



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

No. I.

Price Two-Pence.



Matthew Wood 294-

XI LETTERS TO THE LORD MAYOR, 1817.

With an Appendix, containing an Analysis and New Classification of the State of the Representation, and the House of Commons.

BY MAJOR CARTWRIGHT.

Published by WILL. HONE, at the *Reformist's Register Office*, 67, Old Bailey, three doors from Ludgate-Hill.

TO THE READER.

WHILE Petitions for Reform were daily pouring into the House of Commons, allusions were repeatedly made to the author of the following Letters, as having promoted the signing of such as were too deficient in *respect*, for the House to receive them consistently with its *dignity*.

Well had it been for the reputation of that assembly, had a majority of its members been as solicitous for its honour, as the writer has been.

By its ultimate conduct on the approaching motion, to be grounded on the Prayer of the Petitions, that is to say, by its tenaciousness, touching *its claim to be an asserter of the Rights of the People*, as well as touching *its character for inflexible justice*, let us hope that, notwithstanding its own impaired condition hath, for a petitioning half century, been hid from its eyes, that it now at length, in this its day of trial, knoweth the things which belong unto its dignity and unto the nation's peace!

Forty years ago, namely, in the year 1777, in his Preface to *The Legislative Rights of the People Vindicated*, the Writer replied to the insinuations of *that day*, concerning *disrespect* in discussing the great question which still remains to be decided. A discussion is one thing—a petition is another; of impropriety in either, the writer is not conscious.

But the several propositions in the Petition which of late was most criticised, as well as the objections started, are before the Public. By its decision, the writer is willing to abide.

Some gentlemen gave a singular reason for rejecting those Petitions that were in the form of words which *most sensibly touched the feelings* of the seat-selling fraternity; namely, that they were so worded, for the very purpose of *entrapping* the House into a rejection of them.

16.
It must, however, puzzle men of less ingenuity to discover, why persons who saw a *trap* laid for them in a *by-path*, should go out of the straight road, both

TO THE READER.

of self-respect and of legality, to walk into it.

No: the Rejectors walked not aside into a *Trap* but into a *Terrorem Battery* of their own contriving. Towards Petitioners who know the debt of Rights which is due to them, and who claim to be paid in full, as well as without delay, it was policy in the petitioned to express *anger*. Their *contempt* is reserved for the step-by-step children of imbecility, who have neither a true knowledge, nor a right feeling, of political rights, and who ask for payments by petty instalments at distant intervals. Towards such parties, whose project implies an idea, that Borough-mongers are to be *caught* as boys catch silly birds, the word *entrapping* might have an application.

So much for an Assembly which seems to have become more a representative of the Court than of the Country! A word now on *Statesmen* and on *Government*. Seven years ago, the Writer laid it down as a political axiom, that "He is a STATESMAN " who can preserve a prosperous state " from declension; or who can *restore* " to *Freedom and Prosperity* a state in " which *Corruption* hath made its in- " roads; *Arbitrary Power*, its ra- " vages."*

Between *wielding the power* of a state, and *governing* a state, the difference may be as wide as between Vice and Virtue, Folly and Wisdom, Madness and Sobriety. Government,

or "the *Art of Politics*, is the JUST application of *Common sense* to "public affairs." So says *Locke*.— MISGOVERNMENT, the writer has no need to define.

He may, however, give a sketch of its effects. In misgovernment, a guiding minister—having pillage for his end, with treachery, terror, and torture for his means,—rules with a rod of iron, and chastises with scorpions. *Virtue and wisdom being incumbrances*, he provides himself with a deputy tormentor without either, to disseminate illegal nonsense, for generating the infamies of espionage, for rending asunder the bands of society, for making the weak wicked, and the wicked fiends; treating calamity as crime, the moanings of famine as the language of sedition, and the writhings of the labouring body from inward agony, as a turbulence to be quieted by ball and bayonet.

In real Government, the prescience of true wisdom prevents the growth, and in a great degree, the existence of serious evil. But, if despotism have been once introduced, it is the office of enlightened Reform, to recall banished Freedom to her tranquil throne.

Is it not high time that Property, Knowledge, and Patriotism united, to beat down that rotten pile of misrule, reared on the quagmire of Corruption, which is our curse and our shame!

Under a Despotism, a pernicious craft is the prime qualification of a minister. Of free Government alone, real STATESMEN are the growth.

No word

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM,
will give us **STATESMEN!**

Fear, or caprice, or accident may give us a change of **MINISTERS,** but **CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM** alone can by possibility give us **STATESMEN!**—Could a *Burleigh* himself be recalled to earth and re-placed at England's helm,—and saw he the present calamitous condition of his country; with its radical cause, the absence of Representation; and knew he the present public feeling and state of knowledge; should he not begin his labours with calling for a Constitutional Reform; or, in other words, for a convention of the wisdom and virtue of the community, for securing confidence to his administration and the disinterested aid of all the wise and the good, in “restoring to *Freedom and Prosperity* a state, in which “*Corruption* hath made its inroads; *Arbitrary Power,* its ravages,”—should we not exclaim, ‘*Burleigh's* reputation is a bubble! he is not a truly great man!

LETTER I.

13th March, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

WE have lived to witness an extraordinary political phenomenon, namely, a rejection of *several hundred Petitions,* for no other cause than that of their being, like our daily Petitions to the Deity, in *print.*

At a period of such unspeakable cala-

a Petitioner for Reform, will be little able to prove his true loyalty, or to shew that he merits the freedom which is the birth-right of an Englishman, the circumstance of a *Commons' House* rejecting, by *hundreds,* Petitions for Constitutional Representation, merely because *printed,* is a political phenomenon among the signs of the times, which, although not calculated to work any immediate effect congenial with the character of the act, must yet be considered as a portent of malign aspect.

Whether these *hundreds of Petitions* for a Constitutional Reform were graciously received, or contemptuously rejected, makes no difference respecting the *knowledge* of the House, or the *knowledge* of the United Kingdom. Both *know,* every human being between Cape Clear and the Orkneys *knows,* that they were Petitions for the most patriotic of all purposes, and signed by no insignificant proportion of the much injured and suffering community!

What! rejected for being *printed?* Would it not be as rational, to forbid the Bible Society to distribute any but *manuscript* Bibles? But that no *delusion* may get propagated, touching the *motive* to the rejection, as arising out of the propriety, and even importance of parliaments having their *Standing Orders,* their *rules* of proceeding, or their attention to sound precedents in *practice,*—to none of which have I the slightest objection, but quite the contrary—it appears highly expedient that this most extraordinary act, of rejecting *several hundred Petitions for the most patriotic of all purposes,* merely for having been *printed,* should be correctly stated to the Public.

In the hope of putting the sound part of the House on their guard against the seduction of those whom neither morality nor decency can restrain, as well as through a sense of duty in resisting injustice leading to despotic power, a Petition on the subject had been prepared, in which the merits of the case, as I conceive, were truly stated.

As, however, through a mischance, it so happened, that this Petition was not presented in time; and not being at pre-

your Lordship and the Public, being verbatim as follows :

“ TO THE HON. THE COMMONS,
&c.

“ THE PETITION OF, &c.

“ SHOWETH,—That your Petitioner begs leave to represent to your Hon. House a grievance of great magnitude and *most evil tendency*, of which, on behalf of himself and a large proportion of the population of Great Britain, he has to complain.

“ Your Petitioner complains that, on the 6th day of April, 1813, a Petition for *Peace*, sent up from Nottingham, was rejected by your Hon. House, merely because its recitals and its prayer were *printed*, while it was actually ‘*signed by the Petitioners with their own hands*,’ which is all that law and reason ever required ; and is all that was required by a declaratory Resolution of the Commons’ House, which had passed the *Bill of Rights*, as may be seen by reference to the Journal of the 14th of November, 1689.

“ Your Petitioner also complains that, on the 30th day of June, 1813, a Petition for *Parliamentary Reform*, sent up from Nottingham, and which Petition had your Petitioner’s signature, was likewise rejected by your Hon. House, because, as before, the wording was *printed*, while, as before, this Petition again was ‘*signed by the Petitioners with their own hands*.’

“ Your Petitioner humbly conceives, that he shall prove to your Hon. House, that both rejections were caused by misapprehension on the part of the Right Hon. Gentleman who presides in your Hon. House as SPEAKER, which misapprehension caused the determination touching those printed Petitions ; wherefore he trusts that, should he be so fortunate as to prove the opinion of the SPEAKER founded in error, no similar determination of your Hon. House will in future be opposed by your Hon. House to the just right of petitioning.

“ Your Petitioner well knows that your Hon. House, for the soundest reasons,

ING ORDERS, RULES, PRECEDENTS, and other matters of Form ; and for its guidance, unless dispute arises, most properly relies on him who *fills the Chair*.

“ With regard to the first of the said Petitions from Nottingham, your SPEAKER having perceived that the wording of it was *printed*, opposed its reception by declaring, that to receive such a Petition would be contrary to the RULES of the House.

“ Your Petitioner not a little surprised at such grounds of rejection, did himself the honour, on the 15th of April, 1813, to write to Mr. SPEAKER, submitting to that Gentleman his belief of a misconception in the case, and that ‘*there was no RULE whatever by which that rejection could be supported* ;’ and from what followed, it should seem as if his observations had not been without effect on the mind of Mr. SPEAKER, who, the next time he objected to a *printed* Petition, did it on a different ground ; but, as your Honourable House will soon see, on ground equally untenable.

“ In respect to the second of the said Petitions, your SPEAKER perceiving the Petition, like the former, was printed, he now declared, that to receive it would be contrary to the PRACTICE of the House, and on that allegation from *the Chair*, this Petition also was rejected.

“ Although your Petitioner believed that he was acquainted with the source of this misconception, yet, unwilling to rest on his own judgment, he obtained from a Member an authentic extract from the Journals, made out by Mr. RICKMAN, one of the Clerks of the House, containing, as he was taught to understand, *all that related to PRINTED Petitions*, by which authentic extract he found himself fully confirmed in his belief, that the rejection of such a Petition had no warrant or justification either in the RULES of the House, or in the PRACTICE of the House.

“ The extracts furnished your Petitioner had relation only to what passed in your Hon. House on the 6th May, 1793, and to the reference then had to certain Resolutions of the 23d of September, and

of the 6th of May, 1793, it might be supposed the Petition in question was withdrawn, merely because it ought not to have been received, whereas that was not the fact, as may be seen by reference to the *Annual Register*, to *Debrett's Debates*, and other publications of that time; so that the said withdrawing furnished *no pretence for a rejection*, on the ground of a Petition being *printed*; nor has your Petitioner been able, with all his industry, any where to discover such a PRACTICE prior to the instances of which he now complains, as contrary to the Bill of Rights, contrary to law, contrary to justice, and to reason.

“ But he has, he trusts, discovered why reference was made on the 6th of May, 1793, to the Journals of 1656, for, on the 23d of September, 1656, it was ‘ Resolved, That no *private* Petitions to be directed [to the Parliament be printed before the same be read in the House:’ and on the 1st of December following it was ‘ Ordered, That the order against printing *private* Petitions before they are presented to this House, be duly observed, and that the Serjeant attending this House shall seize upon such printed Petitions in the hands of any person that shall *deliver or disperse* the same.’

“ It would not be proper to trouble your Honourable House with historical observations for showing why such a Resolution and such an Order had been come to, although that might, perhaps, be easy; it being sufficient to remark, that all reference thereto, in the case of a Petition for *Peace*, or a Petition for *Parliamentary Reform*, must have originated in complete forgetfulness of the matter to which those proceedings in 1656 had reference; since it is impossible to give those documents, which are expressly confined to matters of mere *private* interest, any bearing whatever upon, or any application to, matters of the most important *public* concernment.

“ Besides, even in relation to *private* Petitions, those mere occasional declarations had never, during the course of the intervening *one hundred and thirty-seven years*, been once repeated, much less elevated to the rank of RULES of the House.

fatal objection, which your Petitioner is sure will have due weight with your Honourable House. They are mere votes in a *mock Parliament of CROMWELL*, whose armed *soldiers*, taking possession of all the avenues, had but six days before *garbled to the mind of the Usurper*, by forcibly excluding seventy-nine Members returned by the People, because they had not certificates of approbation from the Council of the Tyrant; and your Honourable House will not fail to keep in mind how incongruous it would be to resort for RULES or for PRACTICE to an assembly not considered in law as a Parliament; for which reason the very Acts of that Assembly are not allowed a place in our Statute Book.

“ If these Votes of *the Usurper's garbled Assembly* were not the source of Mr. SPEAKER's objection to public printed Petitions; and if that objection were not a misconstruction of votes so vicious in their origin, by interpreting that which had relation only to what was *private*, to mean that which was of *public* concernment; and if your Petitioner have, indeed, been also misled by the Extracts from your Journals, with which he was furnished as aforesaid, he is yet in the dark respecting those RULES, and that PRACTICE of the House, on authority of which the two Petitions from Nottingham were, on the said 6th of April, and on the said 30th of June, 1813, rejected.

“ Believing, however, that such was the exceptionable source of Mr. SPEAKER's objection on both occasions, to the receiving of public Petitions, if the wording of them happened to be *printed*, your Petitioner trusts your Honourable House is by this time convinced, that, for rejecting public Petitions, because of being PRINTED, there are neither RULES nor PRACTICE on which it can be justified: And he further trusts, that the Right of the case, as well as the great preference which is due to *printed* over *written* Petitions, will be clearly seen by your Hon. House, when it shall have considered the reasons arising out of a comparison between those modes of addressing your Hon. House.

“ Wherefore your Petitioner prays that your Honourable House will be pleased to

ness of rejecting the Petitions of himself and others as aforesaid, and to do thereupon as to its wisdom and justice shall seem meet.

“ And your Petitioner will ever pray, &c. &c. &c.

“ J. C.”

The reasons which, on comparing the two kinds of Petitions, are alluded to in the last clause of the foregoing document, will be found in certain Resolutions agreed to in a Committee of the Hampden Club, on the 22d of June, 1816, from which the following are extracted, namely:—

“ That common as it may be to express the allegations and the prayers of Petitions in *writing*, yet, for occasionally expressing the same in *print*, the following, among other arguments, appear to be conclusive:—

“ 1. To practise either mode, as most convenient, the People have a *Right by Law*.

“ 2. *Printing* gives facility to the placing at the head of every sheet the *words to be subscribed*, whereby all *may know* what they sign.

“ 3. An exceptionable and notorious practice of signing blank sheets, is thus *prevented*.

“ 4. That which is *printed* is perused with ease, by many who find it difficult to read what is *written*, especially when *ill written*.

“ 5. When petitioning forms require to be multiplied, the probable errors of transcribers are obviated by *printing*.

“ 6. In the correctness resulting from *printing*, accommodation is afforded to those Clerks of Parliament, who, in the enrolling of Petitions, are required to note their agreement or non-agreement.

“ 7. After *written* Petitions are signed, insidious alterations may be made with a pen; whereas *printing* prevents any such mischief.

“ 8. When a grievance is general, when the remedy is well understood, and when the importance of rapidly collecting the Public opinion is obvious, then *printing* is of incalculable utility, as well as attended with much economy of time and money.”

ly remark, that his Majesty's Minister, VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH, and the rest of the Members of AN ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS, who, on Wednesday, the 12th of March, 1817, rejected by wholesale *four hundred and sixty-eight PUBLIC Petitions* for a constitutional Reform in the Representation of the much-injured People in that House, merely because those Petitions were worded in *print*, although “ signed by the Petitioners with their own hands,” pretended not to have any other RULES or PRACTICE as a ground of that rejection, than the aforesaid proceedings on the 6th of May, 1793, furnishing neither Rule, Practice, nor Precedent; and the aforesaid proceedings in 1656, of the sword-garbled mock Parliament of the Usurper, CROMWELL, which, corrupt as the source, is equally barren of Rule, Practice, or Precedent; except the aforesaid two rejections in April and June, 1813, both founded in palpable error on the part of the SPEAKER, consequently *unjust, and not to be brought into example*.

What it may be further proper to say on this subject must be reserved for my next Letter.

LETTER II.

15th March, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

PRIOR to noticing the Debate on the *Printed Petitions*, it may be proper to lay before you some further propositions to be found in the Hampden Committee Proceedings of the 22d of June, 1816, as follows:—

That to OBSTRUCT the exercise of this sacred Right was, by that Parliament which declared, claimed, demanded, and insisted upon the undoubted Rights and Liberties of the People of England, pronounced ILLEGAL.

That except in the two cases of OBSTRUCTION on the said allegations of the present SPEAKER, there is not in the Journals, nor ever was a proof of any

That if a single branch of the Legislature, on pretence of regulating its own forms of proceeding, could, at its will, abrogate any one Right of the Subject, no Right could be safe.

That the aforesaid OBSTRUCTIONS to the sacred Right of Petitioning, enforced without explanation, cannot have a shadow of justice, of reason, or of utility.

That whatever might, or might not, have been the *motives* to the aforesaid OBSTRUCTING ALLEGATIONS, it is not discoverable that their *natural operation* could be any other than to *wrong*, to *vex*, and to *irritate* the suffering People; to put them likewise in fear of seeing converted into waste paper *many hundred existing Petitions for Parliamentary Reform*, by which Reform they can alone hope for any substantial or lasting Redress of Grievances; as well as to throw *future obstacles* also in the way of collecting on that point the sense of the nation.

That on the 27th of October, 1680. the then House of Commons, "Resolved, *nemine contradicente*, That it is, and ever hath been, the undoubted Right of the Subjects of England, to petition the King for the calling and sitting of Parliaments, and *redress of grievances*."

"That to traduce such Petitioning is a violation of duty; and to represent it to his Majesty as tumultuous and seditious, is to *betray the liberty of the subject*; and contributes to the *design* of subverting the ancient, legal Constitution of this kingdom, and introducing arbitrary power.--Ordered, That a Committee be appointed to enquire of all such persons as have offended *against these rights of the subject*."

That the first man in those days who, for "having offended against the *said rights of the subject*," appears to have been personally accused, was the—afterwards—notorious Judge JEFFERYES.

That divers other persons were likewise ordered into custody of the Serjeant at Arms, for so "*offending against the rights of the subject*."

That in particular it appears that Sir THOMAS HOLT, Serjeant at Law, received "the censure of the House, upon his knees, at the bar," for having "*betrayed the rights of the subject*, by OBSTRUCT-

ING petitioning to his Majesty for the sitting of that Parliament, and *declaring his dislike and abhorrence* of such petitioning."

That it also appears that on the 29th of October, 1680, it was "Resolved,—That Sir FRANCIS WYTHENS, by promoting and presenting to his Majesty an Address, expressing an *abhorrency* to petition his Majesty for the calling and sitting of Parliaments, hath *betrayed* the undoubted Rights of the Subjects of England.—Ordered, That Sir FRANCIS WYTHENS be EXPELLED this House for *this high crime*."

"Ordered, That Sir FRANCIS WYTHENS do receive his sentence at the bar of the House, upon his knees, from Mr. SPEAKER: which was accordingly done."

That, on the 15th of March last, a Paper from the Mayor and a very few other persons of the *rotten Borough* of Lymington, merely to state that they had *not* joined in a Petition sent up from their own *town* against the Income Tax, and that such Petition had their "*total disapprobation*," was tendered to the House, when, on its being asked by a Member, if that Paper, which "*complained* of nothing, and *prayed* for nothing," ought to be received as a *Petition*, it was replied by the SPEAKER, that, "It was not the USAGE of the House to be *very nice* on that point, as their doors ought to be thrown *as wide open as possible to Petitions*," or in words to that effect; whereupon the said Paper from the *rotten Borough* aforesaid, "*complaining* of nothing, and *praying* for nothing," was *accounted a Petition*, and as such RECEIVED.

That it is somewhat remarkable that, in the margin of the VOTES, which VOTES are printed under the immediate direction of the SPEAKER, the aforesaid extraordinary document from the *rotten Borough* of Lymington, signed by the Mayor, &c. is thus designated:—"Petition of Mayor, &c. of Lymington, AGAINST former Petition respecting the Property Tax."

That between the "DISLIKE and ABHORRENCE" of petitioning in 1680, when despotism desired to rule and raise taxes *without any Parliament at all*, and the "TOTAL DISAPPROBATION" of petitioning in 1816, when despotism

desires to rule and raise taxes *without Representatives of the People*, which comes exactly to the same thing, the identity of nature and motive are too manifest to be *mistaken*.

Here, my Lord, recollecting that the *onus probandi* of showing why *printed* Petitions for redress of *Public Grievances* ought not to be received, lies upon the enemy, allow me to show that this is what they neither have proved, nor can prove. In the first place, they have *not* proved that, on the 6th of May, 1793, the Norwich Petition was *rejected because printed*, the fact having been otherwise; wherefore the aforesaid proceedings of that day furnish neither **RULE** nor **PRACTICE** to their purpose.

The truth is, as was stated by Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, that it was withdrawn, merely that it might not occupy the House, when a much greater question was coming on. What hard straining for a pretext then, must there have been, in attempting to drag this day's proceedings into the unhallowed service of *rejection*, by that Right Hon. Gentleman, who, in the Lymington case, so smoothly assures us, that "it is not the **USAGE** of the House to be *very nice* on that point, as their doors ought to be thrown *as wide open as possible to Petitions!*" Some, indeed, it is most true, are not "*very nice*" respecting Petitions!

In the next place, my Lord, these bold Rejectors, in their scandalous reference to the sword-garbled, mock Parliament of a Usurper in 1656, for proving that "*private*" means "*public*," or, in other words, that *black* is *white*, only prove how black are their own evil deeds; for it is self-evident that the year 1656 is to them as barren, in **RULE** or in **PRACTICE**, as the year 1793; leaving to the present **SPEAKER** the honour of having been the first, successfully to **OBSTRUCT** the right of Petitioning contrary to Law and Reason, by allegations *not founded on fact*.

The *truth* here again was completely adverse to their purpose; for the order against printing *private* Petitions then made was levelled, not at real, identical Petitions intended for *the House itself*, but at a very different object, as may be seen by comparing the text and the context

of the two Resolutions of the 23d of September, and the 1st of December, 1656.

The former concisely says. "That no *private* Petition, to be directed to the Parliament, be printed before the same be read to the House." But the latter *explains* what was intended; for it directs, "That the Order against printing *private* Petitions, before they are presented to this House, be duly observed; and that the Serjeant attending this House shall seize upon such printed Petitions, in the hands of any persons who shall *deliver* or *disperse* the same."

This brings us to understand that the matter objected to was, *not* the mode of preparing an *original* Petition intended for *the House itself*, but—the multiplying of *copies*, for *delivering* and *dispersing* in the way of a canvass, prior to *the House itself* having seen the original; and, considering the purpose in view, there can be no doubt, but that in such *copies* the *names* of the Petitioners, as well as the wording of their Petition, were printed; and it would be absurd to suppose, that a Petition with *printed names* instead of *written signatures* could ever have been intended for, or received by, the House; or that *the same* Petitioners could have signed great numbers of *printed forms* for being dispersed.

The forbidden Petitions of 1656 were not, therefore, such as the Rejectors now affect to forbid in 1817; ours having *printed wording* with *written signatures*, each being an *original* tendered to the House itself, with no printed *copies* by scores or by hundreds for dispersing in the avenues of Parliament.

And although the diction of these Orders of 1656, in not distinguishing between *original* Petitions and *copies*, is as slovenly as the diction of the Votes on the 6th of May, 1793, from which alone, without the aid of historical documents, it is impossible to understand *why* the Norwich Petition had been withdrawn; yet, by a little attention to the nature of the case, which explains the intention of the Orders, we come at the true meaning of them; not that this knowledge is absolutely necessary in our own case, to the understar

know, that the word "private" does not mean *public*.

Nor can we be at a loss for the true meaning of men who, finding *nothing* to their evil purpose in the authentic Journals of legal Parliaments, shamefully resort for precedents to the records of usurpation and military tyranny; and who even then, still finding *nothing* to suit them, stick not to *fabricate*, or boldly to *falsify* what they do find; calling their own falsification of a non-entity a precedent.

I say a *non-entity*; for if the STATUTES themselves of the Usurpation are *not* law, nor allowed to contaminate the Statute Book, how is it possible that the mere casual VOTES of the Usurpation, can become guides and RULES, of a legitimate Parliament? If the Rejectors esteem the present a legitimate Parliament, can they for a moment admit, as authority to them, any acts whatever of a sword-garbled mock Parliament, which had laid in a state of dormancy for more than a century and a half? As well might they have taken a precedent from the Divan at Constantinople. As an experienced and attentive Magistrate, what think you, my Lord, of such fabrication of evidence?

LETTER III.

17th March, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

BEFORE we drop this subject of the *Printed Petitions*, it is but justice to our adversaries to hear what they had to say for themselves in the Debate on the 12th of March. Although, as then observed by Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, "the Treasury Benches and those behind them were very full, and those on the other side of the House were very empty," yet the hostile speakers having been few, and not having had much to say, our task will be easy. Premising that I merely argue from what was reported in the Newspapers. I shall be ready, if in any error to

correct the same as soon as it may come to my knowledge.

MR. BRAGGE BATHURST, Member for the Rotten Borough of Bodmyn, in an anticipating speech the same evening, had argued, that because the *four hundred and sixty-eight Petitions* "were printed, they *could not* therefore be received."

MR. QUIN is reported to have observed, that "with respect to the Resolution" [of the sword-garbled mock Parliament aforesaid] "which referred to *private* Petitions, that all Petitions, in a Parliamentary sense, were *private* which did not come from a *public body*." A happy thought this for our Borough-mongers, who have got at their command so many of these "*public bodies*!" This would be good news to the patrons of the several Irish Corporations of *twelve burgesses* each, in towns having from 5000 to 18,000 inhabitants, as, for instance, Coleraine, Sligo, Wexford, Bandon Bridge, and Belfast; to the Royal Burghs of Scotland universally; nor less so to many in England: such as Bath, where the "*public body*" consists of 30, and the inhabitants of 30,000; not to enumerate a great number where there is, in fact, but a *single person* in whom all power centres. According to this happy thought of Mr. QUIN, several of our individual Petitions, out-numbering in their signatures the corporators of all the Rotten Boroughs in the kingdom put together, shall be subject to rejection for being *private* Petitions, while Old Sarum, having not one house, and only one burgess, shall be entitled, as a "*public body*," to have its Petition received!!!

SIR S. EGERTON BRYDGES is stated to have been of opinion, that when many Petitions are "in the same words," and "printed by the same Printer," it affords "*presumptive evidence* that such Petitions do not speak the *sense of the People* from whom they *professed* to proceed." Why so, good Sir SAMUEL? And why this word "*professed*?"—Did not the Petitions *actually* come from those who *signed* them?

Every Petitioner having had before him only a single sheet, and before his eyes the form of words thereon printed, had the perfect means of knowing *what he signed*. And the Honourable Baro

must know, that not a single signature was obtained either by Close-borough command, Rotten-borough bribery, Aristocratic domination, or cajolery of any kind; and I happen to know, that nineteen times in twenty the printed forms, on a persuasion that they would be found to "speak the sense of the People," were delivered or sent to private persons, who had no controul, and with whom there was no previous acquaintance, and seldom more than half an hour's conversation; and *what was the result?* If "the sense of the People," thus collected, be not to be taken as *theirs*, if their *spontaneous signatures* be not a "genuine expression of their sentiments"—if a *voluntary, an eager-concurrence*, even against opposing and powerful influences, discouragements, and threats, do not indicate "opinions really proceeding from themselves," will the Honourable Baronet, will Mr. WYNN, or will Mr. SMYTH, instruct us in a mode more honest, more wise, and more to be depended on, for learning what the People think and wish?

But what, my Lord, is the "presumptive evidence," when Members of Parliament catch at any cavil, how contrary soever to common sense, and how insulting soever to "the sense of the People," for OBSTRUCTING their legal and just Petitions of Right?—Will the Hon. Baronet, if his indeed were the words, maintain, that because the Lord's Prayer, the common *Petition* of Christendom, has for eighteen centuries been "*in the same words*," and because for some centuries past it have also been "*printed*," and because, moreover, in our own country, this, for the most part, is done by "*the same Printer*," that, therefore, we have "presumptive evidence" that it does "*not speak the sense*" of the millions of Christians who daily use it?

Mr. BOSWELL, Member for the Rotten Borough of Plympton, in support of his vote for rejecting *four hundred and sixty-eight* legal Petitions which ought to have been received, is reported to have uttered a few words of contempt for the signers of the Petitions, and a few words of intended jocularly about "a helpless old man" metamorphosed into a "wandering star;" and this, if newspaper justice were

done him, was all that fell on that important constitutional question, from the lips of this son of the exuberant Biographer of our mighty Lexicographer. How copious the knowledge, how cogent the arguments, how potent the logic of our adversaries!—How formidable the batteries of their wit and their wisdom!

The libel, as I deem it, on the profound Mr. WYNN, must now be noticed. All that is given as coming from so accomplished a person, being mere sophistry and chicanery, must be a fable. Having however got abroad as *his*, it demands our attention. I trust that the remarks I have to offer, will defeat the mischievous intention of an insidious reporter, who aims his poisoned arrows against the Parliamentary Reformers, pretending that they fly from the bow of the libelled Mr. WYNN.

Mr. WYNN is made boldly to begin his speech with taking the unsound and already reprobated proceedings in 1656 and in 1793, as precedents and authorities for rejecting the *four hundred and sixty-eight* Petitions because *printed*; whereas, Mr. WYNN must have known they were neither precedents nor authorities, nor had the slightest bearing on the question before the House.

That Gentleman is then made to speak on what passed in 1813, when the *first* rejections of Public Petitions for being *printed* occurred, in consequence of Mr. SPEAKER'S OBSTRUCTIONS to the Right of Petitioning, on the 6th of April, and on the 30th of June, in that year. The first successful OBSTRUCTION was his allegation touching the RULES of the House; the second, his allegation touching the PRACTICE of the House; allegations which Mr. WYNN, who has assiduously studied all that qualifies a gentleman for *the Chair*, must have known were *allegations in error*, and that the consequent rejections were of course *rejections in error*; and NO PRECEDENTS. And your Lordship must see, that the late wholesale rejection of 1817, is only a *great error piled on a little error*, like a pyramid which is set bottom upwards, and therefore cannot stand.

Mr. WYNN is farther made to observe, that "six days afterwards, a Petition from Major CARTWRIGHT was presented for

leave to present a printed Petition;" and then to add, "No decision took place on that Petition, as from circumstances it was withdrawn." But how withdrawn? The fact however was, that it was promptly met by Mr. SPEAKER with this objection, that "against a decision on any question, no Petition could in the same Session be received;" whereupon the presenting Member, seeing no chance but of a rejection, did withdraw the Petition; but at an unfortunate moment, and too hastily for being supported by Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, who was in the act of rising for that purpose, when he found himself too late.

Now, whether the SPEAKER, or Mr. WYNN, or any others in the House, did, or did not, discover that the Petition had a *primary* and *prominent* prayer, to which this rule of rejection laid down from the Chair had no application, I say not.

But how this *primary*, this *prominent* feature, tending to the correction of an error affecting the House's honour, should have been sharp-sightedly overlooked, while the *secondary* feature, touching justice to Petitioners, was so sharp-sightedly discovered, is matter for reflection.

Although the Petitioner's ultimate object no doubt was, that printed Petitions should be received, as they ought to be, yet the reasoning in that Petition of July, 1813, went to show, in the way of appeal, the error into which the House, by its rejections on the 6th of April, and the 30th of June, had fallen, and the *primary* prayer of the Petition was, that the House would correct its own error, and then allow the rejected Petition of June to be received.

But, instead of attending to this appeal, for a reversal of its own erroneous decision, by an affectation of not understanding what the Petitioner meant, this *Petition of appeal* became waste paper. Whether it were answered or evaded, is left to Mr. WYNN's consideration; and sure I am he is too well-informed a man to have spoken of such a Petition merely as one praying "for leave to present a printed Petition," whereas, its very essence was an appeal from the House to the House; that is, from its haste to its deliberation, from its error to its corrected judgment, from its

That such a Petition might have been received and complied with and most honourably to the House, is manifest; and Mr. WYNN is too intelligent to think, and too manly to say, that it would not become a House of Commons to retract to-day an error of yesterday; much less to countenance the absurdity of a pretended rule, that what it has *mistakenly* done against right in one Session, shall not be undone until a subsequent Session.

What I have next to notice is so confused, that Mr. WYNN's speech must have been misreported. It is stated, that "at the request of the Hon. Gentleman the Clerk read the entry of 1793, which applied only to *Private* Petitions; but that of 1813 related to *Public* Petitions from the town of Nottingham.—He thought that these entries established the RULE."

But, as already shown, it was impossible that the entries on the 6th of April and the 30th of June, in 1813, or either of them, could "establish the rule;" for, on the first occasion, the SPEAKER's objection was, *not* that the Petition for Peace then offered could not, in the nature of things, be received, as being contrary to law, contrary to reason, contrary to justice, morality, or even decorum, but because it was *contrary to the RULES of the House*.

There being, however, in fact, *no such* RULE in existence, the decision was consequently *unfounded* and *illegal*; and, of course, a *nullity*, incapable of becoming a *precedent*. And, so sensible of this had the SPEAKER been made, that, when he opposed the receiving of the Petition for Parliamentary Reform, tendered on the 30th of June, he changed his ground, to its being contrary to the PRACTICE of the House. But as the *nullity* of the 6th of April makes no *precedent*, nor is pleadable as PRACTICE, this decision of June the 30th, 1813, was, consequently, as *unfounded* and *illegal* as the former.—And so the shameful decision of the 12th of March last, must stand an object of every virtuous Englishman's horror and indignation, until, in better times, it shall, like the shameful entry against WILKES's Election for Middlesex, be expunged from the Journals.

But Mr. WYNN is stated to have de-

sonable one, calculated to prevent the manufacturing of Petitions in London, for the purpose of being sent down to be signed, instead of offering a general expression of *the sentiments of the People*." A disgusting unfeelingness towards a suffering population, a flagrant breach of law, and a shocking violation of a sacred Constitutional Right, "A REASONABLE RULE!"—Heavens, what next?

In the STATESMAN, Mr. WYNN is made to remark, that "nothing could be more publicly known than the decisions of 1813, entered on the Journals."—The Journals for the 6th of April and the 30th of June, 1813, I have not seen; but I have seen the *printed votes* for those days, in which votes there is not one syllable relative to printed Petitions being offered and rejected. Understanding the printed votes to be the very matter which, when collected, is called Journals, I confess that at so extraordinary an omission *I was surprised*—but, after a moment's thought, *I was not surprised*.

Here, my Lord, I take leave of the pettifogging cavils, the mockery of our understandings, and the solemn insidiousness foisted on us as a pretended speech of Mr. WYNN, by merely observing, that of a low-bred Borough-jobbing trickster, of whom gain is the god, and plunder the daily bread, we can believe any thing, however base; but we cannot believe such wretched sophistry and disgraceful chicanery as I have quoted, to have been "a genuine expression of the sentiments" of a County Member, a man of high birth, high connexions, and high character; a gentleman of enlarged mind, profoundly learned in the law of the land, and no less learned in the law of Parliament!

In this memorable debate of March 12, 1817, Lord CASTLEREAGH, as might be expected, was concise and *courageous*; for he had the courage to *aver*, yes, to *aver*, that "the uniform PRACTICE of Parliament had been conformable to, and had established the RULE of 1656." Hear it, all People, that it is the *avermment* of Lord CASTLEREAGH, that nullity after nullity, without a single sound step in the process, has established as a RULE for the Government of an English House of Commons, in respect of Petitions for a

redress of *public* grievances, a mere casual vote, passed one hundred and sixty-one years ago by a sword-garbled mock Parliament, the tool of a Usurper, and which vote had relation only to private interests!

The Noble Lord further declared, "He should *feel guilty* of an abandonment of *his duty*"—his duty to whom?—"were he to consent to a relaxation of the *Rule of Parliament* on the subject of printed Petitions."—Good God! if in the teeth of fact, of sense, of decency, a Minister of the Crown was courageous enough so to speak in *open* Parliament, and in the face of the Nation, what have we to expect from the *secret* counsels of such an adviser?

And what, on the other hand, are we to say to the professors of fidelity to the Constitution, who, when the Treasury Benches, for giving a stab to the Right of Petitioning, are in powerful array; for averting that stab, muster in number—*half a dozen*!

But a truce, my dear Lord, to our gravity! and although King ROBERT be determined neither to "*feel guilty*," nor "consent to any relaxation of *his rules*," I must for a moment relax from *my* detection of falsehoods and felonious violations of the "Rights of the subject" of which labour I am somewhat weary, to divert myself with a dramatic scene playing before my mind's eye, being a parody on certain passages in the delectable Tragedy of *Tom Thumb the Great*!

ACT III.—SCENE XII.*

SCENE.—An Apartment in the Palace.

The curtain rising, discovers the *Abbot of St. Stephens*, with *Noodle, Doodle*, and other Courtiers in place; *Foodle*, with a party of Courtiers out of place," and a pyramid of many hundred Petitions for a redress of grievances piled up before them.

DOODLE.

Sure such a day as this was never seen!

* Perhaps alluding to the 3d Month of the year, and the 12th day of the month.

NOODLE.

This day, O Mr. Doodle, is a day
Indeed!—A day we never saw before.
Victorious, the great King ROBERT comes;
Millions of Giants crowd his chariot wheels;
Giants! to whom the Giants in Guildhall
Are infant dwarfs; Spenceans too, and still
More dread than all, Petitioners for Right.

ABBOT.

The palace doors, you see, have open'd wide,
Petitions to receive; but our sound rules,
Rightly construed by the great Rule of Three
To one, will quickly rid us of them all again.

To them enter, at one door, the King;
at the opposite door, *Sir Beard'em*, with
a roll in his hand.

SIR BEARD'EM.

Royal BOB, I a Petition have here got,

KING.

Petition, me no Petitions, Sir, to day.
To day, our pleasure 'tis to take our sport;
And these, our friends, shall sport as well as we.
[*Flourish of Trumpets.*]
Kick we then forth this printed paper pile;
He who kicks best, shall most our favour share.

Here *Doodle*, *Noodle*, *Foodle*, and the
rest join his Majesty in the kicking; the
Petitions are all kicked "*out of doors*;"
the Courtiers bow to the King, then clap
their hands, and, to a full band of mili-
tary music, perform the high-leaping
Dance of Triumph: when, in the same
instant, Thunder, Whirlwind, and the
Ghost of HAMPDEN are heard and seen.
The military music ceases; and all pre-
sent, *Sir Beard'em* and five companions
excepted, petrified with terror, are motion-
less and dumb.

GHOST.

King of Jobbers, Robbers, and Seat-sellers,
ROBERT, for this thy prank of making free
With fruit forbidden, guilt shall gnaw thy heart,
And on thy brow thy shame be so engrav'd
That men shall shun thee as a marked CAIN:
And you, ye vermin, the same mark shall wear;
Reptiles, be gone! Reform is on the wing;
Nor can her flight be staid by things like you!
[*The Curtain Drops.*]

LETTER IV.

19th March, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

AFTER the famous petition of
1793, demonstrating the decayed and
mangled state of our national representa-
tion, has now for *four and twenty years*
had a place in the *Journals of the House*
of Commons, is it not passing strange,
that petitions should of late have been re-
jected, because of saying, "That the pe-
"titioners have a full and immovable
"conviction, a conviction which they
"believe to be universal throughout the
"kingdom, that the Hon. House doth
"not, in any *constitutional or rational*
"sense, represent the nation?"

If this may not be said, how are the
million of men who have already petition-
ed for a constitutional representation to be
justified? Coupling the *fact* with the
modest wording of the *complaint*, how is
it possible for any but a close borough
critic to torture the language I have quoted
into *disrespect*?

Be this as it may, perhaps it might be
the cause of a little more indulgence to-
wards the aggrieved, who have so ex-
pressed themselves, did the honourable
members sent up from *Harwich, Ilchester,*
Galton, Haslemere, Old Sarum, and a
long *et cetera*, but advert to the distinc-
tion in our law between a king *de facto*,
and a king *de jure*.*

It is the voice of our law, that, although
for the sake of order, peace, and "the
administration of the government," *obe-*
dience is required even to "a Usurper
who hath got possession of the throne,"
and that, although the subject be "*ex-*
cused and justified" in that obedience, he
is not required to *respect* the usurpation
because he is deemed incapable of throw-
ing off his allegiance to "the rightful

“King,” or of abandoning the duty of aiding in his restoration when opportunity shall serve.

Whether the assembly petitioned in manner aforesaid be a House of Commons *de jure*, or *de facto*, it is obeyed. Widely extensive as are the exclusions from any share in appointing to its seats, of those whose right it is to fill them, the very practice of *petitioning* proves the *obedience* that is paid to it, as well as the same *respect for its office* as submissive subjects, for the reason assigned, pay to the office of a King *de facto*.

When Richard the Third had waded through the blood of murdered heirs to the throne, was it *respect for his personal virtues*, or for his *regal office*, that was paid him in the *obedience* of the people, until the opportunity presented itself of putting an end to his personal, his ill-gotten power, but of at the same time upholding the office? And what so proper for preventing the regal office from becoming an object of *contempt or execration*, as getting it out of the hands of an unprincipled usurper?

But to return to the consideration of what is due to the House of Commons in its present state; is it not manifest, that if petitioners for its reform desert not the duty they owe their country, if they degrade not themselves below the dignity of man, and abandon not all respect for themselves, they are bound, clearly to mark in their petitions the precise distinction which ascertains the flaw in its title to the claim of being a House of Commons *de jure*, and proves it to be only a House of Commons *de facto*?

If I mistake not, I have furnished an answer to the member for the Cornish borough of Bodmyn, who, as a *placeman*, could not “be capable of serving as a “member of the House of Commons,” had the “Act for the further limitation “of the Crown, and better securing the “rights and liberties of the subject,” remained to us as perfect as in 1700 it passed.

That gentleman tells us, that a petition, speaking the language I have quoted, is not “a matter of feeling, but a challenge “of competency;” and while the petition-

House as now composed, do nevertheless yield the House complete obedience, the learned gentleman (for he is a lawyer) argues as if the contrary were the fact. It is not the submissive, the obedient petitioners, who go into argument on the nature of that flaw, but the learned gentleman himself, who thus reasons:—“If “the House did not constitutionally represent the people, its sitting was unconstitutional, and its acts were not “binding, nor could it legally impose “taxes.” But the learned gentleman carefully abstained from any attempt at showing on what grounds, and on what principles of the *constitution*, it is to be proved that the house *does constitutionally* represent the people.

LETTER V.

21st March, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

DEEMING it of importance, for removing prejudices, for dissipating despondence, and for showing that a substantial Reform *must necessarily follow* Petitions, which a large proportion of the Nation have presented, I purpose to follow up my last Letter to you, with a few others, on points of Constitutional Law, too strong, I trust, for the Borough Faction to grapple with, even in the paroxysms of its unnatural efforts to destroy our liberties. In the remainder of the series, grounding myself on the soundest authorities, I shall consult all possible conciseness.

Having observed the commenting in a certain House on the language of those Petitions which bore the form that originated in the Hampden Club, as offensive, in the vain hope of *justifying* their rejection, it is but fair to the Public, who have a deep interest in the question, to state the case correctly.

That in the first adoption of the form in

offence, *your Lordship knows as well as I*. You also know, that the adoption originated with a larger proportion of the Club than the proportion of the House of Commons which ordinarily votes to the Crown numerous millions of the People's money in a single resolve. And you further know, that the same sort of care had been taken to make that Club what is called respectable, as for giving that character to the House of Commons, so far as relates to pecuniary qualification, since a Member is required to have 300l. a year in land, or to be heir to such an estate.

And your Lordship will remember, that the form of words which has been so quarrelled with, for the most part by Placemen and Members for Rotten Boroughs, was not adopted in the Club until it had, Clause by Clause, been very carefully considered and cautiously debated.

Now, once more adverting to the first Clause in that form, let me ask, does it in reality, according to the notion of Mr. BRAGGE BATHURST, "challenge the competency" of the House to legislate, by asserting that the House *doth not* represent the Commonalty of the Realm? IT CERTAINLY MAKES NO SUCH ASSERTION.

Do the Petitioners in 1817 go the length of those in 1793, in the famous Petition which made *avermment* of facts extending to a *demonstration*, that the House did *not* represent the People, and of which facts they *tendered proof* at the Bar? CERTAINLY NOT.

No; the present Petitioners go no such lengths. They neither *aver*, nor offer to *prove*, but much more respectfully, and with much more diffidence, merely ground their Prayer for Reform in the National Representation, on their own *involuntary mental impression* of its necessity; for what are their words? we have "an immovable conviction," or, in other phrase, a resistless *belief*. Does Lord CASTLEREAGH, or does the Member for any Rotten Borough, conceive, that the *convictions* of our minds are at our command? or that as the foundation of a Prayer for *Constitutional* Representation, a mere statement of our *belief* that we

Commons *de facto*, meriting to be punished by a *rejection of our Petitions* for recovering that *Birth-right*? How, my Lord, does this comport with an idea of the sacredness of Petitioning; or with any notion of an Englishman's freedom of speech in the statement of a grievance?

We should not, my Lord, now have had the misfortune to *think* in any degree disadvantageously of the Honourable House's *title* to be acknowledged a House of Commons *de jure*, had it, at any time, in the course of the last *four-and-twenty years* devoted to that same Petition of 1793 a single discussion, and done what its duty and its *dignity* required it to do.

Touching *dignity*, we may say, with Mr. BURKE, "Let the Commons in Parliament assembled be one and the same thing with the Commons at large. The distinctions that are made to separate them are unnatural and wicked contrivances. Let them be identified and incorporated; then, indeed, they will be truly great. RESPECTING THEMSELVES, they will be RESPECTED BY THE WORLD."*

To any one who, while up to the chin in the sink of Rotten Borough Corruption, babbles about the *dignity* of the House, I address not my arguments; but, of a Gentleman, standing on the elevated ground of County Representation—of a Mr. WYNN, for instance, I would ask, if, after so extraordinary a dereliction of its reputation to the malice of evil tongues, as a *four-and-twenty years* silence, on a direct "challenge of its competency," a positive *avermment* of the fact, and tenders of *proof*, it ought to be very angry when Petitioners merely express a *belief* of what, on that point, the House has never denied, namely, that it is *not* a House of Commons *de jure*, but merely *de facto*?

If the House be now offended at its Petitioners, for giving, in the modest language of mere *belief*, the only *reason* which justifies a prayer for *Constitutional* Representation, ought it to blame those suitors or itself? It being known law that a perfectly free, undenied, uninterrupted use of way across any field, whether

open or inclosed, for *twenty years*, establishes for the Public a right freely to continue the use of such way; shall it not, by parity of reasoning, be established that what, in respect of the defectiveness of Representation, hath been formally in the way of Petition laid before the Commons' House, received and put on record in its Journals, and which for *four-and-twenty years* hath been undenied in a single *iota*, shall in like manner establish in the Public a claim to consider the alleged defectiveness as *admitted*, with a right to plead it even in the Court of Parliament?

It is also known law that the *King*, in his own Courts, may be, as he very frequently is, either a *Plaintiff* or a *Defendant*; and that if, in the latter character, in consequence of a non-denial of a just plea on the part of a Plaintiff, he were to suffer any matter to go by default against himself, it might be freely pleaded in any or all of his Courts.

This sort of conduct, however, on the part of the *King* can scarcely be supposed to happen: for, "where the King is in full possession" of any inheritance belonging to a subject, "and the party suggests such a right as controverts the title of the Crown, grounded on facts in the Plaintiff's *Petition of Right*," this answer is "indorsed or underwritten by the *King*—LET RIGHT BE DONE TO THE PARTY, when a Commission shall issue to enquire of the truth of this suggestion."*

Good God! Where our real *King* is concerned, is this the law of the land? And do our Borough Sovereigns *de facto*, who withhold from us the most valuable of all inheritances, cause our "*Petitions of Right*" to be laid on a shelf for *four-and-twenty years*, and then, when we still "suggest such a right" to that inheritance as "controverts their title" to keep it from us, are we to be told that, because we pay not the same heartfelt homage to the *dignity* of a House of Commons *de facto* as we should to a House of Commons *de jure*, our "*Petitions of Right*" shall be rejected instead of being

"indorsed or underwritten" by that House—"LET RIGHT BE DONE TO THE PARTIES!!!"

LETTER VI.

23d March, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

HAVING, in my letter of the 21st, vindicated the first and principal clause in the Hampden Club form of Petition, from the cavils of certain Parliamentary critics, let us pass on to the other clauses, which, it seems, are as little to their taste, namely, "That when the People have ceased to be Represented, the Constitution is subverted:" and "That Taxation without Representation is a state of Slavery."

What, my Lord, are these but general *political aphorisms*? Can those critics argue that these aphorisms apply to the House, unless they admit all that which, from a *four-and-twenty years of tacit admission* on the part of the House, we merely intimate that we *believe*?

Was this, however, language to offend an *English House of Commons*? Ought it not rather to have raised a blush, on being thus reminded of its own *four-and-twenty years neglect of duty*? Instead of for this cause treating the Petitioners with the *indignity* of rejecting their "*Petitions of Right*," ought it not rather to have ordered a production of the original "*Petition of Right*" it received on the 6th of May, 1793, and then to have called on the Speaker, on behalf of the House, to have "endorsed or underwritten" all the "*Petitions of Right*," according to the uniform practice of the *King* in like cases, when such Petitions are presented to him for a *surrender* of inheritances *belonging to subjects* of which he happens to be in *full possession*,"—"LET RIGHT BE DONE TO THE PARTIES!"*

* Skin. 608. Rast. Ent. 461. Black. Com. 156.

* Black. Com. III. 256.

LETTERS TO THE LORD MAYOR,

With an Appendix, containing an Analysis and New Classification of the State of the Representation, and the House of Commons.

BY MAJOR CARTWRIGHT.

Published by WILL. HONE, at the *Reformist's Register Office*, 67, Old Bailey, three doors from Ludgate-Hill.

(Continuation of Letter VI.)

THERE being, my Lord, the same sense in the distinction between a Commons' House *de jure* and a Commons' House *de facto*, as our law makes between a King *de jure* and a King *de facto*, it may be proper to remark that, so far as I have discovered, no expounder of our law, while explaining the regular course of it when subjects present their "Petitions of Right to the King, praying him to surrender inheritances *which are theirs*, but of which his Majesty is, by error, *in full possession*" as his own property, hath ever pointed out an instance, as an exception to the general rule and practice, wherein even a mere King *de facto*, although a downright "Usurper that had got possession of the Throne," attempted to evade the surrender, by refusing to "endorse or underwrite" their Petitions as aforesaid, for *Right being done*; or to *obstruct the redress*.

BLACKSTONE, in particular, does not even hint at any such instance of injustice, even on the part of a Usurper, but details the regular course of proceeding; in which the right of the Subject and the right of the King are together put upon record, when the subject, having his "plea of right, grounded on facts already acknowledged and established," the COURT is to decide, "whether upon

those facts the King or the Subject hath the right."*

Your Lordship knows that in these cases the King is not only the party who *commands* that right be *done*, but is likewise the party who *does it*. Although his law must be pronounced by the lips of his sworn Judges, he (the King) is deemed to be always present. "The style of the Court," says BLACKSTONE, "still being (*coram ipse rege*) before the King himself."†

Neither can he decide by will and pleasure, or mere royal discretion, for his decisions must be agreeable to right, justice, and "duty;" his "principal duty" being "to govern his People according to law."‡ On this, in fact, depends his right to obedience, for "by the *original contract* between King and People," now legally recognized, it is certain that *protection* and *allegiance* are their reciprocal obligations.§ This has ever been, indeed, a principle of the Common Law, for, as observed by BRAC^TON, who wrote about six hundred years ago, "the King is subject to the Law, for the Law maketh the King." "Let the King therefore render to *the Law* what the Law has vested in him with regard to others; *dominion* and power: for he is *not truly King*,

* Black. Com. III. 256.
‡ Com. I. 233.

† Ibid. I. 41.

§ Ibid.

where will and pleasure rules, and not the Law."*

The grand foundation of the maxim, that the King can "do no wrong," is this, "that the prerogative of the Crown extends not to do any injury; it is created for the benefit of the People, and therefore cannot be exerted to their prejudice."†

And it is evident that the same maxim must apply to every exercise of the power of Parliament; for it would be a solecism, that must shock every reasoning mind, to maintain, that although "the King can do no wrong," Parliament may. The contrary, however, is shown by BLACKSTONE, who expressly says, "It is the supposition of law, that neither the King nor either House of Parliament (collectively taken) is capable of doing any wrong;" and among other principles, which are the foundations of this "supposition of law" are these, namely, that "Equity suffers not right to be without a remedy;"‡ that "Wrong is contrary to the principles of law;"§ and that "The law of England will not endure an absurdity."||

There is, my Lord, another resistless argument on this subject, that must be reserved for my next Letter, which, notwithstanding present appearances, will show additional grounds of confidence why the Commons' House, having provided as it hath done for its deliberations not being disturbed by any tumultuary proceedings, will take care that "RIGHT BE DONE TO THE NATION," by putting it in possession of that birth-right inheritance of Representation for which, with an unexampled unanimity, it now prays.—For the present, I proceed in noticing the Parliamentary criticisms on our Hampden Club form of Petition, and shall finish with recalling your Lordship's attention to that in particular on which one Member commented with more than ordinary displeasure; namely, that which speaks of "contending factions, alike guilty of their country's wrongs, alike forgetful of

her rights, mocking the public patience with repeated debates on questions of refinement in the complicated and abstruse science of Taxation, as if in such refinements, and not in a reformed Representation, as if in a consolidated corruption, and not in a renovated Constitution, relief were to be found!"

Surely, my Lord, seeing that this clause says not *where*, nor *when*, such debates had occurred, it was no proof of extraordinary wisdom for any one to cry out—"Myself and my Honourable Friends, no less than our opponents on the opposite benches, are here libelled;" as if, in the opinion of the sagacious observer, there were neither place, nor persons, nor occasion, nor means, except within the walls of that House alone; where, by whom, or when contending factions could exhibit their disregard of public duty, or disgrace themselves by a flagrant sacrifice of principle to a groveling ambition, or a sordid self-interest! as if the factions had not their Pamphleteers, their Printers, their Publishers, their Journals, and their Reviews, in which their eternal warfare with each other in an indecent forgetfulness of the rights of the People, were unremittingly employed and carried on; and as if their other modes and ways without end of propagating their delusions were not in perpetual activity!

From what sort of consciousness, my Lord, and from what class of objectors, could have proceeded the notion of such mere political aphorisms being offensive to an English Commons' House of Parliament? If the ghosts of murdered rights and assassinated liberties, haunting the feverish imaginations of the buyers and sellers of the seats of Representation, were alone to dictate how the meaning of Petitioners should be construed, what language, short of acknowledging a right in our *Borough Kings de facto* to rule over, and to tax us to the end of time, would satisfy their fastidious Mock-Majesties!

Here, my Lord, the writer must enter a caveat against his being considered one of those illiberal and inexorable judges of *public men*, who cannot allow any merit to such as hold not his own political creed. For full 40 years he has, indeed, been exposed to this sort of imputation

* Black. Com. Lib. I. c. 8. I. 234.

† Ibid. I. 246. Plowd. 487.

‡ Ibid. I. 244. § Prin. Leg. at F. 28.

strenuously exclaimed against faction as now, he, in an Essay then published, said, "Indignant and unguarded as some censured passages may appear, and warm as some others will be found, it is hoped the whole tenor and design of this work will show, that *Reformation*, not resentment or *invective*, is the author's pursuit. And, this being apparent, he trusts that, where his expressions are sometimes *general*, with respect to Parliamentary corruption and the arbitrary designs of Ministers, the candour of his reader will qualify those absolute terms, by such supposed exceptions as must necessarily hold good amongst all bodies of men."*

And in a sharp expostulation with the "Opposition" of that day, he remarked that by a right conduct they would "appear in the eyes of the nation as guardian angels,"† evidently manifesting a hope of such conduct, and a readiness to give it praise.—As he then felt, and thought, and acted, he still feels, and thinks, and acts.

Allow me, before closing this letter, to recall your Lordship's attention to the important inference, in respect to the *conduct of a Commons' House*, which is to be drawn from the *conduct of a King*. It has been shown from BRAGTON, delivering the true dictates of reason, that when a *King*, violating the contract which binds up together allegiance and protection, rules by "will and pleasure" in place of ruling by "law," he is not truly *King*, that is, ceases to be *King*, and becomes a Tyrant.

If then a Commons' House, violating a still closer and more sacred bond of union, should, to the grievous oppression of the People, substitute in its decisions "will and pleasure," in place of "law," would it not thereby forfeit not only its *Representative* character, but its *Legislative* functions and *judicial* authority? Where, in such a case, would be that "*competency*" to impose on us its laws and its taxes, of which MR. BRAGGE BATHURST is so jealous? It is, therefore, to be hoped, that neither that Gentleman, nor

any other Member for a rotten Borough, will halt when only half way through this question, but travel to the end of it, and then report to us their discoveries!

LETTER VII.

25th March, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

IN my fifth and sixth Letters, dated the 21st and 23d of this instant, I presume it is clearly established, that the doctrine of a *disability to do any wrong*, applies as strongly to each *House of Parliament*, as to the *King* himself; and that, whether Petitioners apply to the *King* or to the *Parliament*, the obligation of causing *justice to be done* to the parties who claim a birth-right inheritance, which the authority petitioned holds from them, is in either case rendered equally manifest and irresistible.

Touching the sacred and most important of all inheritances, namely, *Legislative Representation*, for a recovery of which the Nation now, with unexampled unanimity and fervour petitions, the duty of the House of Commons has a *twofold* root.

When (itself being *Defendant*, and the Nation *Plaintiff*) that House is empleaded for a surrender of such inheritance withholden by it from the Plaintiff, *the House*, as we have seen, is necessarily bound, in the same manner as *the King* is bound, to cause *Right to be done*. It has no alternative, but one too monstrous to be thought of in the age in which we live. Our Country, indeed, is but too patient under the shameless sophistries of Corruption; but it would not endure to be told, that its Commons' House was invested with despotic power, that it despised Right, and acknowledged no law but its own will and pleasure; nor could it submit to the House's acting on such principles.

The duty, then, of the House, in the case supposed, we shall find to be of a compound quality, arising first, from

* *Leg. Ri. Com. Vind. Second Pref. VIII.*

in an assembly which, *de facto*, REPRESENTS, and is bound to PROTECT the People.

The House has, secondly, a duty of an uncompounded nature to redress the Plaintiff Nation. This duty arises from the authority it claims, and the power it exercises, and exercises with peculiar jealousy on all matters touching *Legislative Representation*, including every question of *Suffrage and Election*, as a COURT of JUDICATURE, having an *exclusive* jurisdiction.

True it is, that for its own ease it hath caused the Courts of Law to take cognizance of some petty points, for which purpose it introduced the necessary Statutes: but that it holds in its own hands the essential powers of a Supreme Court we see in this, that even under the *Grenville* Act for trying Contested Elections, the powers exercised are *those of the House*, which acts through Delegates, in the form of a Committee, of its Members, appointed by itself, and whose decision has no validity until it have received the *fiat of the House*.

Do we not herein see, that the House has not merely assumed to itself the authority of a COURT of JUDICATURE, but, by means of the *Grenville* Act, has contrived to obtain for its claim an indirect legal sanction; having, by force of that Statute, in the mere matter of *trying Contested Elections*, got itself actually erected into a COURT of JUDICATURE, while, although its Committee in those trials can put witnesses *on their oath*, the House, in all examinations at its own bar, neither has, nor pretends to any such power. This, however, only the more enhances the obligation of faithfully and scrupulously fulfilling the duties of a COURT of JUDICATURE, whenever it claim the authority, and exercise the power.

Had it not been for this claim of authority, and this exercise of power, by the House, I see not why, by questions of right being from time to time argued in the Law Courts, it might not long since, by universal assent, have been established, as a legal principle, that every unoffending ENGLISHMAN, treading on the free soil and breathing the free air of this

presentation, because in the practical enjoyment thereof consists *political liberty*.

By similar discussions it was, within my memory, in due time established, to the honour and universal satisfaction of the Nation, that a NEGRO SLAVE, once fortunate enough to plant his foot on English land, and to breathe English air, instantly becomes a free man. Such a principle of *Representation* once established as sound law, a Legislative Act, for clothing the principle for practical operation would as matter of course, have soon followed; and the question freed, by the invigorating force of argument, from the insufferable nonsense of supposing such an enjoyment of political liberty throughout the community, as endangering and undermining, instead of enlarging and strengthening, the foundations of government, which is its natural and inevitable tendency; provided only it had its constitutional accompaniments, equality of distribution, annual performance of the important duty of Election, and a rational organization for rendering it as tranquil as the attendance on Divine Service.

To an enlightened understanding, it is as incomprehensible, how the political body can be bettered in its condition by a denial of political liberty to its *laborious* and *lower* members, as how the natural body could be improved by amputating a *hand*, or a *foot*, or a large proportion of its *fingers* and *toes*.

Long-practised violations of right introduce absurd notions. Consulting, however, Justice and Nature, we discover Truth in its beautiful simplicity. We then see that the political body is merely the aggregate, of which individual men are the component parts; and that its well-being must consist in the healthful state of all those parts. Liberty being the life of the political body, if that life be palsied in a *hand* or a *foot*, in a *finger* or a *toe*, who, with our experience, shall say, that the disease shall not find its way *to the vital organs*?

But, let us, my Lord, return from this short digression, to a consideration of what results from the aforesaid claim of authority, and exercise of power, on the part of the House of Commons. What

responsibility of an English COURT of JUDICATURE ?

By the great Commentator we are told, that " Since the LAW is in England the supreme arbiter of every man's life, liberty, and property, Courts of Justice *must* at all times be open to the subject, and the LAW be duly administered therein. The emphatical words of *Magna Charta*, c. 29, spoken in the person of the King, are these :—*We will not DENY or DEFER to any man either JUSTICE or RIGHT.*"*

Hence it is plain that an English COURT of JUDICATURE, when appealed to for justice, hath no option either to try, or not to try, an issue : no choice, by which it can either *deny* or *delay* to give right its remedy ; or to withhold from such as are suffering under any dreadful grievance their proper redress. Discretionary justice, characteristic of despotism, hath ever been peculiarly abhorrent to the freemind of England. An English COURT of JUDICATURE cannot, like an Asiatic Tribunal, trifle with a suitor by saying— " Go your way for this time, when we have a convenient season we will send for ye."

Neither is an English COURT of JUDICATURE privileged to substitute its own will for law, its own caprice for the Constitution ; much less to prefer the corrupt interests of its own Members, or of their Patrons, to the undoubted rights and liberties, or to the known interests of the Nation !

If any maxim of *expediency* could authorize the shutting against the People all other COURTS of JUDICATURE, in order that, for a *more sure protection*, an exclusive and absolute jurisdiction should be vested in a single Court which, contrary to the voice of experience, and the dictates of matured wisdom, should unite in itself the *Judicial* with the *Legislative* functions, surely, my Lord, such an extraordinary circumstance must impart to the obligations of promptness and fidelity in the redress of a grievance on the part of such a Court, when solemnly appealed to, an increase of moral force *ten times tenfold* !

Is it, therefore, credible that, after an obligation to the rendering of justice thus an hundredfold increased ; and after what we have seen to be incumbent alike on the *King* and *every Court of Judicature* ; the Commons' House so petitioned by a suffering Nation as it now is, shall be capable of not only acting in defiance of *Magna Charta*, but shall choose to incur the very crime which stands the first and greatest accusation of JAMES II. when charged in the *Bill of Rights* with " endeavouring to subvert and extirpate the laws and liberties of the kingdom," namely, " that he assumed and exercised a power of *dispensing* with, and *suspending* of laws, and the execution of laws !"

Former Houses of Commons, indeed, we but too well know, for a century past, by their claim of judicial authority, and the use they made of it, appeared in the double characters of Judges and oppressors, assuming, as it should seem, an *exclusive* authority to protect, only that they might the more effectually betray, and pretending to an *exclusive* power to emancipate, only that they might, with more facility, enslave ; thereby exhibiting a diabolical refinement on perfidy, which was a main cause of, and directly led to, the present desperate state of this unhappy Nation.

Let us hope, my Lord, that the *present* House, seeing the terrific consequences of the crimes of its predecessors ; coming to a right understanding of the nature of those crimes, as well as to a due sense of their enormity ; reflecting on the duties that are equally incumbent on a COMMONS' HOUSE or a COURT of JUDICATURE, and respectfully ruminating on that PUBLIC VOICE which, with an awe-inspiring certainty, has announced the alternative before us to be, either the infuriate maddening of national desperation, or the deadening degradation of military despotism, unless the House itself, suddenly converted from its political sins, recover the god-like attribute of doing good, and, nobly atoning for past error, re-create by its all-potent fiat the defunct liberties of the United Kingdom !

Indeed, so rooted is my faith in the final invincibility of justice, and the ultimate omnipotence of truth, I am con-

House itself will prove that I am no "visionary;" in which joyful day, old as I am, I may be able to close my forty years' lucubrations on Parliamentary Reform, in these emphatic words, "AND THE HOUSE SAID, LET THERE BE RIGHT, AND THERE WAS RIGHT!"

LETTER VIII.

29th March, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

I RESUME my argument, for showing why, in my humble judgment, the multitudinous Petitions of a suffering Nation will assuredly be heard, and their grievances be redressed to the extent of practicability.

Somewhat allied to the notion of the Commons' House being a COURT of JUDICATURE, is that of Mr. BURKE, who pictures the House as being "in the higher part of Government what *Juries* are in the lower."* Now, so far as it partakes of the character of a *Jury*, it cannot have an alternative between *trying* and not *trying* a cause brought before it; but it must, without postponement, patiently hear, and impartially decide according to evidence.

The Members of a Commons' House are not, however, mere Jurors, but *more than Jurors*; for Jurors are to be *indifferent* between the litigants; whereas, those who are returned to serve in that House are, in the express terms of the law, the "*Attornies*" of the Commons, bound to side with their Clients, to contend for their rights and interests, and in short, to do for them in Parliament, what they, if present, would do for themselves.

And the same Mr. BURKE, who likens them to a Jury, within two pages afterwards, tells us the House "was not instituted to be a controul *upon* the People, but a controul *for* the People," over the Crown and its Ministers.†

Nay, in contemplation of law, here, as in the Courts of Justice, the Clients or

Constituents, *appear* by their Attornies; and are consequently held to be themselves *present*, agreeably to the language of the very style and title of the House, which is there said to be "the *Commons in Parliament assembled*." We have seen that when the King himself, as a *Defendant*, is empleaded, *he himself* renders the requisite justice. The *Courts of Law* all follow the same course. The *Commons' House* must do the same.—It is impossible that, after argument on the question, it can do otherwise.

What is it, my Lord, that we now behold? Do we not behold the life, liberty, and property of every man hanging by a thread, held in the hand of a Secretary of State, while the People are fervently empleading the Commons' House for recovery of that most precious of all inheritances, that most vital of all rights, *Representation*, in which word life, liberty, and property are all included? Can therefore, that House, whether it be a JURY, a COURT of JUDICATURE, or a REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY, any more drive from its presence unredeemed, and in so doing doom to actual slavery, the aggrieved Nation, than the Judges of a Common Law Court can drive from their presence an aggrieved suitor, and command that he be hanged at the door? I must needs think this cannot be. There are outrages of human feeling which none can attempt. When certain Phari-sees said unto JESUS, Master, rebuke thy Disciples; he answered, *I tell you, that if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.*

Between a physical and a moral impracticability, there is a natural difference. When a total subversion of the Constitution, or its restoration "*in more perfect health*" than ever;—when an utter extinction of English liberty, or a recovery, with POSSESSION of those rights which the famous Statutes of Runnimead, and the Revolution only DECLARED to be ours, hang upon a single vote to be given on the present Petitions; is it to be thought possible, that an English *House of Commons* should be capable of raising a voice of unparalleled and unspeakable treason against the community it professes to represent? Is it within the scope of human

* Thoughts Pres. Discou. 66.
P. 68.

credulity to believe, that an English *House of Commons* could bring itself to assassinate, at one deadly stab, the freedom and happiness of the millions under its immediate guardianship?

Whatever umbrage my opinions or my language may have given to some of its Members, I thank God that I never for a moment, have thought the House capable of a conduct, which, for a something beyond even atrocity itself, I hold to be out of human nature. And this sentiment, I trust, stands on proof, in repeated persuasives to measures that would secure that House the heartfelt blessings of this and future generations; persuasives it is not likely to receive from an enemy, or one who could believe it capable of infamy truly demoniacal. I therefore, will not, I cannot believe the House capable of a vote, equivalent to a manifesto for setting up an avowed despotism, wielding in its red right hand a rod of iron!

No: that were what this Nation never could endure, even in *Royally*. It were too preposterous for the adoption of "*Attorneys*," packed together by Mock Elections. I again say No: for such turpitude must render each perpetrator a mark for the scorn and detestation of mankind. And I a third time say No: because many who tamely follow their leaders, *know not what they do*, but if required to leap from a precipice, would be *brought to their senses*; while trading speculators meant not to face the danger of storming the last fortification of freedom, at the hazard of being blown into the air by the opening of some mine. And Country Gentlemen, fond as they may be of following a *CASTLEREAGH* in the political chace, will pull up their fiery coursers rather than plunge headlong into a quarry or a coal-pit.

Reform, therefore, notwithstanding the superfine sophistry of the silver-tongued CANNING; the edifying discourses on the morality of seat-selling, of a *CASTLEREAGH*; the piety of a host of Saints, with whom sin is the high road to salvation; the vapourings of *Close-borough* Champions, who talk of "*close-quarters* with the Reformers," while there is nothing they so much dread as their intellectual gripe; as well as the senseless gibberish which the

out one rational idea in their monotonous screamings, perpetually repeat:—notwithstanding all this, and the activity of spies and informers to boot, Reform, with the steady step of time itself, advances, and will assuredly reach the desired goal.

Considering, my Lord, the very ungracious manner in which the Petitions of the *Commons of the Realm* have lately been received in the *Commons' House of the Realm*, as well as the rigorous ordeal through which those Petitions had to pass; and, more particularly adverting to the actual rejection of *several hundreds* of them, for no other cause than their being, like our daily Petitions to the Deity, in *print*; the observations on which I have entered would be greatly deficient, were I not to show how much a scrupulous *attention to Petitions* and a *redress of grievances*, occupied our ancient Parliaments.

The *Mirroure*, with particular reference to the reign of ALFRED, informs us, that it was the office of Representatives "to speak their minds for the guidance of the People of God, how they should keep themselves from offences, should live in quiet, and should *have right done them* by certain usages, and sound judgments."*

For the satisfaction of such as may need the information, it is to be noted that the "*Earls*" spoken of in the text of the *Mirroure*, were not hereditary, nor the less *Representatives*, having been *chosen* to command the County Power, to preside in the County Courts, and to attend upon the King in the double capacity of a Court of Appeal from all the local Jurisdictions, and of a Legislative Assembly, then called *Wittenage-mote*.

BLACKSTONE observes, that "at the Conquest the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction was diverted into another channel; and the Conqueror, fearing danger from these *Annual Parliaments*, contrived also to separate their ministerial power, as Judges, from their deliberative, as Counsellors to the Crown."†

This, however, is but a very defective explanation of the craft of the tyrant; for,

* C. I. s. 3.

† Com. III. 37. For the extent of Elective Power in those Saxons to whom we owe the

in fact, copying the precedent set about eighty years before in France, by the usurper HUGH CAPET, the Norman WILLIAM cheated the People of England, at one stroke, of their *Representation and Annual Elections*, by making their Earls, Elders, or Oldermen, whom they had *chosen for the year*, a body of *hereditary* legislators; in whose hands he kept the appellent jurisdiction, originally part of the authority annually conferred by the People on their elective Earls. In the high office your Lordship holds, and in the similar dignity at York, we see all that remains to us of *Lords by Annual Election*.

The young King, EDWARD III. on assuming, at 18 years of age, from the corrupt MORTIMER the reins of government, in his writs,* on the occasion for summoning a Parliament, says—"The state of our realm, hath been managed to our loss and dishonour, and the impoverishment of our People"—"wherefore our conscience urging us, and we being unwilling to endure this any longer, and desiring with our whole heart, that the state and government of our realm should be *reformed*, according to the exigency of right and reason," &c. &c.; and previously to the assembling of that Parliament, his Majesty issued *Writs of Proclamation*,† in which he says—

"Whereas we have heard that divers oppressions and hardships have been done to many people of our realm, by some who have been our *Ministers* in different offices; and also by some people of our realm, as well our *Counsellors* as others; whilst our business (by reason of the tenderness of our age) hath been managed by some people to our loss and dishonour, which we will no longer endure, and we have very great desire that such things should be put into due state, and that *wrongs and misprisions* should be *redressed*; we command and charge you, on the faith you owe to us, that speedily and without delay you proclaim throughout your bailiwick, as well within franchises, as without, that all those who wish to complain of oppressions, hardships, or other grievances done to them against *Right*, and the

laws and usages of our realm, may come to Westminster to our next Parliament, and show there, their complaints to us, or to those we shall appoint for that purpose, and *we will give them convenient and speedy remedy.*"* And this Parliament it was that gave us the statute, now so oft quoted by the friends of Constitutional Freedom, which enacts, "That A Parliament"—not a fraction, or a session, but—"A Parliament shall be holden every year once, or more often, if need be."

So attentive, indeed, were our ancient Parliaments to the *redress of grievances*, that, besides a practice of withholding supplies till such redress were had, they appointed two sorts of persons to investigate the complaints of Petitioners, whether they were of public or of private grievances; which persons were to suggest the kind and the extent of the redress to be afforded.

In the first place, persons who were not Members, but legal assistants (generally Masters in Chancery), were appointed "*RECEIVERS OF PETITIONS*," who, as it should seem, were to arrange and digest the matter of them, and probably to offer their opinions touching the justness of the complaints; as well as, according to circumstances, to point out a legal or a legislative remedy; for many Petitions were thus referred:—"Let the Chancellor, *by authority of Parliament*, cause the parties to come before him, &c. and *let that be done by authority of Parliament*, which *Right and Reason require in the case.*"

They, secondly, chose from among their more learned and experienced Members "*TRIERS OF PETITIONS*," who officiated in manner of a Committee, and, after their investigation, reported the merits, and what in their judgment ought to be thereupon resolved; which it may be presumed was generally adopted by the House, although we find that "what answer soever the Triers had prepared, intricate businesses were (afterwards) discussed in open Parliament."†

And so scrupulous were those Parlia-

* 43d October, 1330.

* Pryne's Parl. Writs, I. vol. 31. II. 85.
† Ancient

ments touching a redress of grievances, that "the old modi of Parliament agree in this, that a Parliament should *not be dissolved* till all Petitions were discussed and *answered*; and, that after all, there should be proclamation made in some open place, whether any had a Petition or just Address to the Parliament, and, if none replied, then it was to be dissolved."*

As a remnant of these usages, our modern Parliaments, when they first meet, appoint a "*grand Committee for Courts of Justice*," and a "*grand Committee for Grievances*." How far these may have degenerated into Sinecures, I am not exactly informed; but it is sufficiently apparent in what manner these Committees might now be beneficially employed.

Thus, then, my Lord, have I endeavoured to show what we have to expect from the Commons' House, when the important day, now near at hand, shall arrive, in which it shall be moved to render at the same time unto CÆSAR and unto the People, what is respectively due to each, namely, unto CÆSAR POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE, and unto the People POLITICAL LIBERTY. And I have delineated the grounds on which we may trust that the decision must be made according to the usage of England, rather than according to the practice of Algiers or Morocco.

I am aware, my Lord, of the full import of the words of BURKE, in saying, "when the People conceive that *Laws and Tribunals*, and even *popular Assemblies*, are perverted from the ends of their institution, they find in those names of degenerated establishments only new motives of discontent.—Those bodies which, when full of life and beauty, lay in their arms, and were their joy and comfort, become, *when dead and putrid*, but the more *loathsome* from remembrance of former endearments."†

But having myself witnessed, what that writer lived not to see, namely, the *potent means* provided by nature for a resurrection to life of our Institutions, even from a "dead and putrid" condition, my mind abounds with hope and trust, with

confidence and assurance, that, old as I am, I may yet hope to hail, and perhaps soon, the political salvation of my country!

With, as already declared, an immovable faith in the invincibility of Justice, and the omnipotence of Truth, I firmly believe, that although our Constitution be already more than suspended, *Right will yet be rendered us*; that although our birth-right Liberty be already a non-entity, *Redress will yet be given us*; and that, although a certain small, controuling faction have, during a fit of Parliamentary delirium, obtained decrees, purporting to put down freedom of meeting, freedom of writing, and freedom of speech, the said faction cannot seriously believe themselves able to master the millions, natives of these extensive realms, renowned for the breeding of a generous race, as untameable to the passiveness of abject slavery, as incapable of enduring the shame of being seen with manacles on their hands, fetters on their feet, padlocks on their lips, and ropes round their necks!

Much as it is to be concluded that BURKE was radically hostile to true Freedom, it is nevertheless true, that in occasional flashes of eloquence, for the purposes of an argument or an oration, he frequently rendered it good service. Thus, when he recommends a check to the extravagance of authority, that the authority may be preserved, his words show the only means whereby Liberty, although dead, may have a resurrection. There is, says he, "no other way for the preservation of a decent attention to Public interest in the Representatives, but the *interposition of the body of the People itself*, whenever it shall appear by some *flagrant and notorious act*, by some *capital innovation*, that these Representatives are going to overleap the fences of the Law, and to *introduce an arbitrary power*."*

BURKE certainly did not here mean *physical force*, but merely such an interposition by "Petitions of Right" as we have seen. And for aught, my Lord, that we can assuredly know to the contrary, Parliament, by its novel system of

social order until the first day of July next, may merely mean to secure to itself the inward consciousness as well as the outward honour of perfect free agency, while securing to us, by calm and deliberate debate, full discussion, and unbiassed votes, that truly Constitutional Reform in our Representation which it intends us.

Having provided against being overawed by multitudinous assemblages of ardent men, and being thus freed from all suspicion of an influence from physical force, the value of a Reform worth a thousand *declaratory* Charters and Statutes, would doubtless be in the highest degree enhanced; causing the Runnimead and Revolution Conventions to hide their diminished heads in presence of the Parliament of 1817.

Seeing, my Lord, how heavenly is the delight of knocking off, contrasted with the infernal desire of bolting on, a Nation's chains; how exquisite the gratification of preserving in full plumage the soaring wings of human thought, put in competition with the brutality of clipping them to the stumps, of gagging the mouth, and closing the very avenues of knowledge; and how congenial to man's nature it is to prefer the well-deserved blessings, to the merited curses of mankind; why shall we doubt that the year 1817 is decreed to become more dear to the memory of England, than either the year 1688, or the year, 1215?

LETTER IX.

15th April, 1815.

MY DEAR LORD.

RECOLLECTING that the House of Lords, as well as the other House, must be parties to an Act for a Constitutional Representation of the Commons in Parliament, and for Parliaments of a Constitutional duration; and conscious how important it is the Public should be enabled to judge how far each Assembly respectively may, in consideration of private interests and prevailing prejudices, pro-

bably be favourable, or the contrary, the best analysis of both Houses, which can be obtained, ought to be brought to our aid.

It is necessary this analysis should extend to the Lords, because independent of offices, emoluments, and opinions, which may indispose some of the Peers to popular rights, many of that House have a disposal of Seats in the other; creating in their bosoms an interest against public liberty so potent, as to require a self-denying patriotism of no ordinary force to subdue it, even in bosoms the most noble.

The happiest result, however, may be expected, provided the Commons' House do its duty. There our analysis will begin; and, however imperfect it may be, yet should it call forth the assistance of persons better able to throw light on the subject, the writer's labour will not be thrown away.

A Commons' House should have as few motives and temptations as possible to act contrary to the interests of the body it is, by the Constitution, intended to represent; and it is obvious, that as, in proportion as the principles on which it shall be elected shall be more or less sound, and as the duration of its delegated power shall be more or less rightly limited, so its conduct, as a general rule, will be, and must be more or less correct, as directed to the public good.

For we are ever to keep in mind this simple truth,—that this House consists of the NATIONAL COMMONS ASSEMBLED, in the only way in which the assembling of the millions of a People inhabiting an extensive territory, for the exercise of their rights and preservation of their liberties can, in contemplation of law, take place; namely, in the persons of their chosen attorneys, delegated for those purposes to speak and to act on their behalf; that is, to say for them, and to do for them, what, if present, they would say, and would do, for themselves.

The proportion of rectitude in such a Commons' House will not, however, be in a mere arithmetical ratio, but in a ratio of the kind called geometrical, to the independence resulting from the knowledge, the talent, and public virtue for which its Members have by the People been selected

and elevated to the high station of guardian Legislators; for when public spirit once becomes the *characteristic* of an Elective Legislature, it will ever be sensibly alive to those feelings of honour, to that social sympathy, and that dignity of sentiment, which cast a lustre around the individual patriot.

It is not to be imagined that an assembly of Patriots, constituted by Annual Election, and proud of a responsibility without which *fidelity would want its test*, could be without an *esprit de corps*, inciting to deeds of goodness and greatness, as much surpassing those Legislators of past times who have been most renowned for promoting the welfare and durable prosperity of their country, as modern surpasses ancient knowledge in the science of Civil Government; particularly since the acquisition of an entire and most vital branch, namely, REPRESENTATION, justly denominated "*the happiest discovery of political wisdom.*"

When ruminating, therefore, on all that we have lost of the fruit of this "*happiest discovery,*" and while contemplating, with a view to its recovery, a Constitutional Reform in the Commons' House, it becomes us to penetrate, by analysis, what are the *causes* of its being what it is, and which prevent its being what it OUGHT TO BE. To this end, we must proceed as we do in scrutinizing the Poll on a controverted Election. As in that case, the Poll of the Electors is, so in this case the list of the Members must be scrutinized man by man.

In such a scrutiny, as essential to our country's salvation, there is nothing invidious; and one of the greatest benefits to be expected from it will probably be, the placing before the eyes of Honourable, of Right Honourable, of Noble, and really well-disposed persons, as matter of fact, that which they may be far from-intending, namely, that they are truly accessory, and in no small degree, to the wrongs, the ruin, the misery, and the threatened slavery of their country.

The authorities to be made use of in the writer's analysis, are almost wholly the *Red Book* of 1817, published by Mr. STOCKDALE; *Le Livre Rouge* of 1810, by P. T. McCALLUM. Esq. published by J.

of Great Britain and Ireland, by T. H. B. OLDFIELD, published by BALDWIN, CRADOCK, and JOY; Memorandums and Narratives published in 1809, by R. Scholey; and certain Reports of Committees and other papers laid before the House of Commons.

But the ramifications of expenditure, generating a corrupt influence on a Commons' House not properly returned, are so very numerous, and sometimes so intricate and hidden, our statement may still be far from perfect; and the classification also may possibly be susceptible of improvement. Yet as these are matters in which absolute perfection, or any thing near it, is not requisite, there is no temptation to intended exaggeration.

When a Gentleman, who has an estate in a level country, is informed by his steward that, by the swelling of a river, and the breaking of a bank, his whole property is overflowed, and nought is visible but the *tops of the hedges*, he does not set about ascertaining of how many *gallons of water* the inundation consists. Knowing that his *whole property is overflowed*, he knew too much; and has only to consider how to get rid of the evil, and how, by afterwards giving to his bank a sufficient *increase of strength*, a similar misfortune may in future be prevented.

Of the decayed state, or rather of the utter removal of the swept-away bank of our defence, Constitutional Representation; and of that inundation of arbitrary power which has hidden from our sight even the *tops of the fences of our laws*, our knowledge, without a useless detail of minutiae, is abundantly sufficient. Rationally, resolutely, and unremittingly to act upon that knowledge, is now the part which the English Nation has to perform. Her men of rank and weight are *beginning* to open their eyes. May their future vigilance and activity abate not, until her oppressions be wholly removed!

Before we enter on the analysis, it is particularly necessary we call to mind the nature of *County Representation*; which, in England, Wales, and Ireland, it is a fashion to think stands in little need of amendment. But what, in fact, is it? It will be found, I conceive, liable to weighty objections. First, all *County* is

holders, being only a *small proportion* of those *Inhabitants* who pay all King's Taxes, direct and indirect; who bear all County burdens; who are liable to the Militia Ballot and other public services; who are likewise subject to the Church Rate, the terrific Poor Rate, and every other parochial assessment.—Secondly, let a Leaseholder or Copyholder's property be what it may, —hundreds, or even thousands a year,—if he have not a forty shilling freehold, he has no more share in County Representation than a horse or a dog.

Thirdly, the Freeholders are for the most part a *tenantry*, and, therefore, in ordinary seasons, ten times tenfold more dependent than their own labourers, having ten times tenfold more to lose by offending a landlord, than those have to lose by disobliging an employer. The labouring Freeholder, if he lost one service could readily step into another; but, indeed, if a *good* labourer, he was too valuable to be parted with, for having voted according to his own mind, so long as he did his work according to the mind of his master.

And, fourthly, *County Representation*, to a degree that would astonish such as are ignorant of the fact, sometimes vies in a base subserviency with that of the Rotten Borough. To the man of many acres, who happens to have as little taste for liberty as knowledge of the means of its preservation, the bait of *County patronage* in barter for *Parliamentary votes*, to be given under pretence of *supporting Government against faction*, is too tempting to be resisted; especially as it carries with it the weighty Court interest at the *County Election*, and, for favours conferred on, and favours expected by sons, brothers, cousins, and kindred, *tells at the Poll*.—This gross corruption does not the less do its dirty work, because now and then, in a moment of no real danger to the Minister, an adverse vote proclaims how mightily independent is a *County Member*, how intrinsically valuable *County Representation*!—The farce is truly disgusting.

Where were those high-minded County Members, what the value of this *County Representation*, when the *whole People* of Great Britain, on a bare Ministerial pretence of a plot, by some crazy

ported by a scrap of evidence, were deprived of their liberties, and exposed to incarceration by a *Lettre de Cachet* of a Secretary of State; while not a murderer, a swindler, a house-breaker, or a pick-pocket can, by our law, be punished without a *trial* and without *evidence*! The Constitutional *remedy* for this corruption of County Members is simple and easy, but must be reserved for its proper time and place.

Here it is only necessary to add, that, in the arrangement of the following analysis, the present electoral bodies, whether Counties, or Boroughs, &c. will be presented in *classes*, as more or less independent; and that in each class those of England and Wales will be first brought together; then those of Ireland, and finally those of Scotland.

The classification of the Counties, Cities, Boroughs, Cinque Ports, and Universities will be in the following manner:—

I. COUNTIES—always recollecting the *monopoly* of the forty Shilling Freeholders, in which it can be supposed there is a possibility of returning to Parliament a gentleman of *only one thousand pounds a year clear income*, distinguished for living within his means, although of a generous temper; eminent for Constitutional knowledge, for ability as a man, and impartiality as a magistrate; well known for practical skill, industry, and energy in business; venerated for a devotedness to public liberty, and beloved for manners the most amiable, and virtues the most estimable; but of a soul too dignified to canvass for popular suffrage, or to court a great man's patronage.

II. COUNTIES—always recollecting the aforesaid *monopoly*, in which the Whig principles of the great land-owners preponderate against the dogmatism of the rank Tories; and where there is likewise so much real independence of spirit, as frequently, if not generally, to accomplish the return of two Members on what passes for true Whiggism, that is to say, *declaring* that Parliaments ought to be *free*, and that Crown influence ought by such Parliaments to be *controuled*, as well as *talking about* those “undoubted rights and liberties” *talked about in Magna Charta, and Bill of Rights, BUT NEVER*

III. COUNTIES—always recollecting the aforesaid *monopoly*—in which, between Whiggism and Toryism, there is a *balance of power*, and where it is the common interest and effort of both parties to keep down, and if possible, to blot out every spark of independence, by which means, in fact, a creature of each party is uniformly returned.

A system this, whereby, so far as politics, that is, public interests are concerned, all Representation is, in effect, extinguished, by providing that for every “*aye*” there shall be a “*no*.” On questions of vital interest to liberty, it is a mere chance, and a sorry chance, whether either Member, trained in such a school, and so returned, would, if he could, or if he knew how, be of any use whatever.

IV. COUNTIES — always recollecting the aforesaid *monopoly*—where to introduce at a genteel table, or in a polite circle, the subject of Rights and Liberties, would be deemed an ill breeding, little short of barbarism; and, to advocate Parliamentary Reform, an unpardonable offence.

V. CITIES, TOWNS and BOROUGHS, where neither a Banker nor a Brewer, by his thumbscrew, nor his entire, extorts a seat, nor dictation would be endured; but where merit alone is regarded.

VI. CITIES, TOWNS and BOROUGHS, in which there is a confused medley of independence, of venality and oppression, and where, in a scrambling way, patriotism, or the profession of it, sometimes gains an election.

VII. CITIES, TOWNS and BOROUGHS called open, but open only to Candidates more corrupt than the Electors. In an act of bribery between a poor man and a rich man, the poverty of the former is an extenuating plea. Besides, the crime of the poor man is committed but *once*; whereas, the crimes of the rich man are committed by *scores* or by *hundreds*; and when he buys votes in a Borough only that he may sell himself and his country in Parliament, be he undisguised sinner, or Bible-society Saint, no baseness exceeds his; for no profligacy engenders more vice more evil, more misery!

VIII. CITIES, TOWNS and BOROUGHS including the CINQUE

Election? What is it but an unfeeling mockery of the pillaged Nation’s misery? an insult to its understanding? a deadly stab in the vitals of its Liberty?

Shame on those who attempt its palliation! On those who talk of the *talent* it has placed in Parliament! Yes; there it placed a BURKE, who boasted of his having “*baffled*” Parliamentary Reform; and who sounded that infernal trumpet which called up the demons of despotism, to obliterate, if possible, all the footsteps of freedom on earth; a bloody and desolating strife, of which our hapless country is even now an exemplary victim.

Is not free Election at once the genial atmosphere of *talent*, and the surety for its fidelity? But what is to be expected from *talent* in the service of the close-borough confederacy, when the existence of that confederacy is the master-malady, the grand ulcerous distemper of the body politic; but base arts for “*baffling*” all attempts at a cure, and to feed, instead of eradicating, the ulcers, that the pest may be perpetuated!

IX. COMMUNITIES in which money is not the circulating medium of Election commerce, but a currency lighter than even paper itself, namely, promises, and expectations of good things in Church and State; besides, indeed, a customary conveyance to and from, the seat of action, at the *cost of a candidate*.

LETTER X.

April 17, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

As the proposed analysis of the Commons’ House will be equivalent to a *panel of Jurors*, for deciding the great cause between “THE WRONGFULLY EJECTED NATION, as *Plaintiffs*, and THE USURPING BOROUGH FACTION, as *Defendants*,” so it is to be hoped that a consciousness of the necessity of judicial purity,—as well as that sensibility

to honour which ever marks the gentleman, and indeed the decency inseparable from reputable society, will show that positive law is not requisite for producing the proper *challenges*; but that every honourable Member, who knows he ought to be challenged, will, by a virtuous application of the principle to himself, by WITHDRAWING, avoid being on the ultimate *Jury*.

“Challenges,” says my Lord COKE, “may either be made against the *whole Jury*, called the *Array* (or *Panel*), or to individual *Jurymen*, called the *Polls*. The challenges to the *Array* may be made on the ground of some *partiality* and *interest* in the result, on the part of the Sheriff, or Coroner, or Officer *who made the return*, arising from *kindred or affinity* to either of the parties; or from its appearing that *some one of the Jury* was returned at the *instance of the parties*.”

Now, my Lord, we are to keep in mind, that the Commons’ House is *not* to be considered as a *mere Jury*, who are to be *indifferent* to the parties, in the matter of rendering justice to the Commons, who have been so long and so grievously injured by those who have wrongfully usurped their seats; but ought to be *more than indifferent*, as holding the place of Attorneys, Agents, Advocates, and active Partisans—in short, to say all in one word, of REPRESENTATIVES, to do for the injured Commons what they, if present, would do for themselves.

But provided, in respect of all questions touching suffrage, the said House were indeed, *as it claims to be*, a COURT of JUDICATURE, with exclusive jurisdiction, still the result ought to be precisely the same; since every such Court, as already shown, must render justice without denial and without delay.

What, then, are the inferences we have to draw? Can any Honourable Member of the Commons’ House, whether he consider it as a COURT of JUDICATURE, or as an ASSEMBLY of REPRESENTATIVES, think less sacredly of what becomes him, than if he view it as a *mere Jury* and himself as a *Juror*? If he be

indeed a *Judge*, is he less bound than as a *Juror* to render justice? Or, if he be a REPRESENTATIVE, that is, by personification the very party at issue, and in which issue all generations to come are interested, thus being called upon to act in defence of himself and of all posterity, shall he not promptly and stedfastly determine that *right shall be done*?

Should any Gentleman in that House have a *personal “interest”* against the success of such *right*,—should he be a *candidate* for pension, place, or title—should he have *expectation* of profit or advancement from the Minister,—should he have “*kindred or affinity*” with any of the usurping Oligarchs, or their known supporters,—should he be conscious of *not understanding* the principles of Representation—or, finally, should he *fear* the averted eye, or cold reception of associates, for doing his duty, let him, if he have not nerve for acting the part of a patriot, act at least the part of a gentleman and an honest man,—let him, in the genuine spirit of English law, equitably apply to himself the principle of the “*challenge*,” and WITHDRAW from the panel to avoid a great crime; for it has been said that “the highest crime which an Englishman can commit, is deliberately and intentionally to give a false verdict while in the office of *Jurymen*.”*

The heinousness of corruption in a *Jury* is emphatically set forth by Lord Chief Justice COKE; from whom we learn that “*Juries* convicted of an attainr are outlawed, and rendered for ever infamous; they forfeit their goods, tenements, and lands; their houses are to be razed, and themselves perpetually imprisoned!”†

Even Parliaments, for iniquity, have been attainted; as that of 21 Rich. II. and that of 37 Hen. VI. the former wholly repealed, and all its Statutes annulled, reversed, and expunged, by 1 Henry IV. and the latter by 39 Hen. VI.

The writer, however, persuades himself there are many who, on weighing his arguments, and the authorities on which they stand, will not concur in an unjust decision, pernicious to their country,

* Coke 1. Inst. 156. Phillips on Juries 410

ruinous to their own reputation, destructive of their peace of mind, and possibly exposing them to future vengeance for legal oppression; for even men highest in official power and royal favour have not always in the end found indemnity for having pillaged and oppressed by Act of Parliament. If not endued with fortitude for unhesitatingly sacrificing all selfish considerations on the altar of the Constitution, they may yet have the firmness to bring their passions and their moral obligations to a compromise, by causing their *interest* and their *duty*, like two opponent Members, to *pair off*.

Whatever may have been the neglect of duty and the past carelessness of the English Gentleman, these times—these awful times, as a voice from Heaven, will now remind him, that “law to bind all, must have the assent of all;”* that “equity suffers not right to be without a remedy;”† and that “impious and cruel is he to be esteemed, who favours not liberty.”‡

If, in an action at law, brought by the true and lawful heir to a noble patrimony descending to him from the earliest antiquity, against a swindling guardian, in the person of a low-born upstart, charged with having, by forged deeds, false witnesses, innumerable bribes, perjuries, intrigues and acts of violence, possessed himself of his ward's estate, it should be found out that a large proportion of the panel were *interested* in the result, or were merely of the “*kindred or affinity*” of the base guardian, must not a “*challenge*” set them all aside as *incapable of serving on the Jury*?

But, *after* a trial, in which the wicked usurper of the estate had triumphed over his disinherited and ruined ward, should it then come to light that the cause had been tried by a *packed Jury*, consisting not only of such among the “*kindred and affinity*” of the robber, as he had foisted on the panel, but for the most part composed of his auditors, agents, stewards, clerks, bailiffs, pensioners, menials, and others in his pay, how boundless would be the flame of the public indignation!

What unceasing execrations would be poured out against the traitor! How indelible the infamy that must follow him and his vile accomplices to their graves!

Nor could a less disgraceful stigma attach on *Judges* of a COURT of JUDICATURE, having *exclusive* jurisdiction, themselves alone being *Jurors*, who, in contempt of a *record of their own Court*, enrolled with its unanimous consent, and thereby tacitly admitting the facts, should *decide against the true heir*; or, for keeping the oppressor in possession, should *refuse to try the cause*; when it were impossible to ascribe such conduct to aught but largely *sharing in the spoil*!

The doctrine of *challenges* is, in our present circumstances, of the greatest importance. If, on an ordinary trial between man and man for an estate, for a garden, a cottage, or meaner object, not only individuals on a panel, who ought not to be the ultimate triers of the cause, may be objected to and excluded, but even “*the whole Array* may be challenged, from its appearing that *some one* of the Jury was returned at *the instance of the parties*,”—what is the conclusion to be drawn, when we are on the eve of a trial before the Commons' House, between “THE WRONGFULLY EJECTED NATION, as Plaintiffs, and THE USURPING BOROUGH FACTION, as Defendants,” for that inheritance which includes not merely all property throughout the kingdom, real or personal, but the liberty and life of every man?

If between man and man, and for justice in small matters, a wise and benevolent jealousy hath so admirably provided for purity in the administration of the law in narrow channels, shall not a like jealousy as effectually guard the purity of the great fountain itself of legislation, in defence of the whole People, and of all that can interest them and their posterity to the latest generations?

Can, then, those Members of the Commons' House, be they *Representatives*, be they *Judges*, be they *Jurors*, or whatever called, who are “*returned at the instance*” of the Treasury, by the Cinque Ports, or other sinks of corruption—can those “*returned at the instance*” of Levi-

“kindred or affinity” with any of the tribe,—or who feel a “partiality” for the usurpation,—or have an “interest in the result” of its schemes,—or, lastly, can the obsequious *servants of the Crown*, with their very BRIBES in their hands, amounting to *hundreds of thousands*, taken out of the pockets of an unconsenting and impoverished People,—can, I ask, any *Representatives*, or *Judges*, or *Jurors* so circumstanced, take the hostile side in a division on the great question of Reform, for establishing the paramount Right of the Nation, without being guilty of an injustice too glaring for the age in which we live, and without committing a violation of decency not to be matched, but amongst the lowest and most abandoned of mankind?

Such of the Members as wish to consult the “dignity” of the House, or would avoid the imputation of being “evil-minded” or who desire not to “bring the Government into hatred and contempt,” or subject themselves to an accusation of “conspiring to subvert it,” will do well to reflect on the foregoing queries, touching such parties as, by analogy of law, by purity of reason, as well as by every feeling and sentiment which can actuate a virtuous bosom, ought not to take the hostile side in a division on that particular question on which, at this trying crisis, hinges England’s liberty or slavery!

What, my Lord, is our case?—and what is the practice of the House? Our case is similar to that wherein an heir has lost an inheritance which, by some untoward circumstances and misapplications of law, has got into the hands of the King. The People now are stripped of the inheritance of their ALL, which, by a long course of adverse events, of capricious, contradictory and arbitrary interpretations, as absurd as iniquitous, hath got into the hands of the Borough-mongers and their associates, which, in common parlance, is being in the hands of the Commons’ House, in the same sense as the votes or the acts of the majority, are the votes or acts of the House.

In the former case, the injured heir, as shown in my second Letter, by his petition *impleads the King*, and gets back his inheritance, because the King immediately

mons’ House. In order then that “right be done,” those Members who, either as principals or nominees, are implicated in the commission of the wrong, cannot possibly take upon them to be *judges in their own cause*, but will of course WITHDRAW, and leave the decision to such as, having no “interest in the result,” can alone with clean hands administer justice; with exception of such among the wrongdoers as, awakened to a sense of what is right, shall nobly determine to act on the principle that “equity suffers not right to be without a remedy.”

Every one knows that when any individual Member of the Commons’ House is separately charged with a crime, it is the practice of the House, for such impeached Member to hear the accusation, to make reply, and then immediately WITHDRAW; because of its being the most disgusting of all violations of justice, and the most offensive of all indecencies, for a person accused of a great crime to sit as a *judge in his own cause*, although, by the nature of his office, he can sit as a judge of others.

Abundant are the precedents in the Journals of the Commons, but we know the practice by our own experience in the cases of Mr. PERCEVAL and Lord CASTLEREAGH, in 1809; which to our present purpose are direct cases in point, in as much as the crimes of Mr. PERCEVAL and Lord CASTLEREAGH were precisely the same in detail, as those now charged on the Borough Faction collectively, and by wholesale, namely, that of foully trafficking in the seats of the Commons’ House; thereby selling the People, their laws and liberties, for personal gain and aggrandisement.

This fundamental principle of equity, of none being *judges in their own cause*, as necessarily applies in the Law Courts as in Parliament; of which we have also had a recent proof; for when, on a late occasion, Lord Chief Justice ELLENBOROUGH was pointedly complained of by Lord COCHRANE, that presiding Judge WITHDREW from the Bench, while the charge against him was before the Court; that is, he absented himself on that account; and so his Lordship did again w

No. III. Price Two-Pence.

LETTERS TO THE LORD MAYOR,

With an Appendix, containing an Analysis, and New Classification of the State of the Representation, and the House of Commons.

BY MAJOR CARTWRIGHT.

Published by WILL. HONE, at the *Reformist's Register Office*, 67, Old Bailey, three doors from Ludgate-Hill.

LETTER XI.

April 28th, 1817.

MY DEAR LORD,

THE Public may now clearly understand why Lord CASTLEREAGH and his supporters so carped as they did at certain Petitions, for merely offering it as an *opinion* and a "*conviction*," that the "Honourable House doth not, in any constitutional or rational sense, represent the nation;" and why, on that account, they actually caused, what I shall ever hold to have been an *illegal* rejection of a great number of such Petitions; notwithstanding the truth of that *opinion* had been completely *admitted by the House four-and-twenty years ago*, when it received, enrolled, and without a tittle of objection recorded in its Journals the famous Petition of 6th May, 1793, in which, that the House did not so represent the nation, was *averred as fact*, and, if disputed, *proof was tendered at the Bar*.

His Lordship and the other cavillers saw that such Petitions of 1817, grounded on that of 1793, were not mere loose, indefinite complaints of something being wrong which required to be set right; but,

truly interpreted, were a *charge* against the numerous usurpers of the People's inheritance, that is, an *accusation of a crime*, which, if justice and decency were not banished from our unhappy land, must preclude every man of those usurpers, their nominees or supporters, and every one else "*interested in the result*," from sitting as *Judges in their own cause*. The consequence of such a preclusion was not to be contemplated by the Noble Lord without dismay.

On the great all-comprehending question of Reform, it is now sufficiently plain, that no Member, directly or indirectly implicated in the usurpation of the People's electoral sovereignty; no one who, in a common but most reprehensible phrase, talks of *representing his own money*, money paid for purchasing a *power of selling the People, their Laws and Liberties*; nor any one who, by other means whatsoever than free Election, hath obtained his seat, nor any in the pay of the Crown, can, with the justice of an honest man, or with the decency of a Gentleman, arrange himself on the hostile side in a division.

But, my Lord, there is a point of view in which this usurpation of the People's electoral Right ought to be seen; but which Right, from long-continued encroachment, from the horrid mangling and mutilation it has undergone, and from the deeply concerted and inveterate mockery of justice it has experienced, is grossly

misunderstood, or rather not understood at all.

All violations of this sacred Right, little as at first sight it may appear, are in reality of the nature of *High Treason*. And although I cannot proceed but at the hazard of imputed pedantry, or tautology, I deem a repetition of the demonstration so very important on the present occasion, that no fears of either those, or any other personal imputations, shall deter me from once more giving it.

BLACKSTONE shows that in our ELECTIONS "consists the democratical part of our Constitution; for in a Democracy there can be no exercise of *Sovereignty* but by Suffrage, which is the declaration of the People's will;" "and," says he, "the Athenians were so justly jealous of this prerogative, that a STRANGER, who *interfered* in the assemblies of the People, was punished by their laws with death; because such a man was esteemed guilty of *High Treason*, by *usurping* those Rights of *Sovereignty* to which he had no title."*

But here, ours being a *mixed* Government, we must distinguish between the *Sovereignty* which is *inherent*, and that which is *conferred*; between that which is *absolute* and *boundless*, and that which is *delegated* and *limited*; as again between that which is *supreme*, that which is *secondary*, and that which is *still more subordinate*, for in the polity of England we find these three distinct and separate species of *Sovereignty*.

Inherent, absolute, and boundless *Sovereignty* can only reside in the NATION or PEOPLE, who have willed the *Constitution* under which they agreed to live, and for whose use and benefit were created that Constitution, Parliaments, Kings, and all other Magistracy.

Conferred and delegated *Sovereignty* we find in the PARLIAMENT, whose office it is to legislate for the public weal, and to controul the Administration of the Government; but always limited by the principles of the Constitution, the conservation of which is its prime object and duty.

And there is a third, and still inferior, *Sovereignty conferred* upon the KING, for carrying the Government into execution,

according to law, and for administering justice in the modes prescribed to him.

Without wasting time on a more diffuse delineation, it is from the foregoing outline evident, that, in a Commons' House, representing the *whole nation* (the King and a few Lords excepted), and having the *entire property* of the Country subject to its taxation, must for the most part reside that *national Sovereignty*, which alone is *inherent* and paramount.

Hence we learn to understand the true nature and character of any overt act, which invades the freedom and independency of a Commons' House, or, in other words, which violates the paramount *SOVEREIGNTY inherent* in that Representative Assembly; for, "if it be a *treason* to destroy any one member *only* of the STATE, the most virulent species of the crime must be that which destroys the member that is *most vital*. A traitorous assassin may kill the Prince on the Throne, but he kills not the *King*, for the *King* never dies; The moment one reigning Prince expires, another is instantly *King*; but when the *Representative* of the Nation is by usurpation destroyed, the STATE is literally destroyed, nor can it be restored by a form of re-election. Where none but the USURPERS can be re-elected, election is mere mockery and insult!"*

Hence we learn the full import of the words of Lord Chancellor SOMERS, when he says, "But amongst all the Rights and Privileges appertaining unto us, that of having a share in the *legislation*, and being to be governed by such laws as we ourselves shall choose, is the *most fundamental and essential*;" and when he also declares that "the *FIRST AND HIGHEST TREASON* is that which is committed against the Constitution," and that "they are the *traitors* who design and pursue the subversion of it,"† confirmed to us by L. C. B. EYRE, in his charge to the Grand Jury, on the State Trials, in 1794, who says, that "a design to overthrow the whole Government of the country, in all just theory of the treason, is the *GREATEST OF ALL TREASONS*." Are not they, then, who "design and pur-

* Com

* Ap. to Nation, 1812, p. 41.

sue the subversion" of our Representation, which is "the most fundamental and essential" part of our Government, guilty of this "GREATEST OF ALL TREASONS?"

But Baron EYRE having remarked, "that the statute of EDWARD III., by which *we are governed*, hath not declared this to be High Treason;" we are made to understand why those "who design and pursue the subversion of our Constitution," by undermining, violating, and usurping our Representation, have so long experienced impunity. It is because of the same distinction as hath been noticed in respect of a *King*; for we have in fact High Treason *de facto*, and High Treason *de jure*; for the first, which "is wrapped up in the person of the King,"* a man is hanged, drawn, and quartered; while, for the latter, the culprit has hitherto escaped even any criminal trial.

But it being clear that "all use of Borough property with *intention* to controul the Freedom of Election, is HIGH TREASON; that all bribery in open Boroughs, the act itself proving the *intention*, is HIGH TREASON; that all aristocratic combination in Counties with *intention* to defeat the exercise of the *sovereignty* of the electors is likewise HIGH TREASON;"† it is to be hoped the time is not distant when a remedy for an evil so great, for so foul a conspiracy against the life of the State, will be effectually provided!

It surely ought to be matter of surprise, that, after *Blackstone* had illustrated his own position, touching the "*sovereignty*" inherent in "the democratical part of our Constitution," he should have been so remarkably silent as he was on those overt acts of *treason*, in form of compulsion and bribery, sufficiently notorious in his time, by which that "*sovereignty*" was continually *violated*; and that it should have been left to the writer (so far as he knows) to be the first who should place the *treason* of the Borough-mongers in its proper light; which he has repeatedly done; as may be seen by consulting *The Commonwealth in Danger*, published in 1795, pp. 65, 68;—His Petition to the House of Commons, 1795;—The Consti-

tutional Defence of England, Internal and External, 1796, p. 17;—An Appeal, Civil and Military, on the English Constitution, 1799, pp. 44, 69, 167, 188;—An Appeal to the Nation, by the Union for Parliamentary Reform, according to the Constitution, 1812, p. 40—53 inclusive.

In a parliamentary "*Reprimand*," given in 1767 to the Mayor and others of *Oxford*, for having offered to their Members by Letter, to be again returned, provided they would engage to pay a sum of money, which they specified, Sir *John Cust*, then Speaker, said,—“A more enormous crime you could not well commit, since a deeper *wound* could not have been given to *the Constitution* itself, than by the open and dangerous attempt which you have made to subvert the freedom and independence of this House. *The Freedom of this House is the freedom of this Country*, which can continue no longer than while the voices of the Electors are uninfluenced by any base or venal motive.

“For if abilities and integrity are no recommendations to the Electors, if those who bid highest for their voices are to obtain them from such detestable considerations, this House will *not* be the Representatives of the People of Great Britain. Instead of being the guardians and protectors of their liberties, instead of redressing the grievances, it will become *the venal instrument of Power*, to reduce this happy Nation, the envy and admiration of the world, to the lowest state of misery and servitude.”

Now, as "*Treason* is a *wound* of Majesty" or Sovereignty,* and as "*Treason* against the *Constitution* is the first and highest Treason,"† so the conviction on this point, so obvious in the speech of Sir *John Cust*, ought fully to have opened the eyes of himself and the House to the dire effects of the infinity of treasons uniformly committed in our Elections throughout the kingdom. And while Treason, the highest and most pernicious of all State crimes, is notoriously a *certain* and *unavoidable* consequence of the present de-

* Selden's Disc. edited by Bacon, 45.

† Appeal to the Nation, 1812, p. 52.

* Selden's Disc., 46.

† Somer's Judgm. of Kingd., 4 and 6.

cayed state of our Representation, what must we think of the sense, loyalty, or integrity of those who can rejoice in the hunting down a few poor, impotent, and crazy Spenceans as Traitors, while they can view without emotion the greatest and, as I incline to think, the only Traitors of our time, the BOROUGH-MONGERS, being allowed to lord it over us, in full-blown criminality of *usurped sovereignty*, untouched, uncontroled, unpunished!

In my last Letter, I have used the word BRIBES; and I shall here maintain the correctness of the expression. Mr. CANNING, with his peculiar sensibility to what is *decorous in public men*, his notions of polished society, and his taste in classical composition, may object to the word as coarse and vulgar; and worse than a vulgarism would it be, if applied to salaries, pay, or pensions for public services, merely *as such*, because any of them may be honourably held—but NOT by Members of a Commons' House.

In the hands of such Members they are BRIBES; and, with *the uniform experience of one hundred and seventeen years* before our eyes, since the passing of the Statute which enacted "*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,*" in no other light than that of BRIBES can they be seen; nor ought they to receive any softening appellation to hide their deformity, or to veil their turpitude.

Mr. CANNING, in contempt of the wisdom and virtue of the said enactment, lately delivered a speech of much sophistry, to prove the propriety of having *many Placemen* in the Commons' House, not merely for the real use of which their presence might be, but expressly as dead weights also in the scale of Crown influence; which, as from his determination to oppose Parliamentary Reform *in toto*, it should seem he thinks, cannot easily be too great; but that quondam Ambassador to a petty State, without a Court, at a salary of *fourteen thousand pounds a-year*, will not, I believe, make many converts, among the wise and well informed, to his Belial doctrine; nor will he be able to shew, that this Parliamentary Bribery, which he has the effrontery to call "the

practice of the Constitution," is other than a rank *Treason*.

I too, as well as Mr. CANNING, am for efficient Statesmen, who hold Public Offices, having their appropriate bench in the Commons' House, with freedom of speech, and the propounding of measures completely secured to them; that is, as well informed aids, not members; as commodious and friendly channels of communication with the Crown, not as confounding the legislative with the executive functions; as faithful and honourable servants of one master, not as impostors pretending equal fidelity to two, and who not unfrequently betray both.

Thus, preparatory to a DECISION of far more importance than either that of *Runnimead*, or of the *Revolution*, and agreeably to a more accurate knowledge of the Constitution than distinguished even the latter of those periods, the writer has at least suggested how that decision may be made with honour to the Judges, and with salvation to his Country. But whatever may be the event, and whatever may be the faction, folly, and injustice of the elevated and the wealthy, he knows that the *Law of Nature* is in other hands; whence he concludes that,

Not by th' artillery of fierce debate,
Not by the din of faction's wordy strife,
Shall much-wrong'd England's FREEDOM be
achiev'd:

No: 'tis by the heavenly voice of One,
Musical of tongue, potent to persuade,
Omnipotent in Reason's listed field;
Celestial TRUTH. In panoply of Law,
He wields ITHURIEL's gift, the wondrous spear,
That each sophistical tyrannic foe
Detects and conquers: assured victor
"In the arena of the human mind."*

Farewell for the present.—Yours truly,
J. CARTWRIGHT.

* The Slave, p. 56.

NOTE.—Political liberty being a *common Inheritance*. Justice requires an equal distribution of suffrage throughout the Community. This can only be effected, by dividing the Country into electoral Districts, with all practical equality. A *Right* to vote must then depend, and can only depend, on a proof of three facts, easily ascertained, namely, 1st. That the Party, who claims to vote, is a member of the District; 2dly. That he is past the age of legal infancy; and 3rdly. That he have not, by criminality legally forfeited his right of suffrage.

Contrary to this simplicity and rectitude, we find our representative system a chaos of confusion, contradictions, and iniquity; as if it had

been the work of men the most ignorant and the most wicked.

We are told that it once answered its intended purpose. So, in the best Saxon times of our country, it apparently did. But, perfect as our constitution, civil and military, then was in *principle*, yet, in *organization*, which is essential to the health and perpetuity of human institutions, we know, *from the effects*, that it was imperfect.

Of what were the precise imperfections of the *Saxon organization* we are but too ignorant; but of the imperfections ever since the Saxon era, our knowledge is but too accurate; and, to our cost, we also know the fatal consequences.

What so contrary to common sense as the *present practice* of election by *counties*, many of them more in extent of territory than entire states of Antiquity? What so monstrous as the same quantity of Representation in one place for fifteen persons,—aye, for the fifteenth part of fifteen persons—as in another for fifteen thousand? and what so disgusting, as the insufferable nonsense applied to the word *Right*, in respect of a *Qualification* to vote? “What constitutes a good vote in one borough, makes a bad one in another. In one place, the free-man must be resident, in another, non-residence gives the same qualification. In one borough, a man obtains his freedom by marriage; in a second, by birth; in a third, by servitude; in a fourth, by purchase; in a fifth, by gift of the mayor or aldermen. Burageholds differ as widely as the nature of their tenure; and even inhabitants are defined as variously. In one borough, paying scot and lot, and being a resident householder, is an indispensable qualification; in another, paying scot and lot without residence, or being an housekeeper, constitutes eligibility for voting; in a third residence, without paying scot and lot, or keeping a house: In short, the whole representative system is so intricate, inexplicable, contradictory, and ridiculous, that we believe it would puzzle the whole tribe of quibblers in Westminster Hall to render it more confused and unintelligible.”*

The measure of our folly and iniquity is full; The bitter cup of our consequent misery is also full and overflowing. The appointed day of inquiry is, however, at hand; and it remains to be seen, what will be done for us by that assembly, which in our case claims to itself, a sort of *Omnipotence*, that is, an *Exclusive Jurisdiction* over the means of our Redress.

* Oldfield's Hist. of Counties, Cities, and Boroughs.—Art. Hertford.

May a petitioning People, therefore, be justified in addressing this earthly, in terms equivalent to those addressed to the heavenly Omnipotence—‘*The eyes of all wait upon Thee, and thou givest them their Relief in due Season.*’†

For seeing the caprice which, since the Saxon times, has affected the national Representation, the Reader has only to consult Mr. Oldfield's sixth volume, p. 300—316, where he will find a list of *sixty-seven* boroughs in England, besides *Calais* in France, which returned members to Parliament since the commencement of the reign of Ed. I, but which are now excluded; as well as a farther list of “*ninety-seven* other boroughs which have Charters, and have most probably sent members at some former period since the reign of Ed. I, but for which no summonses are to be found, though they were unquestionably parliamentary Boroughs in the time of our Saxon kings, when every borough in England was represented, as well as the rural tythings, who chose their representatives in the county courts.”

Be all this as it may, it is certain that a Representation elected by *Counties* and by *Boroughs*, considering their extreme *inequality*, must be unfair and imperfect, for which there is not the slightest occasion, seeing the simple and easy remedy, by *electoral Districts of equal population*.

In the “Instrument” agreed on upon Cromwell's usurpation of the Government, a *more equal representation* was made, but still the model was extremely imperfect in respect of *equality*; besides that, independent of the several *borough elections*, the counties had to choose in *one election* the several proportions of members assigned them; amounting, according to circumstances to 8, 10, 12, or more. Than this, a more inconvenient or absurd practice can scarcely be imagined; for even where 2 only are to be elected, it is possible that one of them may be returned by a *minority*, which is *contrary to principle*; and in proportion to the greater number, a member may be returned by a *very small number of votes*.

It was also under this *usurpation*, that the example was first set of attempting to give parliaments a continuance of *three years*; which in itself is a gross violation of Liberty.

Perhaps it was a considerable improvement, in reducing the number of Members. Art. ix. says “The Persons to be chosen within *England, Wales, Jersey, and Guernsey*, shall not exceed 400; Scotland 30, and Ireland 30;” “Total 460.” See Whitelock, 553.

† Ps. xlv. 15.

APPENDIX

TO

LETTERS TO THE LORD MAYOR.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE COMMONS' HOUSE IN THE YEAR 1817.

According to Sir Edward Coke, and all the Law Authorities, it utterly disqualifies any person, how *unexceptionable soever his character*, from being admitted, in the trial of any ordinary matter of property, however trifling, to be upon a COMMON JURY, if challenged for any one of the following causes, namely, That 'tis in fact "*his own cause*,"—that he have an "*interest in the result*,"—that he is "*a servant in the pay of an interested party*,"—that with any such party he have "*kindred or affinity*,"—or have previously made "*declarations proving his partiality*".

Our Law provides that "when a *challenge* is made, the validity is examined on the spot by TRIERS, sworn to try whether the Juror stand *indifferent* between the parties, or *whether the facts alleged against him be true*."

If in the great cause on which, not only the property but the liberty of the whole Nation is now pending, we have not the benefit of the principles of equity which GOVERN the ordinary Law Courts, shall not these be fully made up to us, by a sense of honor on the part of those who are to try the cause?

COUNTIES of the FIRST CLASS, in which Members are chosen for ability and merit alone.—No such County has come to the knowledge of the Writer.

COUNTIES of the SECOND CLASS, where Whiggism is so far predominant over Toryism, that the Rights and Liberties *talked about* in the *Bill of Rights*, but NEVER SECURED, are wished for by the Electors; and where gentlemen who *talk about* those Rights and Liberties are usually elected, *provided they have large estates*, or high connexions.

MEMBERS in April, 1817.

1. BEDFORD.

Pym, Francis.
Tavistock, Marquis.

2. DURHAM.

Lambton, John George.
Powlett, Hon. W. J. F. V.

3. HERTS.

Brand, Hon. Thomas.
Sebright, Sir J. S. Bart.

4. NORFOLK

5. NORTHUMBERLAND.

Beaumont, Thomas R.
Monck, Sir C. M. L.

6. SOMERSETSHIRE.

Langton, W. G.
Dickenson, William.

7. KILDARE.

Fitzgerald, Lord W. C.
Latouche, Robert.

COUNTIES of the THIRD CLASS, under a balance of power, for the most part providing for every Parliamentary "Aye" a balancing "No;" rendering in effect, as respects Public Liberty, Representation a non-entity.

MEMBERS
IN APRIL, 1817.

CAUSES of INFLUENCE at once *unconstitutional*, inconsistent with *probity*, and irreconcilable with *dignity*, in Representatives of the COMMONS OF THE REALM.—** ADDITIONAL CAUSES of INFLUENCE affecting INDEPENDENCE.

1. BERKS.

Dundas, Charles.
Neville, Hon. Richard

** Eldest son of Lord Braybrooke, who is Provost Marshal of Jamaica, a sinecure worth 6000*l.* per annum. Lord Lieut., Vice Adm., and Cus. Rot. of Essex, Recorder of Saffron-Walden, Essex. High Steward of Wokingham, Berks, and hereditary Visitor of Magdalen College, Cambridge.

2. CAMBRIDGE.

Manners, Lord C. S.

Lieut. Col. of the 3d Dragoons.—** Next brother to the Duke of Rutland, nearly related to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland.

Osborne, Lord F. G.

** Brother to the Duke of Leeds, who is Lord Lieut. of the North Riding of Yorkshire. Gov. of Scilly Islands. Ranger of Richmond Forest, and Constable of Middleham Castle. Also brother-in-law to Lord Auckland, a Privy Coun., Director and Auditor of Greenwich Hospital, and Chancellor of the Marischal College, Aberdeen. Pension of 2,300*l.*, unless holding a place to that amount. Robert Elliot, in trust for Lady Auckland, pension of 796*l.* His son, the Hon. W. T. Eden, 2700*l.* per annum, as Teller of the Exchequer.

3. CORNWALL.

Lemon, Sir W. Bart.
Tremayne, J. H.

4. DERBY.

Cavendish, Lord G. A. H.
Munday, Edward M.

** Uncle to the Duke of Devonshire.
Father-in-law to the Duke of Newcastle.

5. DEVON.

Acland, Sir T. D. Bart.
Bastard, Edm. P.

6. DORSET.

Pitt, W. M.

** Brother-in-law to Lord Gambier, father-in-law to Earl Romney, and cousin to Lord Rivers.

Portman, Edw. B.

7. ESSEX.

Houblon, John A.
Western, C. C.

8. GLAMORGANSHIRE.
Hall, Benjamin.

** This County is relieved from balancing the "Aye" with the "No" as it returns but *one* Member.

9. GLOUCESTER.

Somerset, Lord Rob. E. H.

A Major Gen., and 1st Lieut. Col. of the 4th Dragoons, late Paymaster of the Forces, and Gentleman of the Chamber to the Lord Lieut. of Ireland.—** Brother to the Duke of Beaufort, who is Lord Lieut. and Cus. Rot. of Monmouth and Brecon. Receiver of Rents for Monmouthshire, for the Duchy of Lancaster. Col. of the Monmouth and Brecon Militia, and Knight of the Garter.—Also brother to Lord Charles Henry, who is a Lieut. Gen. in the Army, an official Lord of Trade and Plantations, and was Joint-Paymaster of the Forces.

Guisse, Sir Berkeley W. Bt.

10. HANTS.

Chute, W.
Heathcote, Tho. F.

11. HEREFORD.

Cotterell, Sir John G.

Foley, Thomas . . . ** Lieut. Col. of the Hereford Militia.

12. KENT.

Kuatchbul, Sir E. Bart.
Geary, Sir W. Bart.

13. LANCASHIRE.

Blackburn, John.

Stanley, Lord *Col. of the 2d Reg. of Lancashire Militia.—** Eldest son of the Earl of Derby, who is Lord Lieut. and Cus. Rot. of Lancashire.—James Stanley, cousin to the Earl, is a Master in Chancery, and Steward of the Marshalsea Court, Southwark, and of the Court of King's Palace.*

14. LEICESTER.

Keck, George E. L. *Commander of the Leicestershire Vol. Cav.*

Manners, Lord Rob. W. *2d Lieut. Col. of the 10th Dragoons.—** Brother to the Duke of Rutland, before named.*

15. LINCOLN.

Pelham, Hon. C. A. *Patron of the Boro' of Newton, in the Isle of Wight.—** Son of Lord Yarboro'.*

Cust, Hon. W. *** Brother to Earl Brownlow.*

16. MIDDLESEX.

Mellish, W. *Bank Director.*

Byng, G.

17. NORTHAMPTON.

Cartwright, William R. *** Brother-in-law to Viscount Chetwynd, who is Clerk of the Privy Council in England, and brother to General Cartwright.*

Althorp, Lord *Capt. of the 1st. North. Vol. Cav.—** Son of Earl Spencer.*

18. RADNORSHIRE.

Wilkins, Walter. *** This County is relieved from balancing the "Aye" with the*

"No" as it returns but one Member.

19. RUTLAND.

Heathcote, Sir G. Bart.

Noel Noel, Sir G. Bart.

20. SHROPSHIRE.

Powel, John K. *High Steward of the Seigniorship and Town of Oswestry, and Col. of the Shropshire Volunteers.—** Related to the Rev. E. Kynastar, Chaplain to the King, and Rector of Risby and Farnham, in Suffolk.*

Cotes, John, Esq. *** Son-in-law of the Earl of Stamford.*

21. SUFFOLK.

Gooch, Thomas S.

Rowley, Sir William, Bart.

22. SUSSEX.

Webster, Sir Godfrey, Bt. *** Son of Lady Holland.*

Burrell, William.

23. WILTSHIRE.

Long, Richard G.

Methuen, Paul C.

24. WORCESTER.

Lyttelton, Hon. Henry. *** Half-brother of Lord Lyttelton, and son-in-law of Earl Spencer.*

Lygon, Hon. *** Brother of the Earl of Beauchamp.*

25. YORKSHIRE.

Milton, Viscount *** Son of Lord Fitzwilliam, Patron of the County of Wicklow and following Boroughs, Malton, Higham Ferrars, Peterborough, Lord Lieut. and Cus. Rot. of the West Riding of Yorkshire. Cus. Rot. of the Soke of Peterboro'. High Steward of Hull, and Col. of the 1st Reg. of Yorkshire Militia.*

Lascelles, Viscount *** Son of the Earl of Harewood, Joint-Patron of Northallerton.*

26. ARMAGH.

Richardson, William *Trustee of the Linen Manufacture.—** His Patron, the Earl of Gosford.*

Caulfield, Hon. Henry *** Only brother of the Earl of Charlemont.*

27. CARLOW.

Bruen, Henry *** His own Patron.*

Latouch, Robert.

28. **CORK.**
 Bernard, Viscount . . . *** Son of Earl Bandon.
 Hare, Hon. Richard . . . *** Son of Visc. Ennismore, and brother-in-law of Lord Clanbrock.
29. **DUBLIN.**
 Hamilton, Hans. . . . *Governor of the County.*—*** Brother to the Dep. Prothon. of the Court of King's Bench, Ireland. Mrs. Sarah Hamilton, 700*l.* Irish Customer of the Port of Newry, Edward Hamilton, 407*l.* Customers of Drogheda, Dundalk, and Carlington, Edmund Hamilton and Henry Hamilton.
- Talbot, Richard W.
30. **LIMERICK.**
 Quin, Hon. H. W. W. . . . *** Son of Lord Mountearl.
 Odell, W. *Lord of the Irish Treasury, and Col. of the Limerick Militia.*—*** His Patron, the Earl of Clare.
31. **MEATH.**
 Somerville, Sir Marcus, Bart.
 Bective, Earl *** Son of the Marquis of Headfort, who is Lord of the King's Bed-chamber, Governor of the County, Col. of the Meath Militia. Cousin to Mr. Taylor, Commissioner of Excise.
32. **QUEEN'S COUNTY.**
 Pole, W. W. *Joint Chief Remembrancer of the Court of Exchequer in Ireland. Master and Worker of the Mint. Governor of Queen's County.*—*** Brother to the Marquis Wellesley, and the Duke of Wellington.
 Parnell, Sir H. *** Patrons, John Dawson, Earl of Portarlington, and Lord Devesci. Related to the Marquis of Bute, who has a pension of 7000*l.* a year on the Consolidated Fund, and the Archbishop of Armagh. Son-in-law to Earl Portarlington, who is Governor of the County. Countess Dowager Portarlington, a pension since October, 1800, of 800*l.* per annum; and after her decease, 200*l.* per annum, to each of her four daughters. Hon. Joseph Dawson, 200*l.* per annum, per Stamp Office, Ireland.
33. **ROSCOMMON.**
 French, Arthur.
 Mahon, Hon. Stephen . . . *A General.*—*** Son of Lord Hartland, Governor of the County.
34. **SLIGO.**
 O'Hara, Charles *Governor of the County.*—*** Robert O'Hara, Pursuivant of the Court of Exchequer, in Ireland, 1619*l.* per ann. Jemima O'Hara, pension of 100*l.* per annum. His own Patron.
- Cooper, Edward S.
35. **TYRONE.**
 Knox, Thomas *Joint Protho. of the Court of Common Pleas, in Ireland, 11,000*l.**—*** His brother, the Hon. Vesey Knox, the other Protho. of the Common Pleas, also one of the Weighers of Cork. Hon. George Knox, Commissioner of the Customs in Ireland, and from the Irish Civil List, a pension of 400*l.* per an. Son-in-law to the Archbishop of Armagh, who is Patron of the Borough of Armagh.
 Stewart, Sir John, Bart. . . *A Privy Counsellor in Ireland.* To Hugh and Mervin Stewarts, his sons, the Reversion of second Remembrancer of the Court of Exchequer in Ireland.
36. **WATERFORD.**
 Power, Richard.
 Beresford, Lord G. F. . . *Comptroller of the King's Household. A General.*—*** Brother to the Marquis of Waterford, the sole Governor and Cus. Rot. of the County, and patron for this seat.
37. **WEXFORD.**
 Carew, Rob. S. Jun.
 Flood, Sir F. Bart. . . . *King's Col. and Cus. Rot. of the County.*—*** Brother-in-law to Lord Waterpark.
- Total, 72 Members.

COUNTIES of the FOURTH CLASS, in which, according to Report, English Rights and Liberties rarely become a subject of polite conversation, and where nothing resembling Freedom of Election is supposed to exist.

1. **ANGLESEA.**

APPENDIX:

who is Col. of the 7th Dragoons, a Gen. Lord Lieut. and Cus. Rot. Vice Admiral of Anglesea, Ranger of Snowden Forest. Lady Louisa Paget, pension 300*l.* Sir Arthur Paget, pension 1700*l.*

2. BRECONSHIRE.

Wood, Thomas *** Son-in-law of the Earl of Londonderry, and brother-in law to Lord Castlereagh. Patron, Sir Chas. Morgan.

3. BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

Grenville, Hon. Thos. *Chief Justice in Eyre, South of Trent, 3466l. 13s. 4d. Col. of the 2nd Regt. Buc. Vol. Cav. and a Privy Counsellor.*—*** Brother to Lord Grenville, who is Auditor of the Exchequer, uncle to the Marquis of Buckingham, who is Lord Lieut. and Cus. Rot. of the County of Bucks, one of the undiminished Tellers of the Exchequer, 23,093*l.* per annum, Patron of Buckingham Town, St. Maws, and Joint Patron for the County, and for Aylesbury, also uncle to Lord Nugent.

Lowndes, W. S.

4. CARDIGANSHIRE.

Powell, Wm. C.

5. CARMARTHENSHIRE.

Seymour, Lord Robt. *Patent Joint Filazer and Prothonotary of the Court of King's Bench, 12,511*l.*, Clerk of the Crown, 427*l.*, and Keeper of the Writs in Ireland, 11,05*l.*, Craner and Wharfinger of the Port of Dublin, 1936*l.**—*** Brother to the Marquis of Hertford, Brother-in-law to Viscount Chetwynd, who is Clerk to the Privy Council, Lord George Seymour, a Commissioner of Excise in England, 1250*l.*, and the reversion of Craner and Wharfinger of the Port of Dublin.

6. CAERNARVONSHIRE.

Williams, Sir Robt. Bart.

7. CHESHIRE.

Davenport, Davies.

Egerton, William.

8. CUMBERLAND.

Lowther, John *** Brother to the Earl of Lonsdale, the Patron, who is Lord Lieut. of the Counties of Cumberland and Westmoreland, and Recorder of Carlisle, and a Col. in the Army. Uncle to the Hon. H. C. Lowther, a Lord of the Treasury, and Commissioner for India affairs, and also to Viscount Lowther, Major of the 10th Dragoons, and a Commissioner for India affairs, brother-in-law to the Earl of Westmoreland.

Morpeth, Viscount *** Son of the Earl of Carlisle, brother-in-law to the Duke of Devonshire, nephew to the Marquis of Stafford.

9. DENBIGHS.

Wynn, Sir W. W. Bart. *Lord Lieut., and Cus. Rot. of the Counties of Merioneth and Denbigh, Steward of Bommalon, Yale, and Maner, Lord of Trade.*—*** Nephew of Lord Grenville, and nearly related to the Marq. of Buckingham.

10. FLINTSHIRE.

Mostyn, Sir Thomas *** His own Patron, related to the Rev. Thomas Mostyn, Vice Dean, and Prebendary of Chester.

11. MERIONETHSHIRE.

Vaughan, Sir Rob. W. Bt. *** His own Patron.

12. MONMOUTH.

Morgan, Sir Chas. Bart. *** His own Patron.

Somerset, Lord G. C. H. *** Son of the Duke of Beaufort, brother to the Marquis of Worcester.

13. MONTGOMERYSHIRE.

Wynne, Chas. W. W. *** Brother of Sir Watkin W. Wynne, the Patron of the County.

14. NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.

Frank, Frank *An Admiral.*

Bentinck, Lord Wm. H. C. *Col. of the 11th Dragoons, a General, Clerk of the Pipe in the Court of Exchequer, late Amb. pension 2000*l.**—*** Next brother to the Duke of Portland, and son-in-law of Earl Granard, cousin of the Earl of Westmorland, Patron of Lime Regis, Lord Privy Seal, 3000*l.*, Knight of the Garter; brother-in-law to Earl Macclesfield.

15. OXFORDSHIRE.

Fane, John *** Cousin to the Earl of Westmorland, who is Lord Privy Seal and Recorder of Lime Regis. Brother-in-law to the Earl of Macclesfield.

field, who is Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard, President of the Board of Agriculture, and High Steward of Henly.

Ashhurst, Wm. Henry.

16. PEMBROKESHIRE.

Owen, Sir Jno. Bart.

17. STAFFORDSHIRE.

Littleton, Edw. Jno.

Gower, Earl *Late Minister to (quere Pension.)—** Son of the Marquis of Stafford, who is Patron of one Member for Stafford, one for Litchfield, and one for Newcastle. Lord Lieut. of Sunderland. Cus. Rot. Staffordshire. Trustee Brit. Mus. a Privy Counsellor, K. G. Marchioness of Stafford, a pension of 300l. per annum.*

18. SURREY.

Sumner, Geo. H.

Thornton, Samuel *A Bank Director, Gov. of the Russia, and Dep. Gov. of the Eastland Comp.—** Brother-in-law to the Earl of Leven, who is Comptroller of the Customs in Scotland.*

19. WARWICKSHIRE.

Dugdale, D. S. ** Son-in-law of Viscount Curzon, who returns one Member for Clithero.

Mordaunt, Sir Chas. Bart.

20. WESTMORLAND.

Lowther, Viscount *A Lord of the Treasury, and Commissioner for India affairs.—** Son of the Earl of Lonsdale.*

Lowther, Hon. H. C. *Major of the 10th Dragoons.—** Son of the Earl of Lonsdale.*

21. ANTRIM.

Yarmouth, Earl *Lord Warden of the Stanaries.—** Son of the Marquis of Hertford, nephew to the Seymours.*

O'Neill, J. R. B. *Captain in the Guards, and Col. in the Army.—** Brother of Earl O'Neill, who is Joint Post Master Gen. for Ireland, and Gov. of the County. One of the 28 Peers for Ireland, whose near relations of the name of Lees, are joint Secretaries of the Post Office, Comptroller of the port of Cork, 896l. besides fees, also Searcher, Packer, and Guager of the County of Wexford, 563l. per annum, and fees.*

22. CAVANSHIRE.

Sneyd, Nat. *Cust. Rot. Coy. Cavan, director of the Bank of Ireland.—** Eliza Sneyd, a pension of 336l. per annum. His wife, Anne Sneyd, 400l. per annum. His relation, Thomas Burgh, per Irish Compensation List, as Treasurer and Paymaster of the Ordnance, 500l., also as Agent to R. Art. Regt. of Ireland, 11,1216l. Anne Burgh, his wife, 200l. Gov. of the County, Trustee of the Linen Man, and Lord of the Treasury in Ireland.—** Cousin to the Earl of Farnham, and brother-in-law to the Earl of Mountnorris.*

23. CLARE.

O'Brien, Sir Edw. Bart.

Fitzgerald, A. *A General, Col. of the Clare Mil.—** Relation to Duke of Leinster.*

24. DONEGAL.

Stewart, Sir Jas. Bart.

Hart, Geo. V. *A General.—** Patron, the M. of Downshire.*

25. DOWNSHIRE.

Castlereagh, Lord *Secretary of State, &c. &c.—** Son of the Marquis of Londonderry, Gov. of the County of Londonderry, and Cus. Rot. of the same County and Downshire, Com. 2d Vol. Corps, brother-in-law to Earl Camden, brother to Lord Stewart, Col. of the 25th Dragoons, a General Officer, Lord of the King's Bed-chamber, and Amb. to Vienna.*

Meade, Hon. Jno. *Col. in the Army.—** Son-in-law of the Earl of Carrick, uncle to the Earl of Clanwilliam.*

26. FERMANAGH.

Cole, Hon. Sir G. L. *Gen. and Col. of the 34th Regt.—** Brother of the Earl of Enniskillen, Gov. and Cus. Rot. of the County, Col. of its Militia. Son-in-law of the Earl of Malmesbury, Ld. Lt. of the County of Southampton.*

Archdall Mervyn *A Gov. of the County of Ferm. a Gen. and Lieut. Gov. of the Isle of Wight.—** Neph. to Bar. Master General.*

27. GALWAYSHIRE.

28. HUNTINGDON-
SHIRE.

- Fellowes, W. H. . . . * * * First Cousin of the Earl of Portsmouth.
 Proby, Lord *A General.*—* * * Eldest Son of the Earl of Carysfort.

29. KERRY.

- Fitzgerald, Rt. H. M. . . *Knight of Kerry, Col. Kerry Mil. Priv. Coun. and Trustee of the Linen Man.*—
 Crosbie, Jas. . . . *Cus. Rot. and Gov. of the County.*

30. KILKENNY.

- Butler, Hon. Jas. W. . . . * * * Brother to the Marquis of Ormond, Cus. Rot. and sole Gov. of Kilkenny, Honorary Chief Butler of Ireland, and Col. of the Kilkenny Mil.
 Ponsonby, Hon. F. C. . . *Col. of the 12th Dragoons, and Aid de Camp to the Regent.*—* * * Son of the Earl of Besboro', and Nephew to Earl Spencer.

31. KING'S COUNTY.

- Bernard, Thos. John . . . * * * Brother-in-law of Lord Donnally, who is half-brother to Lord Charleville, the Patron of this Seat.
 Lloyd, Hardress * * * Brother-in-law to the Earl of Ross, who is Joint Post Master Gen. of Ireland, Patron of this Seat.

32. LEITRIM.

- Clements, Henry Jno. . . *Gov. of the County, Lord of the Treasury, and Trustee of the Lin. Man.*—* * * His own Patron, Brother to the Earl of Leitrim, Searcher of the Port of Dublin, with R. C. Clements, 1,359*l.* Cus. Rot. of Leitrim and Donegal, Trust. Lin. Man. Dame C. Clements, Keep. Irish Pon. House, 600*l.*, Hon. R. C. Clements, Searcher and Packer of all the Ports, 800*l.*, and reversion of Comptrollership.
 Latouche, Jno. *A Banker in Dublin.*

33. LONDONDERRY.

- Stewart, Alexander . . . * * * Brother to the Marquis of Londonderry, uncle to Lord Castle-reagh, and Son-in-law of the Marquis of Drogheda.
 Dawson, Geo. R. * * * Patron, Marquis of Drogheda.

34. LONGFORD.

- Fetherstone, Sir T. Bart. * * * A pension of 300*l.* per Annum for his six daughters.
 Forbes, Viscount *Cus. Rot. of the County, a Col. in the Army, and Aid de Camp to the Regent.*—* * * Son of the Earl of Granard, who is a Gen. sole Gov. and Cus. Rot. of this County, Clerk of the Crown and Hanaper, and a Privy Counsellor in Ireland.

35. LOUTH.

- Foster, Rt. Hon. Jno. . . *Gov. of the County, Visitor of the Royal College of St. Patrick's, Corporator for the Port of Dublin, Trustee of the Linen. Man. a Privy Counsellor, once Chancellor of the Exchequer, and a Lord of the Treasury of Ireland, and now has a pension for life, as Speaker of the Commons of Ireland of above 6000*l.* per annum.*—* * * His wife created a Peeress in 1797 by the title of Vicountess Ferrard. His son, Thomas Henry was Lord of the Irish Treasury, 1200*l.* per annum. His nephew, John L. Foster, is King's Advocate General in Ireland. Mrs. Mary Foster, as house-keeper of Irish Parliament House, by compensation a pension of 352*l.* per annum. Mary Ann Foster, as House-maid, a compensation of 13*l.* 11*s.* 9*d.* per annum.
 Jocelyn, Viscount . . . *Vice Chamberlain to the King, Joint Auditor General with his father, of the Irish Exchequer, 3,508*l.**—* * * Son of the Earl of Roden, who is Aud. Gen. of the Exchequer, Cus. Rot. of this County, and a Trustee of the Linen Man. Son-in-law of Lord Le Despenser.

36. MAYO.

- Brown, Rt. H. Dennis . . *A Privy Counsellor in Ireland.*—* * * Uncle to the Marquis of Sligo, Patron for his seat, father-in-law of Viscount Dillon, who is Col. of the 101st Regt., and Patron for the other seat.
 Brown, Dan.

37. MONAGHAN.

- Leslie, Chas. Powel . . . *Gov. of the County, Trustee of the Linen Man. and Col. of the Monaghan Mil.*
 Corry, T. C. S. * * * Related to Right Hon. Isaac Corry, who is Surveyor General of Lands and Manors, worth 600*l.*; has a pension by patent of 1200*l.*; a pension on the Irish Civil List, 300*l.*; a ditto, 300*l.*

38. TIPPERARY.

- Prittie, Hon. F. . . . *Cust. Rot. of this County.*—** Brother of Lord Demally, and son-in-law of the Right Hon. George Ponsonby, who has a pension of 4000*l.* per ann. as Ex-Chancellor of Ireland.
39. WESTMEATH.
Rochford, G. H. . . . ** His own patron. Richard Rochford, Pratique Master of the Port of Dublin, 1047*l.*
- Pakenham, Hon. H. R. . . . *Col. in the Army, and Capt. 2d Regt. Foot Guards.*—** Brother to the Earl of Longford, the *Cus. Rot. of the County.* Patron for this seat, and one of the Irish Representative Peers. Hon. E. M. Pakenham, *Col. 7th Regt. of Foot.* Hon. F. Pakenham, an Admiral. Pension from Irish Commission list, as Master-Gen. of the Ordnance, 1200*l.* Ditto to T. Pakenham, as Secretary to ditto, 100*l.* Ditto to Wm. Pakenham, as Clerk to ditto, 50*l.*
40. WICKLOW.
Proby, Hon. G. L. . . . *Capt. in the R. N.* **—Son of the Earl of Carysfort.
Ponsonby, Rt. Hon. G. . . . *As Ex-Chancellor of Ireland, a pension of 4000*l.* per ann.*—** Uncle of Lord Ponsonby, of the Earl of Shannon, who is *Cus. Rot. of the County of Cork, and Clerk of the Pells*;—and of Viscount Lismore. Uncle-in-law of Earl Grey, and of the Earl of Lanesboro'. Patron for both seats, Earl Fitzwilliam.
41. ABERDEEN.
Ferguson, James . . . *Lord Rector of King's College, as Commissioner, 600*l.**—** Patron, Duke of Gordon. Geo. Ferguson, one of the Lords of Session, in Scotland, 2000*l.*
42. ARGYLE.
Campbell, Lord J. D. E. H. ** Brother to the Duke of Argyle. Hered. Master of the King's Household in Scotland. Keeper of Dunstaffnage and Carrick. State Counsellor to the Prince of Wales, in Scotland. Lord Lieut. of Argyleshire, and Patron of this seat.
43. AYRSHIRE.
Hamilton, Sir Hew D. . . . ** Brother-in-law to Viscount Duncan. Patron of the seat, Earl of Eglinton.
44. BAMFESHIRE.
Abercrombie, Robert . . . ** Son of Sir G. Abercrombie. Patron, Baroness Abercrombie.
45. BERWICK.
Baillie, George . . . ** Cousin to the Earl of Haddington, Lord Lieut. Haddingtonshire.—Patron, Earl of Home.
46. 47. BUTE and CAITHNESS-SHIRE.
Majoribanks, Sir J. Bart. ** Patron for Bute, Marquis of Bute—for Caithness, Sir J. Sinclair.
48. 49. CLACKMANNAN and KINROSS.
Abercrombie, Hon. Sir J. *Colonel of the 53d Regiment, and a Lieut.-Gen*—** Son of Baroness Abercrombie, who has a pension of 2000*l.* per ann. Patroness for Clackmannan. For Kinross, Thos. Graham.
50. 51. CROMARTY and NAIRN.
Macintosh, Sir James . . . *Late Recorder of Bombay.*—** Patron for Cromarty, H. Davidson—for Nairn, Lord Cawdor.
52. DUMFRIES.
Douglas, Wm. R. K. . . . ** Brother to the Marquis of Queensbury.
53. DUMBARTON.
Colquhoun, Rt. Hon. A. *Lord Register of Scotland.*—** Patron, Duke of Montrose, who is Master of the Horse to the King. Lord Justice General of Scotland. Lord Lieut. of Stirlingshire. Chancellor of Glasgow University. Au extra Director of the Bank of Scotland.
54. EDINBURGHSHIRE.
Clerk, Sir G. Bart. . . . ** Patron, Duke of Buccleugh.
55. ELGINSHIRE.
Grant, F. W. . . . *Col. in the Army, Lord Lieut. of Inverness, and Col. of the Inverness Mil.* ** Brother to the Earl of Seafield, the Patron.
56. FIFESHIRE.
Wemyss, Wm. . . . *A General, and Colonel of the 93d Regt.*—** David G. Wemyss, a General, and Colonel of the 18th Regt. Foot. His own patron.
57. FORFAR.

58. **HADDINGTON.**
Suttie, Sir James, Bart. *** Patron, Earl of Hopetoun.
59. **INVERNESS.**
Grant, Charles *Chairman to the East India Company, and Director of the Sierra Leone Company.*—*** His own patron.
60. **KINCARDINE.**
Drummond, Geo. H. *A Banker in London.*—*** Patron, Mr. Barclay.
61. **KIRKCUDBRIGHT.**
Dunlop, James *A General.*—*** Patron, Earl of Galloway.
62. **LANARK.**
Hamilton, Lord A. *** Son of the Duke of Hamilton, the patron.
63. **LINLITHGOWSHIRE.**
Hope, Hon. Sir A. *A General, Colonel of the 47th Regt., Governor of the Royal Mil. College, Lieut-Governor of Edinburgh Castle.*—*** Half-brother to the Earl of Hopetoun, the patron.
64. **ORKNEY & SHETLAND.**
Honeyman, R. B. J. *** Patrons, Lord Dundas and Sir Wm. Honeyman.
65. **PEEBLESIIRE.**
Montgomery, Sir J. Bart. *Presenter of Signals in the Exchequer Court of Scotland, and Keeper of the Great Seal of the Prince of Wales.*—*** Patron, Sir Hugh Montgomery.
66. **PERTHSHIRE.**
Drummond, James *** Son-in-law of the Duke of Athol, the patron. Lord of the Isle of Man. Lord Lieut. of Perthshire. A pension on Cons. Fund of 3,686*l.* 9*s.* 4*d.*
67. **RENFREWSHIRE.**
Speirs, Archibald *** Patron, Sir M. Shaw Stewart.
68. **ROSS-SHIRE.**
Fraser, Charles *** Patron, the heir of the late Lord Seaforth.
69. **ROXBURGHSHIRE.**
Don, Sir Alexander *** Patron, Earl of Minto.
70. **SELKIRK.**
Lockhart, Wm. Elliot *** Patron, Duke of Buccleugh.
71. **STIRLING.**
Riddell, Sir John, Bart. *** Brother-in-law of the Earl of Romney, who is Director of Greenwich Hospital. Hon. Jack Marsham, Canon of Windsor, 600*l.* per ann. and Prebendary of Rochester, 400*l.* Patron, Duke of Montrose.
72. **SUTHERLANDS.**
Grant, G. M. : *** Patron, Marchioness of Stafford.
73. **WIGTOUNSHIRE.**
Blair, James H. *** Patron, Earl of Galloway.

Total, 100 Members.

CITIES, TOWNS, and BOROUGHs, of the FIRST CLASS, where Elections are free and without expense.

1. **WESTMINSTER.**
Burdett, Sir Francis.
Cochrane, Lord.

Total, 2 Members.

CITIES, TOWNS, and BOROUGHs, of the SECOND CLASS, in some few of which considerable independence is to be found; but which for the most part exhibit a confused medley of freedom and influence, of domination and venality; and where an Election without the aid of money or high connexions is little to be hoped for.

1. **ST. ALBANS.**
Hasley, Joseph.
Smith, Christopher An Alderman of London; excluded from the Mayoralty in 1816, by the present Lord Mayor's second election

2. **BEDFORD.**
 Russell, Lord G. W. . . *Colonel.—** Son of the Duke of Bedford.*
 Waldegrave, Hon. Wm. . . *Captain R. N.—** Brother to Earl Waldegrave.*
3. **BERWICK.**
 Allen, Alexander.
 St. Paul, Henry H. . . . *** Brother to the Member for Bridport.*
4. **BEVERLEY.**
 Wharton, John.
 Forbes, Charles *Lord Rector of the Marischal College of Aberdeen.*
5. **BRIDPORT.**
 Abdy, Sir W.
 St. Paul, Sir Horace D. C. *** Horace St. Paul, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Sweden, a pension of 600*l.**
6. **BOSTON.**
 Maddock, Wm. A.
 Burrell, Hon. P. R. D.
7. **BRISTOL.**
 Davis, R. H.
 Protheroe, Edward.
8. **CANTERBURY.**
 Lushington, Stephen R. . *Joint Secretary of the Treasury.—** Son-in-law of Lord Harris.*
 Baker, John.
9. **CARLISLE.**
 Graham, Sir James, Bart. *Recorder of the Borough of Appleby.*
 Curwen, J. C.
10. **CHESTER.**
 Grosvenor, Thomas . . . *General, and Colonel 65th Regt.—** Cousin of Earl Grosvenor.*
 Egerton, Sir J. G. Bart.
11. **CHICHESTER.**
 Huskisson, Rt. Hon. Wm. *First Commissioner of Woods and Forests. Colonial Agent for Ceylon. Pension of 1200*l.* when not in office.—** Pension to his wife on his death, 615*l.* per ann.*
 March, Earl of *A Colonel.—** Son of the Duke of Richmond, late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. A General. Colonel of the 53d Regiment. Governor of Plymouth. Lord Lieutenant and Cus. Rot. of Sussex. High Steward of Chichester,—and a pension on Cons. Fund, to him and heirs male of 12,666*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.**
12. **COVENTRY.**
 Moore, P.
 Butterworth, Joseph
13. **GLOUCESTER.**
 Molyneux, H. T. H. . . . *Deputy Earl Marshal of England and High Steward of this City.—** Brother to the Duke of Norfolk.*
 Webb, Edward.
14. **HEREFORD.**
 Symonds, T. P. . . . *Colonel of the South Gloucester Militia.*
 Scudamore, Richard P.
15. **HERTFORD.**
 Cowper, Hon. E. S. . . . *** Brother of Earl Cowper.*
 Calvert, N.
16. **HULL.**
 Staniforth, John.
 Denys, Sir George Wm. . *Equerry to the Duke of Sussex.—** Brother-in-law to the Earl of Pomfret.*
17. **LEICESTER.**
 Smith, Samuel *** Brother of Lord Carrington.*
 Babington, Thomas.
18. **LEWES.**
 Shiffner, George.
 Shelly, Sir John, Bart.
1. **LIVERPOOL.**
 Gas-yne, Isaac *Gen. and Col. of the 54th Reg. Foot.*
 Cannell, Right Hon. George *President of the Board of Controul, Receiver General of the Alienation Office, late Sincere Ambassador to Portugal, at 44,000*l.* per ann.—*

20. LONDON.

Combe, Harvey C.
 Curtis, Sir Wm. Bart. . . . *President of Artillery Company.*
 Shaw, Sir James, Bart.
 Atkins, John.

21. NEWCASTLE-UN-
DER-LYNE.

Boughey, Sir John, Bart.
 Chetwode, Sir John, Bart. *** Son-in-law of the Earl of Stamford.

22. NEWCASTLE-UPON-
TYNE.

Ridley, Sir Matt. W. Bart. *** His Brother Henry, Prebendary of Gloucester, 600*l.* per ann.
 Ellison, Cuthbert.

23. NORTHAMPTON.

Hanbury, William.
 Compton, Earl *** Son of the Marquis of Northampton, Lord Lieut. and Cust. Rot. of the County of Northampton, and Recorder of Northampton.

24. NORWICH.

Smith, William.
 Harvey, Charles.

25. NOTTINGHAM.

Smith, John.
 Rancliffe, Lord.

26. OXFORD CITY.

Wright, John, A.
 Lockhart, John J.

27. PONTEFRACT.

Milnes, Robert P. . . . *** Brother-in-law to Viscount Galway.
 Pollington, Viscount . . . *** Son of the Earl of Mexborough. Son-in-law of the Earl of Hardwick.

28. PORTSMOUTH.

Markham, John *Admiral.*—*** Son of the Archbishop of York. George Markham, Dean of York, 1000*l.* per ann. Osborn Markham, Chancellor of the Province of York, 800*l.* per ann. Robert Markham, Archdeacon and Canon Residentiary of York, 500*l.* Robert Markham, Prebendary of Carlisle, 400*l.* per ann.

Barter, John.

29. PRESTON.

Horrocks, Samuel.
 Hornby, Edmund Nephew to the Earl of Derby.

30. READING.

Lefevre, Charles Shaw . . . *Recorder of Basingstoke.*
 Simeon, Sir John, Bart. . . *Master in Chancery, Commissioner for the Protection of the King's Property.*

31. ROCHESTER.

Calcraft, John.
 Barnett, James.

32. SHREWSBURY.

Bennet, Hon. H. G. . . . Son of the Earl of Tankerville.
 Lyster, Richard.

33. SOUTHAMPTON.

Rose, George Henry . . . *Envoy Ext. and Minister Plen. to Berlin.*—*** Son of the Rt. Hon. George Rose, the great Placeman and Pensioner.
 Atherly, Arthur *** Brother-in-law to the Marquis of Lothian.

34. SOUTHWARK.

Calvert, Charles.
 Barclay, Charles.

35. TAUNTON.

Baring, Alexander *Bank Director.*
 Collins, Henry P.

36. TEWKESBURY.

Dowdeswell, John E. . . . *Commissioner of Bankrupts.*
 Martin, James *A Banker in London.*

No. IV.

Price Two-Pence.

LETTERS TO THE LORD MAYOR,

With an Appendix, containing an Analysis and New Classification of the State of the Representation, and the House of Commons.

BY MAJOR CARTWRIGHT.

Published by WILL. HONE, at the *Reformist's Register Office*, 67, Old Bailey, three doors from Ludgate-Hill.

37. WINDSOR.

Desbrow, Edward . . . *Vice-Chamberlain to the Queen.*

Ramsbottom, John . . . *Banker in London.*

38. WORCESTER.

Robarts, Abraham . . . *Director of East India Comp.—** Partner in the Banking House of Robarts, Curtis and Co.*

Gordon, Sir Wm. Duff, Bart.

39. YORK.

Sykes, Sir Mark M. Bart.

Dundas, Hon. Laurence . . . *** Son of Lord Dundas, who is Lord Lient. and Vice-Admiral of Orkney and Shetland, and a Counsellor of State to the Prince of Wales, in Scotland.*

40. CARRICKFERGUS.

Chichester, Arthur.

41. CORK.

Longfield, Mountiford.

Colthurst, Sir N. C. Bart.

42. DOWNPATRICK.

Glerawley, Viscount . . . *** Son of Lord Annesley.*

43. DROGHEDA.

Ogle, Hon. M.

44. DUBLIN.

Grattan, Right Hon. H.

Shaw, Robert.

45. GALWAY.

Blake, Val.

46. LIMERICK.

Vereker, Right Hon. C. . . *Constable of Limerick.—** Nephew of Viscount Gal.*

47. NEWRY.

Needham, Hon. F. . . . *General, and Col. of the 86th Reg.—** Brother of Visc. Kilmorey.*

84. WATERFORD.

Newport, Sir John, Bart.

Total 91 Members.

CITIES, TOWNS, and BOROUGHs of the Third Class, commonly called *Open*; and open indeed to the rank bribery of the highest bidder.

1. BARNSTAPLE.

Lopez, Sir M. M. . . . *Recorder of Westbury.*

Coote, Sir Eyre *Late a General, and Lieut. Governor of Jamaica.—** Brother of Lord Castlecoote, a Governor of the Queen's County, and Chief Commissioner of the Customs.*

2. COLCHESTER.

Thornton, Robert . . . *East India Director.—** Brother-in-law of the Earl of Levin and Milville.*

83. EXETER.

- Buller, James *Commissioner of Bankrupts.*
 Courtney, Wm. *Commissioner of Bankrupts.—Brother-in-law to the Earl of Rothes. Cousin and heir to Viscount Courtney.*

4. HEYDON.

- Broadhurst, John.
 Browne, Anthony *Agent of the Island of Antigua.*

5. HONITON.

- Vyse, Richard, W. H. . . . *Major in the Army, and Capt. 2d Reg. Life Guards.—** Son of R. Vyse, a General and Colonel 3d Regiment Dragoon Guards; Comp. of the Duke of Cumberland's Household; and Commander of the Yorkshire District, with 1400l. per ann.—Rev. Wm. Vyse, Chancellor and Archdeacon of Litchfield and Coventry, 300l. Canon of Litchfield, 400l.; Rector of Lambeth, 1000l. per ann.*
 Robinson, George A. . . . *Late Account. Gen. in India. A Director of the East India Company.*

6. IPSWICH.

- Crickett, Robert A. . . . *A Banker.*
 Round, John.

7. KING'S LYNN.

- Folkes, Sir M. B. Bart.
 Walpole, Lord *Col. West Norfolk Militia.—** Son of the Earl of Orford, High Steward of this Borough.*

8. LINCOLN.

- Fitzakerley, John N.
 Sibthorp, Coningsby W. . . *Colonel of South Lincoln Militia.*

9. MAIDSTONE.

- Simson, George *A Banker in London.*
 Brydges, Sir Samuel E.

10. STAFFORD.

- Benson, Ralph *•• A Bankrupt.*
 Wilson, Thomas.

11. STOCKBRIDGE.

- Barham, Joseph Foster . . *** Brother-in-law of the Earl of Thanet.*
 Porter, George *Gen. and Col. of 103d Reg.—** Father-in-law of Earl Grosvenor.*

12. SUDBURY.

- Hippisley, Sir John Cox, Bt. *Recorder of this Borough.*
 Wyatt, Charles.

13. WELLS.

- Taylor, Charles Wm.
 Tudway, John Paine.

Total 26 Members.

CITIES, TOWNS, and BOROUGHs of the FOURTH CLASS, commonly called *Close*, including the CINQUE PORTS; where arbitrary Nomination supplies the Place of Election.

1. ABINGDON. (*Quere Independent.*)

- Bowyer, Sir George, Bart.

2. AGMONDESHAM.

- Drake, Thomas Tyrwhitt. *** Proprietor.*
 Drake, Wm. Tyrwhitt . . *Major in the Army, and a Capt. in the Royal Reg. Horse Guards.*

3. ALDBOROUGH.

- Fynea, Henry *** Son of the Rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster. Brother to the Prebend of Westminster. Patron, the Duke of Newcastle.*
 Vernon, Granville, Visc. . *** Son of the Archbishop of York, Primate of England, and Lord High Almoner to the King. Nephew to the Marquis of Stafford and of Lord Vernon; Son-in-law of the Earl of Luccan.*

4. ALDEBURGH.

- Dufferin, Lord *Governor of the County of Down.*

5. **ANDOVER.**
 Fellowes, Hon. Newton : ** Brother to the Earl of Portsmouth, and Bailiff of Burley, in the New Forest.
 Smith, Thomas A.
6. **APPLEBY.**
 Lowther, James ** Earl of Lonsdale, Patron.
 Tierney, Right Hon. G. . . . ** Earl of Thanet, Ditto.
7. **ARUNDEL.**
 Wilder, Francis J. . . . *A General.*—** Duke of Norfolk, Ditto.
 Romilly, Sir Samuel, Knt.
8. **ASHBURTON.**
 Sullivan, Right Hon. Jas. *Commissioner for the Affairs of India.*—** Sir L. Palk, Patron.
 Preston, Richard ** Lord Clinton, Patron.
9. **AYLESBURY.**
 Nugent, Lord ** Brother to the Marquis of Buckingham, the Patron, and Nephew of Lord Grenville.
 Cavendish, Charles C. . . . ** Son of Lord George A. H. Cavendish, the Patron, and Cousin of the Duke of Devonshire.
10. **BANBURY.**
 Douglas, Hon. Fred. S. N. *Pension 600l.*—** Son of Lord Glenbervie, who has another Pension of 600l., and is Surveyor General of Forests. Nephew of the Earl of Guildford, the Patron.
11. **BATH.**
 Thynne, Lord John . . . *Lord Chamberlain of his Majesty's Estate at Windsor.*—** Brother to the Marquis of Bath, the Patron, Nephew of Lord Carteret.
 Palmer, Charles *Colonel and Aid de Camp to the Prince Regent.*—** His Father, a Pension of 3000l. per annum. His own Patron.
12. **BEAUMARIS.**
 Lewis, Thomas F. . . . ** Patron, Viscount Bulkeley.
13. **BEDWIN.**
 Leigh, James Henry . . . ** Brother-in-law of Lord Say and Seale, and related to the Earl of Aylesbury, the Patron.
 Nichol, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Knt. *Dean of the Arches, and Judge of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, and a Lord of Trade and Plantations.*—** Patron, the Earl of Aylesbury.
14. **BEREALSTON.**
 Lovaine, Lord *Colonel of Northumberland Militia, and Commissioner for India Affairs.*—** Son of the Earl of Beverley, the Patron, and Nephew of the Duke of Northumberland.
 Percy, Hon. J. *Captain in the Navy.*—** Brother to Lord Lovaine.
15. **BEWDLEY.**
 Wilson, Charles E. . . . ** Patron, Roberts, an Attorney.
16. **BISHOPS CASTLE.**
 Clive, William ** Uncle to the Earl of Powis, the Patron.
 Robinson, John *General, and Colonel of 60th Reg.*—** Brother-in-law to Earl Powis.
17. **BLECHINGLY.**
 Bolland, John } ** Patron, Judge Kenrick.
 Newman, Robert W. . . . }
18. **BODMYN.**
 Giddy, Davies ** Patron, Lord de Dunstanville.
 Bathurst, Right Hon. Chas. *Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.*—** Brother-in-law to Viscount Sidmouth.
19. **BOROUGHBRIDGE.**
 Clinton, Sir W. H. . . . *Gen. and Col. 53d Reg.*—** Son-in-law of the Earl of Sheffield.
 Clinton, Sir H. . . . *Gen. and Col. 3d Reg. and Quarter-Master-Gen. in Ireland, 2,507l. per ann.*—** Brother-in-law of the Earl of Wemyss. Patron, Duke of Newcastle.
20. **BOSSINEY.**
 Wortley, James A. S. . . . ** His own Patron. Son-in-law of the Earl of Errol.
 Desert, Earl Patron, Earl of Mountedgecombe.

22. **BRAMBER.**
 Irving, John *** Patron, Duke of Rutland.
 Wilberforce, Wm. *** Ditto, Lord Calthorpe.
23. **BRECON.**
 Morgan, Charles ** Son of Sir Charles Morgan, the Patron.
24. **BRIDGENORTH.**
 Whitmore, Thomas *** Patron for both seats.
 Jenkinson, Hon. C. C. C. *** Half-brother to the Earl of Liverpool.
25. **BRIDGEWATER.**
 Pocock, George ** Brother-in-law to Earl Powlet, the Patron for both seats.
 Astell, William *Director of the East India Company.*
26. **BUCKINGHAM.**
 Ebrington, Viscount *** Son of Earl Fortescue, who is Lord Lieut. of the County of Devon, and High Steward of Barnstaple and South Molton.
 Freemantle, W. H. *Pension from Irish Comp. List, as Joint Resident Secretary in London to Lord Lieut. 636l. Ditto, as Joint Solicitor for Great Britain, 391l. per ann.—** Patron, Marquis of Buckingham.*
27. **CALLINGTON.**
 Poyntz, W. S. ** Father-in-law of Lord Clinton, the Patron.
 Trefusis, Hon. Chas. R. *** Brother of Ditto.
28. **CALNE.**
 Abercrombie, Hon. James *Commissioner of Bankrupts.—** Son of Baroness Abercrombie.*
 Macdonald, James *A Clerk of the Privy Seal.—Son of Sir A. Macdonald, Bart. and Nephew to the Marq. of Stafford. Patron, Marq. of Lansdowne.*
29. **CAMBRIDGE BORO'**
 Finch, Hon. E. *Groom of the King's Bed-chamber, a General, and Col. of the 22nd Regiment of Foot.—** Uncle to the Earl of Aylesford.*
 Manners, Robert *Gen. Col. of the 30th Reg. and Clerk Marshal, and first Equerry to the King.—** Related to the Duke of Rutland, the Patron.*
30. **CAMELFORD.**
 Leader, William ** Patron, the Earl of Darlington.
 Scott, Samuel.
31. **CARDIFF.**
 Stuart, Lord E. J. ** Uncle of the Marquis of Bute, the Patron.
32. **CARDIGAN.**
 Vaughan, Hon. John *Col. in the Army.—** Half-brother to the Earl of Lisburn, the Patron. Brother-in-law of Viscount Courtney.*
33. **CARMARTHEN.**
 Campbell, Hon. J. F. ** Son of Lord Cawdor, the Patron. Son-in-law of the Marquis of Bath.
34. **CAERNARVON.**
 Paget, Hon. Charles *Captain in the Navy.—** Brother to the Marquis of Anglesea, the Patron.*
35. **CASTLE RISING.**
 Howard, Hon. F. G. *Col. in the Army.—** Brother of Viscount Templetown, and brother-in-law of the Earl of Bristol. R. Howard, Patron, Receiver General of the Land-Tax.*
 Bradshaw, Hon. A. C. *Groom of the King's Bed-chamber.—** Brother of Lord Waterpark.*
36. **CHIPPENHAM.**
 Peel, Right Hon. Rob. *Secretary of State for Ireland, and a Lord of the Treasury.—** Patron, J. Maitland, Son to Sir R. Peel, of Tamworth.*
 Brooke, Charles ** His own Patron.
37. **CHRISTCHURCH.**
 Rose, Right Hon. George *Clerk of the Parliaments, 3278l. Treasurer of the Navy, 4324l.—Keeper of the Records in the Receipt of the Exchequer, 400l. One of the Verdurers of the New Forest.—** His own Patron. His son George H. Envoy Extraordinary, and Minister Plenipotentiary to Berlin, also the Reversion of Clerk of the Parliaments. William Stewart Rose, Reading Clerk, and Clerk of Private Committees, 1500l. per annum. Also Clerk of the Pleas in the Exchequer. Office of Pleas, 900l. per annum.*
 Tomline, William E. ** Son of the Bishop of Lincoln.
38. **CIRENCESTER.**

- Apsley, Lord *Commissioner for India Affairs.*—** Son of the Secretary of State for the Colonial Department.
39. CLITHERO.
Curzon, Hon. Robert . . . ** Son of Viscount Curzon, the Patron.
Wilbraham, Edward B.
40. COCKERMOUTH.
Wallace, Right Hon. T. . *Commissioner for India Affairs.*—** Brother-in-law of the Earl of Hopetown. General, and Colonel of the 92d Regiment. Patron, Lord Lonsdale.
- Lowther, John H.
41. CORF CASTLE.
Banks, Henry ** His own Patron.
Banks, George ** H. Banks, ditto.
42. CRICLADE.
Calley, Thomas.
Pitt, Joseph *A Banker at Cirencester.*—** His own Patron.
43. DARTMOUTH.
Holdsworth, A. H. . . . *Governor of Dartmouth Castle.*—** Patron, the Treasury.
Bastard, John *Captain in the Navy.*—** Patron, the Treasury.
44. DENBIGH.
Kirkwall, Viscount . . . ** Son of the Countess of Orkney. Query, open for money?
45. DERBY.
Coke, Edward ** Patron, himself.
Cavendish, Henry F. C. . . ** First cousin of the Duke of Devonshire, the Patron for this seat.
46. DEVIZES.
Smith, Joshua ** Patron, himself. Father-in-law to the Marquis of Northampton.
Estcourt, Thomas G. . . ** Patron, Lord Sidmouth.
47. DORCHESTER.
Williams, Robert . . . *Banker.*—** His own Patron.
Shepherd, Sir Samuel . . *Attorney-General to the King.*—** Patron, the Earl of Shaftsbury.
48. DOVER.
Jenkinson, Charles . . . ** Cousin to the Earl of Liverpool.
Jackson, Sir John, Bart. *Director of the East India Company.*
49. DOWNTON.
Pechell, Sir T. B. Bart. . *A General.*—** Patron, the Earl of Radnor.
Golding, Edward.
50. DROITWICH.
Foley, Hon. Andrew . . . ** Uncle to Lord Foley, the Patron.
Sefton, Earl ** Brother-in-law to the Earl of Craven.
51. DUNWICH.
Barne, Michael ** Himself the Patron.
Huntingfield, Lord . . . ** Himself the Patron.
52. DURHAM.
Wharton, Richard . . . *Chairman of the Committee of Supply, 1500l. per annum.*—** Patronage, complex; chiefly money, said to be furnished by a northern Goliath, the Church of course favouring; but its influence less in the City than the County; in which the Earl of Strathmore has the giving of the good things of the Treasury.
- Allen, George.
53. EAST LOOE.
Buller, Sir Edward, Bart. *An Admiral. Recorder of this Borough, and late Lord of the Admiralty.*—** Himself the Patron.
- Macqueen, Thomas P.
54. EDMUNDSBURY, ST.
Fitzroy, Lord Charles . . *General, and Col. of the 48th Reg.*—** Brother to the Duke of Grafton, the Patron, and brother-in-law to Lord Castlereagh.
Foster, Frederick T. H. . . Son of the Duchess of Devonshire, and nephew of the Earl of Bristol, the other Patron.
55. EVESHAM.
Manning, William . . . *Bank of England Director, and agent for the Island of St. Vincent.*—

56. **EYE.**
 Singleton, Mark . . . *Principal Store-keeper of the Ordnance.—** Brother-in-law to the Marquis Cornwallis, the Patron.*
 Gifford *Solicitor-General.*
57. **FLINT.**
 Lloyd, Sir E. P. Bart. . . *** Patron, Sir W. W. Wynne.*
58. **FOWEY.**
 Wigram, Robert . . . *Bank of England Director.—** Patron, the Earl of Mountedgecombe.*
 Rashleigh, William . . . *** His own Patron.*
59. **GATTON.**
 Wood, Sir Mark, Bart. . . *Col. in the Army in India, late Chief Engineer at Bengal.—** His own Patron.*
 Wood, Mark.
60. **ST. GERMAIN'S.**
 Goulburn, Henry . . . *Under Secretary of State for the War Department.—** Nephew to Viscount Chetwynd.*
 Pringle, Sir William H. . . *General, and Col. of the 64th Regiment.—** Nephew-in-law to the Earl of St. Germain's, the Patron.*
61. **GRAMPOUND.**
 Teed, John *** 300 Guineas a Vote, now Sir M. Lopez, Patron.*
 Collet, Eben. John . . . *** Sir C. Hawkins, Patron.*
62. **GRANTHAM.**
 Welby, Sir W. Earl, Bart.
 Smith, Robert *Late Advocate-General at Bengal.—** Sir W. Manners, Patron.*
63. **GRIMSBY.**
 Heron, Sir Robert, Bart.
 Grant, John P. *Barrister at Law, and Advocate at the Scotch Bar.—** Money.*
64. **GRINSTEAD.**
 Gunning, Sir G. W. Bart.
 Hope, Sir George J. . . . *An Admiral, and Lord of the Admiralty.*
65. **GUILDFORD.**
 Onslow, Hon. T. C. . . . *** Son of the Earl of Onslow, the Patron.*
 Onslow, Arthur *King's Serjeant at Law.—** His uncle, Viscount Cranley, is Col. of the Surry Militia, and Out-ranger of Windsor Forest, 600*l.* per annum. Pension for his life, and of his son, George, 3000*l.* Sir Richard Onslow, an Admiral. Arthur Onslow, Dean of Worcester, 800*l.* per annum, and Archdeacon of Berks. Arthur Onslow, in trust for Pooley George Walter, and Arthur Onslow, 300*l.* per annum.*
66. **HARWICH.**
 Addington, Rt. Hon. J. H. *Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, and High Steward of Harwich.—** Brother of Viscount Sidmouth, Chief Secretary of State for the Home Department.*
 Vansittart, Right Hon. N. *Chancellor of the Exchequer.—** Brother-in-law of Lord Auckland. Patron, the Treasury.*
67. **HASLEMERE.**
 Long, Right Hon. Charles *Joint Paymaster of the Forces.—** Mrs. Long, on the death of her husband, 750*l.* per annum. Rev. W. Long, his brother, is Canon of Westminster, 600*l.* per annum.*
 Ward, Robert *Clerk of the Ordnance.—** Brother-in-law to the Earl of Mulgrave, Master General of the Ordnance. Mrs. Ward, on her husband ceasing to hold a situation of equal value, a pension of 1,000*l.* per annum. Patron, the Earl of Lonsdale.*
68. **HASTINGS.**
 Hume, Sir Abraham, Bart. *** Father-in-law of the Right Hon. Charles Long, and of Earl Brownlow. Brother-in-law of the Earl of Bridgewater. Patron, the Treasury.*
 Dawkins, James.
69. **HAVERFORDWEST.**
 Kensington, Lord *** Patron, Lord Milford.*
70. **HELLSTONE.**
 Hammersley, Hush

- Home, William *Commissioner of Bankrupts.—** Patron, the Duke of Leeds.*
71. HEYTESBURY.
Bridport, Lord *** Son of Viscount Hood, and son-in-law of Earl Nelson. Patron, Sir William A. Court.*
- Duncombe, Charles.
72. HIGHAM FERRERS.
Plumer, William *** Patron, Earl Fitzwilliam.*
73. HINDON.
Beckford, William *** Father-in-law of the Marquis of Douglas, and uncle-in-law of the Earl of Aboyne. His own Patron.*
- Hobhouse, Sir Ben. Bart. *First Commissioner between the East India Company and the Creditors of the late Nabob of the Carnatic.—** Patron, Lord Calthorpe.*
74. HORSHAM.
Pigot, Sir A. *King's Counsellor, formerly Attorney-General.—** Patron, the Duke of Norfolk.*
- Hurst, Robert *** Patron, the Duke of Norfolk.*
75. HUNTINGDON.
Calvert, John *Secretary to the Lord Chamberlain.—** Patron, the Earl of Sandwich.*
- Farmer, Samuel *** Patron, the Earl of Sandwich.*
76. HYTHE.
Perring, Sir John, Bart. *A Banker in London.—** Patron, the Treasury.*
- White, Matthew *** Patron, the Treasury.*
77. ILCHESTER.
Ward, Hon. John W. . . . *** Son of Viscount Dudley and Ward. Patron, Sir W. Mansers.*
- Philips, George.
78. ST. IVES.
Stirling, Walter *A Banker in Westminster.—** Patron, Sir C. Hawkins.*
- Wellesley, W. P. T. L. . . *** Son of the Master of the Mint. Nephew to the Marquis Wellesley, and the Duke of Wellington. Patron (Money).*
79. KNARESBOROUGH.
Townsend, Lord John . . *** Uncle of Marquis Townsend.*
- Ossulston, Lord *** Son of the Earl of Tankerville, and son-in-law of the Duke de Grammont. Patron, the Duke of Devonshire.*
80. LANCASTER.
Cawthorn, J. F. *Quere if not to be placed amongst open Boroughs.*
- ** Cashiered in a Regiment of Militia. Patron, ten guineas a man.*
- Doveton, Gabriel *General in the East India service.—** Ten guineas a man.*
81. LAUNCESTON.
Brogden, James *Chairman of the Committees, 2000l. per annum.—** Patron, the Duke of Northumberland.*
- Pellew, Hon. P. B. . . . *Captain in the Navy.—** Son of Viscount Exmouth.*
82. LEOMINSTER.
Harcourt, John *** Quere Money.*
- Lubbock, Sir J. W. . . . *Banker in London.—** Quere Money.*
83. LESKEARD.
Elliot, Hon. W. *A Lord of the Treasury.—** Brother of the Earl of St. Germain's, the Patron, and brother-in-law of the Marquis of Stafford.*
- York, Right Hon. C. P. . . *Teller of the Exchequer.—** Half-brother of the Earl of Hardwick, late Lord Lieut. of Ireland, High Steward of Camb. Univ. and Lord Lieut. and Cus. Rot. of the County of Cambridge.*
84. LESTWITHEL.
Valletort, Viscount . . . *** Son of the Earl of Mountedgecombe, the Patron.*
- Warre, John A.
85. LITCHFIELD.
Anson, Sir G. *Gen. and Col. of the 23rd Dragoons.—** Brother of Visc. Anson.*
- Vernon, Geo. G. V. . . . *** Son of the Archbishop of York. Nephew to the Marquis of Stafford, the Patron.*
86. LIME REGIS.
Fane, Sir Henry *Gen. and Col. of the 4th Drag. Guards.—** Patron, Earl of Westmorland.*

87. **LUDGERSHALL.**
 Birch, Joseph * * Patron, Mr. Everet.
 Pallmer, Charles N. . . . * * Patron, Sir Jas. Graham.
88. **LUDLOW.**
 Clive, Viscount * * Son of the Earl of Powis, the Patron.
 Clive, Henry.
89. **LYMINGTON.**
 Neale, Sir Harry B. . . . *An Admiral.*—* * Patron for both Seats.
 Tayler, Jno.
90. **MALDEN.** Quere if not to be transposed.
 Strutt, Jos. H. . . . * * Uncle-in-law to the Duke of Leinster. Wm. Gooday Strutt,
 a Gen. and Gov. of Quebec.
- Gaskell, Ben.
91. **MALMESBURY.**
 Beach, Wm. H. . . . * * Patron, Jos. Pitt.
 Bold, Peter P.
92. **MALTON.**
 Duncaunon Visc. . . . * * Son of the E. of Besboro', and son-in-law E. of Westmorland.
 Ramsden. Jno. C. . . . * * Son-in-law of Lord Dundas. Patron, Earl Fitzwilliam.
93. **MARLBORO'.**
 Stopford, Hon. Sir Edw. . . . *Gen.*—* * Brother of the Earl of Courtoun.
 Hill, Hon. Wm. . . . *En. Ex. and Min. P. to the Court of Sardinia.*—* * Brother of Lord
 Berwick, and brother-in-law to the Earl of Aylesbury, the Patron.
94. **MARLOW.**
 Williams, Owen. . . . * * The Patron.
 Grenfell, Pascoe. . . . * * Brother-in-law of Ow. Williams, of Visc. Doneraile, and of
 Lord Riversdale.
95. **MAWES, ST.**
 Morland, Seop. B. . . . *Banker in Lon.*—* * Patron, M. of Buckingham.
 Phillimore, Doctor.
96. **MICHAEL, ST.**
 Law, Hon. Edw. . . . *Chief Clerk of the Pleas Side of the Ct. of King's Bench.*—* * Son of
 Lord Ellenboro', son-in-law of the Marquis of Londonderry, and
 brother-in-law of Viscount Castlereagh, and Lord Stewart. Patron,
 Earl Falmouth.
 Binning, Lord. . . . *Com. for India affairs.*—Son of the Earl of Haddington. Patron, Sir
 Ch. Hawkins.
97. **MIDHURST.**
 Thompson, Thos. . . . *Banker in Hull.*
 Mahon, Viscount . . . *Lieut. of the Cinque Ports, Surveyor of Green Wax, 360l. Keeper of
 Records in Birmingham Tower, 431l. per annum.*—* * Son of Earl
 Stanhope, and son-in-law of Lord Carrington, the Patron.
98. **MILBURN PORT.**
 Paget, Sir Edw. . . . *Groom of the King's Bed-chamber, Gen. and Col. of the 28th Regt.*—
 * * Brother to the Marquis of Anglesey, &c.
 Casberd, Robt. M. . . . * * Steward of the Marq. of Anglesey, the Patron.
99. **MINEHEAD.**
 Luttrell, Jno. F. . . . } * * Their own Patrons, related to Earl of Corkhampton, who is
 Luttrell, Henry F. . . . } Gov. and Cus. Rot. of the County of Dublin, Patent Customer of
 Bristol, a Gen. and Col. of the 6th Regt. Dra. Guards, Fran. F.
 Luttrell, Commissioner of Customs, 1000l. per annum.
00. **MONMOUTH.**
 Worcester, Marq. . . . *A Lord of the Admiralty, Lieut. of the 14th Dragoons.*—* * Son of
 the Duke of Beaufort, the Patron.
01. **MONTGOMERY.**
 Keene, Whitshed * * Patron, Earl of Powis. Chas. Keene, a pension of 250l.
02. **MORPETH.**
 rd, Wm. * * His own Patron.
 oward, Hon. Wm. . . . * * Son of the Earl of Carlisle, the Patron. Lady Mary Howard,
 a pension, 150l., Lady Eliz. Howard, a pension, 150l. per annum.
 Quere if the same family?
03. **NEWARK.**
 illoughby, Henry * * Patron, Lord Middleton.
 nnant, Geo. Hay D. . . . * * Brother-in-law of Visc. Howarden, Patron, D. of Newcastle.
04. **NEWPORT.**
 rthey, Wm. * * Patron, Duke of Newcastle.

- Raine, Jon. *King's Counsel, and Auditor to the Patron, the Duke of Northumb.*
105. NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT.
Holmes, Sir L. T. W. ** Patron for both Seats.
Taylor, Geo. W.
106. NEWTON.
Blackburne, Jno. J.
Legh, Thos. ** Patron for both Seats.
107. NEWTOWN.
Pelham, Hon. Geo. A. *** Patron, his brother, son of Lord Yarborough.
Gurney Hudson *** Patron, Sir J. Barrington.
108. NORTHALLERTON.
Peirse, Henry ** Patron, himself.
Morritt, Jno. B. S. ** Patron, Lord Harewood.
109. OAKHAMPTON.
Saville, Albany *Recorder of Oakhampton.—** Patron for both Seats.*
Graves, Lord *Lord of the King's Bed-chamber, Compt. of the household, to the D. of Sussex.—** Brother-in-law of the Marquis of Anglesey.*
110. ORFORD.
Arbuthnot, Rt. Hon. Chas. *Joint Sec. of the Treasury, and a pension since 1807, of 2,000l. per annum.—** Patron, M. of Hertford.*
Macnaughton, Edm. A. *A Lord of the Treasury in Ireland.—** Patron, M. of Hertford.*
111. PEMBROKE.
Jones, Jno. ** Patron, Sir J. Owen.
112. PENRYN.
Swan, Henry } ** Patron, Lord de Dunstanville.
Gell, Philip }
113. PETERBORO'.
Elliott, Rt. H. Wm. *Privy Counsellor.*
Lamb, Hon. Wm. ** Son of Visc. Melbourn, son-in-law of the Earl of Besboro', Patron, Earl Fitzwilliam.
114. PETERSFIELD.
Jolliffe Hylton ** Patron for both Seats.
Canning, Geo. ** Son-in-law of the Marquis of Londonderry, brother-in-law to Lord Castlereagh.
115. PLYMOUTH.
Pole, Sir Chas. M. Bart. *An Adm. and Groom of the Bed-chamber to the Duke of Clarence.—** Patron, the Regent.*
Bloomfield, Sir B. Bart. *Gen. and Col. of the Royal Regt. of Artillery, Chief Equerry, and Clerk Marshal to the King, and Auditor and Sect. of the Duchy of Cornwall.*
116. PLYMPTON.
Macdonald, Ronald G. *** Son-in-law of Earl Mountedgecombe, who is Lord Lieut. Cus. Rot. and Vice Adm. of Cornwall, High Steward of Plymton, and Capt. of the Band of Gent. Pensioners, 1000l. per annum.
Boswell, Alex. ** Patron P. Treby Treby.
117. POOLE.
Taylor, Mich. A. *Recorder of this Boro', and one of the Counsel to the P. of W. for the Duchy of Cornwall.—** Patron, Jeffries, who is Com. Gen. to Portugal.*
Lester, Ben. L. *Mayor of this Boro'.—Patron, himself.*
118. QUEEN BORO'.
Moorsom, Sir Robt. *An Adm. Surveyor Gen. of the Ordnance.—** Patron, the Treasury.*
Osborn, Jno. *A Lord of the Admiralty.—** Patron, the Treasury.*
119. RADNOR.
Price, Richard. *Quere to be transposed.*
120. RETFORD.
Osbaldeston, Geo. *Quere as last.*
Marsh, Chas. ** Recommended by Lord Fitzwilliam, and twenty guineas a man. *Pension as late Prin. Clerk in the War Office, 1,000l. formerly Adv. in the Adm. Ct. at Madras.—** Rev. Herbert Marsh, pension 514l. (money).*
121. RICHMOND.

122. **RIPON.**
 Gipps, Geo. * * * Patron, Miss Lawrence.
 Robinson, Rt. H. Fred. J. *Joint Paymaster of the Forces, and Vice Pres. of the Board of Trade.*—
 * * * Brother of Lord Grantham.
123. **ROMNEY.**
 Duckworth, Sir J. T. Bart. *Adm. and Port Adm. of Plymouth, and a pension of 1000*l.* per annum.*
 — * * * Patron, Sir Edw. Deering.
 Mitford, Wm. * * * Brother of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland.
124. **RYE.**
 Arkwright, Richard. . . . * * * Patron, Mr. Lamb for the Treasury.
 Maberly, Jno.
125. **RYEGATE.**
 Cocks, Hon. Jno. S. . . . * * * Son of Lord Somers, and son-in-law of the Earl of Hardwick,
 the Patrons.
 Cocks, Jas. *Banker in London.*— * * * Cousin of the other Member.
126. **SALTASH.**
 Russell, Mat. * * * Patron, J. Buller.
 Prendergast, Mich. G.
127. **SANDWICH.**
 York, Sir Jos. S. *Adm. and Lord of the Admiralty.*— * * * Half-brother to the Earl of
 Hardwick.
 Marryatt, Jos. *Agent for Canada.*— * * * Patron, the Treasury.
128. **SARUM NEW.**
 Folkstone, Viscount . . . * * * Son of the Earl of Radnor, the Patron.
 Jervoise, Geo. P. * * * Patron, himself.
129. **SARUM OLD.**
 Porcher, Josias D. * * * Cousin of the Earl of Caledon, the Patron.
 Alexander, Jas. * * * Cousin of the Earl of Caledon, the Patron.
130. **SCARBOROUGH.**
 Phipps, Hon. Edm. *Gen. Paymaster of Marines, Clerk of the deliveries of the Ordnance,
 and Col. of the 60th Regt.*— * * * Brother of the Earl of Mulgrave,
 the Patron.
 Sutton, Rt. H. Chas. M. . . *Judge Marshal, and Adv. General.*— * * * Son of the Archbishop of
 Canterbury. Patron, D. of Rutland.
131. **SEAFORD.**
 Ellis, Chas. R. * * * Father of Lord Howard, of Walden. Patron himself.
 Cockerell, Sir Chas. Bart. *Late Post Mast. Gen. in Ireland.*— * * * Patron, Mr. Leach.
132. **SHAFTSBURY.**
 Wetherell, Chas. *King's Col.*— * * * Patron, J. Dinely.
 Kerrison, Sir Edw. Kt. . . *Col. of the 7th Light Dragoons.*
133. **SHOREHAM.**
 Burrell, Sir Chas. M. Bart. * * * Patron, Earl of Egremont.
 Shelly, Sir Fin. Bart. . . . * * * Patron, Duke of Norfolk.
134. **STAMFORD.**
 Foulkes, Evan * * * Agent to the Marquis of Exeter, the Patron.
 Henniker, Lord * * * Nephew to the Duke of Chandos, his brother, the Hon. B. F.
 Henniker, a Gen. and Col. of the 9th Dragoons.
135. **STEYNING.**
 Lloyd, Jas. M. *Col. Sussex Mil.*— * * * Patron, Duke of Norfolk.
 Aubrey, Sir Jno. Bart. . . * * * Patron, Duke of Norfolk.
136. **TAMWORTH.**
 Peel, Sir Robt. Bart. . . . * * * Patron himself, and father of the Sec. of State for Ireland.
 Townshend, Lord C. V. F. * * * Brother to the Marquis of Townshend, the Patron.
137. **TAVISTOCK.**
 Russell, Lord Wm. * * * Brother of the Duke of Bedford, the Patron.
 Tavistock, Marquis of . . . * * * Son of the Duke of Bedford.
138. **THETFORD.**
 Fitzroy, Lord Jno. * * * Brother of the Patron, the Duke of Grafton, who is
 Ranger of Whit. Forest, Master of the Game to the King,
 at Newmarket, Havoner of the Dutchy Ports Cornwall and
 Devon, Chan. Univ. Camb. High Stew. Dartmouth, Recorder
 of Thetwood and Coventry, Trust. Brit. Mus. Gov. Charter Ho.
 K. G., Receiver Gen. of the profits of the K. B. and Com. Pleas

ment for life, and heirs male of his great grandfather, 6870*l.*, in lieu of prize on wines, Lord Lieutenant, Vice Admiral, and Cus. Rot. of the County of Suffolk. Brother also to Lord Henry, Prebend of Westminster, brother to Lord Chas. a Gen. and Col. of the 48th Regt. Brother-in-law of Lord Castlereagh.

- Creevy, Thos. * * Patron, Lord Petre, father-in-law of Mr. Ord, Mem. for Morpeth.
139. THIRSK.
Frankland, Robt. * * Son of the Patron, Sir Thos. Frankland, who is Col. of the N. York Mil.
- Russell, Robt. Greenhill * * A barrister.
140. TIVERTON.
Fitzhugh, Wm. * * A barrister.
Ryder, Rt. H. Richd. *Joint Reg. of the Consistory Court.*—Brother of the Patron, the Earl of Harrowby, president of the Council.
141. TOTNESS.
Courtney, Thos. P. *Sec. to the Com. for India affairs, and principal Reg. of the Land Tax.*—* * Patron, the Treasury.
- Wise, Ashford.
142. TREGONY.
Holmes, Wm. } * * Supported by Lord Yarmouth and the Treasury, and it appeared before a Com. of the House, that 5000*l.* was spent in bribery, and Thos. Crogan committed to Newgate.
Grant, Alex. C. }
143. TRURO.
Warrender, Sir Geo. A *Lord of the Admiralty.*—* * Brother-in-law to Viscount Falkmouth, the Patron.
Dashwood, Geo. * * Son of Sir Henry W. Dashwood, Gent. of the King's Privy Cham.
144. WALLINGFORD.
Fuller Maitland, Eben. Quere, to be transposed, as open to the highest bidder?
Hughes, Wm. L. *Colonel of the Anglesea Militia.*—* * Brother-in-law to the Members for Caernarvon and Marlow.
145. WAREHAM.
Broadhead, T. H. * * Patron, John Calcraft, Member for Rochester, son of the late Army Agent.
Gordon, R. * * Open now, but will close with Earl Warwick.
146. WARWICK.
Mills, Charles. *Colonel of the 38th Regt. of Foot.*—* * Patron, Earl of Warwick.
Greville, Hon Sir C. *Director of the East India Company.*—* * Brother to Lord Carrington, the patron.
Smith, George * * Nephew to Lord Carrington, ditto.
148. WENLOCK.
Forester, Cecil W. * * Brother-in-law to the Duke of Rutland. His own patron.
Simpson, Hon. John B. * * Brother of the Earl of Bradford, the patron.
149. WEOBLEY.
Naper, James L. W. * * Cousin to the Duke of Richmond. Patron, Marquis of Bath.
Bentinck, Lord F. C. *Colonel of the 1st Regt. of Foot Guards.*—* * Brother to the Duke of Portland.
150. WESTBURY.
Shaw, Benjamin. * * Nephew and heir of Sir M. Lopez, patron and Recorder of the Borough.
Franco, Ralph * * Son of Baroness de Ros.
151. WESTLOOE.
De Ros, Hon. H. W. F. * * Patron, J. Buller. See Saltash.
Hulse, Charles
152. WEYMOUTH and
MELCOMBE REGIS. Quere if not open.
Murray, Sir John, Bart. *Gen. and Col. 3d West India Reg.*—* * Brother of the late Sir J. M. Pulteney, late Secretary at War. *Quere*, Charlotte Anne Murray, called Lady George Murray, pension of 385*l.*
- Ure, Masterson.
Cranbourne, Viscount * * Son of the Marquis of Salisbury, who is Joint Postmaster-Gen., Lord Lieut. and Cust. Rot. of the County of Herts, and High

153. **WHITCHURCH.**
 Broderick, Hon. Wm. * * * Brother of Viscount Middleton, the Patron, Lord Lieut. and Cust. Rot. of the County of Surrey.
- Townshend, Hon. H. G. P. *Col. in the Army, and Capt. 1st Reg. Foot Guards.*—* * * Brother of Viscount Sidney, the other Patron.
154. **WIGAN.**
 Leigh, Sir R. H. Bart. } * * * The Patrons.
 Hodson, John }
155. **WILTON.**
 Sheldon, Ralph * * * Patron, Earl of Pembroke.
 * No second Member in the Kalendar.
156. **WINCHESTER.**
 Mildmay, Sir H. C. J. Bart. * * * The Patron.
 Meyler, Richard.
157. **WINCHELSEA.**
 Brougham, Henry.
 Barnard, Viscount *Lieut. 7th Dragoons.*—* * * Son of the Earl of Darlington, the Patron, Lord Lieut. and Vice-Adm. of the County Palatine of Durham.
158. **WOODSTOCK.**
 Dashwood, Sir H. W. *Gent. of the King's Privy Chamb.*—* * * Father-in-law to the Marquis of Ely.
 Thornton, William *A General.*—* * * Patron, Duke of Marlborough.
159. **WOOTTON BASSET.** (*Quere, open for Money.*)
 Ellison, Richard * * * Patronage bought by Joseph Pitt, for 24,000*l.*, from Kibblewaite, an Attorney.
 Money, Wm. Taylor * * * *Quere, Wm. Money, a pension of 380*l.* and 100*l.**
160. **WYCOMBE.**
 King, Sir John D. Bart. * * * The Patron.
 Baring, Sir Thomas, Bart. * * * Do.
161. **YARMOUTH.**
 Loftus, William *A General, Col. 24th Reg. Dragoons, and Lieut. Gov. of the Tower.*—* * * Uncle-in-law to the Marquis of Townshend, the Patron for this Seat.
 Lacon, Eden K. * * * Patron, Treas. and Post-Office.
162. **YARMOUTH (I. of Wt.)**
 Wellesley, Richard.
 Foster, John L. *King's Adv. Gen. in Ireland. Pension from Irish Comp. List, as Speaker's Secretary, 433*l.**—* * * Patron, Sir L. J. W. Holmes.
163. **ARMAGH BOROUGH.**
 Webber, Dan. Webb *King's Counsel.*—* * * Patron, Archbishop of Armagh.
164. **ATHLONE.**
 Croker, John William *Secretary to the Admiralty, and to the Widows' Pension; Director of Greenwich Hospital.*—* * * Patron, Right Hon. Wm. Handcock.
165. **BANDON BRIDGE.**
 Bourne, Right Hon. W. S. *Commissioner for the Affairs of India, 1500*l.* per ann.*—* * * Patron, Earl of Bandon.
166. **BELFAST.**
 Michael, John *A General.*—* * * Patron, Marquis of Donegal.
167. **CARLOW BOROUGH.**
 Falkiner, Sir F. John *Secretary of the Order of St. Patrick, (Quere, if not a Col. of a Reg.)*—* * * His Wife, a Pension of 400*l.* Patron, Earl of Charleville.
168. **CASHEL.**
 Saxton, Sir Charles *A Pension of 750*l.* per ann. as Principal Officer and Commissioner of the Navy.*—* * * Patron, Richard Pennefather.
169. **CLONMEL.**
 Bagwell, Right Hon. W. *Joint Muster-Master-Gen. for Ireland, and Governor of the County of Tipperary.*—* * * His own Patron.
170. **COLERAINE.**
 Beresford, Sir John P. Bt. *An Admiral*—* * * Brother of Lord Beresford. Patron, J. C. Beresford, Agent for London Society.
171. **DUNDALK.**
 Evelyn, Lyndon * * * Patron, Earl of Roden.
172. **DUNGANNON.**

173. **DUNGARVON.**
Walpole, Hon. George . . . * * Brother to the Earl of Orford. Patron, Duke of Devonshire.
174. **ENNIS.**
Fitzgerald, Right Hon. Wm. *Lord of the Treasury in England, and of the Treasury in Ireland; Chancellor and Under Treasurer of the Exchequer in Ireland; Lord of Trade and Plantations; Trustee of the Linen Manufactory; a Commissioner of National Records; and Governor of the County of Clare.*—
* * Son of the Right Hon. J. Fitzgerald, the Patron alternately with Sir Edward O'Brien.
175. **ENNISKILLEN.**
Magennis, Richard . . . * * Brother-in-law of the Earl of Enniskillen, the Patron.
176. **KILKENNY BORO'.**
Butler, Hon. Charles H. . . * * Brother of the Marquis of Ormond. The Patron alternately with the Earl of Besborough.
177. **KINSALE.**
Martin, Henry *King's Counsel.*—* * Patron, Lord de Clifford.
178. **LISBURN.**
Moore, Lord H. Seymour . . *Joint Must.-Mast-Gen. in Ireland.*—* * Son of the Marquis of Drogheda, and Nephew of the Marquis of Hertford, the Patron.
179. **LONDONDERRY CITY.**
Hill, Rt. Hon. Sir G. F. Bart. *Lord of the Treasury, Trustee of the Linen Manufactory, and Recorder of Londonderry.*
180. **MALLOW.**
Cotton, J. L. * * Son of Sir J. L. Cotton, Bart. Patron, Mr. Jephson.
181. **PORTARLINGTON.**
Sharp, Richard * * Patron, Earl of Portarlington.
182. **ROSS (NEW).**
Leigh Charles * * His own Patron, alternately with Mr. Tottenham.
183. **SLIGO BOROUGH.**
Spencer, Sir Brent . . . *Colonel of the Rifle Brigade.*—* * Patron, Owen Wynn.
184. **TRALEE.**
Baillie, James Evan . . . * * Patron, Sir Edward Denny.
185. **WEXFORD BORO'.**
Neville, Richard *Teller of the Exchequer in Ireland.*—* * His own Patron, alternately with the Marquis of Ely.
186. **YOUGHALL.**
Keane, Sir John, Bart. . . * * Patron, the Earl of Shannon.
191. **ABERDEEN, MONTROSE, BRECHIN, INVERBERVIE, ABERBROTHWICK.**
Farquhar, James . . . *Joint Dep. Reg. Adm. Court.*—* * The Patron.
196. **ANNAN, DUMFRIES, KIRKCUDBRIGHT, SANQUHAR, LOCHMABEN.**
Douglas, W. R. K. . . . * * Brother to the Marquis of Queensbury, the Patron.
201. **ANSTRUTHER, EASTER, Do. WESTER, CRAIL, KILRENNY, PITTENWEEM.**
Anstruther, Sir J. Bart. . . * * The Patron.
206. **CULLEN, KINTORE, BANFF, INVERARY, ELGIN.**
Milne, Patrick * * Patron, Earl of Seafield.
211. **DORNOCK, DINGWALL, KIRKWALL, TAIN, WICK.**
Innes, Hugh * * Patron, Marchioness of Stafford.
216. **DUMFERMLINE, CULROSS, STIRLING, QUEENSFERRY, INVERKEITHING.**
Campbell, A. *A General, and Col. 32d Reg.*—* * Patron, Earl of Hopetoun.
217. **EDINBURGH (City).**
Dundas, Right Hon. Wm. *Keeper of the Signet in Scotland.*—* * Cousin to Viscount Melville. Patrons, Duke of Buccleugh and Mr. Dundas.
221. **FONTRÖSE, FORRES, INVERNESS, NAIRN.**
Grant, Charles *A Lord of the Treasury.*—Patron, his Father, who is Member for Inverness, Chairman of the East India Company, &c.
225. **GLASGOW, RENFREW, RETHENGLLEN, DUMBARTON.**
Finlay, Kirkman * * Patrons, Sir John Maxwell and Arch. Campbell.
230. **HADDINGTON, DUNBAR, LAUDER, JEDBURGH, NORTH BERWICK.**
Maitland, Hon. Ant. . . . *Captain in the Royal Navy.*—* * Son of the Earl of Lauderdale, The Patron.

APPENDIX.

139. ROTHSAÿ, CAMBLETOWN, AYRE, IRVINE, INVERARY.
Campbell, Duncan . . . *General, and Col. 91st Reg.*—Patron, Duke of Argyle.
244. ST. ANDREW'S, CUPAR, DUNDEE, FORFAR, PERTH.
Wedderburn, Sir D. Bart. The Patron.
248. SELKIRK, PEEBLES, LANARK, LINLITHGOW.
Lockhart, Wm. E. . . . *Advocate.*—Patron, Duke of Buccleugh.
252. STRANRAWER, WHITEHORN, WIGTON, NEW GALLOWAY.
Stewart, Hon. James . . . *Colonel in the Army, and Capt. 3d Foot Guards.*—** Brother of the Earl of Galway, the Patron.

COMMUNITIES abounding with Electors in Holy Orders, where faith, which is the evidence of things not seen, and the substance of things hoped for, decides the Election.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY.

Scott, Right Hon. Sir W. Kt. *Judge of the High Court of Admiralty and of the Consistory Court, Vicar-General to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Master of the Faculties, Chancellor of London, and Official Commissary of the City and Diocese of Canterbury and London.*—** Brother of the Lord Chancellor, and father-in-law of the Marquis of Sligo.

Abbott, Right Hon. Charles. *Speaker of the House, and a Keeper of the Privy Seal in Ireland.*

CAMBRIDGE UNIV.

Palmerston, Viscount . . . *Secretary at War.*
** Son-in-law of the Duke of Grafton, who is Ranger of Whittlebury Forest, Lord Lieut., Vice-Adm., and Cust. Rot. of the County of Suffolk, and Recorder of Thetford.

Smyth, John H.

DUBLIN UNIVERSITY.

Plunket, Right Hon. W. C.

RECAPITULATION.

		No.	Members.
COUNTIES.—1st Class . . .	Elections perfectly free	0	0
— 2d ditto . . .	No Election without wealth or high connexion	7	14
— 3d ditto . . .	Under a paralyzing balance of factions	37	72
— 4th ditto . . .	On a par with the Close Boroughs	73	100
CITIES, TOWNS, } and BOROUGHs. }	1st Class. Election perfectly free	1	2
—	2d ditto, A medley; under a prevalent venality	48	91
—	3d ditto, Corrupt in the extreme; open to the best bidder	13	26
—	4th ditto, { Close; dictation, with a mixture of bribery, } { excluding Election }	252	348
UNIVERSITIES	Peculiarly influenced	3	5
Total number of Members		658	

CONCLUSION.

May, 1817.

FROM the foregoing analysis, what is it we learn?—This it is we learn; that instead of a perfect, an unsuspected freedom in the elections of 658 members of the Commons House of our Country, we have positive evidence of such freedom in electing only TWO; together, indeed, other FOURTEEN; making a mighty total of SIXTEEN!

On contemplating our Counties of the 3rd. Class, being in number 37, and returning 72 members, nought can we discover but a medley of independence and depend

meriting the title of Representative, is mere matter of *chance*.

Viewing the entire House, we perceive that of 658 members who ought to hold their seats by no other tenure than that of free choice, and by a due proportion of the People, we behold no fewer than **THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHT** who, by a treasonable violation of the constitution, hold the *public* seats as a *private* property, or occupy them as the servile *nominees* of the usurpers.

Embracing the 73 remaining counties, together with 262 Boroughs, furnishing 565 members, although wearing no semblance of freedom, yet *chance* again occasionally sends from them a few meritorious individuals. This is *not* the design of the constitution, which intends, by the freedom and frequency of election, that the People shall not have a mere *chance*, but a certainty, that **ALL** their Representatives shall be meritorious, or, turning out otherwise, shall themselves be turned out at an early period.

Adding these 565 to the former 72, we perceive 637 vicious appointments, calling aloud for reform. Now observe the effects of this *external* fraud, bribery, and usurpation, in producing an *internal* corruption; for why all this wickedness and grasping at illicit power, but for the *pillage* it is to bring?

Of the 658 members of a Commons House of Parliament, who ought, *every man of them*, to stand proudly independent of the Crown and its Minister, disdaining to league with him in any branch of a corrupt system of state management, we find of Placemen, Pensioners, Naval and Military Commanders, India and Bank Directors, no fewer than **ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FOUR**. If, under a reformed system, any electoral District shall choose to be represented by such Directors, or by Gentlemen who, at an hour's notice, may be commanded on foreign service, why, be it so. But men, when freely electing persons to serve them in parliament, will probably not forget, that no man can serve two masters.

In addition to all the foregoing mischief, the analysis feebly attempts to picture an

lify any one from serving on a Jury, for trying the right to a property, however small.

If the reasoning in my XIth Letter (p. 67) be correct, as calm reflection tells me it is, in the Analysis may be seen, of **PALPABLE TREASON**, an Ossa planted on a Pelion, and a Potosi crowning both, mountain on mountain piled, paining the vision of all whose faculty of sight is human; while mole-eyed ministers, with minds as dark as Erebus, are groping for treasons in dark holes and corners, the abodes of the wretched, sweeping together the crumbs of complaint, the scraps of discontent, and the tags of indignant sayings, to be if possible *constructively* moulded into a treasonable shape; but I suspect that their fabrication will never arrive at a magnitude visible to the sound eye of a jury; although we may readily believe that the prosecuted parties do not bear very true allegiance to their mock-majesties, the **BOROUGH-MONGERS!**

I have said—'while mole-eyed ministers, &c.'—ought I not rather to have said,—while ministers, who are themselves principals and ringleaders in this gigantic conspiracy against the constitution, when, in the Commons House, they are joining in the act, in the shameful, the disgusting act, of **SHUTTING-OUT EVIDENCE**, for effecting that pre-eminent wickedness, a **DENIAL OF JUSTICE**, hope to divert public attention from their own guilt, although as notorious as the noonday sun, by an affectation of treason-hunting among a few half-famished artizans, driven by excess of calamity to the utterance of their discontents!

The old cry of '*Stop-Thief?*' might serve the turn of a solitary light-heeled depredator, who had dropped a stolen treasure to make his escape; but it would not prevent the identifying of him who was too heavy laden with his plunder for speed, and too tenacious for quitting his hold. Such a robber must depend on the strength of his gang.

Well! The motion of Sir *Francis Burdett*, seconded by Mr. *Brand*, for a Committee to *inquire* into all this iniquity of usurpation. after a surfeiting repetition

who is heir to the patron of several such sinks of corruption, has been negatived. But what of that? Does, or does not, the iniquity exist? That is the question on which the cause hinges. If a conviction of that existence cannot be rooted out of the minds and hearts of the Public, our borough-monger kings may vote, and vote, and vote again, for stifling an inquiry into their title to tyrannize over a nation which they, and their predecessors in usurpation, have ruined; but, in the end, they must, and they will, vote their own abdication.

What, in fact, says their vote of the 20th?—Doth it not say this;—‘We, in truth, four and twenty years ago, passively admitted the fact, by recording in our journals the famous petition of 1793, without denying, or even questioning any one of the many averments of that petition; not even those quoted by the Honorable Baronet. Besides, the fact of the House not being in any constitutional or rational sense a Representative of the people, is now too notorious to all the world to be doubted; why, therefore, appoint a Committee to inquire into that which is known to all?’

And perhaps, considering all circumstances, and particularly the flexibility of the RULES and the PRACTICE of the House, as exemplified on the subject of the PRINTED PETITIONS, it might be rather too much to expect, that it should always adhere to one of its favourite maxims, namely, that of laying a ground for the discussing of a subject, by bringing it regularly before the house, and showing the expediency of the discussion; which seems to have been the object of the Honorable Baronet; and on which there was not on his part any failure.

Did not the vote also in effect say, what in fact Sir J. Nichol expressly argued, that ‘as it was not to be denied that some alteration might be expedient, it was incumbent on those who proposed alterations, to show that they would cure the evil complained of;’ or, in other words, that the honourable mover, instead of calling for an inquiry in a matter of universal notoriety, ought to have tendered his “proposed alterations,” in the shape of a Bill, for the Reform of the evils complained of.

Being altogether of this mind, I earnestly hope the Baronet will, ere the session expire, answer this very proper call of Sir J. Nichol; thereby taking away the power of imputing to him what he does not mean, by shewing exactly what he does mean; and obviating all doubts on the part even of those Reformers, who say, ‘We cannot subscribe to your doctrines, till we see the practical use to be made of them. Let us see your Plan, and then you shall know whether it shall, or shall not, have our support?’ Nothing more reasonable or proper!

But the motion of Sir Francis Burdett had the support of EIGHTY-SEVEN voices. Here, then, after a tedious night of darkness, and of danger, threatening shipwreck to the state, dawns the great day of our political redemption!

Liberty, our inheritance—Justice, our Shield—Truth, omnipotent Truth! our spear—what man so dull of intellect, what mind so unbelieving in that fundamental of morality, that Truth and Justice emanate from an all-perfect Author of Nature and Nature’s eternal Law, as to doubt of the Nation’s final triumph over its oppressors!