

A Scheme of the Income and Expense of the several Families in England, Calculated for the Year 1688.

Number of Families.	Ranks, Degrees, Titles, and Qualifications.	Heads per Family.	Number of Persons.	Yearly Income per Family.		Yearly Income in General.
				£.	s.	
160	Temporal Lords.....	40	6,400	3,200	0	512,000
26	Spiritual Lords.....	20	520	1,300	0	33,800
800	Baronets.....	16	12,800	880	0	704,000
600	Knights.....	13	7,800	650	0	390,000
3,000	Esquires.....	10	30,000	450	0	1,200,000
12,000	Gentlemen.....	8	96,000	280	0	2,880,000
5,000	Persons in greater offices and places.....	8	40,000	240	0	1,200,000
5,000	Persons in lesser offices and places.....	6	30,000	120	0	600,000
2,000	Eminent merchants and traders by sea.....	8	16,000	400	0	800,000
8,000	Lesser merchants and traders by sea.....	6	48,000	200	0	1,600,000
10,000	Persons in the law.....	7	70,000	154	0	1,540,000
2,000	Eminent clergymen.....	6	12,000	72	0	144,000
8,000	Lesser clergymen.....	5	40,000	50	0	400,000
40,000	Freeholders of the better sort.....	7	280,000	91	0	3,640,000
120,000	Freeholders of the lesser sort.....	5½	660,000	55	0	6,600,000
150,000	Farmers.....	5	750,000	42	10	6,750,000
15,000	Persons in liberal arts and sciences.....	5	75,000	60	0	900,000
40,000	Shopkeepers and tradesmen.....	4½	225,000	45	0	2,250,000
60,000	Artisans and handicraftsmen.....	4	240,000	38	0	2,280,000
5,000	Naval officers.....	4	20,000	80	0	400,000
4,000	Military officers.....	4	16,000	60	0	240,000
500,586	Common seamen.....	5½	2,675,520	68	18	34,488,800
50,000	Labouring people and out-servants.....	3	150,000	20	0	1,000,000
364,000	Cottagers and paupers.....	3½	1,275,000	15	0	5,460,000
400,000	Common soldiers.....	3¼	1,300,000	6	10	2,000,000
35,000	Vagrants, as gipsies, thieves, beggars, &c.....	2	70,000	14	0	490,000
			30,000	10	10	60,000
1,349,586	Neat totals.....	4½	5,500,520	32	5	43,498,800

NOTE.—Mr. Gregory King, the author of this Scheme, considers that the 21 classes, whose families amount to 500,586, are accumulators, spending less than their income; and that the other classes require some support beyond their earnings—that they decrease the National Capital.

There are some few discrepancies between the items and the totals in the above Table but they do not affect the conclusions to be derived from this "Scheme."

CHAPTER XXIII.

Resolution and conduct of the Prince of Orange set forth in the Proclamation of William and Mary.—Character of William.—Aspirants for office.—The king's ministers.—The judges.—Jealousy of William's Dutch friends.—The Convention declared to be a Parliament.—Oath of Allegiance.—Refused by some spiritual and lay peers.—Non-jurors.—A Supply voted.—The principle of appropriation established.—Comprehension Bill.—Reform of the Liturgy.—The Test Act.—The Toleration Act.—High and Low Church.—Mutiny at Ipswich.—The first Mutiny Act.—Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.—Bill of Indemnity postponed.—The Coronation Oath.—The Coronation.—War with France.

"WHEREAS it hath pleased Almighty God, in his great mercy to this kingdom, to vouchsafe us a merciful deliverance from Popery and arbitrary power; and that our preservation is due, next under God, to the resolution and conduct of his highness the prince of Orange." Such were the opening words of the proclamation, which, on the 13th of February, 1689, announced to the people of England that William and Mary were king and queen of these realms. The same "resolution and conduct" which had delivered England from the most imminent dangers, had to support the man who was acknowledged as her deliverer, amidst perils and difficulties of which not the least were the treachery, the self-seeking, the ingratitude of the greater number of those who had called him to rule over them. For thirteen years this Dutch William almost stood alone as the representative of what was heroic in England. He is not a hero to look upon, according to the vulgar notion of the hero. "He had a thin and weak body. . . . He was always asthmatical, and the dregs of the small-pox falling on his lungs, he had a constant deep cough."* This prince had no power of subduing men to his will by rhetorical arts. He was a master of seven languages, speaking "Dutch, French, English, and German, equally well," as Burnet records. But his possession of this necessary accomplishment of a prince did not lead him to the ambition of employing words to conceal his thoughts. "He spoke little and very slowly, and most commonly with a disgusting dryness," †

* Burnet, "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 547.

† *Ibid.*

says Burnet. "He speaks well, and to the point," says one of the French negotiators of the peace of Ryswick. He came amongst courtiers who recollected the charm of the manners of Charles the Second—that fascinating gossip which always evaded "the point"—and in a few weeks they talked of "the morose temper of the prince of Orange." * Under this frigid demeanour superficial observers could comprehend nothing of the marvellous energy of this man of action; and they descanted upon "the slothful, sickly temper of the new king." † Though "he had a memory that amazed all about him," his great abilities were not generally recognised, for he had few of the showy qualities which pass for genius. Men of that time had not studied the science of Lavater and Spurzheim, yet they had a notion that "foreheads villainous low," were symbols of imbecility: and when they looked upon the "large front" of this cautious undemonstrative stranger, they might perchance have thought that there was something in him, and that there was meaning in the silent eloquence of his bright and sparkling eyes." There was no vivacity in the man—"solemn and serious, seldom cheerful, and but with a few," says Burnet. Yet he managed to use his talents, such as they were, not for display but for service. In war he carried the hearts of all along with him by his fire and his daring. In negotiation he accomplished the most difficult objects by his perseverance, and, above all, by his truthfulness. Tallard, the ambassador from Louis XIV., writes to his master: "He is honourable in all he does; his conduct is sincere. . . . If he once enters into a treaty with your majesty, he will scrupulously adhere to it." ‡ The same impartial observer bears testimony to his sagacity: "He is very quick-sighted, and has a correct judgment, and will soon perceive that we are trifling with him if we protract matters too much." § "Few men had stronger passions," according to Burnet; but "few men had the art of concealing and governing passion more than he had." He disarmed the hostility of factions by his seeming imperturbability. "The wishes of the king are checked," writes Tallard, "and it is only by his extreme patience, and by incessantly applying remedies to everything, that he succeeds in a part of what he desires." || And yet from the depths of this seemingly impassive nature breaks out the secret agony of

* Evelyn, "Diary," January 29.

† Grimblot—"Letters of William and Louis," vol. ii. pp. 48 and 56.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

‡ *Ibid.*, March 29.

|| *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 233.

his real sensitiveness, told only to his friend Heinsius: "Matters in Parliament here are taking a turn which drives me mad." * Such was the man who was called to rule over England, in times when a statesman not to be treacherous, unpatriotic, corrupt, was a rare distinction. "He is generally hated by all the great men, and the whole of the nobility," says the French ambassador, after William had been ten years on the throne. † But Tallard adds: "It is not the same with the people, who are very favourably inclined towards him, yet less so than at the beginning." What this prince had done for England, from the beginning to the end, to raise her in the scale of nations, to save her from foreign domination, to keep her safe from domestic tyranny, to uphold that liberty of conscience which is the basis of true Protestantism, to make constitutional government a reality in spite of the low ambition of ignorant factions,—this, the people of that generation could not wholly appreciate, however they might feel that it was good for them to be under a ruler who knew that he had a work to do in the world, and who did it.

"Innumerable were the crowds who solicited for and expected offices," says a bystander in 1689, who saw the progress of the game. ‡ "The pasture was not large enough for the flock," writes an anonymous historian of the next generation. § In those days statesmen were justly open to the reproach of seeking high place out of the lust of gain, rather than for the gratification of an honourable ambition. The official salaries were extravagantly large. It was no part of the policy of the aristocratic movers in the settlement of 1689 to disturb the lavish bounties of the Stuarts to their obsequious servants. But the people felt these burdens. In 1690, Sir Charles Sedley, in a debate on the Supply, said of William, "He is a brave and generous prince, but he is a young king, encompassed and hemmed in by a company of crafty old courtiers. To say no more, some have places of 3000*l.*, some of 6000*l.*, and others of 8600*l.* per annum." || In the lower offices of the household and of the revenue, the pay was disproportionately large, and the perquisites still larger. The coach and six horses of the Comptroller of the Customs was a deep offence to the country gentlemen. ¶ We may readily imagine that in such a total change as that of 1689, there was a scramble for office, in which the real principles

* Grimblot—"Letters of William and Louis," vol. i. p. 355.

† *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 466.

‡ Evelyn, "Diary," February 21.

§ Ralph, "History," vol. ii. p. 57-1746.

|| "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 562.

¶ *Ibid.*, col. 670.

of public men were severely tested. The king—called to the succour of England by the united voice of men of all parties, and placed upon the throne with the partial approbation of many who were opposed to the principles of his most ardent supporters,—ventured upon an experiment in government, which to us would be perfectly unintelligible if we were to judge of it by the practice of modern times. He desired to govern by a balance of parties; he sought to carry that desire into effect by choosing his ministers from parties whose principles were diametrically opposed, each to the other. To comprehend why it was thought possible to twist such a rope of sand into a state-cable, we must bear in mind that, under the system which had passed away, of governing as much as possible without parliaments, an administration was merely composed of men who were thought qualified to serve the king in their respective offices, without any common agreement upon particular measures. An active king, such as Charles I. and James II., was in many respects his own administrator. William III. was willing to give the same personal superintendence to the conduct of that great policy, whose advancement had chiefly moved him to contend for the English throne. He would himself conduct the foreign relations of the country, for which duty, indeed, he was more fitted than any man. But his confidential advisers in domestic politics should be officers who had influence with the two great parties in the State, and with the sub-divisions of the Whig and Tory factions. There was Halifax, who was known as the Trimmer,—one who was selected to tender the crown to William and Mary, but who had taken no part in the first steps which deprived James of the crown. There was Danby, who had been impeached under Charles II. for his arbitrary and corrupt practices, and who had only given a modified support to the present change of government. There was Nottingham, whose nomination to office was a propitiation to the High Church party. There was Shrewsbury, who had borne a distinguished part in the battle which had resulted in the great victory of the Whigs. But the Revolution was the triumph of Whig principles; and thus it was natural, in the hour of triumph, after some concessions to open adversaries or doubtful friends, that the Whigs should have the larger share of the spoils. The Great Seal was put in Commission. The great office of Lord High Treasurer was not filled up, but Commissioners of the Treasury were appointed. In the same way the duties of Lord High Admiral were entrusted to a Board. These arrangements for Com-

missions were considered as politic devices "to gratify the more."* One signal benefit of the great change was manifested to the nation—there would be no attempt to suppress public opinion by the agency of corruption on the judgment seat: "Nothing gave a more general satisfaction than the naming of the judges. The king ordered every privy counsellor to bring a list of twelve; and out of these, twelve very learned and worthy judges were chosen."† Somers, to whose eloquence and sagacity the success of the Revolution was so much indebted, was named Solicitor-General.

In the spirit of that mean dislike of foreigners which characterises the vulgar Englishman, a writer of our own day thus records one of the complaints against the arrangements of 1689: "Three of the king's Dutch followers, Bentinck, Auverquerque, and Zuylistein, were placed by him about his person,—with a disdain, not of the prejudices, but of the feelings of the nation, which might have recalled to mind his Norman predecessor."‡ There were others about William's person, who were amongst the most true-hearted of Englishmen. The Duke of Devonshire was Lord Steward; the earl of Dorset was Lord Chamberlain; Sidney, the brother of the republican, Algernon, was a gentleman of the bed-chamber. Yet William is held to have outraged the national feeling because he gave one place, not of political importance, but of necessary companionship, to Bentinck, the friend of his youth—the man who had nursed him in sickness, who had stood by him in battle; because he gave another to Auverquerque, who had saved his life by personal intrepidity in the field of St. Dennis, in 1678; and another to Zuylistein, whose father had earned a debt of gratitude from the saviour of Holland, by perishing in his cause, when Luxemburg stormed his quarters in 1672. We doubt if the people—not the mere place-hunters—were so unreasonable as to expect that their deliverer, as they called him, should be isolated amongst strangers; should have wholly to make new friends; should cast aside all memories of old affections; should forget all the associations of that life of toil and danger which he had endured from his twenty-second year to this his thirty-ninth. They could not surely forget that William was Stadtholder of Holland, as well as King of England; that the interests of both countries were the same; that the first magistratè of each of the two free states of Europe was embarked in a contest against the absolute monarch

* Evelyn, "Diary," March 8.

† Burnet, vol. iv. p. 7.

‡ Continuation of Mackintosh's "History," by William Wallace, vol. viii. p. 300.

who aimed at universal dominion; that for the proper conduct of this great enterprise, it were well that he should have some few faithful friends, to whom he could pour out his heart without dread of fickleness and faithlessness. Yet against such popular prejudices it is hard to contend. William must have felt that the mere circumstance of his being a foreigner was a serious impediment to his power of doing his duty efficiently; and thus amidst undeserved suspicions, and causeless jealousies, he pined for that happier state from which he had been called; he felt the want of that admiration which surrounded him at the Hague; he intensely longed for the return of the tranquillity that he had thrown away when he quitted his quiet home at Loo.

King William opened the Parliament on the 18th of February. He addressed the two Houses in a very brief speech, composed of the plainest words: "I have lately told you how sensible I am of your kindness, and how much I value the confidence you have reposed in me. And I am come hither to assure you, that I shall never do anything that may justly lessen your good opinion of me." The chief point of the speech was a recommendation "to consider of the most effectual ways of preventing the inconveniences which may arise by delays; and to judge what forms may be most proper, to bring those things to pass for the good of the nation, which I am confident are in all your minds, and which I, on my part, shall be always ready to promote." The possible delays to which the king alluded grew out of the agitation of the question, whether the Convention which had altered the Succession could continue to sit as a Parliament. The Lords immediately passed a Bill "for removing and preventing all questions and disputes touching the assembly and sitting of this present Parliament," in which it was declared that the Convention which assembled on the 22nd of January are the two Houses of Parliament, "as if they had been summoned according to the usual form." But in the Commons the question was debated with great violence, upon what were maintained as constitutional principles. There had been two months of excitement since James had quitted the kingdom; and the inevitable re-action of opinion made many eager to unsettle the Settlement. Old Serjeant Maynard maintained that this was not a time to stand upon forms. "There is a great danger in sending out writs at this time, if you consider what a ferment the nation is in. I think the clergy are out of their wits." The outrages that James had attempted upon the national religion were by many forgotten. The

dread of Popery was extinguished in the dread of Dissent. This was the first move of a powerful faction when they agitated the question whether the Convention were a Parliament; thus to postpone the formal adhesion of the Church and the Laity to the new sovereign, and to delay the grant of supplies, at a time of impending danger on every side. The state of the parliamentary constituencies—a state that remained unaltered for nearly a century and a half—presented a wide field for intrigue and corruption. The real opinion of the people upon such a vital question as that of uncompromising fealty to a new dynasty could not be fairly arrived at, when Cornwall, with its twenty-five thousand householders, returned one-third more members than Yorkshire with its hundred thousand; and when Sussex, another great seat of decayed boroughs returned nearly four times as many members as Middlesex and London. In this question of the legality of the Parliament, the constituencies were not however called upon to decide. The Bill was passed; and it was accompanied with a clause that no person should sit and vote in either House of Parliament without taking the prescribed oath to be faithful and bear true allegiance to king William and queen Mary, according to the form prescribed in the Declaration of Rights.* The 1st of March was the day after which no seat could be taken in Parliament unless allegiance had thus been previously sworn. The archbishop of Canterbury and seven other spiritual peers absented themselves, as well as various lay peers. In the Commons the absentees were not so proportionately numerous. The Jacobite party sustained a defeat; but the example of the prelates operated upon many of the inferior Clergy, when the time arrived in which they also were to declare in the most solemn manner their adherence to the new government. An oath, in place of the old oath of allegiance and supremacy, was to be taken by all lay persons holding offices, and by all in possession of any benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment. Those churchmen who did not take this oath on or before the 1st of August were to be suspended; and if at the end of six months they continued to refuse, were to be deprived.† About four hundred refused the oath, and, losing their benefices, were, during three reigns, a constant source of irritation and alarm, under the name, familiarised to us by our lighter as well as graver literature, of Nonjurors. Whatever opinions may be entertained of the wisdom of this resistance, we must in this case, as in the previous cases of the Episco-

* 1 Gul. & Mar. c. 1.

† *Ibid.*, c. 2.

paliars ejected by the Long Parliament, and of the Puritans ejected after the Restoration, respect the self-denial of those who suffered for conscience sake. Their devotion to the principle of hereditary right might be a weakness, but it was not a crime. The policy of their deprivation was very questionable. Those who took the oaths, and satisfied their principles by intriguing and preaching against the government *de facto*, were really more dangerous than the eminent divines, such as Ken, and Sherlock, and Leslie, who openly refused to support it by their declared allegiance. Violent and factious men might bring contempt on the name of Nonjurors; but many of the less distinguished among them set about getting their bread by the honest exercise of their talents and learning. If some became fawning domestic chaplains to plotting Jacobite lords, others kept themselves above want by literary labours, however humble. John Blackbourn, the ejected incumbent of two livings, earned his bread as corrector of the press for William Bowyer.*

In this first Session of the first Parliament of the Revolution, amidst signal manifestations of a narrow and a factious spirit, we have abundant evidence of statesmanlike sagacity. The king looked upon many unsettled questions with a wider range of view than his own Council, or the Grand Council of the Nation. He was confident in the justice and necessity of the objects for which he desired to have his hands strengthened. The Parliament refused its confidence. The king desired to carry out the fullest principles of religious liberty that were consistent with the public safety. The Parliament thought that there was a very strict limit even for toleration. And yet, out of these differences, resulted much practical good. The king wished to have ample means for maintaining the Protestant ascendancy in Ireland, for the pacification of Scotland, for giving efficiency to the confederacy against the ambition of the French. The Commons manifested a greater jealousy of entrusting the supplies to their deliverer than they had manifested towards their oppressor. There were immediate evil consequences. The Roman Catholic adherents of James devastated the Protestant settlements in Ireland; the standard of resistance was successfully reared in Scotland; Louis threatened England with invasion, and was marching a great army upon Holland. But the benefits of the jealousy of the Commons are felt by us to this day. Those Whigs who carried their confidence in the intentions of William to an extreme, were of opinion that the Revenue which had been settled

* Nichols' "Literary Anecdotes," vol. iii. p. 252.

upon king James for life should revert to the sovereign who had taken his place. Some Tories, who were adverse to the government, but were eager to secure power by a simulated confidence in the king, agreed in this view. The majority in Parliament successfully resisted it. William had proposed to his Council that the Hearth-money, or Chimney-tax, should be abolished. Sir Robert Howard told the house that the king said, "It was much in his thoughts." Sir Robert added, "I could wish the house had heard his discourse in all this business; and in all his discourse from Exeter hither, he expressed his inclination to do good to the people."* To abolish the Hearth-money, an especial tax upon the poor, was a duty to which William was called by the earnest solicitations of the crowds who followed his march from Torbay to London. But he frankly said to Parliament, "as in this his majesty doth consider the ease of the subject, so he doth not doubt but you will be careful of the support of the crown." The official biographer of James II. sneers at William's self-denial; "He wheedled them [the Commons] with a remission of chimney-money, when he was well assured he should be no loser by his generosity, and that it would be only like throwing water into a dry pump to make it suck better below, and cast it out with more abundance above."† This was not exactly the best mode of wheedling the rich country gentlemen, by removing a tax from the cottage to put it in some shape upon the mansion. - Yet the Commons respected the motive of the king, and substituted less oppressive taxes. But they declined to grant the temporary revenue for the lives of the king and queen. The hereditary revenue they did not touch. Moreover they resolved that whatever sums they voted should be appropriated to particular services, according to estimates. This principle, partially adhered to in the time of Charles II., but wholly disregarded by the parliament of his successor, has from the time of the Revolution been the great security of the nation against the wanton and corrupt expenditure of the Crown. Parliament may make lavish votes; but there must be a distinct vote in every case for the service of a particular department. It is this which renders the legislative power so really supreme in England; it is this which renders it impossible that an executive can subsist except in concord with the representatives of the people. We therefore owe a debt of gratitude to the Parliament of the Revolution that they

* "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 153.

† "Life of James II." vol. ii., p. 310.

clung to a principle and established a practice which have never since been departed from. A temporary vote of credit is sometimes asked under extraordinary circumstances; but the constitutional right of appropriation, always secured in the express words of the grant of supply, is the general rule which no minister would dare to ask the representatives of the people to forego.

But if the Parliament of William and Mary is to be commended for their jealousy of the king in the matter of Revenue, we may doubt if they were equally wise in halting far short of his known wishes in the great questions of religious liberty, and religious union. If the king's abstract sense of what was due to the consciences of men could have been carried out, we might have been saved from a century and a quarter of bitter animosities; and the Church of England might have been more secure and more influential, than during the long period when the Test Act remained in force against Protestants, and Roman Catholics were not only ineligible to civil officers, but had to undergo what we now justly regard as persecution. But in this, as in all other cases, no reform can be permanent which is premature. William desired such an alteration in the ritual and discipline of the Church, as had been vainly attempted from the time of James I., so as to satisfy the scruples of non-conformists who were honestly averse to separation. He advanced so far as to have what was called a Comprehension Bill introduced into the House of Lords, by a zealous churchman, the earl of Nottingham. It passed the Peers in a mutilated shape; was coldly received by the Commons; and dropt through upon a reference to Convocation. That ecclesiastical parliament had transacted no real business since 1665, when they gave up the right of taxing themselves. They had now been summoned, as had been usual; but, contrary to use, important measures were to be submitted to them at a time of violent divisions amongst the Clergy. A considerable number of eminent divines were disposed to such changes in the Services of the Church as would conciliate the moderate Presbyterians and others who conscientiously objected to certain portions of the ritual. A Commission was appointed to consider what changes were desirable. A Report was drawn up by the moderate Churchmen, such as Tillotson, and submitted to the Convocation. The "rigid" or high-church party had there prevailed; and their prolocutor, Dr. Jane, when presented to the bishop of London, proclaimed the resolve of the majority, in the words of the barons of Henry III.,—"Nolumus leges Angliæ

mutari." The Comprehension Bill, and the Reform of the Liturgy, went to the ground together.

Another ruling desire of the king was that all Protestants should be eligible to employments. On the occasion of giving his assent to two Bills, on the 16th of March, he said, "I am, with all the expedition I can, filling up the vacancies that are in offices and places of trust by this Revolution. I know you are sensible there is a necessity of some law to settle the oaths to be taken by all persons to be admitted to such places. I recommend to your care to make a speedy provision for it; and as I doubt not you will sufficiently provide against Papists, so I hope you will leave room for the admission of all Protestants that are willing and able to serve." William proposed this at the time when the question was under debate, whether the Clergy should be required to take the oaths. He proposed it without consulting his Council, in the hope that the two violent parties would agree to a compromise—that the Whigs would not press the oath of allegiance upon the Clergy; that the Tories would not press the Sacramental Test upon the Dissenters. He was deceived in his expectations. The Test Act remained in force against non-conformists. The Bill which deprived the nonjuring Clergy of their benefices was carried.

The last and the least objectionable wish of the king was agreed to, after long debate—that Dissenters should not be molested in the celebration of their worship. The Toleration Act—"An Act for exempting their majesties' Protestant subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the penalties of certain laws"—was a signal relief from a heavy burden, long borne by indignant sufferers. Judged by the opinions of our own day the Toleration Act was a very imperfect boon, requiring from dissenting ministers and teachers subscription to certain articles of faith, as contained in the Thirty-nine articles of the Church, with the exception of the 34th, 35th, and 36th Articles, and of those words of the 20th Article which declared that the Church had power to decree rights or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith. The Protestants who "scruple the baptising of infants," were further exempted from subscribing part of the 27th Article. The Quakers were exempted, upon a declaration of fidelity, and a simple profession of their Christian belief. The Act of Toleration only relaxed the severe enactments of the two former reigns, under this and other conditions, without providing for their repeal. Yet eventually, this famous Statute was a measure of real relief, for its cumbrous

and impracticable conditions gradually fell into disuse. We may judge of the satisfaction it gave to Dissenters, by the enthusiastic plaudits of Defoe, in calling upon his dissenting brethren, "annually to commemorate by a standing law among themselves, that great day of their deliverance, when it pleased God to tread down persecution, oppression, church-tyranny, and state-tyranny, under the feet of the law, and to establish the liberty of their consciences, which they had so long prayed for, in a public and legal toleration" * The ministers of dissenting meeting-houses had thus no longer reason to dread informations under the Act of Uniformity and the Five Mile Acts. Their followers were discharged from all apprehension of penalties for attending Conventicles, or for neglecting the worship of the Establishment, provided they took the oath of allegiance, and subscribed the declaration against Popery prescribed by the Statute of Charles II. The Protestant Dissenters were relieved by Act of Parliament from those restraints which James II. attempted to remove by the dispensing power. The Papists were specifically excluded from this relief; and thus the statutory indulgence was welcomed by Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and Quakers, as much for what it denied to others as for what it gave to themselves. But inasmuch as it narrowed the area of state intolerance, it rendered a large proportion of the Clergy more than ever intolerant towards those legally tolerated. The king was brought up as a Calvinist; and thus his tendencies towards religious freedom were always suspected as having for their end something adverse to the Anglican church. Swift, writing in 1711, in the spirit of triumphant Toryism, says, "the Revolution being wholly brought about by Church of England hands, they hoped one good consequence of it would be the relieving us from the encroachments of Dissenters as well as those of Papists." The hope was happily disappointed. The Dissenters were no longer to be hunted by the constable, and imprisoned by the justice of peace. "They," says Swift, "had just made a shift to save a tide and join with the Prince of Orange, when they found all was desperate with their protector king James; and observing a party then forming against the old principles in Church and State, under the name of Whigs and Low-churchmen, they listed themselves of it, where they have ever since continued." † In a subsequent paper, Swift affirms that the distinction of High and Low Church, "which came in some time after the Revolution,"

* "Review," quoted in Wilson's "Defoe," vol. i., p. 181. † "Examiner," No. 37.

was raised by the Dissenters, "in order to break the church party by dividing the members into high and low; and the opinions raised that the high joined with the Papists, inclined the low to fall in with the Dissenters." * The unchristian hatreds of the Revolution gave their colour to the politics of two reigns. Since the accession of the house of Brunswick, these polemics have been gradually diluted, so as to impart at last the faintest tinge to the real course of public policy. Very slowly has the hold of intolerance of all kinds been relaxed. But as past years have diminished the length and breadth of that debateable land, where deadly controversialists once fought *à l'outrance*, may we not hope that succeeding years will completely reduce the old battle-field to the dimensions of a pleasant tilting-ground, where blunt lances and daggers of lath shall leave no scars after a gentle and joyous passage-at-arms.

One of the most important securities for the liberties of England was accomplished at the Revolution. In the Declaration of Rights it was maintained "That the raising or keeping a Standing Army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with consent of Parliament, is against law." An accidental occurrence gave a legislative shape to this doctrine, which from 1689 has been invariably adhered to. The English regiments which had served under James II. were not in a complacent humour towards his foreign successor. They looked with jealousy upon the Dutch guards that had attended William to Whitehall; and they took various occasions of manifesting their dislike to the new government. They prevented the people lighting bonfires at Cirencester when the king and queen were proclaimed. At Newbury and Abingdon they would not allow the town crier to say, "God bless king William and queen Mary." "The old army is rather grown worse than mended," said a violent Whig. "I believe the black coats and the red coats to be the grievances of the nation." † This discontent took an alarming form. Under the treaty of Nimeguen, England promised succours to the States-General, in the event of France being at war with them. France had declared war. Troops in the service of England were ordered to embark for the continent. On the 15th of March, it was announced in the House of Commons that lord Dumbarton's regiment—composed chiefly of Scotchmen—had mustered at Ipswich; had seized the artillery; and had made proclamation of king James. The Com-

* "Examiner," No. 44. † Howe. ‡ "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 137.

mons immediately voted an address to the king, "to desire him to take effectual care to suppress the soldiers that are now in rebellion." The king quietly replied "that he had already appointed three regiments of dragoons, with orders to stop them, and bring them to their duty." One of the most distinguished of the Dutch officers headed these troops. He came up with them near Sleaford, where, after a feeble show of resistance, they surrendered. They were marched up to London. They had been guilty of high treason, in levying war against the king; and a few were brought to trial at the county assizes for Suffolk. But no life was forfeited. The government acted with a judicious mercy; and this regiment, now the first of the line, served William faithfully in his hard campaigns. This occurrence produced the first Mutiny Bill. The preamble of the Act sufficiently explains its necessity, and the caution with which the principle of a Standing Army, governed by martial law, was adopted: "Whereas the raising or keeping a Standing Army within this kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with consent of Parliament, is against Law. And whereas it is judged necessary by their Majesties and this present Parliament, that during this time of danger several of the forces which are now on foot should be continued and others raised for the safety of the kingdom, for the common defence of the Protestant Religion, and for the reducing of Ireland. And whereas no man may be fore-judged of life or limb or subjected to any kind of punishment by martial law, or in any other manner than by the judgment of his peers and according to the known and established laws of this realm. Yet nevertheless it being requisite for retaining such forces as are or shall be raised during this exigence of affairs in their duty, an exact discipline be observed. And that soldiers who shall mutiny or stir up sedition, or shall desert their majesties' service be brought to a more exemplary and speedy punishment than the usual forms of Law will allow."* The Mutiny Act was limited to a duration of six months. It was necessarily renewed, again and again, during the reign of William. A standing army became an integral part of the government of this country, whether during peace or during war. But Parliament always held its effectual control over the executive, so as to prevent any abuse of military power, by never passing a Mutiny Bill for a longer term than a year. For one hundred and sixty-nine years the statute book has continued to have its "Act for punishing Mutiny and

* 1 Gul. & Mar. c. 5.

Desertion;" and in the Act of the 21st of Victoria, as in the Act of the 1st of William and Mary, it is still recited that the raising or keeping a Standing Army, unless it be with the consent of Parliament, is against law; that a body of forces is necessary for the safety of the kingdom; that no man can be punished except by the laws of the realm; yet nevertheless, &c. &c. This Act, now swollen to a hundred and seven Clauses, is to continue in force for one year, at dates commencing and ending according to the distribution of the forces, whether in Great Britain or Ireland, or in the numerous stations in every region of the globe where the British flag now floats. Under the two constitutional principles, therefore, of an appropriation of the supply, and the passing of an annual Mutiny Bill, the power of the Crown cannot be maintained without the co-ordinate power of Parliament. The sovereign cannot raise an army, or pay an army, without the consent of Parliament. The annual assembly of Parliament is therefore absolutely essential to the conduct of the government; and if evil times should ever by possibility arise in which the Crown and the Parliament should be at issue, the maintenance of an army would be an act of pure despotism on the part of the executive power, only to be met by an equally unconstitutional assumption of executive power on the part of the legislature.

The position of the new government was necessarily a dangerous one. Triumphant as had been the first days of the Revolution, it was inevitable, especially whilst there was a civil war in Ireland, and whilst Scotland was distracted by party-strife, that plots should be formed in England for bringing back King James. William had notified to Parliament that he had caused several persons to be apprehended, on credible information that they were conspiring against the government; and he asked for advice under the difficulty of his unwillingness to act against law on the one hand, or to suffer dangerous men to avail themselves of the privileges of the Habeas Corpus Act on the other hand. The Lords, in an excess of loyal devotion, recommended the king to take extraordinary care of the public safety, by securing all disaffected persons. The Commons, much more wisely, passed a Bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act till the 17th of April. This Act was twice renewed during the session.* If William thus thought it necessary to strengthen his hands against existing dangers, he desired, as all high-minded possessors of power in troublous times should

* 1 Gul. and Mar. c. 2, c. 7, and c. 77.

desire, that in a great degree there should be oblivion for past political offences. The cruel chancellor Jeffries; the corrupt chief-justice Wright; other unjust judges and agents of despotism, were in confinement. Many who had been manifest enemies of public liberty dreaded that the day of retribution was at hand. "The hottest of the Whigs," according to Burnet, would not forward this honest design of the king. "They thought it best to keep many under the lash; they intended severe revenge for the blood that had been shed, and for the many unjust things that had been done in the end of king Charles's reign." They carried their opposition to the king by indirect means, rather than by sweeping exceptions to a general amnesty. "They proceeded so slowly in that matter, that the Bill could not be brought to ripeness during this Session." The people admired the mildness of the king's temper. The factious politicians got up an imputation against him that he desired "to make use of a set of prerogative men, as soon as he legally could."*

The terms of the Coronation Oath, which for many years in the memory of some living was a fatal stumbling-block in the great healing measure of Roman Catholic relief, were debated in the first Parliament of William and Mary, as if the difficulty was foreseen that did arise under a very different condition of society. The ancient oath was declared to be "framed in doubtful words and expressions with relation to ancient laws and constitutions at this time unknown."† This part of the preamble of the Act had especially reference to ecclesiastical laws. Those words of the new oath which were the subject of debate run thus: The archbishop or bishop is to ask the sovereign, "Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the free profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant reformed religion, established by law?" And the sovereign promises so to do. It was moved "that the king, in the oath, swear to maintain the Protestant religion, as it is, or shall be, established by law." Those who contended for the introduction of the words "shall be," amongst whom was Somers, were in a minority. They desired that no such construction should be put upon the words "is established by law," as should lead a conscientious ruler to imagine that he was to sanction no legislative change that might affect the existing condition of the Church. The historian of this period says: "Every person who has read these debates must be fully convinced that the states-

* Burnet, "Our Time," vol. iv. p. 26.

† 1 Gul. & Mar. c. 6.

men who framed the Coronation Oath did not mean to bind the king in his legislative capacity."* It is indeed true that the apprehension that the words "established by law" would make the laws unalterable, was felt as an absurdity by the soundest heads in that Parliament. "Not able to alter laws as occasion requires!" indignantly exclaimed sir Robert Cotton. They looked only to such alterations as might widen the limits of the Church by a liberal comprehension of Protestant Dissenters. Sir George Treby seems, if we rightly understand his words, to have looked further. "When we are dead and gone, all these debates will be in the air, and a greater scruple remain."† One greater scruple was that which harassed the mind of George III. Happily the question is set at rest by the common sense of our own times.

The Coronation of king William and queen Mary took place on the 11th of April, according to the ancient ceremonials. The archbishop of Canterbury was absent. The bishop of London supplied his place. Burnet, now bishop of Salisbury, preached "with great applause," says Evelyn. The Members of the Lower House had especial places of honour; they were feasted in the Exchequer-chamber, and had each a gold coronation medal. The honest citizens rang their bells and made their bonfires. The Jacobites circulated their doggerel against "the dainty fine king;" and the Dutch guards who kept the ground were abused as foreign mercenaries. The House of Commons, two days after the Coronation, went up with a congratulatory address to the king and queen. But, eleven days later, the House presented an address of far greater import—declaring that they would support the crown in a war against the French king. The seconder of the address maintained "that it is of absolute necessity to declare war against the most Christian Turk, who ravages all Christendom, and makes war more barbarously than the Turks themselves." To Louis was attributed, in the address, "the present invasion of the kingdom of Ireland, and supporting your majesty's rebellious subjects there." William, in his answer, said, "I look upon the war to be so much already declared by France against England, that it is not so properly an act of choice, as an inevitable necessity, in our defence." The spirit of the king leapt up at this hearty support of the Commons in the great contest for which he had been long preparing. He is reported to have exclaimed to one of his intimates—"This is the first day of my reign!"

* Macaulay, vol. iii. p. 117.

† "Parliamentary History," vol. v. col. 210.