	14 June, 1705	15 April, 1708	2 10 1
	8 July, 1708	21 Sept. 1710	2 2 13
	25 Nov. 1710	8 Aug. 1713	2 8 14
	12 Nov. 1713	15 Jan. 1715	1 2 3
George I.....	17 March, 1715	10 March, 1721	5 11 21
	10 May, 1722	5 Aug. 1727	5 2 26
George II. ....	28 Nov. 1727	18 April, 1734	6 4 21
	13 June, 1734	28 April, 1741	6 10 15
	25 June, 1741	18 June, 1747	5 11 24
	15 Aug. 1747	8 April, 1754	6 7 26
	31 May, 1754	20 March, 1761	6 9 20
George III.....	6 Nov. 1761	12 March, 1768	6 9 21
	10 May, 1768	30 Sept. 1774	6 4 20
	29 Nov. 1774	1 Sept. 1780	5 9 3
	31 Oct. 1780	25 March, 1784	3 4 25
	18 May, 1784	11 June, 1790	6 0 24
	25 Nov. 1790	20 May, 1796	5 5 25
	27 Sept. 1796	29 June, 1802	5 9 3

From an attentive consideration of the above table, the following facts, which will sufficiently establish the right of the people to short parliaments, according to ancient usage, may be deduced :

In the first place it appears, that, since 1509, (when it is generally supposed that the duration of parliament was extended beyond one year,) only **FOUR** parliaments have existed beyond **SEVEN YEARS**, and that only eight more have had a **sexennial** duration.

In the second place, it is sufficiently evident that of the rest only six parliaments have lasted above five years, two above four, and two above three.

Thirdly, of the remaining number, only NINE existed above *two years*, and no less than THIRTY-FOUR for a shorter period.

Lastly, it is certain that, one parliament with another, the duration of each, since the reign of Henry the Seventh, does not exceed the space of TWO YEARS and about NINE MONTHS, even including the long parliament in the reign of King Charles the First, and the still longer one which his son retained in existence for the enormous period of about seventeen years.

The following abstract will show at one view, the gradual alterations in the representation of the people.

### Shires and Universities.

	<i>No. of Members.</i>
Edward I. ....and preceding Monarchs, 37 counties .....	74
Henry VIII. { shires of Chester and Monmouth ..... 4 } { 12 Welsh counties, 1 member each ..... 12 }	16
James I. ....the two Universities.....	4
Charles II. ....Durham county .....	2
Anne .....30 Scotch counties, with 1 member each ....	30
	126

### Cities and Boroughs.

Edward I. { and preceding Monarchs, created 78 boroughs, } { with 2 members each, and London with 4.. }	160
Edward II. ....created 6 boroughs, with 2 members each ..	12
Edward III.. { created 9       —       2       —       18 } { restored 2       —       2       —       4 }	22
Henry VI. .. { created 5       —       2       —       10 } { restored 2       —       2       —       4 }	14
Edward IV... { created 3       —       2       —       6 } { restored 1       —       2 members   2 }	8
Henry VIII. { created 4       —       2 members each 8 } { — 12 Welsh boroughs 1       —       12 } { — 1 borough, with 1 member 1 }	21
Edward VI.. { — 14       —       2 members each 28 } { restored 10       —       2       —       20 }	48



The Treasury have a controlling influence over nearly the whole of the Scotch representation. The late Lord Melville always boasted that he could return *thirty-nine* out of *forty-five*, who represented the whole kingdom of Scotland! The Duke of Montrose is now considered the patron-general for the Treasury of all Scotland.

In Ireland, where freeholders can be created at pleasure, the representation is not less deplorable. A county member, if he support the ministers, or if he be in opposition to the ministers' opponent, has, what is called "*the patronage of the county*," that is, he appoints excise and custom-house officers, officers of militia, &c. Possessed of this influence, the claims upon his friendship are numerous; and as long as any thing remains to be given away, he deals out his favours to the gentlemen who brought their voters to support him on the day of trial. These latter men, forming another link in the chain of political corruption, distribute their favours to their tenants, who have made the greatest number of freeholders on their estates.

The Irish Peers are returned on similar corrupt and slavish principles. They are virtually nominated by ministers. When a Peer dies, government intimate, through the Irish secretary, by whom they wish the vacancy to be supplied; this, according to the account of Mr. Wakefield, in his Tour, invariably procures the election of the desired person. So much for the independence attached to rank and property!



## LIST OF THE MEMBERS

OF

## THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Showing the Places for which they sit, with the Number of Electors; the Relationships, Offices, Pensions, Salaries, and Titles of the Members; and also the Manner in which they voted on Parliamentary Reform; and the late Bills, so far as those things can be ascertained.

---

The words in *Italic*, are the places for which the Members sit.

Those to which a \* is prefixed, voted with the minority on Sir F. Burdett's motion on Parliamentary Reform, July 1, 1819.\*

Those to which a † is prefixed, voted for the *Libel Banishment Bill*.

\*.\* When the reader is desirous of more particular information of the connexions of any Member, he must turn to the *List of Places* and the *List of Peers*.

---

ABERCROMBY, hon. James, *Calne*, 17, third son of baroness Abercromby, a barrister, commissioner of bankrupts, £350.  
Alexander, James, *Old Sarum*, a *thorn-bush*, cousin of the earl of Caledon.

\* As Sir F. Burdett's motion was limited merely to pledge the House to inquire into the State of the Representation, the members supporting the motion can only be considered as having admitted the necessity of at least *some reform*, without pledging themselves to any specific principle.

† The *Libel Banishment Bill*, passed the third time only two days before Christmas; therefore the names we have marked as voting for that infamous measure, only show the most determined adherents of ministers, who remained in town to the last, in order to afford government their support.

*State of the Representation.*

- Allan, Alexander, *Berwick*, 800.
- Allen, John Hensleigh, *Pembroke*.
- Althorpe, right hon. John Charles Spencer, viscount, *Northamptonshire*, son of earl Spencer.
- Anson, sir George, *Lichfield*, 600, brother of viscount Anson; a general, colonel of 23d dragoons, equerry to the duke of Kent.
- \*Anson, hon. George, *Great Yarmouth*, next brother to Viscount Anson.
- Apsley, right hon. Henry George Bathurst, lord, *Cirencester*, commissioner for affairs of India, £1500; eldest son of earl Bathurst.
- †Arbuthnot, right hon. Charles, *Rye*, pension, £2000; joint secretary of the treasury, about £3000.
- Archdall, Mervyn, *Fermanaghshire*, a general, lieutenant-governor of the Isle of Wight.
- Ashurst, W. H. *Oxfordshire*.
- Astell, William, *Bridgewater*, brother-in-law to earl Poulett.
- Aubrey, sir John, bart. *Steyning*, 80.
- Bagwell, right hon. William, *Tipperary*, joint muster-master general, £2274.
- †Banks, Henry, *Corfe Castle*, 44, trustee of the British museum.
- †Banks, George, *Ditto*, son of the above.
- Barham, Joseph Foster, *Stockbridge*, 57, brother-in-law to earl Thanet.
- Baring, sir Thomas, *Wycombe*, 65, a merchant in London.
- Baring, Alexander, *Taunton*, 400, next brother to the above; a director of the bank of England.
- Barnard, right hon. Henry, viscount, *Tregony*, 180, eldest son of the earl of Darlington, son-in-law of earl Poulett, lieut. in the 7th dragoons.
- Barne, Michael, *Dunwich*, 17. See Barnes, *List of Places*, who are relations.
- Barnet, James, *Rochester*, 800.
- Barry, right hon. John Maxwell, *Cavanshire*, brother-in-law of the earl of Mountnorris, cousin to the earl of Farnham; lord of the treasury in Ireland, £1200.
- Bastard, John, *Dartmouth*, 40, a captain in the navy.
- Bastard, Edmund Pollexfen, *Devonshire*, 14,000, brother to the above.
- †Bathurst, right hon. Charles, *Harwich*, brother-in-law of viscount Sidmouth; chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, £4525.
- Baumont, Thomas Wentworth, *Northumberland*, colonel in the army.
- \*Becher, William Wrioxn, *Mallow*, Ireland.
- †Becket, right hon. John, *Cockermouth*; judge-advocate. £2552.
- Beckford, William, *Hindon*, 110, father-in-law of the marquis of Douglas.
- †Becket, Thomas, earl of, *Meathshire*, son of the marquis of Headfort.
- Belfast, George Hamilton, earl of, *Carrickfergus*, eldest son of the marquis of Donegall.
- Belgrave, Richard Grosvenor, viscount, *Chaster*, eldest son of earl Grosvenor, and brother to Thomas Grosvenor, a general in the army.
- Bennet, hon. Henry Grey, *Shrewsbury*, 900, second son of the earl of Tankerville, F.R.S.
- Bent, John, esq. *Sligo*.
- Bentinck, lord William Henry Cavendish, *Nottinghamshire*, next brother to the duke of Portland. See *List of Places*.
- Bentinck, lord Frederick, *Weobly*, 45, brother to the above, colonel of 1st regiment foot guards.

*State of the Representation.*

- \*Benyon, Benjamin, esq. *Stafford*, 600.
- Beresford, sir John P. *Coleraine*, elder brother of lord Beresford, and a rear-admiral.
- Beresford, lord George T. *Waterfordshire*, brother to the marquis of Waterford, and a general. See *List of Places*.
- \*Bernol, Ralph, *Lincoln*, 1260.
- Bernard, right hon. James, viscount *Youghall*, son of earl Bandon.
- Bernard, Thomas, *King's County*, brother-in-law of lord Donally.
- †Bensing, Thomas, lord, *Rocheater*, 760, eldest son of the earl of Haddington, and son-in-law of earl Macclesfield; commissioner for the affairs of India, £1500.
- Birch, Joseph, esq. *Nottingham*, 1700; a merchant of Liverpool.
- Blackburne, John, *Lancashire*, F.R.S.
- Blair, James, *Hunter*; *Wigtownshire*, 53.
- Blair, James, *Saltash*, 36.
- Blake, Valentine, *Galway Town*.
- †Blandford, George Spencer Churchill, marquis of, *Chippingham*, eldest son of the duke of Marlborough.
- Boswell, Alexander, *Plympton*, 40.
- †Bourne, rt hon. W. Sturges, *Christchurch*, commiss. for the affairs of India.
- Bouverie, hon. B. *Downton*, 21, half-brother to the earl of Radnor.
- Braddyll, Thomas, *Bodmyh*, 36.
- †Bradshaw, R. H. *Brackley*, 32, a trustee of the late duke of Bridgewater's estates.
- Broadhurst, John, *Sudbury*.
- †Brogden, James, *Launceston*, 15; chairman of committees of the House of Commons; £1500.
- Brougham, Henry, *Winchelsea*, 17, a barrister at law, sergeant at arms in the treasury department.
- Browne, Dominick, *Mayo County*, father-in-law of viscount Dillon.
- Browne, James, *ditto*.
- Brown, Peter, *Rye*.
- Brownlow, Charles, *Armaghshire*.
- Brudenell, lord Thomas James, *Marlborough*, 21, only son of the earl of Cardigan.
- Bruen, Henry, *Carlowsheire*.
- Buller, sir Edward, *East Looe*, 21, admiral, and recorder of East Looe.
- Burdett, sir Francis, bart. *Westminster*, 14,000.
- Burgh, sir U. B. *Carlowsheire*.
- Burrell, sir C. M. *New Shoreham*, 1500.
- Barrell, Walter, *Sussex*, youngest brother of sir C. Burrell.
- Burrel, hon. P. R. D. *Boston*, 400, eldest son of baroness Willoughby and lord Gwydir.
- Burton, Robert Christie, *Beverley*.
- Butler, hon. James W. *Kilkenny*, next brother of the marquis of Ormond.
- Butler, hon. C. H. *ditto*, brother of the above.
- Buxton, J. J. *Great Bedwin*, 80.
- †Buxton, T. Fowell, *Weymouth*.
- Byng, George, *Middlesex*, 9000.
- \*Calcraft, John, *Wareham*, 180, proprietor of the borough.
- Callaghan, Gerard, *Dundalk*.

## State of the Representation.

- Calthorpe, hon. F. C. *Hindon*, 240, next brother to lord Calthorpe.
- Calvert, Charles, *Southwark*, 8000, brother to the member for *Hertford*.
- Calvert, Nicholson, *Hertford*, 600, brother to the above.
- Calvert, John, *Huntingdon*, 200, cousin to the above; secretary to the lord-chamberlain, and cousin to lieut.-general sir H. Calvert, adjut.-general.
- Campbell, hon. John F. *Carmarthen*, 500, eldest son of lord Cawdor, and son-in-law of the marquis of Bath.
- Campbell, right hon. lord J. D. E. H. *Argyleshire*, 220, brother to the duke of Argyle.
- Campbell, Archibald, *Dundee*.
- Campbell, A. Glyn, *Fowey*, 70, a banker in London.
- Canning, right hon. George, *Liverpool*, president of the board of control, £4000; receiver-general of alienation-office, £448. Mary and Maria Hunn, the reputed mother and sister of this right hon. gentleman, have received a pension of £500 out of the Leeward Island duties, ever since 1799.
- Carew, R. Shapland, jun. *Wexfordshire*.
- †Carroll, J. *Ross*, Ireland.
- \*Carter, John, *Portsmouth*, 110, son-in-law of William Smith, member for Norwich.
- Cartwright, William Ralph, *Northamptonshire*, brother-in-law of viscounts Howarden and Chetwynd.
- †Casberd, R. M. *Milborne-Port*; 80, a barrister-at-law.
- †Castlereagh, right hon. viscount, *Downshire*, M.R.I.A. F.R.S. son of the marquis of Londonderry, and nephew of the marquis of Hertford; secretary of state for the foreign department, £6000, commissioner for the affairs of India, £1500. For relations, see Seymours, *List of Peers*.
- Cavendish, lord G. Aug. Henry, *Derbyshire*, uncle of the duke of Devonshire.
- Cavendish, H. F. Compton, *Derby*, 700, son of the above.
- Cecil, lord Thomas, *Stamford*, 540; brother to the marquis of Exeter, cornet in the 10th hussars.
- Chamberlayne, William, *Southampton*, Treasury borough.
- Chaplain, Charles, *Lincolnshire*, 1600.
- Chichester, Arthur, *Belfast*.
- Churchill, lord Charles, *St. Albans*, 690, second son of the duke of Marlborough.
- Chute, William, *Hampshire*, son-in-law of J. Smith, esq. member for Devizes.
- Claughton, Thomas, *Newton*.
- Clerk, sir George, bart. *Edinburghshire*, 96.
- Clifford, capt. A. W. I. *Bandon-bridge*.
- Clifton, lord, *Canterbury*, 1600, son of the earl of Darnley.
- Clinton, sir W. H. *Newark*, son-in-law of the earl of Sheffield, a general and colonel of the 55th regiment.
- Clive, right hon. Edward viscount, *Ludlow*, 500, son of the earl of Powis.
- Clive, hon. R. H. ditto.
- Clive, Henry, *Montgomery*.
- Clyde, William, *Bishops Castle*, 120, uncle to the earl of Powis, proprietor of the borough.
- Cockburn, sir G. *Portsmouth*, 110, a lord of the admiralty, £1500.

*State of the Representation.*

- Cockerell, sir Charles, *Evesham*, brother-in-law to lord Northwick.
- †Cocks, hon. John Somers, *Hereford*, eldest son of lord Somers, proprietor of the borough, and son-in-law of lord Hardwicke.
- Cocks, James, *Ryegate*, 200, a banker in London, cousin to the above.
- Coffin, sir Isaac, *Lichester*, 70, admiral of the blue.
- Coke, Thomas William, *Norfolk*, brother-in-law to lord Sherborne, and father-in-law to viscount Anson.
- Coke, T. W. jun. *Derby*, 700, brother of the above.
- Colburne, N. W. R. *Thetford*, 31, next brother to sir M. W. Ridley, bart. and son-in-law to the right hon. T. Sheelie.
- Colclough, Caesar, *Wexford county*.
- Cole, hon. sir G. Lowry, *Fermanaghshire*, next brother to the earl of Enniskillen, and son-in-law of the earl of Malmesbury, a general and colonel of the 34th regiment.
- Colquhoun, right hon. Archibald, *Dumbartonshire*, 65, lord advocate for Scotland, £1447.
- Colthurst, sir Nicholas Conway, bart. *Cork*.
- †Collett, D. E. J. *Cushel*, Ireland.
- Collins, Henry P. *Taunton*, 400.
- Compton, right hon. S. J. Alwyne, earl, *Northampton*, 1300, son of the marquis of Northampton.
- Concannon, Lucius, *Appleby*.
- †Congreve, sir William, *Plymouth*, 230, comptroller of the royal laboratory, and superintendent of military works, and a pension of £1200.
- Conyngham, lord F. *Westbury*, 60, second son of the marquis of Conyngham.
- Cooper, E. S. *Sligo county*.
- †Cooper, R. B. *Gloucester*, 2200.
- †Copley, sir John, *Ashburton*, 170, solicitor-general, £3000.
- Cotes, John, *Shropshire*, son-in-law of the earl of Stamford and Warrington.
- Cotterell, sir John Geers, bart. *Herefordshire*.
- Courtenay, William, *Exeter*, 1200, brother-in-law to the earl of Rothes, commissioner of bankrupts, £350; subpoena-office court of chancery, £855.
- Courtenay, Thomas Peregrine, *Totness*, 78, brother to the above, register of the land-tax, and secretary to the India board; salary unknown. See *List of Places*.
- Coissmaker, George, *Kinsale*.
- Crabtree, right hon. Jos. Cecil, viscount, only son of the marquis of Salisbury, and commissioner to the India board, £1500.
- Crawford, J. Arthur, esq. *Old Sarum*, 7.
- Crawley, Samuel, *Honiton*, 380.
- Crickett, Robert Alexander, *Ipswich*, 720, a banker at Colchester, proprietor of the borough.
- Grippe, Joseph, *Gloucester*.
- Crompton, Samuel, *East Retford*.
- Croker, John Wilson, *Yarmouth*, a barrister at law, secretary to the widow's charity, secretary to the admiralty, £3000.
- Crosbie, James, *Kerryshire*, governor of the county of Kerry.
- Curwan, John Christian, *Carlisle*, 750.
- Curtis, sir William, bart. *Blethingly*, 80, an alderman and banker in London, and president of the artillery company.

- Curzon, hon. Robert, *Clithero*, 80, son of viscount Curzon, and son-in-law of lord Zouch.
- †Cust, hon. Edward, *Grantham*, 760, brother to earl Brownlow, captain to the fifth dragoon guards.
- †Cust, hon. P. Francis, *Honiton*, 380, brother to the above, captain in the army.
- Cust, hon. W. *Clithero*, 80, another brother, barrister at law.
- Daly, James, *Galwayshire*.
- Dalrymple, A. J. *Appelby*, eldest son of sir Hugh Dalrymple, and son-in-law of sir James Graham.
- Dashwood, sir Henry Watkins, *Woodstock*, 200, father-in-law of the marquis of Ely, and one of the gentlemen of the king's privy chamber.
- Davenport, Davies, *Cheshire*, commander of the Macclesfield volunteer foresters.
- Davis, Richard Hart, *Bristol*, 6000, a banker in Bristol.
- Davies, Thomas H. *Worcester*, 200, a colonel.
- Dawkins, James, *Hastings*, 12.
- Dawson, George Robert, *Londonderry county*, brother-in-law to R. Peel.
- \*De Crespigny, sir W. C. bart. *Southampton*, 800.
- De Hochepeid, George, *Stockbridge*, father-in-law to earl Grosvenor, a general in the army.
- Deerhurst, viscount, *Worcester*, eldest son of the earl of Coventry.
- Dennison, William Joseph, *Surrey county*.
- \*Denman, Thomas, *Wareham*, a barrister at law.
- Dent, John, *Poole*, 95, a banker in London.
- Dickinson, William, *Somersetshire*, a barrister at law.
- Donally, lord, *Oakhampton*, 22, brother to the hon. W. Bagwell, muster-master-general in Ireland.
- Domville, sir Comp. bart. *Bossiney*.
- Don, sir Alexander, *Roxburghshire*, 81.
- Dottin, A. R. *Gatton*.
- Douglas, hon. F. S. N. *Banbury*, 19, only son of lord Glenberrie, and nephew to the earl of Guildford. Lord Glenberrie's pensions and places to the amount of £4200, part of which the son holds in reversion.
- Douglas, William Rubeck Keeth, *Dumfries*, brother to the marquis of Queensberry.
- Douglas, John, *Oxford*, 20.
- Doveton, Gabriel, *Lancaster*, 1600, major-general in the East India service.
- Dowdeswell, John Edmond, *Tewkesbury*, 500, commissioner of bankrupts, £350.
- Drake, W. T. *Agmondsdeham*, 125, a major in the army.
- Drake, Thomas, T. *Agmondsdeham*, a captain in the army.
- Drummond, George Harley, *Kincardineshire*, a banker in London.
- Drummond, James, *Perthshire*, 145, son-in-law of the duke of Athol.
- Dugdale, Stratford Stratford, *Warwickshire*, son-in-law to viscount Curzon.
- Duncannon, viscount, *Malton*, 400, son of the earl of Bebborough, and son-in-law of the earl of Westmoreland.
- Duncombe, Charles, *Newport*.
- †Dundas, right hon. William, *Edinburgh*, cousin of viscount Melville, register of seigns, £2269.
- Dundas, right hon. G. H. L. C. *Orkney*.

## State of the Representation.

- \*Dundas, Charles, *Berkshire*, cousin of lord Dundas, counsellor to the Prince of Wales, in Scotland.
- \*Dundas, Thomas, esq. *Richmond*, 270, grandson of the above.
- Dundas, hon. Lawrence, *York*, 3000, father of the above, and eldest son of lord Dundas.
- Dunlop, James, *Kirkcudbright*, 155, a lieutenant-general.
- \*Ebrington, right hon. Hugh, viscount, *Devonshire*, son of earl Fortescue.
- Edmonstone, sir Charles, *Stirlingshire*, 56, uncle-in-law of lord Hatham.
- Egerton, Wilbraham, *Cheshire*, nephew to the member for Clithero.
- †Eliot, hon. William, *Liskeard*, 24, brother to the earl of St. Germain, and brother-in-law to the marquis of Stafford; a lord of the trade and treasury, £1600.
- Ellice, Edward, *Covenry*, 2500, a merchant in London, and brother-in-law to earl Grey.
- Ellis, Charles Rose, *Seaford*, 120, father of lord Howard de Walden.
- Ellison, Cuthbert, *Newcastle upon Tyne*, 250.
- Ellison, Richard, *Wootton Bassett*, 250.
- Estcourt, T. G. *Devizes*, 60, joint proprietor of the borough, nephew to viscount Sidmouth; and brother to E. Estcourt, late solicitor to the stamp-office, who retired before 1809 on a pension of £1200.
- Euston, H. Fitzroy, earl of, *St. Edmundsbury*.
- Evans, William, *East Retford*.
- Evans, capt. Henry, *Wexford*.
- Fane, John Thomas, *Lyme Regis*, 31, a major in the army.
- †Fane, John, *Oxfordshire*, brother-in-law to the earl of Macclesfield, and cousin to the earl of Westmoreland.
- †Fane, Vere, *Lyme Regis*, 31.
- Farrand, Robert, *Heydon*, 120.
- Fazakerley, John Nicholas, *Grimsby*, 290.
- \*Fellows, hon. Newton, *Andover*, 24, only brother to the earl of Portsmouth.
- Fellows, William Henry, *Huntingdonshire*, first cousin to the earl of Portsmouth.
- \*Ferguson, James, *Aberdeenshire*, 158, an advocate at the Scots bar and lord rector of king's college, Aberdeen.
- Ferguson, sir R. C. *Kirkaldy*, 4, lieutenant-general, and colonel of the Sicilian regiment of foot.
- Fetherston, sir Thomas, bart. *Longfordshire*, George and John Fetherston have in trust for the six daughters of the baronet, and the survivor, a pension, dated February, 1806, of £300.
- Finch, hon. Edward, *Cambridge*, 240, uncle of the earl of Aylesbury; a lieutenant-general and colonel of the 22d regiment, and groom of the king's bed-chamber, £500.
- †Finlay, Kirkman, *Malmsbury*, 13.
- †Fitzgerald, right hon. Vesey, *Clare-county*, eldest son of the right hon. James Fitzgerald; lord of the treasury, £1500.
- Fitzgerald, right hon. Maurice, *Kerryshire*, knight of Kerry, a privy-counsellor in Ireland.
- Fitzgerald, lord William Charles, *Kildareshire*, next brother to the duke of Leicester.

- Fitzgibbon, hon. R. *Limerickshire*, only brother to the earl of Eglinton, cashier to the court of exchequer.
- Fitzharris, James E. Harris, viscount, *Wilton*, 20, eldest son of the earl of Malmsbury, governor of the Isle of Wight.
- Fitzhugh, William, *Tiverton*, 24, a relation of lord Harrowby, a barrister at law.
- \*Fitzroy, lord Charles, *Thetford*, 31, a younger brother of the duke of Grafton.
- Fleming, John, M.D. *Gatton*, 30.
- \*Foley, Thomas, *Droitwich*, 40, lieut.-col. in the army, relation of lord Foley.
- Folkes, sir Martin Browne, bart. *King's Lynn*.
- Folkestone, right hon. William Pleydell, viscount, *New Sarum*, 50, son of the earl of Radnor.
- Forbes, right hon. George John, viscount, *Longfordshire*, son of the earl of Gronard, nephew of the marquis of Hastings, a colonel in the army, and aid-de-camp to the Prince Regent.
- Forbes, Charles, *Malmsbury*, 13.
- Forester, Cecil Weld, *Wenlock*, 110, brother-in-law to the duke of Rutland, proprietor of the borough.
- Foster, right hon. John, *Louthshire*, formerly speaker of the Irish House of Commons, pension, £5038.
- Foster, John Leslie, *Armagh*, king's advocate-general in Ireland.
- Frankland, Robert, *Thirsk*, 50, only son of sir T. Frankland, bart.
- Freemantle, William Henry, *Buckingham*, 13, joint resident secretary in Great Britain to the lord-lieutenant of Ireland, £638, one of the joint solicitors in Great Britain, £391.
- French, Arthur, *Roscommonshire*.
- Fynes, Henry, *Aldborough*, 64, a relation to the duke of Newcastle, proprietor of the borough, a barrister at law.
- Garvagh, lord, *Petersfield*.
- Gascoyne, Isaac, *Liverpool*, 2600, a general and colonel of the 54th regiment.
- Gaskell, Benjamin, *Maldon*, 800.
- †Gifford, sir Robert, *Eye*, 100, attorney-general, £6000. The total emoluments of this office, from excise informations and other sources, are immense.
- †Gilbert, Davies G. *Bodmyn*, 36.
- Gipps, George, *Ripon*, 146.
- Gladstone, John, *Lancaster*, 1600, a merchant and banker.
- Glerawley, viscount, *Downpatrick*, eldest son of the earl of Annesley.
- Gooch, Thomas Sherlock, *Suffolk*, eldest son of sir T. Gooch, brother-in-law to lord Rous.
- Gordon, John, *Athlone*.
- Gordon, Robert, *Cricklade*.
- †Goulburn, Henry, *West Looe*, 55, nephew of viscount Chetwynd, under secretary of state for the war-department.
- Gower, right hon. George G. earl, *Staffordshire*, son of the marquis of Stafford.
- Graham, sir James, *Carlisle*, 750, recorder of Appleby, formerly an eminent conveyancer.



*State of the Representation.*

Graham, J. R., *G. Hull*, 1800.

\*Graham, Sandford, *Ludgershall*, only son of sir James Graham, M.P. for Carlisle.

Graham, Thomas, *Kinross county*.

Grant, right hon. Charles, *Invernesshire*, 3, lord of the treasury, £1600.

Grant, Alexander, *Lostwithiel*, son of Sir A. Grant.

Grant, Francis William, *Elgin county*, brother to the member for Inverness.

†Grant, Robert, *ditto*.

Grant, George M'Pherson, *Sutherlandshire*, 35.

Grant, J. P. *Tavistock*, a barrister at law, and advocate at the Scots' bar.

Grattan, right hon. Henry, *Dublin*, a privy counsellor in Ireland. Mr.

Grattan received a present of £50,000 from his grateful countrymen for exertions in defence of the liberties of Ireland.

†Graves, lord, *New Windsor*, 420, brother-in-law to the marquis of Anglesey; comptroller of the household to the duke of Sussex; lord of the bed-chamber to the king, £1000.

Grenfell, Pascoe, *Marlow*, 216, brother-in-law to viscount Doneraile and to lord Riversdale.

Greville, hon. sir Charles, *Warwick*, 350; colonel in the army, and lieutenant-colonel of the 38th regiment of foot.

Griffith, John Wynne, *Denbigh*, 560.

Grosvenor, Thomas, *Chester*, 1200, cousin to earl Grosvenor, patron of the borough; lieutenant-general in the army, and colonel of the 65th regiment.

Grosvenor, R. E. Drax, *New Romney*, 17.

Guise, sir Berkeley William, *Gloucestershire*.

Gurney, Hudson, *Newtown*, 33.

\*Gurney, Richard Hanbury, *Norwich*.

Hamilton, lord Archibald, *Lanarkshire*, 148, second son of the duke of Hamilton.

Hamilton, Hans, *Dublinshire*, a governor of the county.

Harcourt, John, *Leominster*, 700.

Hare, hon. Richard, *Corkshire*, eldest son of viscount Ennismore, and brother-in-law of lord Clonbrock.

†Hart, George Vaughan, *Donegalshire*, a lieutenant-general.

Harvey, Charles, *Carlou*, a barrister-at-law.

\*Harvey, Daniel Whittle, *Colchester*, 1560.

Hawkins, sir Charles, bart. *Penryn*, 140.

Heathcote, sir Gilbert, bart. *Rutlandshire*.

Heathcote, Thomas Freeman, *Hampshire*, eldest son of sir William Heathcote, bart.

†Heygate, William, *Sudbury*, 800, an alderman and banker in London.

Hill, lord Arthur, *Downshire*, next brother to the marquis of Downshire; general in the army, and a captain in the 2d regiment of dragoons.

Hill, right hon. sir George Fitzgerald, *Londonderry*; recorder of Londonderry, £60, a clerk of the Irish-house, £2265, and a lord of the treasury, £1600.

Hodson, John, *Wigan*, 60.

Holdsforth, Arthur Howe, *Dartmouth*, 40, governor of Dartmouth castle, £182.

## State of the Representation.

- † Holdford, George Peter, *Hastings*.  
 Holmes, sir L. Thomas Worsley, *Newport, Hants*, 24.  
 † Holmes, William, *Totness*, 58.  
 Homfray, Samuel, *Stafford*, 600.  
 Honeywood, W. P. *Kent county*.  
 Hope, sir Alexander, *Linlithgowshire*, 62, half-brother to the earl of Hopetown; a general in the army, colonel of the 74th regiment, and a governor of the royal military college.  
 Hope, sir William Johnson, *Dumfriesshire*, rear admiral of the red.  
 Hornby, Edmund, *Preston*, 2200, nephew to the earl of Derby.  
 Horrocks, Samuel, *Ditto*, a merchant and manufacturer in Lancashire.  
 Houblon, John Archer, *Essex*.  
 Houldsworth, Thomas, *Pontefract*, 600.  
 Houston, Alexander, *Glasgow*.  
 Howard, hon. William, *Morpeth*, 200, second son of the earl of Carlisle.  
 Howard, lord H. T. M. *Arundel*, 450, brother to the duke of Norfolk.  
 Howard, hon. Fulke Grenville, *Castle Rising*, 50, brother to viscount Templetown, brother-in-law to the earl of Bristol, and a colonel in the army.  
 Howorth, Humphrey, *Evesham*, 600.  
 Hudson, Harrington, *Hellestone*, 36.  
 Hughes, William Lewis, *Wallingford*, 140.  
 Hulse, sir Charles, *West Looe*, 145.  
 \*Hume, Joseph, *Montrose*.  
 Hurst, Robert, *Horsham*, 24, a barrister-at-law.  
 † Huskisson, right hon. William, *Chichester*, 620; commissioner of woods, forests, and land-owners, colonial agent for Ceylon, £700; a pension from May, 1801, of £1200, with a pension to his wife on his death of £615.  
 Hutchinson, hon. Christopher H. *Cork*, brother of the earl of Donoughmore, and lord Hutchinson, and sir N. C. Colchurst.  
 Innes, sir Hugh, bart. *Dingwall*.  
 † Innes, John, *Grampound*, 160.  
 † Irving, John, *Bramber*, 20, a merchant in London.  
 Jackson, sir John, bart. *Dover*, 1200, a merchant in London, a director of the East India company.  
 Jenkinson, hon. Charles Cecil Hope, *East Grinstead*, 120, half-brother to the earl of Liverpool, formerly under secretary of state in the home department.  
 Jocelyn, right hon. Robert, viscount, *Louthshire*, son to the earl of Roden, and son-in-law of lord Le Despencer; vice-chamberlain to the king, £1158, joint auditor-general in the Irish treasury, December 1800, £1784.  
 Jolliffe, Hylton, *Petersfield*, 154, proprietor of the borough.  
 Jones, sir Thomas John Tyrwhitt, *Bridgenorth*, 750.  
 \*Kennedy, Thomas Francis, *Ayr, Irvine, &c.*  
 Kerrison, sir Edward, *Northampton*, a colonel in the army, and lieutenant-colonel of the 7th regiment of dragoon guards.  
 King, sir John Dashwood, bart. *Wycombe*, 65.  
 Kiely, John, *Clontmell*.  
 Kingsborough, viscount, *Cork county*, eldest son of the earl of Kingston.  
 † Kinnersly, William Shepherd, *Newcastle-under-Line*, 660.

## State of the Representation.

- Knatchbull, sir Edward, bart. *Kent*.
- Knox, hon. Thomas, *Dungannon*, grandson of viscount Northland, and son-in-law of the bishop of Armagh; joint prothonotary of the common-pleas in Ireland. His brother, the hon J. Vesey Knox, is the other joint prothonotary, with a like salary, granted July 1794.
- Lamb, hon. William, *Peterborough*, 460, eldest son of viscount Melbourne, and son-in-law of the earl of Besborough.
- \*Lamb, hon. George, *Westminster*, 14,000 brother of the above.
- Lamb, T. Davies, *Rye*, 8.
- Lambton, hon. George, *Durham county*, son-in-law to earl Grey.
- Langton, William Gore, *Somersetshire*.
- Lascelles, right hon. Henry, earl, *Northallerton*, 200, only son of the earl of Harewood, lord-lieutenant of the West-Riding of Yorkshire.
- Latouche, John, *Leitrimshire*, a banker in Dublin.
- Latouche, Robert, *Kildareshire*; brother-in-law of the earl of Clancarty.
- †Lawson, Marmaduke, *Boroughbridge*, 60.
- Leake, William, *Medshall*.
- Lefevre, Charles Shaw, *Reading*, 700, recorder of Basingstoke, a director of the Sun-fire office.
- †Legh, Thomas, *Newton*, 60, proprietor of the borough.
- Leigh, James Henry, *Winchester*, brother-in-law to lord Say and Sele, and nephew to the late duke of Chandos.
- Leigh, sir Robert Holt, bart. *Wigan*, 100.
- \*Lemon, sir William, bart. *Cornwall*.
- Leslie, Charles Powel, *Monaghan*, governor of this county, and a trustee of the linen manufacture.
- Lester, Benjamin Lester, *Poole*, 95, mayor of this borough.
- †Lewis, Thomas Frankland, *Beaumaris*, 24.
- Littleton, Edward John, *Staffordshire*.
- Lloyd, James Martin, *New Shoreham*, 1650, lieutenant-col. of the militia.
- \*Lloyd, sir Edward Pryce, *Flint*, 4.
- Lloyd, Samuel Jones, *Hythe*, 40.
- Lockhart, William Elliot, *Selkirkshire*, 40, advocate.
- †Long, right hon. Charles, *Haslemere*, 60; commissioner for the erection of national monuments, director of Greenwich hospital; a pension, dated February 1801, £1500; joint paymaster of the forces, £2000; also a pension of £750 to Mrs. Long on his death.
- \*Longman, George, *Maidstone*, 650.
- Lovaine, right hon. George, *Beralstone*, 100, son of the earl of Beverley, proprietor of the borough, nephew of the duke of Northumberland.
- Lowndes, W. Selby, *Buckinghamshire*.
- †Lowther, right hon. William, viscount, *Westmorland*, second son of the earl of Lonsdale; a lord of the treasury, £1600; commissioner for the affairs of India, £1500.
- Lowther, hon. Henry Cecil, *Westmorland*, second son of the earl of Lonsdale; major of the 10th regiment of dragoons.
- Lowther, John, *Cumberland*, brother to the earl of Lonsdale.
- Lowther, John Henry, *Cockermouth*, 180, relation to the above.
- Lubbock, sir John William, bart. *Leominster*, 800, a banker in London.
- Lushington, Stephen Rumbold, *Canterbury*, 1000, son-in-law of lord Harris; joint secretary to the treasury, £3000.

## State of the Representation.

- Infirrally**, John Fownes, *Minthead*, 160, a relation of the earl of Carlisle, and proprietor of the borough.
- Luttrell**, Henry Fownes, *Minthead*, 160, brother to the above.
- Lyttleton**, hon. William Henry, *Worcestershire*, half-brother to lord Lyttleton, and son-in-law of earl Spencer.
- Maberly**, John, *Rye*, 8.
- Maberly**, W. L. *Westbury*, 60.
- Macdonald**, James, *Calne*, 17, eldest son of sir Archibald Macdonald, bart. (who has a pension of £3300 a year) and nephew of the marquis of Stafford; one of the clerks of the privy seal, £358.
- Macdonald**, Ronald George, *Plympton*, 40, son-in-law of the earl of Mount Edgecumbe; patron of the borough.
- Mackenzie**, Thomas, *Ross county*.
- Mackinnon**, W. A. *Dunwich*, 20.
- Mackintosh**, sir James, *Knaresborough*, 110, late recorder at Bombay; professor of general polity and the English laws at the East India college.
- Macnaughton**, Edmund Alexander, *Oxford*, 20, a lord of the treasury in Ireland, £1200.
- † **Macqueen**, Thomas Peter, *East-Looe*, 21.
- **Maddocks**, William Alexander, *Boston*, 400.
- Magenis**, Richard, sen. *Enniskillen*, brother-in-law of the earl of Enniskillen.
- Mahon**, hon. Stephen, *Roscommonshire*, second son of lord Hartland; a major-general.
- Maitland**, James Maitland, viscount, *Richmond*, 270, eldest son of the earl of Lauderdale.
- Maitland**, Ebenezer Fuller, *Wallingford*, 140.
- Manners**, lord Charles Somerset, *Cambridgeshire*, next brother to the duke of Rutland; colonel in the army, lieutenant-colonel of the 3d regiment of dragoons, and extra aide-de-camp to the Prince Regent.
- Manners**, lord Robert William, *Leicestershire*, brother to the above, lieutenant-colonel of the 10th regiment of dragoons.
- Manners**, Robert, *Cambridge*, 240; a general, colonel of the 60th regiment, clerk-marshal and first equerry to the king, £736.
- Manning**, William, *Lymington*, a merchant and banker in London; a Bank director.
- Mason**, sir John, bart. *Berwickshire*, Scotland.
- Marryatt**, Joseph, *Sandwich*, 500, a merchant in London, and agent for Grenada.
- \* **Martin**, sir Thomas Byam, *Plymouth*, 230; a rear-admiral.
- \* **Martin**, John, *Tewkesbury*, 500; a banker in London.
- **Martin**, Richard, *Galwayshire*.
- Maule**, hon. William Ramsay, *Forfarshire*, 92, brother to the earl of Dalhousie.
- \* **Maxwell**, John, jun. *Renfrewshire*.
- † **Mellish**, William, *Middlesex*, 9000; a director of the Bank of England.
- Merest**, John William Drage, *Ilchester*, 70.
- Methuen**, Paul Cobb, *Wiltshire*, brother-in-law to sir H. Mildmay, bart.
- Mildmay**, sir Henry Carew St. John, bart. *Winchester*, 60.
- Miles**, William, *Chippenham*, 135.

## State of the Representation.

- Mills**, Charles, *Warwick*, 530; a commissioner to the lieutenantcy in London, and assistant to the corporation for smelting lead.
- Mills**, George, *Winchester*, 17.
- Milton**, right hon. Charles Williams, (Wentworth-Fitzwilliam,) viscount, *Yorkshire*, 22,300, only son of earl Fitzwilliam, and son-in-law of lord Dundas; an alderman of York.
- Mitchell**, John, *Kingston-upon-Hull*, 1700.
- Monck**, sir Charles Miles Lambert, bart. *Northumberland*, 200.
- Money**, William Taylor, *Wootton Bassett*, 250.
- Montgomeryshire**, sir James, *Peebleshire*, 37; advocate, keeper of the great seal to the Prince of Wales; presenter of signatures in the exchequer court of Scotland, £200.
- Montgomeryshire**, James, *Ayrshire*, a general in the army, and colonel of the 74th regiment of foot.
- \***Moore**, Peter, *Coventry*, 2500.
- Moorson**, sir Robert, *Queensborough*, 131, a vice-admiral of the blue; surveyor-general of the ordnance.
- Mordant**, sir Charles, *Warwickshire*.
- Morgan**, sir Charles, bart. *Monmouthshire*.
- Morgan**, George Gould, *Brecon*, 300, eldest son of the above.
- Morland**, sir Scrope Bernard, *St. Mawes*, 22, brother to sir T. Bernard, bart. a banker in Westminster.
- Morpeth**, right hon. George, (Howard,) viscount, *Cumberland*, son of the earl of Carlisle, and brother-in-law to the duke of Devonshire.
- Morritt**, John Bacon Saverey, F.S.A. *Shaftesbury*, 300.
- Mostyn**, sir Thomas, bart. *Flintshire*.
- Mountcharles**, Henry Joseph Conyngham, earl, *Donegalshire*; eldest son of the marquis of Conyngham.
- Mundy**, George, *Boroughbridge*, 60, brother to the duchess of Newcastle, a captain in the royal navy.
- Mundy**, Edward Miller, *Derbyshire*, father-in-law of the duke of Newcastle.
- Neale**, Sir Harry Burrard, *Lymington*, 18, K.C.B. a vice-admiral of the blue.
- Needham**, sir H. B. *Newry*, a general, and colonel of the 86th regiment.
- Neville**, hon. Richard Neville, *Berkshire*, eldest son of lord Braybrooke, and nephew of lord Grenville.
- Newman**, Robert William, *Exeter*, 1500.
- Newport**, right hon. sir John, bart. *Waterford*, a privy counsellor of Ireland.
- Newton**, William, *Ipswich*, 720.
- Nicholl**, right hon. sir John, knt. *Bedwin*, 80, a lord of trade and plantations; official principal of the court of arches, £5000.
- Noel**, sir Gerald Noel, *Rutlandshire*, husband of baroness Barham.
- \***North**, Dudley, *Jedburghshire*, son-in-law of lord Yarborough, and brother-in-law to the members for Newton and Lincolnshire.
- \***Nugent**, right hon. George, (Grenville,) *Aylesbury*, 1200, only brother to the marquis of Buckingham, and nephew to lord Grenville.
- Nugent**, sir George, *Buckingham*, 17, a general in the army, colonel of the 6th regiment of foot, and governor of St. Mawes.
- O'Brien**, sir Edward, bart. *Clare county*.
- O'Callaghan**, James, *Fragony*, 180.
- Ogle**, Henry Meade, *Drogheda*.

*State of the Representation.*

- O'Hara, Charles, *Sligo*, one of the governors of the county of Sligo.
- O'Neil, hon. John Richard Bruce, *Antrim*, only brother of earl O'Neil; a colonel in the army, and a captain in the Coldstream regiment of guards.
- †Ommaney, Francis Molyneux, *Barnstaple*, 380, a navy agent.
- Onslow, Arthur, *Guildford*, 200, a king's sergeant; pension for the lives of himself and son, £3000.
- Ord, William, *Morpeth*, 200, son-in-law of Mr. Creevy, late member for Thetford.
- \*Osborne, lord Francis Godolphin, *Cambridgeshire*, brother to the duke of Leeds, and brother-in-law to lord Auckland.
- †Osborne, sir John, bart. *Bedfordshire*, a lord of the admiralty, £1500.
- Owen, sir John, bart. *Pembrokeshire*.
- Paget, hon. Berkeley, *Anglesey*, younger brother of the marquis of Anglesey; a lord of the treasury, £1600.
- Paget, hon. Charles, *Carnarvon*, 700, brother to the above, a captain in the royal navy.
- Paget, hon. sir Edward, *Milborne-Port*, 80, brother to the above, and brother-in-law to the earl of Dartmouth, a lieutenant-general, and colonel of the 28th regiment; a groom of the king's bed-chamber, £500.
- Palk, sir Lawrence Vaughan, *Ashburton*, 170, patron of the borough.
- Palmier, Charles, *Bath*, 30, a colonel in the army, and aide-de-camp to the Prince Regent. John Palmer, esq. father of this member, receives a pension from the post-office of £3000.
- \*Palmer, Charles Fyshe, *Reading*, 700.
- †Palmerston, Henry John Temple, viscount, *Cambridge University*, secretary at war, £2480.
- \*Pares, Thomas, jun. *Leicester*, 1600, a barrister-at-law.
- Parnell, sir Henry, *Queen's County*, brother-in-law of the earl of Portarlington. The hon. Joseph Dawson, a relation of sir Henry, has a pension of £200.
- Parnell, William, *Wicklow*.
- Parsons, John, *King's county*.
- †Pearse, John, *Devizes*, 40.
- Pechell, sir Thomas Brooke, bart. *Downton*, 21, a major-general.
- Peel, sir Robert, *Tamworth*, 500, joint proprietor of the borough, a merchant and manufacturer in Lancashire.
- Peel, right hon. Robert, *Oxford University*, eldest son of the above; a lord of the treasury, and privy counsellor in Ireland, £1200; principal secretary to the lord-lieutenant of Ireland, £6000.
- Peel, William Yates, *Tamworth*, 500, brother to the above.
- Pierse, Henry, *Northallerton*, 200, related to lord Monson.
- Pelham, hon. Charles Anderson, *Lincolnshire*, eldest son of lord Yarborough.
- Pelham, hon. George Anderson, *Newtown*, 33, brother to the above.
- Pellew, hon. Pownall Bastard Pellew, *Launceston*, 15, eldest son of viscount Exmouth, a captain in the navy.
- Perceval, Spencer, *Ennis*, eldest son of the late Mr. Perceval; one of the tellers of the exchequer, £2700. Of this member, it is enough to say, that his maiden speech was rapturously applauded by the immaculate lord Castlereagh. His mother, the hon. lady Perceval, (now Carr,) a pension of £2000.

*State of the Representation.*

- †Percy, hon. Jocelyn, *Beralston*, 100, brother to lord Lovaine, the other member, nephew to the duke of Northumberland, a captain in the navy.
- Perring, sir John, bart. *Hythe*, 126, an alderman and banker in London, president of the city of London Lying-in hospital.
- †Phillimore, Joseph, *St. Mawes*, 20, professor of civil law, and chancellor of the diocese of Oxford.
- \*Phillips, Charles Marsh, *Leicestershire*.
- Phillips, George, *Steyning*, 110.
- Phillips, George Richard, *Horsham*, 25.
- Phipps, hon. Constant, *Scarborough*, 44, eldest son of the earl of Mulgrave, late master-general of the ordnance.
- †Phipps, hon. Edmund, *Queenborough*, 170, nephew of the above, colonel of the 60th regiment of foot; clerk of the deliveries of the ordnance, £1015.
- Piggott, sir Arthur, *Arundel*, a king's counsel; late attorney-general.
- Pitt, Joseph, *Cricklade*, 1200, a banker at Cirencester.
- †Pitt, William Morton, *Dorsetshire*, father-in-law of the earl of Romney, brother-in-law to lord Gambier, and a cousin to lord Rivers.
- Plumer, William, *Higham-Ferrars*, 40.
- Plunkett, right hon. William Conyngham, *Dublin University*, a privy counsellor in Ireland, a barrister-at-law.
- Pocock, George, *Bridgewater*, 400, brother-in-law of earl Poulett.
- Pole, right hon. William Wellesley, *Queen's county*, brother to marquis Wellesley and the duke of Wellington; a governor of the county and a privy counsellor in Ireland; master and worker of the mint, £10,350; joint remembrancer of the court of exchequer in Ireland, £2100. Another brother of this family, the hon. Gerard V. Wellesley, is rector of Chelsea, and vicar of West-Ham, £1300.
- Pole, sir Peter, bart. *Yarmouth*, a banker in London.
- Pollington, right hon. John, (Saville,) viscount, *Pontefract*, 450, son of the earl of Mexborough, and son-in-law of the earl of Hardwicke.
- \*Ponsonby, hon. Frederick Cavendish, *Kilkennyshire*, second son of the earl of Besborough, and nephew of earl Spencer; a colonel in the army, lieutenant-colonel of the 12th regiment of dragoons, and an extra aide-de-camp to the Prince Regent.
- Portman, Edward Berkeley, *Dorsetshire*, son-in-law to lord Dormer.
- Powell, John Kynaston, *Shropshire*, high-steward of Oswestry.
- †Powell, William Edward, *Cardiganshire*.
- Power, Richard, *Waterfordshire*.
- Powlett, hon. William John Frederick Vane, *Durham county*, second son of the earl of Darlington, son-in-law of the earl of Lonsdale, and brother to lord Barnard.
- Price, Richard, *Radnor*, 1150.
- \*Price, Robert, *Herefordshire*.
- Primrose, hon. W. F. *Stirling*, brother of the earl of Roseberry.
- †Pringle, sir William Henry, *Leckard*, 105, nephew-in-law of the earl of St. Germain's; a major-general, and colonel of the 64th regiment.
- Prittie, hon. Francis Aldborough, *Tipperary*, only brother to lord Donnelly, and son-in-law of the hon. George Ponsonby, *custos rotularum* of the county.

- Proby, hon. Granville Levison, *Wicklowshire*, son of the earl of Carysfort, a captain in the navy.
- Protheroe, Edward, *Bristol*, 6000.
- Pryse, Pryse, *Cardigan*, 1460.
- † Raine, Jonathan, *Newport*, 62, a king's counsel.
- † Ramsbottom, John, jun: *Windsor*, 300, a banker in London.
- Ramsden, John Charles, *Malton*, 400, eldest son of sir John Ramsden, bart. and son-in-law of lord Dundas.
- Rancliffe, right hon. Geo. Aug. Henry Anne, (Parkins,) lord, *Nottingham*, 3200, an Irish baron, son-in-law of the earl of Granard, a captain in the army.
- Richardson, William, *Armaghshire*, a trustee of the linen manufacture.
- \* Ricardo, David, *Portarlinton*.
- Rickford, William, *Aylesbury*, 600, a banker of this borough.
- Ridley, sir Matthew White, bart. *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, 2500, a banker of this town. His brother, the Rev. H. Ridley, a prebendary of Gloucester, £300.
- \* Robarts, A. W. *Maidstone*, a banker in London.
- Robarts, W. Tierney, *St. Albans*, brother to the above.
- \* Roberts, W. A. *Bewdley*, 13, a banker in this town.
- Robertson, Alexander, *Grampound*.
- † Robinson, right hon. Frederick John, *Ripon*, 146, brother of lord Grantham; vice-president of the board of trade and plantations, treasurer of the navy, £2000.
- Robinson, John, *Bishop's Castle*, 60, brother-in-law to the earl of Powis, patron of the borough; a lieutenant-general in the army, and colonel-commandant of the 60th regiment.
- † Robinson, sir Christopher, *Callington*, the king's advocate-general.
- Rochfort, Gustavus Hume, *Westmeath*.
- † Rocksavage, Jas. H. Cholmondeley, earl of, *Castle Rising*, eldest son of the marquis Cholmondeley.
- Rose, right hon. George Henry, *Christchurch*, 24, son of the late right hon. Geo. Rose, the famous placeman and sinecurist; clerk of parliaments, (sinecure,) £4946; ambassador at Berlin, £3379.
- Rowley, sir Wm. *Suffolk*.
- Rumbold, Charles Edmund, *Yarmouth*, 1140, uncle to sir W. Rumbold, bart.
- \* Russell, lord George William, *Bedford*, second son of the duke of Bedford, a lieutenant-colonel in the army.
- Russell, lord John, *Tavistock*, 110, third son of the duke of Bedford, patron of the borough.
- Russell, Matthew, *Saltash*, 36.
- Rider, right hon. Richard, *Tiverton*, 24, brother of the earl of Harrowby; joint-registrar of the consistory-court, £180; judge-advocate-general, £4280; a Welsh judge, £600:—total £5060.
- St. John, hon. Frederic, *Oxford*, only brother to viscount Bolingbroke, and brother-in-law to the earl of Craven, a general in the army.
- St. Paul, sir Horace David Cholwell, *Bridport*, 250, pension £600.
- St. Paul, Henry Heneage, *Berwick*, 800, brother to the above.
- Savile, Albany, *Oakhampton*, 220, recorder of Oakhampton.
- Scarlett, John, *Peterborough*, a king's counsel.
- † Scott, right hon. sir William, *Oxford University*, 1200, eldest brother



## State of the Representation.

to lord Eldon, and father-in-law to the marquis of Sligo; judge of the admiralty-court, £6524; judge of the consistory-court, £180. See Eldon, *List of Places*.

†Scott, hon. William Henry John, *Heytesbury*, 50, only son of lord Eldon, commissioner of bankrupts, £350.

Scott, Samuel, *Whitchurch*.

Scourfield, William Henry, *Haverfordwest*.

Sebright, sir John Saunders, *Hertfordshire*.

Sefton, right hon. William Philip, (Molyneux,) earl of, *Droitwich*, 40, an Irish earl, and brother-in-law of the earl of Craven.

Seymour, lord Robert, *Carmarthenshire*, uncle of lord Castlereagh, brother to the marquis of Hertford, and brother-in-law to viscount Chetwynd.

Joint prothonotary in the court of king's bench, in Ireland £6250

Joint clerk of the crown ..... 1213

Joint keeper of declarations, &c. .... 552

Crane and wharfinger ..... 1930

All these are sinecures or offices executed by deputy. See

*List of Places*.

†Seymour, Horace, *Lisburne*, a captain 1st regiment of life-guards.

†Seymour, Hugh, *Antrobusshire*, nephew to the marquis of Hertford and son-in-law of the marquis of Cholmondeley.

Shaw, Robert, *Dublin*, a merchant and banker in London.

†Shefferson, Ralph, *Wilton*, 20.

Shelley, sir John, bart. *Lewes*, 320.

Shepherd, sir Samuel, *Dorchester*, 200, late attorney-general, lord chief baron of exchequer, Scotland, £4000.

Shepherd, John Henry, *Shaftesbury*, 300, son of the above.

Shiffner, sir George, *Lewes*, 320.

Sibthorpe, Copingsby Waldo, *Lincoln*, 1260, lieut.-col. of the south Lincoln militia.

Simpson, hon. John Bridgeman, *Wentlock*, 110, brother to the earl of Bradford.

†Sinclair, George, *Caithness county*.

Singleton, Mark, *Eye*, 200, brother-in-law to marquis Cornwallis, principal store-keeper of the ordnance, £1863.

Smith, hon. Robert, *Wendover*, 100, brother of lord Carrington, late advocate-general at Bengal.

Smith, hon. George, *Wendover*, 100, brother to the above, a banker in London, and director of the East-India Company.

Smith, Samuel, *Midhurst*, 18, brother to the above, a banker in London.

Smith, John, *Midhurst*, 18, brother to the above, a banker in London.

Smith, T. Ashton, *Andover*, 24.

Smith, William Henry, *Norwich*, 3000, a merchant in London.

Smith, T. H. *Cambridge University*, 1200, son-in-law to the duke of Devonshire.

Sneyd, Nathaniel, *Cavanshire*, custos rotulorum of the county, a merchant in Dublin, deputy governor of the bank of Ireland.

*Anne Sneyd, his wife, a pension, Aug. 1809, £400. Elizabeth Sneyd, pension, Sept. 1793, £336. Thomas Baugh, a relation, a pension, Oct. 1812,*

- Anne Baugh, his wife, a pension of £200. It were curious to know the history of Nathaniel Sneyd's public services.*
- Somerset, lord Robert Edward Henry, *Gloucestershire*, brother to the duke of Beaufort, and brother-in-law of Viscount Courtney; a major-gen. and first lieutenant-colonel of the 4th regiment of dragoons, joint deputy paymaster of the forces, £500.
- Somerset, lord G. C. Henry, *Monmouthshire*, second son of the duke of Beaufort, joint paymaster of the forces, £2000.
- † Somerset, lord Fitzroy J. Henry, *Truro*, 26, brother to the above, colonel in the army.
- Somerville, sir Morcas, bart. *Meathshire*.
- Sotherton, F. Frank, *Nottinghamshire*, rear-admiral of the red.
- \* Spencer, lord Robert, *Woodstock*, uncle to the duke of Marlborough and lord Churchill, and great uncle to the members for Chippenham and St. Albans.
- Stanley, right hon. Edward, lord, *Lancashire*, son of the earl of Derby.
- † Staunton, sir George Thomas, *St. Michael*.
- Stephens, Samuel, *St. Ives*, 190.
- Stewart, hon. Alexander, *Londonderry*, brother to the marquis of Londonderry, and son-in-law of the marquis of Drogheda.
- Stewart, right hon. sir John, *Tyrone*, a barrister-at-law; pension of £1000; baron of the exchequer, £1200.
- \* Stewart, William, *Tyrone*.
- † Stewart, hon. J. H. K. *Wigton*, brother to the earl of Galloway, a lieut.-colonel in the army, captain in the 3d regiment of foot-guards.
- Stewart, John, *Camelford*, 19.
- † Sterling, sir Walter, bart. *St. Ives*, 183, brother to admiral Stirling, a banker in Westminster.
- Strahan, Andrew, *New Romney*, 12, king's printer.
- Strathaven, lord, *East Grinstead*, 30, son of the earl of Aboyne.
- Strutt, Joseph Holden, *Malden*, 800, uncle-in-law of the duke of Leinster.
- Stuart, lord Evelyn James, *Cardiff*, 1000, uncle to the marquis of Bute, brother to the lord bishop of Armagh.
- Sturt, Henry Charles, *Bridport*, 230.
- Sumner, George Holmes, *Surrey*, F.R.S. and F.S.A.
- Sottie, sir James, bart. *Haddingtonshire*, 70.
- Sutton, right hon. Charles Manners, *Scarborough*, 44, son of the archbishop of Canterbury, and nephew of lord Manners; barrister-at-law, judge-martial, and advocate-general.
- Sykes, sir Mark Masterman, bart. *York*, 3000, brother-in-law of Wilbraham Egerton, M.P. for Cheshire.
- Symonds, Thomas Powell, *Hereford*, 1200.
- Talbot, Richard Wogan, *Dublinshire*.
- \* Tavistock, Francis, (Russell,) marquis, *Bedfordshire*, 2200, eldest son of the duke of Bedford, and son-in-law of the earl of Harrington.
- Taylor, John Blaydon, *Hythe*, 40.
- Taylor, Charles William, *Wells*, 150.
- Taylor, Michael Angelo, *Durham City*, 1200, one of the Prince of Wales's council for the duchy of Cornwall, recorder of Poole.
- Temple, R. T. Grenville Nugent Chandos Temple, earl, *Buckinghamshire*,

*State of the Representation.*

- only son of the marquis of Buckingham, nephew to lord Nugent, and son-in-law to the earl of Breadalbane.
- †Fennyson, Charles, *Great Grimsby*, 200.
- Titchfield, Wm. H. Bentinck, marquis, *Bletchingly*, 80, eldest son of the duke of Portland, and nephew of the members for Nottinghamshire and Weobly.
- \*Thorpe, John Thomas, *London*, 10,000, alderman of Aldgate.
- Thynne, lord John, *Bath*, 30, brother to the marquis of Bath, and nephew of lord Carteret; vice-chamberlain to the king, £1200.
- Tierney, right hon. George, *Knaresborough*, 110, D.C.L.
- †Tomline, William Edward, *Truro*, 26, son of the bishop of Lincoln, master of St. John's hospital, Northampton.
- Townshend, lord James Nugent B. B. *Helstone*, half-brother to the marquis Townshend.
- †Townshend, hon. Horatio Geo. Powis, *Whitchurch*, 70, only brother of viscount Sydney; a lieutenant-colonel in the army, and captain in the first foot guards.
- Tremayne, John Heale, *Cornwall*, son-in-law of sir Wm. Lemon, the other member.
- Tredway, John Payne, *Wells*, 150.
- Tuxton, Edward Peters, *Heydon*.
- †Valletort, right hon. W. Richard, (Edgecombe,) viscount, *Fowcy*, 70, nephew of lady Castlereagh, and son of the earl of Mount Edgecombe, the proprietor of the borough.
- †Vansittart, right hon. Nicholas, *Harwich*, 32, brother-in-law of lord Auckland, a barrister-at-law, vice-president of the British and Foreign Bible Society.
- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| Chancellor of the exchequer .....           | £2600 |
| Lord of the treasury .....                  | 1600  |
| Commissioner for the affairs of India ..... | 1500  |
| Under treasurer of the exchequer .....      | 1800  |
- Vaughan, sir Robert Williams, *Merionethshire*.
- Vereker, right hon. Charles, *Limerick*, nephew and presumptive heir to viscount Gort, a privy counsellor of Ireland, and constable of Limerick.
- †Vernon, George Granville Venables, *Litchfield*, 600, eldest son of the archbishop of York, nephew of the marquis of Stafford, and son-in-law of the earl of Lucan.
- Vernon, Granville Venables, *Litchfield*, 600, brother to the above.
- Upton, hon. Arthur Percy, *St. Edmundsbury*, brother to viscount Templeton, brother-in-law to the earl of Bristol, first major of the first regiment of foot guards.
- Ure, Masterton, *Weymouth*.
- \*Waithman, Robert, *London*, 10,000, alderman of Farringdon without.
- Walker, Samuel, *Aldborough*, 80.
- Walker, Joshua, *Aldborough*, 80.
- †Wallace, right hon. Thomas, *Weymouth*, 400, brother-in-law to the earl of Hopetown, commissioner for the affairs of India, £1500.
- Wall, C. Baring, *Guildford*, 230.
- †Walpole, hon. Horatio, lord, *King's Lynn*, 300, son to the earl of Oxford.
- Walpole, hon. George, *Dungarvon*, brother of the earl of Oxford and uncle to the above.

## State of the Representation.

- †Ward, hon. John Wm. *Bossiney*, only son of viscount Dudley and Ward.
- Ward, Robert, *Haslemere*, 64, brother-in-law to the earl of Mulgrave, a barrister-at-law, clerk of the ordnance, £1958. His lady receives a pension of £1000.
- †Wardender, sir George, *Sandwich*, brother-in-law of viscount Falmouth, a lord of the admiralty, £1500. See *List of Places*.
- Webbe, Edward, *Gloucester*, 3000.
- Webster, sir Godfrey, bart. *Sussex*, son of lady Holland.
- Welby, sir Wm. Earl, bart. *Grantham*, 800, a banker of that town.
- Wellesley, Wm. Pole Tynley Long, *Wiltshire*, son of W. W. Pole, member for Queen's county, nephew of marquis Wellesley and the duke of Wellington.
- Wemyss, William, *Fifeshire*, 188, a general, and colonel of the 93d regiment.
- Westenra, hon. Hen. Robert, *Monaghanshire*, eldest son of lord Rosmore.
- Western, Charles Callis, *Essex*.
- Weymouth, Thomas Thynne, viscount, *Weobly*, eldest son of the marquis of Bath, and brother-in-law to the hon. Frederick Campbell.
- \*Wharton, John, *Becerley*, 1400.
- Wharton, Richard, *Durham*, 1200, brother-in-law of the above, barrister-at-law, formerly chairman of the committee of supply in the house of commons, and a lord of the treasury; a pension of £500, payable out of the 4½ per cent. duties.
- Whitbread, Wm. Hen. *Bedford*, 1500, eldest son of the late Mr. Whitbread.
- White, Luke, *Leitrimshire*.
- Whitmore, Thomas, *Bridgenorth*, 750, a director of the bank.
- Wigram, sir Robert, *Lostwithiel*, 24, eldest son of sir Robert Wigram.
- Wilberforce, William, *Bramber*, 20.
- †Wilbraham, Edward Bootle, *Dover*, 13, (*admiralty borough*.)
- Wildman, John Beckford, *Colchester*, 1560.
- Wilkins, Walter, *Radnorshire*.
- Williams, sir Robert, *Carnarvonshire*.
- Williams, Owen, *Marlow*, 216, brother-in-law to Pascoe Grenfell, the other member, proprietor of the borough.
- Williams, Robert, *Dorchester*, 200, a banker in London.
- \*Williams, William, *Weymouth*, 420.
- †Willoughby, Henry, *Newark*, 720, a barrister-at-law.
- †Wilson, Thomas, *London*, 10,000, a merchant.
- Wilson, sir Robert Thomas, *Southwark*, 3000, a major-general in the army.
- Wodehouse, hon. John, *Marlborough*, 21, son of lord Wodehouse. See *List of Peers*.
- Wodehouse, Edward, *Norfolk*.
- \*Wood, Matthew, *London*, 10,000, alderman of Cripplegate.
- Wood, Thomas, *Breconshire*, son-in-law of the marquis of Londonderry, and brother-in-law to lord Castlereagh, a colonel in the army.
- Worcester, Henry, (Somerset,) marquis of, *Monmouthshire*, eldest son of the duke of Beaufort, a lieutenant of the 14th regiment of dragoons, a lord of the admiralty, £1000.
- Wortley, James Archibald Stuart, *Yorkshire*, cousin to the marquis of Bute, and son-in-law to the earl of Erne.

*State of the Representation.*

- †Wright, John Atkins, *Oxford city*, 1600.  
 †Wrottesley, Henry, *Bruckley*, 32, *curator-in-chancery*, a commissioner  
 of bankrupts, £350.  
 Wyndham, Wadham, *New Sarum*, 54.  
 Wynn, sir Watkin Williams, bart. *Denbighshire*, nephew to lord Grenville,  
 lord-lieut. of the county, and steward of Bromsholme-Yale Manor.  
 Wynn, Charles Watkin Williams, *Montgomeryshire*, brother to the above,  
 barrister-at-law. See *List of Places*.  
 Yorke, sir Joseph Sydney, *Ryegate*, 200, brother to the right hon. C. P.  
 Yorke, teller of the exchequer, and half-brother to the earl of Hard-  
 wicke, vice-admiral of the blue.

*Classification of the Members.*

1 Relations to Peers.....	228
2 Lawyers .....	25
3 Officers in the Navy .....	15
4 Officers in the Army.....	80
5 Placemen and Pensioners.....	126
6 Miscellaneous ....	186
7 Representatives of the People....	0

*Remarks.*

1.—Part of our motto says, “That it is a *high infringement upon the liberties and privileges* of the Commons of Great Britain for any LORD OF PARLIAMENT to concern themselves in the election of members.” Here are 228 members *relations of peers*. Surely if it be an *infringement of the privileges* of the Commons for peers to interfere in the election of members, it must be a much higher infringement of their liberties to thrust their relatives into the house itself. The object of this privilege doubtless was to prevent the influence of the peerage; but certainly this influence is admitted in a direct and palpable form, if the relations of peers, if those who in a few years may expect to take their seats in the upper house, are allowed to sit and vote in the lower.

But there is another objection to the *relations of peers*. Many of them hold commissions in the army or navy; some are placemen or pensioners; and if we consider that many of them are returned by places possessing few

or no voters, there can be little doubt that the first class, forming nearly one-third of the house, are disqualified in about half a dozen ways for their seats.

2.—There are a far greater number of *lawyers* in the house than twenty-five, but that is the number we find designated as barristers, apparently at present without any place or pension, and who may be supposed to have procured seats as a shorter way to office and emolument than pleading at the bar.

3.—*Officers in the navy.* It is not easy to discover the fitness of this class for members at all. Besides their dependence on ministers for promotion, the duties of their profession requiring their absence, it is impossible they can discharge the duties of representatives.

4.—*Officers in the army.* Commissions in the army, held by members, are held similarly to livings in the church, being nearly all *pluralists*: some are generals, holding at the same time a colonel, lieutenant-colonel, a major, or captain's commission. The great number of this class is one reason why the interests of the army are so much better attended to than the interests of the navy.

5.—*Placemen and pensioners.* We might have included in this class the third and fourth, and a large proportion of the first class, forming a vast majority of the house, disqualified for their seats by the Act of Settlement, which says, "no person who has an office or place of profit under the king," &c. See the motto.

6.—*Miscellaneous.* These are principally bankers, a few merchants and traders, fox-hunters, men totally unknown, of no name nor occupation, representatives of rotten boroughs, &c.

7.—*Representatives of the people.* We can find none of this class, unless it be sir *Francis Burdett*, the worthy member for Westminster, freely elected, by the unbought, unbiassed, and unsolicited votes of his constituents.

STATE  
OF THE  
FINANCES.

---

THE annual income of a nation consists of the united produce of its agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. Taxes are a certain proportion of the annual income levied for the public service. In other words, they are a certain proportion of the income of the labourer, the farmer, the merchant, and manufacturer, abstracted for the use of government. The portion of income the different classes can appropriate to this purpose, without creating national poverty and misery, is limited. If taxation be carried beyond this limit, the necessaries of life of the labouring classes will be abridged, the profits of trade and agriculture will be so far reduced, that capital will diminish, or cease to be employed, or transferred to countries where it will be more productive. England, in the privations of the people—the stagnation of industry—the embarrassments of the commercial and manufacturing classes—the emigration of capital—and the inability of its farmer to cultivate the soil from the weight of his imposts—exhibits all the evils of a country suffering from the pressure of excessive taxation.

Some indeed contend that taxation has no share in producing these calamities. The fallacy of this will easily appear. Taxation being a certain portion of the income of every individual, the evils it produces will be obvious, by considering the different effects produced by this portion of the annual income remaining in the hands of individuals, and being paid to government. In the former case, the income of every individual would be increased, the labourer and artizan would have a greater command over the

necessaries of life; the profits of the farmer, merchant, and manufacturer augmented, their capital increased, consequently commerce and the means of creating employment, extended. But this is not all, supposing taxes abolished, there would be no placemen, pensioners, collectors of taxes, nor standing armies. These classes might all be returned to the plough or the loom, or occupied in the cultivation of the waste land. There would be no want of capital for these undertakings. The abolition of taxes would create capital. In short the general effect of a reduction of taxes is this: the power of production and consumption, or in other words, the quantity of employment and the means of subsistence would be augmented.

It is a favourite dogma with some, especially those who live on the taxes, that taxes return to those from whom they are collected. This it has been justly remarked is about as good as the defence of a housebreaker, who, convicted of carrying off a merchant's property, should plead he did him no injury, for the money would be returned to him in purchasing the commodities he dealt in.

But further we may ask of those who maintain this position, in what manner are the taxes returned? Certainly, taxes are paid in money, this money is again paid to the servants of government; these again pay it to the cultivator of the soil and manufacturer; and in this manner it may be said that taxes return to those from whom they were collected. But on the last part of this operation it must be observed, that before either the cultivator or manufacturer can re-possess himself of his portion of the taxes, he must part with a certain quantity of his commodities in exchange; so that tax-paying resolves itself at last into the industrious giving a certain portion of their produce for the maintenance of government.

Here is the true source of the privations and embarrassments of the country. The portion of every man's produce levied for the support of government, of pensioners, placemen, sinecurists, and standing armies, has invaded the funds necessary to the comfortable subsistence of the labourer, and for carrying on the trade, commerce, and agriculture of the kingdom!

Having alluded to the general principle of taxation, let us consider those measures by which the present enormous load of debt and taxes has been incurred. The principles on which government has been conducted have not varied from the Revolution of 1688 to the present time. The wars waged have generally commenced for trivial and unattainable objects, — and these objects have generally not been obtained; under pretence of guarding against distant and improbable danger, the country has



*State of the Finances.*

been involved in present and imminent ones; passion and pride, rather than any views of national advantage, have been the actuating principles of government; and as they engaged in war rashly, they persevered in it obstinately, and rejected more favourable terms of pacification than they were afterwards under the necessity of accepting. In short, our wars have been wars of ambition, of pride, folly, and despotism, originating in and carried on by the corrupt state of the representation. Let us endeavour to give some idea of the cost of these parliamentary wars from the Revolution, as evinced by the increase of taxation and the Borough Debt.

## WILLIAM III.

*Duration of Reign from 1688 to 1702.\**

The public income at the Revolution amounted to £2,001,855. At the death of William it had increased to £3,895,205, being nearly doubled. This augmentation arose from various new duties; especially the excise on salt, the distillery, and the malt-tax. The other sources of revenue were the customs, land-tax, poll-taxes, a tax on births, marriages, and burials, hearth-money, the post-office, and other smaller duties. The total sums raised by taxes and by loans, during this reign, were as follow:

Customs .....	£ 13,296,833	14	6
Excise .....	13,640,328	0	5½
Land-taxes .....	19,174,059	8	3½
Polls .....	2,557,649	7	7½
Burials, births, marriages, and bachelors, &c.	275,517	18	1
Various articles, including permanent loans and temporary loans unpaid .....	23,093,980	16	7½
	<u>£ 72,047,369</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6½</u>

Of the fourteen years of this reign, nearly ten were years of war. The military and naval expenses amounted to £44,847,382, being more than one-half the whole expenditure of government. After all the blood and treasure expended by William, his ambition and revenge remained unsatisfied; and the ostensible object of the war, the curbing the ambition of Louis XIV. unattained. Speaking of the conclusion of this contest at the

\* The amount of revenue, and the estimate of the naval and military expenses, from the Revolution to the end of the reign of George II. are taken from Mr. Colquhoun's Treatise on the Resources of the British Empire.

*State of the Finances.*

treaty of Ryswick, Smollett observes: "Such was the issue of a long and bloody war, which had drained England of her wealth and people, almost entirely ruined her commerce, debauched her morals, by encouraging venality and corruption, and entailed upon her the curse of foreign connexions, as well as a national debt, which was gradually increased to an intolerable burden."—Continuation of Hume, vol. i. p. 330.

The funding system, and the mode of raising money by lotteries and exchequer-bills, commenced in this reign.

## QUEEN ANN.

*Duration of Reign from 1701 to 1714.*

The revenue at the commencement of this reign amounted to £3,195,205. At the period of the union with Scotland, in 1709, the revenue of England amounted to £5,691,803. The sums received into the Exchequer during twelve years and three quarters were—

Customs.....	£15,113,811
Excise.....	20,850,909
Land Tax.....	12,285,909
Miscellaneous, including Post Office, Stamps, and smaller loans of the Revenue.....	5,261,348
Amount of Loans.....	59,853,154

Total....£122,373,531

Of the thirteen years of this reign twelve were years of war. The military and naval expenses amounted to £58,560,581. The object of Queen Ann's wars, like those of her predecessor, purely continental. They were terminated by the disgraceful treaty of Utrecht, in 1712, when our allies were ignominiously abandoned. The peace establishment of this period is estimated at £1,965,605.

## GEORGE I.

*Duration of Reign from the year 1714 to 1727.*

On the death of Queen Ann, the Borough debt amounted to £52,145,362; but though her successor enjoyed a period of uninterrupted tranquillity, no effort appears to have been made to reduce it. On the 31st of December, 1727, the principal amounted to £52,092,235; the interest to £2,219,551. The aggregate sum which passed into the exchequer of George

*State of the Finances.*

In during a reign of twelve years, three months, and ten days, amounted to £70,833,160. The revenue at the time of his death amounted to £4,162,643.

## GEORGE II.

*Duration of Reign from 1727. to 1760.*

The prosperous state of the country for the first twelve years of profound peace at the commencement of this reign, might have admitted of a considerable reduction of the debt, had not Sir Robert Walpole, a *genuine Whig*, been minister. Instead of expending the surplus revenue in the liquidation of the Debt, it was employed in parliamentary corruption. During ten years, from 1707 to 1717, *secret service money* amounted only to £337,960. From 1731 to 1741 it cost the nation £1,453,400. This augmentation is ascribed to the increased pay Sir Robert gave to the *honorable* members for their votes and speeches in support of his administration. The whole of the debt paid off in this long peace, amounted only to £5,137,612, the interest of which was £253,516.

The wars of George II. commenced in 1739, and were concluded at the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748. The total expense of these contests is estimated, by Mr. Colquhoun, at £46,418,680. The nation gained nothing by all this expenditure of treasure. The war originally arose with Spain; that nation claiming the right of searching all English vessels navigating the American seas. This subject, which formed the ground of the war, was never mentioned at the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. The only advantage the English gained, was the *glory* of placing Maria Theresa, grand duchess of Tuscany, on the throne of Germany, in opposition to the King of Prussia.

In the interval of peace, to the commencement of war, in 1755, there was a trifling reduction in the debt to the amount of £3,721,472, and the interest of the capital was reduced from 4 to 3 per cent.

The expense of the second war, called the seven years' war, amounted to £111,271,996. This contest first commenced about the respective boundaries of the French and English in the deserts of Canada. On this frivolous pretext commenced a war then unexampled in magnitude and expense; its ravages extended to Europe and even to the other side of the globe in the East Indies. It is worthy of remark too, that on the continent George II. took the part diametrically opposite to the part he had taken, in the former contest. The war of 1740 was for the humiliation of the King of Prussia; the war of 1755 for his aggrandizement!

State of the Finances.

It will be proper to notice particularly the state of the debt, finances, and peace establishment at the conclusion of this reign. They are thus stated by Mr. Colquhoun:

Public Revenue.		Peace Establishment.	
	£		£
Customs.....	1,985,376	Civil List.....	836,000
Excise.....	3,877,349	Navy.....	900,000
Stamps.....	263,207	Army.....	900,000
Land-Tax, (deducting deficiencies,).....	1,737,608	Ordnance.....	80,000
Miscellaneous.....	650,000	Miscellaneous.....	50,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>£8,523,540</b>		<b>£2,766,000</b>

Debt at the conclusion of the peace of 1762.... **Principal. £146,682,844** — **Interest. £4,840,821**

GEORGE III.

Duration of Reign from 1760 to 1820.

There were three principal wars in this reign: the American war, the revolutionary war, and the war of 1815. They are the most disastrous wars in English history, and were all waged against the principles of liberty and justice. We will state the cost of each, as shown in the summary by taxes and by loans.

AMERICAN WAR.

YEARS.	REVENUE.	LOANS.
1775	£10,138,061	
1776	10,265,405	£2,000,000
1777	10,604,013	5,500,000
1778	10,732,405	6,000,000
1779	11,192,141	7,000,000
1780	12,255,214	12,000,000
1781	12,454,936	12,000,000
1782	12,593,297	13,500,000
1783	11,962,718	12,000,000
1784	12,905,519	12,879,341
1785	14,871,520	10,990,651
	<b>£142,975,229</b>	<b>£93,860,997</b>

The American war terminated in 1783, but as the loans of the two following years were raised to wind up the expenses of that struggle, it is proper they should be included. The total expense of the American war will stand thus:

## State of the Finance.

Taxes	£142,975,279
Loans	93,869,992
Advances by the Bank of England	110,000
Advances by the East India Company	3,200,000
Increase in the unfunded Debt	5,170,273
	£242,265,494
Deduct expense of a peace establishment for eleven years, as it stood in 1794	£113,142,403
Net cost of the American war	£129,123,091

This then is the sum expended by the *Bowghmongers* in an attempt to enslave the Colonies. George III. boasted, that he was the last man in his dominions to subscribe to the peace with America. He has left his people burdened with a debt of *one hundred and thirty millions*, as the price of his obstinacy, and an abortive attempt to impose on a brave people the tyrannical principle of "*taxation without representation.*"

The second war was still more atrocious than the first; it was a war not merely against liberty, but the principles of liberty; it was a barbarous and gigantic effort to prevent the amelioration of society, and to render mankind the eternal victims of ecclesiastical and aristocratical tyranny. As the war of 1793 was more diabolical in its objects than the contest with America, so we should say, had its calamities only extended to its authors, has it been more justly ruinous in its consequences. Let us endeavour to estimate the cost of this liberticide and *Vandal* contest. We will state the sums raised by taxes, and the debt contracted each year from its commencement, and then deduct the probable expenditure of the country had no such war existed.

The account of sums raised by taxes, is taken from Dr. Hamilton's *Inquiry into the National Debt*, p. 203, 3d. edit. The amount of debt contracted, including navy and exchequer bills funded, is also taken from the same writer, p. 320. The short peace of Amiens, and the interval betwixt the exile and return of Bonaparte from Elba, may be considered, rather, a suspension of hostilities, than a period of peace; therefore, we have considered it as one uninterrupted war from 1793 to 1815, having the same objects—the maintenance of the ridiculous pretensions of Legitimacy and Aristocracy.

State of the Finances.

YEARS.	TAXES.	LOANS.
1793	£17,656,418	£25,926,526
1794	17,170,400	
1795	17,308,411	51,705,698
1796	17,858,454	56,946,566
1797	18,737,760	25,350,000
1798	20,654,650	35,624,250
1799	30,202,915	21,875,000
1800	35,229,968	29,045,000
1801	33,896,464	44,816,250
1802	35,415,296	41,489,438
1803	37,240,213	16,000,000
1804	37,677,063	18,200,000
1805	45,359,442	39,543,124
1806	49,659,281	29,880,000
1807	53,304,254	18,373,200
1808	58,390,255	13,693,254
1809	61,538,207	21,278,122
1810	63,405,294	19,811,108
1811	66,681,366	29,244,711
1812	64,763,870	40,743,031
1813	63,169,845	54,780,324
1814	66,925,835	63,645,930
1815	69,684,192	70,888,402
	<u>£952,929,653</u>	<u>£764,859,036</u>

After making some deductions on account of the operations of the *loyalty loan*, and the transfer of annuities, the total debt, contracted from 1793 to 1815, amounts to £762,537,445. If to this sum, we add the increase in the unfunded debt during that period, and the additional sums raised by taxes in consequence of hostilities, we shall have the total expenditure, owing to the French war, as follows :

Debt contracted from 1793 to 1815 .....	£762,537,445
Increase in the unfunded debt, do. ....	50,194,060*
War Taxes .....	do. .... 614,488,459†
<b>Total expense of the French war .....</b>	<b>£1,427,219,964</b>

Two objections may be made to the fairness of this statement. First, the amount of debt redeemed during the war by the operation of the *Sinking*

\* The unfunded debt in 1793.....£14,902,635  
 ditto 1815..... 65,096,695 Increase as above. *Dr. Hamilton's Inquiry*, p. 338.

† This sum is obtained by deducting from the total amount of taxes during the war, the taxes which would have been raised had the expenditure of 1793 continued.

# CORRUPTION UNMASKED.

## State of the Finances.

*Fund\** ought to be deducted from the amount of debt contracted. The second objection arises from the mode of negotiating loans. In each loan, the capital funded exceeds the sum actually advanced to government. In some loans government acknowledges itself debtor £100, when only from £54 to £60 is actually received. Hence it follows, that, from the debt contracted since 1793, ought to be deducted the difference betwixt that debt and the sums which passed into the exchequer. In this case, the difference is, £256,081,267. The capital funded since 1793, amounts to £762,837,445. The sums actually raised on that capital, £506,081,267. Difference, £256,081,267.—*Inquiry concerning the National Debt*, p. 322.

Then as to the first objection. The total redeemed debt, or *sinking fund* as it is called, amounted in 1793, to £12,416,505. The total redeemed debt in 1815, amounted to £273,418,402. Hence, the capital of the debt paid off during the war, amounts to £261,001,897. The sums received by the commissioners for the purchase of this capital, we collect from p. 8, of a parliamentary account of the debt, ordered to be printed 21st December, 1819, to be £173,309,383. It is this sum therefore which must be deducted on account of the reduction of the debt from the war expenditure.

After admitting these deductions from the charges of the war, we must be allowed to make a trifling addition. The loans raised for Ireland, guaranteed by Britain, amounted to £103,032,750. The sums actually received on account of these loans to £64,750,000. The revenue of Ireland in 1791, amounted only to £1,190,684. Owing to the increase of the Irish revenue during the war, the war-taxes of Ireland cannot be estimated at less than £80,000,000:—After these deductions and additions the account will stand thus:

Sums raised on account of loans .....	£ 506,081,267
Sums raised on account of Irish loans.....	64,750,000
War Taxes in England.....	614,488,459
Ditto in Ireland .....	80,000,000
Increase in the unfunded debt.....	50,194,060

1,255,513,786

Deduct sums paid to the Commissioners for the reduction of the debt.....	173,309,383
---	-------------

Total.....£1,082,204,403

\* We intended to expose the famous juggle of the *Sinking Fund*, but our limits compel us to refer it to another place. It is well worthy of the other delusions practised on the country during the last thirty years.

The statement is now divested of every extraneous item, and reducing it to its lowest amount, ONE THOUSAND AND EIGHTY TWO MILLIONS TWO HUNDRED AND FOUR THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND THREE POUNDS remains, as the sum actually received and expended on account of the war with France from 1793 to 1815. This sum is more than seven times the annual income of the country, according to the returns under the income tax in 1815. On an average of the twenty-two years from 1793 to 1815, it is a war expenditure of near fifty millions; and this is the sum which the tax-ridden, law-ridden, priest-ridden, deluded people of England yearly contributed out of the produce of their industry, agriculture, and commerce, to prevent an independent state altering the form and ameliorating the abuses of its government.

Can we wonder, after this tremendous sacrifice in pursuit of this unrighteous object, at the terrible calamities with which the country is afflicted? Can we wonder at our exhausted, impoverished, and embarrassed condition? More than *one hundred millions* expended in an abortive attempt to enslave the Colonies; more than *one thousand millions* expended to prevent France recovering her liberties. This forms the financial history of the late reign; this is the short history of the Boroughmongers' Debt, ELEVEN HUNDRED MILLIONS expended in the wars of despotism.

When we look back to the history of the last century—the wars of folly, ambition, and tyranny which have been waged, when we reflect on the millions expended in these wars—the fruits of unexampled industry, skill, and enterprise; when we think of our present situation—the people exposed to lawless outrage—the constitution subverted—population degraded—commerce and agriculture in a state of decay and ruin; when we compare these things with the situation of glory and happiness England might have attained, under a wise and honest government, administering her exhaustless resources in the promotion of the arts of peace, instead of war and devastation; we feel not less indignant at the wickedness of our rulers, than the apathy which has so long tolerated their folly and their crimes.

Having brought the financial history of the country down to 1815, it only remains to notice the years since elapsed. The chief object of importance, is the state of the *Borough debt*. We are now in the *fifth year of peace*, and unless the debt has been considerably reduced, it is evident the country cannot long go on under the present system. All classes are sinking under



## State of the Finances.

the pressure of taxation, and it is clear, if, under that pressure, the Debt has not been reduced, its reduction is hopeless; while its continuance at its present magnitude would be ruinous. We will state the amount of the funded and unfunded debt since the peace, from an account ordered to be printed in December, 1819. It is the latest official account published.

Yrs.	Funded Debt.	Unfunded Debt.	Total, Funded and Unfunded.	Total Charge.
1815	£1,056,611,555	£59,227,600	£1,115,839,155	£44,017,655
1816	1,143,981,357	41,441,900	1,185,423,257	47,228,243
1817	1,146,769,617	44,650,300	1,191,412,917	46,310,238
1818	1,146,730,982	56,729,400	1,203,460,382	45,929,756
1819	1,181,504,362	43,655,400	1,225,159,762	48,395,272

This account comes down to the 5th of January, 1819. From this official statement, the annual charge on account of the funded and unfunded debt, is more than *forty-eight millions*, which exceeds the same charge by more than a million in any former period of either peace or war. Is it possible that the commerce and agriculture of a country can flourish which has to pay annually more than *forty-eight millions* for the interest of its debt? Is it possible that the present system can much longer continue, when in the fifth year of peace the debt is increasing, the revenue decreasing, and industry and the people perishing under the weight of fresh burdons? To us it appears nothing more is necessary to show the inextricable difficulties of government by the infatuated policy of the Pitt and Brough system.

## CONCLUSION.

Having treated on every subject announced in the prospectus to this publication, we shall only add one or two more observations to those already made in different parts of the work.

The primary object of the *Black Book* was to show the influence by which government is supported in opposition to the opinion and interests of the community. This point, we think, has been clearly elucidated in the list of

---

*Conclusion.*

---

places and pensions—the analysis of the house of peers—the state of the representation,—the state of the church—the emoluments of courts of justice—the connexion of Government with the Bank and East India Company—the plunder of charitable foundations, and a hundred other sources of corrupt influence by which it is enabled to overawe, plunder, and delude the country :

The corruption by which the system is supported forms the resources by which England might be restored to prosperity and happiness. While the system continues, they are requisite to its support ; when it is reformed, they will be available for the relief of the country.

## APPENDIX.

## No. I.

EXCESSIVE taxation, originating in non-representation, every one must admit is the chief cause of the distresses of the country. Ministers will not allow that further retrenchment is practicable, and they have publicly declared their inability to afford any relief to the sufferings of the People. How far these assertions are well founded, will be seen from the following statement. It will be seen that the mere expense of managing the Collection and Expenditure of the Revenue amounts to more than FIVE MILLIONS AND A HALF; that the salaries of public officers have been greatly augmented, and the expenditure of the Victualling Office, the Office of Secretary at War, Navy Office, the Pay Office, the Dock Yards, and the civil department of the Navy, the Ordnance and the Storekeeper's department, have not only increased enormously, but that they are now kept up with little or any reduction in the fifth year of peace, and when the privations of the People are unexampled from the weight of their burdens. The Resolutions of which we have inserted the substance, were opposed, as might be expected, by the Longs, the Palmerstons, the Martins, and other placemen and pensioners who live on the public taxes.

*SUBSTANCE of certain Financial Resolutions, submitted to the House of Commons by Sir H. PARNELL, 1st July, 1819; showing the INCREASE in, and the SAVING which might be made in various departments of the PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.*

## PUBLIC FINANCES.

That the gross Receipt of the Ordinary Revenue of the United Kingdom, in the year 1818, was £62,230,527 :

Out of which there was paid for Charges of Collection.....	£4,367,750
For Charges for managing the Expenditure of the same....	1,173,116
	£5,540,866

## Appendix.

*viz.*

To the Treasury.....	£103,139
The Bank.....	277,228
The Civil Departments of the Navy.....	506,000
Ditto of the Army.....	150,228
Ditto of the Ordnance.....	82,891
The Commissioners for auditing the Public Accounts	53,630

£1,173,116

Making a sum of £5,540,866, paid out of the Annual Public Income, for managing the Collection and Expenditure of the same :

That the gross receipt of the ordinary revenue of the years 1818, 1810, and 1796, was collected at the following rates *per centum* :

	Excise.			Customs.			Stamps.			Assessed Taxes.			Post Office.			Hackney Coaches.			Hawkers and Pedlars.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1818 England	3	11	2	9	3	8	2	12	6	3	17	11	27	18	0	14	6	10	18	2	16
Scotland	6	17	10	16	9	11															
Ireland	12	9	11	16	13	9	8	5	6	16	19	10	71	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1810 England	3	0	5	5	19	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scotland	7	11	8	6	14	3	4	10	10	0	0	0	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ireland	17	3	6	13	0	11	6	13	11	0	0	0	51	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
1796 England	4	2	10	6	0	11	4	3	7	4	6	1	28	2	11	8	11	0	33	9	3
Scotland	7	18	4	11	8	7	7	10	2	5	18	0	13	12	11						

That the ordinary Revenue of the United Kingdom is collected by three Boards of Customs, three Boards of Excise, two Boards of Stamps, one Board of Taxes, one Board of Hawkers and Pedlars and Hackney Coaches, and two Post Offices, consisting of sixty-four Commissioners and four Post-masters General :

That if the principle on which the Officers of the English Excise are appointed, *viz.* the exclusion of Treasury influence, was made general in that Department, and extended to all other Departments, such a reform would tend very materially to diminish the charges of collection :

That if the simple mercantile system of accounts was established in all the Public Departments ; and if the rules of office, and the regulations of the Revenue Laws, were simplified ; such a reform would tend materially to diminish the charges of collection :

That, if the Salaries of all the Revenue Officers, and the Poundage Fees of the Receivers General, and of the Stamp Distributors, were revised ; if the hours of attendance were increased ; and if the Incidental and Law Expenses belonging to the Public Departments were properly controlled and limited ; such a reform would tend materially to diminish the charges of the collection :

That if the present Boards for collecting the Revenue were consolidated, and brought together into the Metropolis, so as to act immediately under the inspection of the Treasury, and subject to the constant control of Parliament, such a reform would tend materially to diminish the charges of Collection :

*Appendix.*

That the intricacies and cross payments in the nature of Drawbacks, Allowances, and Bounties; the excessive Duties on Tea, and certain other articles, by encouraging smuggling; and the Laws of Navigation, and for prohibiting Foreign Manufactures, add considerably to the charges of collection:

That the expense of the Office of Treasury was  
 in the year 1796.....£40,764  
 in the year 1818..... 103,139

Of which latter sum, £13,410 was for the Commissariat Branch, and £5,327 for the Irish Branch; both of which have been added to the Treasury Department since the year 1796:

That the whole expense incurred by the Bank of England in managing the Public Business was estimated by the Committee on the Public Expenditure in the year 1807, at £119,500; that it may now be estimated at £150,000; which sum being deducted from the sum of £277,228, paid to the Bank in the year 1818, will leave a net annual profit to them of £127,228, for managing the Public Business:

That the expense of the Admiralty Office was, in the year 1796, being the third year of War.....	£ 52,666
in the year 1819, being the fourth year of Peace, the sum voted is.....	59,332 :
That the Establishment of the Navy Pay Office was fixed by an Order of Council, dated 9th October, 1789, at, exclusive of the Salary to the Treasurer of the Navy .....	9,128 :
That the sum voted for Salaries and Contingencies for this Office in the year 1819, is .....	37,839 :
That the Establishment of the Navy Office amounted to, in the year 1796 .....	40,561
in the year 1819, the sum voted is.....	27,189 :
That the sum voted for Dock Yards at Home, was in the year 1795, being the second year of War .....	25,351
in the year 1813, being the tenth year of War .....	212,142
in the year 1819, being the fourth year of Peace .....	225,000 :
That the sum voted for the Establishment of the Victualling Office, was in the year 1795 .....	45,405
in the year 1819 it is .....	47,000 :
That the number of Seamen voted in the year 1795 was 100,000, and in the year 1819, 19,000 :	
That the sum voted for the Civil Departments of the Navy, was in the year 1792, being the last year of Peace.....	125,109
in the year 1813, being the tenth year of War.....	572,373
in the year 1819 it is, being the fourth year of Peace .....	506,000 :
That the Salaries in the Commander in Chief's Office amounted to in the year 1793, exclusive of any Salary to the Commander in Chief.....	813
in the year 1819, the sum voted is.....	7,424

## Appendix.

to which is to be added,	£
for the Commander in Chief.....	5,999
Four Aides de Camp.....	693
Contingencies.....	724

making in the whole for the year 1819 ..... £14,840 :

That the Establishment of the Office of Secretary at War  
amounted to

in the year 1796 ..... 8,256

in the year 1819, the sum voted is ..... 55,290 :

That, notwithstanding the great establishment of this Office, the number of Military Accounts in arrear is so large as to incur an annual expense of £18,121.

That the perplexed nature of the Regimental Accounts, arising from the several stoppages and allowances, is productive of great delay and trouble; and occasions a great part of the expense incurred in the present system of examining the Accounts at the War Office.

That the Establishment of the Pay Office amounted to, £

in the year 1796..... 15,354

in the year 1819, the sum voted is ..... 30,506 :

That the Establishment of the Office of Comptrollers of Army Accounts  
amounted to

in the year 1797..... 4,470

in the year 1819, the sum voted is ..... 12,458 :

That the Civil Establishments of the Ordnance amounted to,

in the year 1796..... 51,618

in the year 1819 the sum voted is ..... 82,891 :

That if the Offices of Paymaster of the Army, Treasurer of the Navy, and Treasurer of the Ordnance, were consolidated into one Board, to transact the business of a Bank for the whole Military Expenditure; and if the Civil part of the Office of the Commander in Chief, the Office of Secretary of War, and the Office of Comptrollers of Army Accounts, were consolidated into one Board, to examine and control all Army Accounts; such a reform would tend materially to diminish the charges for these Establishments :

That, of late years a system of progressive increase of salaries has been extended to most of the Public Offices, but that in the Ordnance Department, this practice has been carried to the greatest length, and applied to messengers and others, not entitled to the benefit of increase of salaries in any other Departments :

That the progressive increase of Salaries has accompanied the change in the value of Money, which began in the year 1797, and, therefore, there is reason to infer that a considerable reduction of expense might be obtained by a proper revision of all Salaries, and by adjusting them to the new value of the currency :

That the expenditure of so large a sum annually as £387,111 in Bounties, is attended with no public good, and is inconsistent with every sound principle of political economy :

That the advance of the Civil List from £900,000 to £1,028,000 has been made from time to time, according as the value of money has become of late years more and more depreciated; and that therefore there will be

*Appendix.*

just cause for reducing it to its former amount, if the value of money shall again rise to its original standard :

That the establishment of the offices of the Three Secretaries of State amounted to, in the years 1796 and 1818,

	1796.	1818.
For the Home Department .....	£17,792.....	£31,978
For the Foreign ditto.....	14,167.....	63,056
For the War ditto.....	7,865.....	27,851 :
That the Civil Government of Scotland amounted to,		
In the year 1761.....	£52,830	
In the year 1797.....	84,167	
In the year 1818.....	129,627 :	

That the annual expense of the Office of Lord Lieutenant, and the separate Executive Government of Ireland, may be estimated at £100,000 ;—expenditure in four years on Dublin Castle and the Phoenix Park, £117,052 ; in the year 1816, £13,235.

*Store Keeper General's Department.*

That it appears, that prior to 1808 the business of the Storekeeper General's Department was transacted under the direction of Mr. John Trotter, of Soho Square, and that his total Expenditure for the same, for a period of fifteen years, of which thirteen years were in time of war, and which Expenditure included all Pay for Establishments and Contingent Charges of every kind, such as insurance, freight, carriage, rent, salaries of agents, repairs of returned stores, packers, charges, &c. was £252,939, or on an annual average £16,862 :

That it appears, that the Storekeeper General's Expenditure for 1809, was, for his Establishment alone.....	£ 7,591
And that for the same year his Contingent Charges amounted to .....	49,212
Amounting together to .....	56,803

and forming an Increase on the Expenditure of the preceding year of £20,129, independently of the annual rent of the two wharfs and warehouses estimated at £5000 :

That it appears, that his Expenditure for 1813 was, for his Establishment alone.....	£ 12,645
And that for the same year his Contingent Charges amounted to .....	122,004

Amounting together to .....

135,549 :

That it appears, that his Expenditure for 1816 was, for his Establishment alone .....	£ 21,138
And that for the same year his Contingent Charges amounted to .....	120,698

Amounting together to .....

141,836 :

## Appendix.

That it appears, that his Expenditure for 1817 was, for his Estab- lishment alone.....	£ 21,418
And that for the same year his Contingent Charges amounted to	72,470
Amounting together to .....	93,888

That it appears, that his Expenditure for 1818 was, for his Estab- lishment alone.....	£ 31,647
And that for the same year his Contingent Charges amounted to	42,032
Amounting together to .....	73,679

That it appears, that the amount of Stores bought by the Com- missariat, and delivered to the Storekeeper General, amounted in 1816.....	to 59,448
in 1817.....	to 37,318
in 1818.....	to 56,563

Total 153,329

and that the amount of the Stores sold by order of the Storekeeper General, amounted in 1816.....	to 45,766
in 1817.....	to 38,986
in 1818.....	to 49,283

Total 178,035

and that the Expenses of the Storekeeper General's Department amounted in 1816.....	to 141,836
in 1817.....	to 93,888
in 1818.....	to 73,679

Total 309,403

So that the Expenses of the Storekeeper General's Department for these three years amounted to £156,074 more than the value of the Stores purchased by Government (say to more than double the amount of those Stores), and to within £21,900 of the joint amount of the Stores bought and sold by Government, although the Stores sold in these three years amounted to two-thirds of all the Stores sold by the Storekeeper General during a period of eleven years :

That it appears that Seven Deputy Storekeeper Generals and Assistant Storekeeper Generals have been placed on Half-Pay, although none of their services extended to a period of four years, and the services of one of them to a period of one year and four months only ; whereby the Country has already been subjected to an annual expense, during the lives of many young men, of £722 7s. 11d. :

That it appears, that the Establishment of the Storekeeper General has been, from its institution, exorbitant, and is at present wasteful and extravagant ; altogether disproportionate to a time of Peace, and to the duties to be performed by it ; and that therefore it ought to be reduced to an economical and efficient Establishment, proportionate in expense to what the Storekeeper General's Department was before 1808,



## Appendix.

## No. II.

At page 167, we alluded to the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent duties. We now insert from a parliamentary paper the names of the persons to whom pensions are payable out of this famous jobbing fund. It will be observed that about two-thirds of the number are females, the names of some of whom are better known than their public services.

An Account of the Pensions now payable out of the four and a half per cent. duties; together with the names of the several persons to whom such pensions or grants are respectively payable.

PENSIONERS' NAMES.	ANNUAL AMOUNT.		
	£.	s.	d.
Lord Auckland.....	400	0	0
Executors of the late Edmund Burke.....	2,500	0	0
J. Hossier and T. Barnard, Esqrs.....	600	0	0
Mrs. P. Gordon.....	200	0	0
H. Cowper, Esq.....	1,026	0	0
Mrs. E. Hamilton.....	200	0	0
Miss M. A. P. Hamilton.....	100	0	0
W. Burrowes, Esq. in Trust for Mary and Maria Hunn..	500	0	0
Mrs. C. M. Locke.....	411	0	0
A. Dickie, Esq. to pay the late Servants of the younger Princes	862	17	0
Lord Viscount Hood.....	1,500	0	0
Mrs. S. Ricketts.....	411	0	0
Miss J. Ricketts.....	103	10	0
Lady C. Parnell.....	200	0	0
Lady H. Erskine.....	200	0	0
Lady L. Dawson.....	200	0	0
Lady M. A. Dawson.....	200	0	0
Mrs. M. Irving.....	120	0	0
Miss L. C. M. Irving.....	80	0	0
Right Honourable O. Long.....	1,500	0	0
Honourable Mrs. H. Blackwood.....	206	0	0
General C. Craufurd.....	1,200	0	0
The Rev. H. Hobart, and J. Sullivan, Esq. in Trust for the Children of the late G. Hobart.....	400	0	0
Mrs. C. Sargent.....	616	0	0
Mrs. R. Huyghues.....	91	5	0
Mrs. C. Snow.....	50	0	0
Miss F. Morgan.....	50	0	0
Lady E. Auckland.....	500	0	0
Mrs. C. De Curt.....	150	0	0
Lady A. De Ameland.....	1,292	10	0
R. Wharton, Esq.....	500	0	0
J. Grange, Esq.....	250	0	0
The Countess of Mansfield.....	1,000	0	0
Lord Glenberrie.....	745	2	0
Lady De Clifford.....	1,200	0	0
Mrs. A. Rockett.....	5	0	0
Wm. Waugh.....	46	16	0
Rd. Shirley.....	67	6	0
Thomas Jordan.....	78	6	0
Mrs. Dillon.....	82	0	0
Lady H. Stanhope.....	1,200	0	0
Mrs. A. Haughton.....	35	0	0
Dr. Wm. Short.....	400	0	0

Total Annual Amount £21,479 12 0

Customs,  
9th May, 1817.

C. W. CRACROFT,  
Hnsbd. of the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per Cent. Duties.

## No. III.

At page 129, we inserted a comparative statement of the salaries of different officers in England and America. The account of American salaries was taken from *Warden's Travels in the United States*. We now insert, from *Seybert's Annals of the United States*, published at Philadelphia, a more complete list of all the civil offices belonging to the general government, with the number of individuals in each office, and the pay annexed to it.—There are many things to admire across the Atlantic. America presents a singular contrast to the situation of England. The total expense of her civil government, including her President, Secretaries, Judges, Foreign Ministers, Naval Department, Treasury Department, and every other department, is considerably less than £100,000 a-year; being about the income of the Duke of York. According to the annual Treasury Report, (*Times*, January 28,) the public expenditure of the United States last year, amounted to £5,417,132; being, according to an authentic document, (*vide Appendix No. I.*) less than the charges of collecting and managing the expenditure and revenue of this country. The debt of America, on the 1st of January, is estimated at £18,888,101. The debt of England is stated in a parliamentary paper, December 21, to be £1,225,159,762. In France, the interest of her debt and sinking fund, amount to £9,500,000. In England, the interest of her debt and sinking fund amount to £48,000,000.—When we contrast the situation of England with surrounding States; when we think again of her paupers and her poor rates, of her commerce and agriculture, of her ministers and her princes; we cannot help marvelling greatly at the exceeding weight of glory and happiness she has acquired under the sway of the “*Good King George*,” and the “*Heaven-born Minister*.”

*A STATEMENT of the number of the Officers and Agents employed in the Civil Department of the United States; together with their Annual Compensations.*

*Note.*—Pursuant to the resolution of Congress, of the 27th of April, 1816, the Secretary of State is required to compile and print, once in every two years, a Register of all the Officers, Civil, Military, and Naval, in the service of the United States.

Number of Persons, & in what Branches employed.	Compensation.		Compensation.		
	Dolls.	Cents.	£	s.	d.
<b>I.—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.</b>					
<i>Officers of the Senate.</i>					
1 Secretary .....	3,000	00	675	0	0
3 Clerks .....	4,800	00	1080	0	0
1 Serjeant at Arms and Door-Keeper .....	1,500	00	337	10	0
1 Deputy Door-Keeper .....	1,450	00	326	5	0

## Appendix.

Number of Persons, & in what Branches employed.	Compensation.		Compensation.		
	Dolls.	Cents.	£	s.	d.
<i>Officers of the House of Representatives.</i>					
1 Clerk of the House .....	3,000	00	675	0	0
5 Clerks .....	7,800	00	1755	0	0
1 Serjeant at Arms .....	1,500	00	337	10	0
1 Door-Keeper and Assistant ditto .....	2,950	00	663	15	0
1 Messenger .....	350	00	78	15	0
1 Librarian to Congress .....	1,000	00	225	0	0
<b>II.—EXECUTIVE BRANCH.</b>					
1 President of the United States .....	25,000	00	5625	0	0
Vice President of ditto (vacant) .....	5,000	00	1125	0	0
<b>IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.</b>					
1 Secretary .....	5,000	00	1125	0	0
9 Clerks .....	11,350	00	2553	15	0
3 Messengers .....	746	00	167	17	0
<b>IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.</b>					
1 Secretary .....	5,000	00	1125	0	0
7 Clerks in the office of the Secretary .....	10,000	00	2250	0	0
2 Messengers ditto .....	710	00	159	15	0
1 Comptroller .....	3,500	00	787	10	0
15 Clerks in the offices of the Comptrollers .....	15,756	00	3545	2	0
1 Messenger ditto .....	410	00	92	5	0
1 Auditor .....	3,000	00	675	0	0
15 Clerks in the Auditor's offices .....	16,275	00	3664	17	6
1 Messenger ditto .....	410	00	92	5	0
1 Register .....	3,000	00	675	0	0
19 Clerks in the offices of the Registers .....	19,039	98	3808	0	0
1 Messenger ditto .....	500	00	112	10	0
2 Watchmen for the Treasury .....	600	00	135	0	0
1 Labourer ditto .....	300	00	67	10	0
1 Treasurer of the United States .....	3,000	00	675	0	0
5 Clerks in the office of the Treasurer .....	5,440	00	1224	0	0
1 Messenger in ditto .....	410	00	92	5	0
1 Commissioner of Revenue .....	3,000	00	675	0	0
9 Clerks in the office of the Commissioner .....	9,400	00	2115	0	0
1 Messenger in ditto .....	410	00	92	5	0
1 Commissioner in the General Land Office .....	3,000	00	675	0	0
11 Clerks in the office of the Commissioner .....	10,850	00	2441	5	0
1 Draughtsman in ditto .....	1,100	00	247	10	0
1 Messenger in ditto .....	410	00	92	5	0
<b>DEPARTMENT OF WAR.</b>					
1 Secretary .....	4,500	00	1012	10	0
14 Clerks in the office of the Secretary .....	15,230	00	3426	15	0
2 Messengers in ditto .....	710	00	159	15	0
1 Paymaster-General .....	2,500	00	562	10	0
13 Clerks in the office of Paymaster-General .....	17,735	00	3990	7	6
1 Messenger in ditto .....	450	00	101	5	0

## Appendix.

Number of Persons, & in what Branches employed.	Compensation.		Compensation.	
	Dolls.	Cents.	£	s. d.
2 Accountants.....	4,000	00	900	0 0
27 Clerks in the offices of the Accountants.....	27,650	00	6221	5 0
1 Superintendent-General of Military Supplies..	3,000	00	675	0 0
8 Clerks in the office of ditto.....	7,500	00	1687	10 0
1 Messenger in ditto.....	600	00	135	0 0
<b>NAVY DEPARTMENT.</b>				
1 Secretary.....	4,500	00	1018	10 0
5 Clerks in the office of the Secretary.....	7,500	00	1687	10 0
1 Messenger in ditto.....	410	00	92	5 0
3 Commissioners of the Navy Board.....	10,500	00	2362	10 0
1 Secretary to the Commissioners.....	2,000	00	450	0 0
3 Clerks to ditto.....	3,000	00	675	0 0
1 Messenger to ditto.....	410	00	92	5 0
1 Accountant.....	2,300	00	517	10 0
13 Clerks in the office of the Accountants.....	14,300	00	3217	10 0
1 Messenger in ditto.....	410	00	92	5 0
<b>POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.</b>				
1 Post-Master-General.....	3,000	00	675	0 0
2 Assistant Post-Masters-General.....	3,300	00	742	10 0
20 Clerks in the Post Office.....	19,375	00	4359	7 6
2 Messengers in ditto.....	660	00	148	10 0
1 Commissioner of Claims.....	2,000	00	450	0 0
1 Clerk to the Commissioner.....	1,000	00	225	0 0
1 Superintendent of Indian Trade.....	2,000	00	450	0 0
3 Clerks in the office of the Superintendent Indian Agents and Sub-Agents.....	2,500	00	562	10 0
1 Transport Agent.....	400	00	90	0 0
Factors.....				
1 Packer and Messenger.....	360	00	81	0 0
Clerks.....				
<b>TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENTS.</b>				
4 Governors.....	8,000	00	1800	0 0
4 Secretaries.....	4,000	00	900	0 0
<b>JUDICIARY OF THE UNITED STATES.</b>				
1 Supreme Court, Chief Justice.....	4,000	00	900	0 0
6 Associate Judges.....	21,000	00	4725	0 0
1 Attorney-General.....	3,000	00	675	0 0
1 Clerk.....	Fees, &c.			
25 District Court, Judges.....	†			
23 Attorneys.....	†			
22 Marshals.....	†			
22 Clerks.....	†			
12 Territorial Judges.....	14,400	00	3240	0 0
3 Attorneys.....	Fees, &c.			
3 Marshals.....	Ditto.			

## Appendix.

Number of Persons, & in what Branches employed.	Compensation.		Compensation		
	Dolls.	Cents.	£	s.	d.
<b>FOREIGN MINISTERS OF THE UNITED STATES</b>					
7 Envoy Extraordinary and Ministers Plenipotentiary.....	63,000	00	14175	0	0
1 Chargé des Affaires.....	†				
5 Secretaries of Legation.....	10,000	00	2250	0	0
61 Consuls.....	†				
3 Commissioners of Boundaries, under the Treaty of Ghent.....	13,332	00	2999	14	0
2 Agents to the Commissioners.....	6,000	00	1350	0	0
<b>OFFICERS OF THE MINT, &amp;c.</b>					
1 Director.....	2,000	00	450	0	0
1 Treasurer.....	1,200	00	270	0	0
1 Chief Coiner.....	1,500	00	337	10	0
1 Assayer.....	1,500	00	337	10	0
1 Melter and Refiner.....	1,500	00	337	10	0
2 Engravers.....	1,800	00	405	0	0
1 Clerk.....	700	00	157	10	0
1 Door-Keeper and Watch.....	462	00	103	19	0
1 Carpenter and Adjuster.....	462	00	103	19	0
1 Melter.....	462	00	103	19	0
1 Afineuler.....	387	00	87	1	0
2 Pressmen.....	762	00	171	9	0
15 Commissioners of Loans.....	†				
21 Clerks in the offices of the Commissioners....	†				
99 Collectors of the Customs.....	†				
79 Surveyors of the Ports.....	†				
14 Naval Officers.....	†				
199 Collectors of the direct Tax.....	†				
188 Principal Assessors of the direct Tax.....	†				
67 Superintendents and Keepers of Light Houses	†15,640	00	3519	0	0
36 Registers and Receivers of Public Monies....	†				
3 Surveyor-Generals.....	7,000	00	1575	0	0
6 Clerks.....	3,700	00	832	10	0
1 Recorder of Land Titles.....	500	00	112	10	0
1 Clerk and Translator for the Land Offices....	1 dol. pr claim				
3,214 Deputy Post-Masters.....	†				
120 Clerks and Assistants in Post Offices.....	†				
505 Contractors for the transportation of the Mail	†				
1 Superintendent of Washington City.....	1,200	00	270	0	0
5 Clerks in the Superintendent's office.....	2,500	00	562	10	0
1 Commissioner of Public Buildings.....	2,000	00	450	0	0
1 Clerk to the Commissioner.....	1,000	00	225	0	0
1 Messenger to ditto.....	500	00	112	10	0
1 Surveyor of City Lots (Washington, D. C.)..					
1 Architect (Washington).....					

† Each of the Judges of the district court receives an annual salary, which varies from 800 to 3000 dollars; the Attorneys receive from 200 dollars, and fees, to 600 dollars per annum; some of them are compensated by the fees only; some of the

## Appendix.

Marshals receive a small salary and fees, others only receive fees; besides the fees, some of the clerks of the courts receive a per diem allowance, during the session of the court.

A *Chargé des Affaires* is entitled to 4500 dollars per annum, and the same for an outfit. Ministers Plenipotentiary also receive a year's salary as an outfit. Of the Consuls in Europe, three are also Agents, and receive 2000 dollars per annum each; the other European Consuls receive no salary. In Barbary the Consul-General receives 4000 dollars per annum, and the Consuls 2000 dollars per annum each. The Commissioners of Loans received in the aggregate 15,630 dollars; the clerks in the aggregate received 12,195 dollars per annum. No Collector of the Customs is allowed more than 5000 dollars per annum; some are paid as low as 150 dollars per annum; others receive a salary and a commission per cent. on the amount received, and some of them only receive a commission on the monies received. The compensations to the Surveyors and Naval Officers, vary from 150 to 3000 dollars per annum each. The aggregate compensation paid to the Collectors of the Direct Tax, for 1815, amounted to 299,642 dollars, 44 cents; this sum included the payments to deputies and clerks. The principal Assessors receive each 200 dollars per annum, and 3 dollars for every one hundred taxable persons on their tax list, besides reasonable expenses for books and stationery; no allowance was made to an Assessor when the State assumed the payment of the tax.

Each Superintendent of a Light-House receives two-and-a-half per cent. on the amount of his disbursements.

Two of the Registers of the Land Offices receive 200 dollars per annum, and 1 per cent.; sixteen of them receive 500 dollars per annum, and 1 per cent. Two of the Receivers are paid 200 dollars per annum, and 1½ per cent.; sixteen of them 500 dollars per annum, and 1½ per cent. on the amount received.

The Deputy Post-Masters are compensated by commission on the postages collected, which, in no case, is allowed to exceed 2000 dollars per annum. The compensation for the transportation of the Mail, is in proportion to the distance.

## No. IV.

## CHRIST'S HOSPITAL.

(Extract from the Charter, vide p. 147 and 162.)

“ EDWARD the Sixth, by the grace of God of England, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, and in Earth of the Church of England and Ireland Supreme Head, To all whom the present letters shall come greeting. Whereas, We, pitying the miserable state of the ~~POOR~~ FATHERLESS, decrepid, aged, sick, infirm, and impotent persons, languishing under various kinds of diseases; and also of our special grace, thoroughly considering the honest pious endeavours of our most humble and obedient subjects, the Mayor, Commonality, and Citizens of our city of London, who by all ways and methods, diligently study for the good provision of the poor,

*Appendix.*

and of every sort of them, and, that by such reason and care, neither children yet being in their infancy shall lack *GOOD education and instruction*, nor when they obtain riper years, shall be destitute of honest callings and occupations, whereby they may honestly exercise themselves in some good faculty and science, for the advantage and utility of the commonwealth, nor that the sick and diseased, when they shall be restored to health, may remain idle and lazy vagabonds of the state, but that they, in like manner may be compelled to labour at honest wholesome employments: Know ye, that We, as well for the considerations aforesaid, as of our special grace, and of our certain knowledge and meer motion, desiring not only the progress, amplification, and increase of so honest and noble a work, but also condescend in our name, and by our royal authority, to take upon ourself the patronage of this most excellent and most holy foundation now lately established, have given and granted, and by these presents do give and grant, to the Mayor and Commonality, and Citizens of our city of London, all that our manor, capital, messuage," &c.

The Charter then enumerates the tenements, edifices, and hereditaments, &c. for the aforesaid purpose of providing for the "*aged, sick, and infirm.*"

## CHARTER HOUSE.

(*Extract from the Charter, vide p. 149 and 162.*)

"KNOWE ye therefore that we graciouslye affecting so good and charitable a worke, of our princelye disposition and care for the furtherance thereof, and of our especiall grace, certaine knowledge, and meer motion, have given, granted and confirmed, and by these presents, do give, grante, and confirme, for us, our heires, and successores, unto the said Thomas Sutton, his heires, successors, administrators, and assignes, and to every of them, full power, license, and lawfull authoritie, at all times hereafter, at his and their will and pleasure, to place, erect, found, and establish, at, or in the saied house, called the late dissolved Charter-house, besides Smithfield, and other the premises within our saied countie of Middlesex, *one hospital house or place of abiding, for the finding sustentation and reliefe of POORE, AGED, MAIMED, NEEDEY, OR IMPOTENT PEOPLE.*—And further, we of our saied especiall grace, certaine knowledge, and meer motion, have given, granted, and confirmed, and by these presents, do give, grante, and confirme, for us, our heires and successors, unto the saied Thomas Sutton, his heires, executors,

## Appendix.

administrators, and assigns, and to every of them, at his, and their wills and pleasures, full power, license, and lawfull authoritie, at all times hereafter, to place, erect, found, and establish, at, or in the saied house, called the late dissolved Charter-house, besides Smithfield, and other the premises, in our saied countie of Middlesex, *one FREE SCHOOLE, for the instructing, teaching, maintenance, and education of POORE CHILDREN OR SCHOLLARS*, and that the saied Thomas Sutton, during his life, and after his decease the governors hereafter named and their successors, and survivor of them, and his and their successors for ever, and the governors of the saied hospitall for the tyme being, and their successors shall have full power, license, and lawfull authoritie, at his, and their wills and pleasures, from tyme to tyme, and at all tymes hereafter, to place therein such number of *POORE CHILDREN or schollars*, as to him the saied Thomas Sutton, during his life, and after his death to the saied governors and their successors, and to the survivors and survivor of them, and his and their successors, and to the governors of the saied hospitall for the tyme being, and their successors shall deem convenient, and likewise *one able learned and sufficient person to be schoolmaster* of the saied school, and one other able learned and sufficient person to be usher thereof, to teache and instructe the saied children in grammar, and also one *godlie preacher, to preach and teache the worde of God to all the saied persons, POORE PEOPLE and children*, members and officers, at or in the saied house."

## No. V.

## CITY'S ESTATE.

Under this name are various funds in the City of London arising from tolls, markets, bequests, sale of freedoms and of offices, sheriff fines, &c. We insert an abstract of the receipts and payments from these sources, presented to the Common Council, in the year ending 31st December, 1815.

RECEIPTS.	£.	s.	d.
By balance of cash in hand, 31st December, 1814.. .. .	14,997	3	2½
Rents and quit-rents .. . . .	41,600	8	8½
Markets, tolls, offices, and bequests, heretofore called rent-farms .. . . .	45,194	3	8½



## Appendix.

	£	s.	d.
Brokers' rents and admissions .....	2,590	0	0
Freedoms, enrolments, &c. ....	1,122	17	6
Casual receipts .....	6,191	17	3
Sheriffs fines .....	9,200	0	0
Sales and alienation of offices .....	221	0	0
Fines for leases .....	3,004	18	2
Fines for leases in Conduit Mead .....	244	2	5
Insurance of officers lives .....	534	3	0
Interest on government securities.....	629	6	0
Money borrowed.....	9,000	0	0
Sales of securities.....			Nil

£138,779 19 11½

Guildhall, April 2, 1816.

Richard Clark, Chamberlain.

## PAYMENTS.

	£	s.	d.
Rents and Quit Rents .....	1,511	1	7
Mansion House .....	3,730	14	11
Orphans .....	11,500	0	0
Extraordinary Works.....	18,619	18	8
Foreign Charges.....	30,102	4	5½
Assessments, Tythes, &c.....	2,225	11	2½
Market Charges .....	5,129	14	3½
Courts of Conservancy .....	1,309	1	2
Gifts and Rewards .....	10,917	4	2
Remembrancer, Solicitors' Bills, &c....	7,383	3	11
Fees, Pensions, and Liveries .....	22,709	7	1
Bequests .....	358	3	4
Insurance paid .....	450	0	0
Interest and Annuities .....	9,197	6	3
Purchase of Securities .....	504	12	7
For Account of the Entertainment to his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, and his Illustrious Visitors, and the Duke of Wellington .....	7,879	9	5
Balance of Cash in Hand, Dec. 31, 1815	2,663	19	4½

£138,779 19 11½

## INDEX.

## A.

*Abbey*, see *Monastery*.

*Ale-drinkers*, curious anecdote of a rev. Dean poisoning, 228.

*America*, comparison of salaries in that country and England, 129.

*Appropriations*, nature of, explained, 280.

*Aquinas, Thomas*, on the conception of the Virgin, 275.

*Archdeacons*, their office, 284—incomes, 303.

*Aristocracy*, influence of, 389—rental thirty-six millions a year, 392—increase in different reigns, tenure on which they received their estates, 390—church livings in their gift, 391—engross all offices in the army, navy, revenue, church, and state, except those requiring industry and talents, *ib.*—List of the Aristocracy, showing their family connexions, parliamentary influence, and the places and pensions held by themselves and relations, 394.

*Attorneys*, number of, in London, 2000, 217—in the country, about 4000, *ib.*—the clerks and their salaries, 218—incomes of attorneys, *ib.*

## B.

*Bailey, Mr. Justice*, memorable instance of judicial ignorance, 189.

*Bank of England*, 238—number of country banks, 240—the connexion with the system, *ib.*—gain about three millions annually, 243—history of the Bank, originally pawnbrokers, 245—no notes issued under £20, 246—increases its advances to government in proportion to the increase in the issues of its notes, 247—terrible laws enacted to uphold its credit, *ib.*—becomes a mere government office, 248—origin of the *Restriction-Act*, 249—juggle between Mr. Pitt and the directors, 250—base hypocrisy of the latter, *ib.*—history of the renewals of the stoppage, 251—inquiry into the possibility of cash-payments, 252—supply of specie obtained only by balance of trade; 254—quantity of specie yearly imported into Europe from the New World, 255—*BANK HANGINGS*, more than four hundred victims to the paper Moloch, 256—prosecutions for forgery before and after the stoppage, 257—horrible obstinacy of the Bank, 259—execution of Cashman and Duncoll, 260—expense of prosecutions, 262—number of notes rejected as *forged* proved to be *genuine*. *Bank profits*, sources of, 263—salaries to clerks and expenses of management, *ib.*—net profits, besides dividends and bonuses in nineteen years after the stoppage, THIRTEEN MILLIONS, 266—brief history in nineteen years, Bank hanged and transported eight hundred persons, and in addition to old dividends made a profit of 300 per cent. 268—state of the debits and credits of the Bank in 1819:

*Benfield, Paul*, account of, 367.

*Barrington, George*, anecdote of, 103.

*Beckett, John*, judge-advocate, 18—history of, 19—curious anecdote, *ib.*

*Bentham*, his work on "Church of Englandism," 276—remarks on the Catechism, 277—on the bishop of London's charge to the clergy, 336—on the patronage of the Church of Scotland, 320.

*Bentinck*, lord William, clerk of the pipe, degrading office, 19.

*Bishops*, not a part of Christianity, 289—base treatment of their secretaries, 294—incomes of Irish bishops, 312.

## Index.

- Blasphemy*, its absurdity, 275—set up as a pretence for the clergy dipping deeper into the pockets of their dupes, 319.
- Bowles, John*, conductor of the *Anti-jacobin Review*, 43—a Dutch commissioner, *ib.*—his rapacity, *ib.*—*brought up to the bar*, *ib.*
- British Critic*, conducted by two clergymen, Beloe and Nares, 44.
- Burke, Edmund*, a pensioner, 23—pension to his widow, *ib.*—his speech on the Civil List, 113.

## C.

- Camden*, marquis of, resigns his salary, 24.
- Canterbury*, archbishop of, origin of this great personage, 81—curious story about a *stone-mason's wife*, *ib.*
- Cape of Good Hope*, immense value of offices in that settlement, 77.
- Capper*, Mr. of the Alien-office, 107—curious plunder of a gaming-house, *ib.*
- Cashman and Driscoll*, barbarous execution of, by the Bank, 260.
- Castlereagh, lord*, salary, 26—foreign missions, *ib.*—his relations receive £43,427 yearly, 76—zeal of government partizans in proportion to their emoluments, 411.
- Chancery*, value of effects in, more than thirty-five millions, 219.
- Charitable Foundations*, robbery of, 142—flagrant cases of abuse, Pocklington, Huntingdon, and Wellingborough, Yeovil, Croydon, and Berkhamstead charities, 145—7—charities in the Metropolis, *ib.*—*Christ's Hospital*, *ib.*—income, £40,000 a year, 148—salaries of the masters and other officers, *ib.*—abuses in the admission of improper objects, *ib.*—*Charter-house*, its founder, 149—number of scholars, *ib.*—expenses, £18,000 a year, *ib.*—salaries of officers, *ib.*—abuses, *ib.*—*St. Paul's School*, a very rich foundation, 150—income, *ib.*—salaries, *ib.*—account of smaller charities in the metropolis, 151—Mr. Troutback's charitable bequest of £80,000 applied to defray the Regent's expenses at Brighton, 152—four charities with an annual income of £84,000,—abuse of Eton College, see Eton College. Abuses of Winchester College, see Winchester—Total revenue of all charities near two MILLIONS, 161—inadequacy of the Commission of Inquiry to investigate charitable abuses, 163.
- Cheap publications*, change they have effected in the moral and religious character of the people, 334.
- Christianity*, corruptions of, 287.
- Church Catechism*, hypocrisy, lying, vice, and bad grammar taught in, 276.
- Civil List*, hereditary revenue of the crown, 110—various sources of *private* emolument, 111—*privy purse*, unknown in preceding reigns, 112—twenty-six peers and four commoners in the household, 115—useless establishments of counties palatine of Durham and Chester, *ib.*—landed estate of the crown source of abuse and patronage, 116—statement of the charges on the Civil List, from 1804 to 1815, 117—total incomes of the royal family, reflections, 119—expenditure in lord chamberlain's department, 122.
- Civil List of the Regent*, enormous increase in its expenditure, 124—expense of upholsterers, linen-draperies, and silversmiths bills in two years, *ib.*—Civil List Regulation bill, in 1816, 125—auditor appointed, 127—its absurdity, merely to keep up the quantum of patronage, *ib.*—comparative statement of salaries of offices in America and England, 129—general statement of expenditure in 1816, 139.
- Commissioners*, their appointment, the favourite Whig and Tory mode of supporting the system, 94.
- Compensations*, their injustice, 92.
- Cove*, Mr. his book on the revenues of the clergy entitled to no credit, 297—misstatements relative to the poor clergy, 307.
- Cranmer's*, archbishop, curious letter on the "*belly cheer*" of church dignitaries, 283.
- Curran*, his remarks on pensions, 93.

## Index.

## D.

- Debtors*, receipt for defrauding their creditors, 221.  
*Dignified Clergy*, their number, 296—revenue, £380,000, 302—spend their time at card-tables and watering places, 308.  
*Distillery-Laws*, savage barbarity with which they are enforced, 229.  
*Dunning*, Mr. anecdote of, 205.  
*Droits of Admiralty*, total amount more than eight millions, 168—purposes to which they have been applied, 169—payments to Dr. Slop, Parson Daniels, sir George Young, earl of Dunmore, lord Keith, lord Gambier, captain Temple, William Bourne, to the royal family, 176—origin of Droits, 172—management vested entirely in ministers.

## E.

- East India Company*, influence of, 344—its connexion with government, *ib.*—origin and history, 345—territorial acquisitions, 349—obtained valuable cessions from the Great Mogul by curing him of a venereal complaint, *ib.*—Mr. Pitt's India bill, 350—deposition of the Mogul, and immense power of the dealers in pepper and ginger, 351—number of persons employed by the Company, 353—their average income, *ib.*—salaries to their servants, 354—rate of pensions allowed to retired officers, 355—patronage, in whom vested, 356—judicial system, 378—its abuses, *ib.*—revenue of Hindostan more than eighteen millions; expenditure in their three principal establishments, 359—shipping employed, 360—debt of the Company 40 millions, 361—scandalous abuse of patronage, 369—election influence exercised by the Company over their servants in England, 371.  
*Edinburgh Review*, its defence of rotten boroughs exposed, 414.  
*Eldon*, lord, history of this avaricious Tory, 37—his immense wealth, *ib.*—salaries of offices in his gift, *ib.*—frequents the *Pitt-Club*, 38—offices held by relations, *ib.* his unprincipled devotion to Mammon, *ib.*  
*Ensor*, his remarks on tithes, 326.  
*Episcopacy*, substitution of for popery injurious to the people, 281.  
*Established clergy*, expense of, 272—origin of tithes, 278—not a part of Christianity, 279—non-residence of, 289—curious disclosures of Mr. Wright, *ib.*—revenues £5,059,400, 310—immense incomes of the London clergy, 325—rapacity of the Fire-act clergy, 321—treatment of their curates, 323—false allegations about their "ancient rights," *ib.*—two millions of charitable plunder in the hands of the clergy, 329—character of the established clergy, *ib.*—extract from Locke, *ib.*—patronage, in whom vested, 311.  
*Eton College* founded by Henry VI. for "seventy poor and indigent scholars," 153—revenue of £10,000 a year divided betwixt the master and fellows, 154—shameful abuses, 155—violation of their oaths by the reverend fellows, *ib.*—fraudulent alteration of the statutes of the founder, 155.  
*Excise* principally paid by the working classes, 192—remarks on the use of tobacco, porter, and tea, 201.  
*Excise informations*, instances of, 223—expense of, *ib.*—more oppressive in Ireland, 229.

## F.

- Family connexions*, curiously dovetailed into each other, 93.  
*Finances*, state of, 447—progress of debt and taxation from the Revolution, 449—sums expended in the American war, 452—in the French war, 454—deplorable state of, and inextricable difficulties in 1820, 457.

ind. r.

*Fire-Act Clergy*, see Established Clergy.

*First fruits*, yearly value of, 297.

*Foreign ministers*, salaries in 1804, 120.

*Fox, Charles James*, sinecurist and placeman, 41—his argument in defence of sinecures, *ib.*—its fallacy, *ib.*

## G.

*Gaming-houses*, increase in number, 106—sums won and lost in a year, SEVEN MILLIONS, *ib.*—sinecurists and placemen principal gamblers, 107.

*Garnier*, apothecary-general, surrenders patent of his situation, 43.

*Garrow*, Mr. Justice, extract from his address to the grand jury of Surrey, 187—his calumnious misrepresentations of the Reformers exposed, 190.

*Gentleman's Magazine* proprietor, printer to government, 44.

*George III.* his immense riches, 176—his avarice and character, *ib.*

*Gifford, William*, a shoemaker, 43—comptroller of the lottery-office, &c. *ib.*—editor of the *Quarterly Review*, *ib.*—falsehoods and misrepresentations of that journal.

*Gunn*, Rev. Mr. curious anecdote of, 323.

## H.

*Heriot*, Mr. editor of the Sun newspaper, receives £500 a year for eulogizing Mr. Pitt, 43.

*Holy Ghost*, mode of filling the clergy with, 286—its monstrous stupidity, *ib.*

*Hunn, Mary*, mother of Mr. Canning, 53—formerly an actress, *ib.*—keeps a shop at Plymouth, *ib.*—marries Mr. Reddish, *ib.*—receives a pension, *ib.*

*Huntingdon School*, funds of that charity employed in procuring corrupt returns of members of parliament, 146.

## I. &amp; J.

*Impropriators*, amount of tithes in their hands, £1,025,440, 311.

*Jones, William*, marshal of the King's Bench, 55—his emoluments, *ib.*—regulations of that prison, *ib.*

*Ireland*, revenues of the Protestant church in, £676,000,—311—incomes of bishops, 312—immense value of church land, *ib.*—an archbishop a lieutenant in the navy, 313—rapacity of the tithe proctors, 314—barbarous execution of the distillery laws, 229—representation of, 424.

*Justice*, expense of, 186—Magna Charta violated, 219—instances of delay, 220—instances of despatch with which it is administered in Ireland, 230.

## K.

*Kipling's*, Dean, furious letter to Mr. Lingard, 317.

## L.

*Laws*, no man acquainted with English laws, 204—7000 persons in the legal department in London.

*Lawyers* have same motives for resisting improvement that workmen have for the introduction of machinery, 222.

*Leeward Island* duties, 166—wasted in pensions, *ib.*

*Locke*, Mr. remarks on the servility of the clergy, 329.

*London*, its civil government, 100—salaries to the marshals, patrol, &c. *ib.*—amount of robberies annually committed, 104—prostitutes, classification and number, 109.

*Lord privy seal*, his duties, 115.

## Index.

- Lopez, sir Massch*, fined £10,000 for an offence as "notorious as the sun at noon-day," 371.
- Lottery*, influence of, 373—history of, 374—originally intended to promote works of public utility, 375—only become pernicious under the "social order" administration of Mr. Pitt, 377—price of tickets, and profit to government in five years, 379—fifteen suicides produced annually by lotteries, 380—deplorable facts of their tendency, 381—Mr. Vansittart, his speech in defence of, 383—general reflexions on, 386—on Reformers gambling in, 388.
- Louther*, lord, commissioner of the Treasury, 60—livings in the gift of the family, *ib.*—the noble earl's famous speech on Reform, *ib.*

## M.

- Master of the Horse*, his office, 114.
- Middling classes*, their criminal and culpable neutrality, 145—their condition in France before the Revolution a warning to the same order in England, 202.
- Military College*, Sandhurst, expense of, 3.
- Monasteries*, dissolution of, 281—amount of revenues, 282.
- Monthly Review*, curious fact relative to the East India Company, 371.

## N.

- Nabob of Arcot*, origin of the debts of, 368.
- National Debt*. See Finances.
- National School Society*, system of morality taught, 277—necessity of dissenters watching their proceedings, 278.
- Naval Asylum*, 3.

## O.

- Oldham*, judicious conduct of the Reformers there, 200.
- Ordnance*, expense of, 3.

## P.

- Parliamentary Patronage*, 425—One hundred and forty-four peers return three hundred members, *ib.*
- Parliamentary Reform*, reasons for, every where.
- Peerage*. See Aristocracy.
- Pensions* amounting to £642,621 granted to 1109 persons, 8—to ladies, on the death of their husbands, 9—foreigners on the pension list, *ib.*—immense number of Scotch pensioners, *ib.*—act to restrain granting of pensions exceeding £300 a-year, *ib.*—compensation for loss of office, 10—classification of, 11—instances of subserviency to literary prostitution, 43.
- Pluralism*, instances of parsons holding three, four, five, and six livings, 291.
- Pocklington School*, master £900 a-year for teaching one scholar, 145.
- Police Establishments*, number of police offices, 95—salaries of the principal officers, 96—clerks practise as solicitors, *ib.*—enormous fees exacted, *ib.*—pay of the horse-patrole, *ib.*—allowance for attending the Regent at the Opera House, Excise and Stamp offices, *ib.*—annual cost of the London police, 98—*patronage*, in whom, 99—abuses of the police,—gaming houses, female prostitution, and riot, 108-9.
- Publicans*, their base and stupid subserviency to the magistrates, 199.
- Public Offices*, number of persons employed in, 3.

## Index.

## Q.

*Quarterly Review*, its editor, 43—falsehoods and misrepresentations, *ib.*—extract from, relative to Excise laws, 209.

## R.

*Regent, Prince*, his character, 117—personal income of, 118—grant to Spitalfields weavers, 177—observations on late proclamation, 186.

*Reports of law cases*, 206.

*Representation*, state of, 412—its absurdity, neither representing property, intelligence, nor population, 413—under the Saxons the election to all offices vested in the people, 417—list of places formerly returning members, 418—number of parliaments in each reign, 419—durations of in the reign of Henry VIII. show right of people to short parliaments, 421—view of changes in representation, 422—parliamentary patronage, 144 peers returning three hundred members, 423—list of members, showing their relationships, pensions, salaries, &c. 425.

*Restrictions on the Press*, reflections on, 331.

*Revenue*, war upon, 192—its policy shown, *ib.*—best mode of conducting it, 198.

*Reversions*, their origin, 7.

*Ricardo*, Mr. estimates Bank profits in 19 years at THIRTEEN MILLIONS, 266.

*Royal Family*, sums received out of the Droits of Admiralty, 167.

*Royalty*, an expensive government, 110—ridiculous pageantry of gold keys, ermine, lawn, maces, and wigs, *ib.*

## S.

*Salaries* increased twenty to thirty per cent., 3.

*Saleable Offices in Courts of Justice*, enormous value of, 12.

*Scotch Pensioners*, increase of, in the last reign, 17.

*Scotland*, hereditary revenues of the crown in, 14.

*Seditious Meetings' Bill*, reflections on, 331.

*Sinecures*, description of, 6—colonies chief nidus of, 7—value of colonial sinecures, £76,546, *ib.*—total value of sinecures in the gift of the crown, £356,555, *ib.*—noble lords and fine ladies searchers, packers, gaugers, &c. 8.

*Slop*, alias Dr. Stoddart, sums received out of Droits of Admiralty, 168.

*Smith's, Adam*, observations on lotteries, 386.

*Society*, different classes divide, 193—their incomes, 194.

*Southey Robert*, his pension, 78—author of *Wat Tyler*, and many other crazy, *loyal*, and *jacobinical* works, *ib.*—English bards strangely inspired with a love of pensions and places,—Wordsworth, Moore, Coleridge, and Fitzgerald, 79.

*Stanhope*, lord, on defects of English law, 234.

*Statute Law*, origin of, 203—prodigious accumulation, 206—ignorance of the judges, 205.

*St. Botolph*, valuable living of, 325.

*Steward*, lord, of the household, 114—his office and duties, *ib.*

*St. Paul's School*, abuses in this rich foundation, 150—account of its founder, 150—extract from statutes to show the right of the poor to this charity, 162.

*Superannuations*, real services to the state inadequately paid, 94.

*Suppression of Vice Society*, their connivance at gaming houses and the vices of the "higher orders," 107.

*Surplice Fees*, origin of, 327—how paid in London, 328.

## Index.

## T.

- Taxation*, principles of, 447.  
*Tithes and Pensions*, generally conferred together, and a person at the same moment made a *nobleman* and a *pauper*, 93.  
*Tithe System*, origin of, 278—no part of Christianity, 279—cruelties of, in Ireland, 314—Ensor, Paley, and Malthus's remarks on 326.  
*Tomline, George*, bishop of Lincoln, 83—accused of misapplying the charitable funds of Mere and Spital.  
*Troutback, Mr.* left £80,000 to erect an Orphan Hospital, 151—applied to defray the Regent's expenses at Brighton, 152.  
*Tyburn Ticket*, exempts the owner from parochial duties, 97.

## V.

- Vansittart, Mr.* defence of lotteries, 383.

## W.

- Walter, Mr.* late proprietor of the Times, a pension for supporting Mr. Pitt,  
*Warrender, Sir George*, lord of Admiralty, 86—injustice of ministers keeping up the number of these officers, *ib.*—would as soon grant the elective franchise to the people as abate the amount of patronage, *ib.*  
*Wellington, Duke of*, his immense income, 87—wealth accumulated by particular families in a few years, *ib.*—contrast of the Duke's services, with those of the Duke of Marlborough, *ib.*—prodigal grants of the House of Commons, *ib.*—refuse only reform and retrenchment, never to vote away the liberties and properties of the people, *ib.*  
*Westminster*, defect of its police, 100—dean and chapter the disposal of all offices, *ib.*  
*Whigs*, their lavish grants to the royal family, 108—to Hester Stanhope, 79—two reversions to Lord Erskine's favourite clerk, 47—additions to the audit office, 120—grants out of Droits of Admiralty, 176.  
*Winchester College*, founded for seventy "poor and indigent scholars," 157—management of the college, *ib.*—violation of the statutes, *ib.*—income £14,000, *ib.*—abuses, 158—shameful violation of oaths, *ib.*  
*Wright, Mr.* commences action against the clergy for non-residence, 288—penalties £80,000, 293—formation of clubs among the parsons to calumniate this gentleman, 294—clergy indemnity bill, 295—disclosures of Mr. Wright in the Morning Chronicle, 269.  
*Writs* issued in a year, 222.  
*Wyndham, Percy Charles*, registrar at Jamaica, 89—immense value of colonial securities, 90—under an honest government an exhaustless resource for relieving the burdens of the people, *ib.*  
*Wynn, Henry Watkin*, not "*Squeaking Wynn*," 90—*profitable loyalty* of that family, *ib.*

## Y.

- Yeovil Charities*, estates in the hands of trustees, 147.  
*York, Duke of*, infamous grant of £10,000, 4—contrast with James II., 91.

THE END.

Printed by John Fairburn, 2, Broadway, Ludgate-hill.

