

schemes of escape. The king landed on the 7th at Vaert, in Holland. On the 8th he proceeded on his journey, leaving the duchess of Kendal on the Dutch frontier. On the 9th, he slept at Delden; and was again in his coach at four o'clock in the morning of the 10th, accompanied by two official persons of the court of Hanover. In the forenoon of that day he was struck by apoplexy. He refused to stop at Ippenburen, as his attendants wished. His hands fell; his eyes were heavy; but his will was strong. "Osnabruck! Osnabruck!" he exclaimed. His one surviving brother, the prince bishop, had his palace at Osnabruck. The king's voice grew fainter. He murmured in his death-sleep, "C'est faite de moi" (All is over with me). All was over. When the bishop was roused by the gallop of horses in his court-yard at midnight, George, king of Great Britain, and elector of Hanover, was dead. He was buried at Hanover.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

Accession of George II.—Walpole confirmed in power.—Frederick, the heir-apparent.—Course of foreign policy.—The Stuarts.—Arrival in England of prince Frederick.—Townshend leaves office.—What is History?—The Dissenters.—Inquiry into the state of the Gaols.—Law proceedings in English.—Party Quarrels and Libels.—Parliamentary Opposition.—The Salt-tax.—The Excise Scheme.—Wars in Europe.—Neutrality of Great Britain.—Motion for the Repeal of the Septennial Act.—Wyndham's character of Walpole.—Walpole's character of Bolingbroke.—Bolingbroke quits England.

SIR ROBERT WALPOLE is seated at dinner in his villa at Chelsea on the 14th of June, 1727. An express arrives from lord Townshend, who has accompanied George I. to the Continent as Secretary of State. The king is dead. The First Commissioner of the treasury is instantly in the saddle on his road to Richmond, where the prince of Wales is staying. The prince of Wales has dined and is asleep in his bed-chamber, the princess sitting by his side. Sir Robert Walpole must see the prince immediately. At that moment the great minister probably regarded his tenure of power as more uncertain than when the duchess of Kendal was intriguing with Bolingbroke against him. The prince looked upon his father's chief adviser with suspicion and resentment. "I am come to acquaint your Majesty with the death of your father," was Walpole's hasty communication. He then asked certain questions about the king's pleasure as to the Council being summoned, and as to other necessary formalities. "Go to Chiswick, and take your directions from sir Spencer Compton," was the uncourteous reply.\* Sir Spencer Compton was Treasurer to the prince of Wales. He was Speaker of the House of Commons and Paymaster to the Army—"a plodding heavy fellow, with great application, but no talents," says lord Hervey. Walpole told Compton it was clear that the king meant him for his minister. Walpole professed that he had no desire of power for himself—a small office in the household would be sufficient to show that he was not disgraced. The minister expectant, who was "always more concerned for the man-

\* "The Memoirs of John, Lord Hervey, from the Accession of George II. to the Death of queen Caroline," edited by Mr. Croker, and first published in 1848, have drawn aside the veil from many a courtly scene, although the mutilation of the MS. has left some enigmas yet unsolved.



ner and form in which a thing was to be done than about the propriety or expediency of the thing itself," was charmed with the moderation of the man who had been the ruler of England. He asked Walpole to make for him a draught of a speech to be delivered by the king to the Council, while he went to the king at Leicester House. When he returned, the speech was ready. Sir Spencer made a copy of it; and went back to Leicester House. One passage in the speech was objected to by the king; and sir Spencer, not seeing his way to alter it, requested sir Robert to see his Majesty and implore him to leave it as originally drawn. The shrewd Caroline of Anspach, who was the firm friend of Walpole—"a better judge than her husband of the capacities of the two men, and who had silently watched for a proper moment for overturning the new designations,—did not lose a moment in observing to the king how prejudicial it would be to his affairs to prefer a man in whose own judgment his predecessor was the fittest person to execute the office."\* The next day, when the son-in-law of Walpole was displaced from his office of Master of the Robes, all thought the fall of the ministry was certain. The king had been known, in his father's time, to speak of Walpole as a rogue; of his brother, Horace, as a dirty buffoon; of Newcastle, as an impertinent fool; of Townshend as a choleric blockhead. But the king made no decided movement towards a new administration. The courtiers flocked around sir Spencer; they got out of the way of sir Robert. The Civil List was to be settled by Parliament in a fortnight. The Court moved to Kensington; "where the king," says Hervey, "by the audiences that were asked, and the offers that were made to him by the great men of all denominations, found himself set up at auction, and every one bidding for his favour at the expense of the public." Walpole outbid his rivals. He proposed in Parliament that the entire revenue of the Civil List should be settled on the king, being an increase of about 130,000*l.*; and that queen Caroline should receive a jointure of 100,000*l.* Not a voice was raised against the proposal, but that of Shippen. Walpole and his party continued in power. Compton was consoled with the Presidency of the Council, and a peerage. Horace Walpole, as well as lord Hervey, attributing the triumph of Walpole to the strong influence which the queen possessed over her husband, intimate that Walpole's political opponents, and even some of those who acted with him, thought that the prince's favourite mistress, Mrs. Howard (afterwards Lady Suffolk) would be the dispenser of court favours in the new reign. "Sir Robert's

\* Horace Walpole, "Reminiscences."

agacity discerned that the power would be lodged with the wife, not with the mistress; and he not only devoted himself to the princess, but totally abstained from even visiting Mrs. Howard."\*

Queen Caroline's jointure, and an addition of a hundred and thirty thousand pounds to the royal income, provoked only the remonstrance of Shippen. He did not even find a seconder to his amendment. The time was not yet ripe for agitating the question of a distinct provision for the eldest son of the king, independent of any allowance the Crown might bestow upon him. Frederick was about twenty years of age; was not a resident in England; and was not yet created Prince of Wales. The case of his father was different, when he was Prince of Wales. He was thirty-two years of age; he came to England at the accession of George I.; and he lived here with his wife and daughters. Unhappily, both on the part of the father and the mother of Frederick, there was a deep rooted antipathy towards this eldest son—an unhappy circumstance which probably interfered with such an arrangement as would not have left him wholly dependent upon what lord Hervey terms "the discretion and generosity of his father." George II. was not very discreet, and he was very far from generous. The unkingly passion of avarice was predominant in his most trivial disbursements. But this precise little man had one supreme royal virtue, that of an inflexible love of justice. Personal courage he signally possessed—it is an attribute of his race. He fought under Marlborough at Oudenarde in 1708. He headed the charge of his infantry at Dettingen in 1743. In queen Caroline, George, for ten years of his reign, had such an adviser and friend as few sovereigns have ever been blessed with. She possessed the rare wisdom—difficult even in private life, but far more difficult in the relations of a king and his consort—of governing her husband without appearing to govern. She never offered an opinion when any matter of state was discussed between the king and his ministers in her presence; but her opinion was ever certain to prevail. Queen Caroline and Robert Walpole perfectly understood the system under which the succession of the house of Brunswick became less and less assailable. Expediency was their great principle—let well enough alone—*quieta non movere*. Keep the nation as much as possible at peace with its neighbours. Abstain from asserting any prerogative that might appear to interfere with parliamentary government. Secure a majority in parliament, even at the cost of pandering to the cupidity of the dishonest and time-serving. Surrender even what you know to be right, if

\* Horace Walpole, "Reminiscences."



the danger of popular clamour against a measure be greater than the good which it proposes to accomplish. These are not noble maxims of government; but they were not without their beneficial results upon a nation that had been disturbed by conflicting principles for nearly a century. The consequence of this policy was that there are fewer stirring events in the first fourteen years of the reign of George II. than in any period of like duration in our history. Happy is the family which is reared without any adventures to record beyond the "migrations from the blue bed to the brown." Happy the nation which has little to offer to the notice of the historian, during the period of half a generation, but its steady progress in the arts of industry; its growth of capital; its abundant provision of the funds for sustaining labour; its general contentment, which some silly outbreak of popular prejudice only renders more remarkable; its leisure to examine into social evils, which chiefly affect those masses of the people that politicians have been too apt to neglect, till they have become dangerous in their impatience of intolerable abuses.

The foreign policy of England had ceased to be perplexed with apprehensions of insurrection and invasion for restoring the Stuart family. At the accession of George II. there was a momentary hope amongst the Jacobites that something might be done. Atterbury, who had thrown off all disguise, described to James the spirit of caution and fear which possessed his friends "at home,"—how nothing could be expected of them without foreign assistance. The British and French governments were in entire accord. Spain, although still grumbling about Gibraltar, had consented to a peace. All unsettled questions with the Emperor and others were to be referred to a Congress at Soissons. Eighteen months were the Deputies at this Congress, pretending to debate about The Pragmatic Sanction,\* and other nice points of diplomatic subtlety. "The cooks of the Plenipotentiaries," says lord Hervey, "had much more business there than their secretaries." The ministry of George became tired of a state of things which was neither peace nor war; and, when their patience was worn out by the never-ending discussions of Soissons, they, in conjunction with France and Holland, concluded the Peace of Seville with Spain, leaving the Emperor to fight his own battle. Some sixteen months later, by the Treaty of Vienna with Great Britain and Holland, there was obtained a guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, by which Charles, the Emperor, who had no sons, had provided that the succession to the hereditary estates of Austria should rest in

\* See Table of Treaties, *ante*, vol. v. p. 264.

the female line. Spain, shortly after, acceded to the Treaty. The disputes as to the Spanish Succession came to an end—"the problem with which creation had groaned for some twenty years past, finally accomplished better or worse." \* During the twelve years in which England was at peace with all nations, the Pretender fell into a state of humiliation which compelled his supporters long to remain in hopeless apathy. There were always scheming priests and unprincipled adventurers about him, to tell him of some party-quarrel, or some popular discontent, in England and Scotland, as being propitious to his return. But no man of any mark or influence could now be induced to engage in a dangerous adventure for the cause of a man who was faithless and ungrateful—who had quarrelled with Bolingbroke and Atterbury, and had chosen his advisers from amongst the weakest and most bigoted of his adherents. James Edward's character was such as to alienate his warmest friends. The cause of the Stuarts they thought was utterly lost, unless the grandson of James II. should burst out in a more propitious day, to witch the world with a revival of the heroic attributes claimed for some of Scotland's ancient line of kings.

The year 1728 is chiefly noticeable for the arrival in England of Frederick, now styled duke of Edinburgh, but afterwards prince of Wales. In the Session of Parliament which commenced in January, 1729, the Commons congratulated the king upon this arrival—a congratulation which the king could have well dispensed with. At the debate upon the Address, the prince was present, "to satisfy a laudable curiosity with the manner of proceeding in the House of Commons." † The young heir to the crown was in a somewhat unhappy position—stinted of pecuniary means by his parsimonious father; brought up from his childhood to believe that he was to marry Wilhelmina, the pretty, clever, and accomplished princess of Prussia, as Friedrich, Crown Prince of Prussia, was to marry the English Princess Royal. This double-marriage project was always liable to wreck upon some political rock a-head, some petty quarrel or jealousy between the royal cousins—the fidgetty George, Elector of Hanover, and the fiery Friedrich Wilhelm, king of Prussia; a leaning to French and Spanish alliances on the English part—a clinging to German interests, represented by the Emperor, on the Prussian part. The prince of Wales, who had never seen his destined bride, professed to be madly enamoured of her. The princess rather affected indifference, although her mother was set upon the match, and her ladies saluted her as

\* Carlyle, "Friedrich II." vol. ii. p. 68.

† "Historical Register."



princess of Wales. An envoy is sent from England in 1730, to settle these nuptial projects at Berlin. Sir Charles Hotham is to insist upon the double-marriage; the passionate Friedrich Wilhelm will hear only of one, at the present time. The prince of Wales writes to the envoy to get the affair finished—for he is desperately in love. Though there is much feasting, and immoderate libations, the affair will not get finished. Hotham goes back to England to report his ill success. In four years, Frederick, prince of Wales, has another wife provided for him; the clever Wilhelmina having in 1731 been compelled to marry the prince of Baireuth—a happier fate, probably, than that of keeping a petty Court as princess of Wales; the central point of opposition to the government of her husband's father.\*

In 1730, lord Townshend and sir Robert Walpole quarrelled; and the quarrel ending in Townshend's resignation of office, Walpole became supreme in the administration. It is related by Coxe, under the date of 1729, that a personal scuffle took place between the two ministers. The famous quarrel scene of Peachem and Lockit in the "Beggar's Opera" has been held to have been derived from this unseemly exhibition; which lord Mahon considers to have occurred in 1730, just before Townshend's resignation. Mr. Croker has pointed out that, "as the 'Beggar's Opera' was played on the 29th of January, 1728, it is certain either that the date of the historians is an anachronism, or that Gay alluded to some earlier dispute, or that the story was made from the scene." † Lord Townshend did not conduct himself ungenerously towards his old friend and brother-in-law. He did not join the violent faction by which Walpole was assailed. He retired to the country; and by the encouragement which he gave to the turnip-husbandry, he led the way to that system of cultivation which enabled the agricultural production of England to keep pace with her growing population.

The same keen critic who notices the anachronism of the quarrel scene as caricatured by Gay, points out that "it is remarkable that Coxe [Life of Walpole] passes, in two lines, the period from May 1730, to January 1733, as wholly unmarked by any public event;" and that "lord Hervey's Memoirs make exactly the same leap." ‡ We do not assume that history has nothing to record during this period. It is our duty to notice some matters as public events, which those who chiefly deal with the grand affairs called history—rivalries of ministers, intrigues for places and honours,

\* See Carlyle, vol. ii. pp. 31, 147, 151.

† Note in Lord Hervey's "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 117.

‡ *Ibid.*

wonderful adjustments of the balance of power—very frequently pass over. If we dilate somewhat upon topics that have more especial reference to the progress of "the people" in material prosperity and in good government, than we have found in the complexities of the Congress of Soissons, of the Peace of Seville, and of the Treaty of Vienna—topics perhaps more useful than a minute inquiry into the equivocal relations of George II. with lady Suffolk—we must be content to bear the reproach of a school that defines "the people" as "the lower orders." The "eminent hands" of the last century invariably denominated "the people" as "the mob;" and they have successors who divide society into "upper classes" created to govern, and "lower orders" sent into the world to obey.

The alleged leap of two years and a half in the 'Memoirs' of lord Hervey is not strictly correct. He notices, at considerable length, as occurring in the latter end of the summer of 1730, a design "projected among all the Dissenters of England to petition the Parliament in the next Session for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts."\* From lord Hervey's official position of vice-chamberlain to the king—which he attained in May 1730, when he left the opposition party of Pulteney, around which he had been hovering, to become the adherent of the minister whose power was now firmly established—he acquired an intimate acquaintance with the inner workings of the court life. The Dissenters represented their steady support of the government on Revolution principles—their unwavering adherence to the Protestant succession. Walpole could not deny their claims; but he knew the storm that would be raised if he gave them encouragement. The queen was persuaded to send for Hoadley, then bishop of Salisbury, to persuade him that "all times were not proper to do proper things,"—that the bringing forward such a measure as the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts would still further divide the already divided Whig party—that "as the clergy had hitherto been kept quiet by a promise of everything in their province remaining as it was, so consequently, when that promise was broken, it would set all the turbulent spirits and ill-humours of that body again afloat." Hoadley declared that as he had so often given his opinion as to "the unreasonableness of these laws in a social light, and the profaneness of them theologically considered," he must always support the repeal of them; but that he would nevertheless employ his interest among the Dissenters to divert "the immediate trying of this point." A report soon got abroad that the bishop had told the queen that the

\* "Memoirs," chap. vii. pp. 144 to 158.



request of the Dissenters was so unreasonable that he could not give them his support. The bishop was indignant, and urged Walpole to allow him to hold out some promise of future relief to the Dissenters. Sir Robert was firm, and would give no such assurance. The adroit minister, whose power of management was ready to grapple with every difficulty, got the body of London Dissenters to choose a Committee. "As the honest gentlemen who composed that committee were all moneyed men of the city, and scriveners, who were absolutely dependent upon sir Robert, and chosen by his contrivance, they spoke only as he prompted, and acted only as he guided." They were induced to meet the Lord Chancellor, the Speaker of the House of Commons, the two Secretaries of state, and sir Robert; and these great men convinced them that, as there was no prospect of success, the present was an improper time for any application to Parliament for their relief. The Committee reported their negotiations to a general assembly of the London Dissenters especially convened; and that assembly adopted their convictions, and communicated them to all their brethren in England. "In this manner this storm that threatened the Administration from the Presbyterian party blew over." Looking at the manœuvre of Walpole, and the subserviency of his committee of Dissenters, we must not altogether forget that in 1727 and 1728 Acts of Indemnity had been passed in favour of those who had not duly qualified for office. In 1729 such an Act was intermitted. In 1730 it was renewed; in 1731 it was again intermitted. During the remainder of Walpole's administration this relief was regularly granted. With four other exceptions, in the reign of George II., the Indemnity was passed every year, till the repeal of the obnoxious laws in 1828.

The Parliamentary Records of 1729 and 1730 present us with three Reports of the Select Committee of the House of Commons "on the State of the Gaols of this Kingdom." These reports contain a minute exposure of as horrible a system of oppression and cruelty as probably ever existed in any civilised country. The inquiry was confined to the three London prisons for debtors—the Fleet, the Marshalsea, and the King's Bench. This exposure was one of the most important steps in the slow march of a just administration of the law—that step which at last arrives at the capacity to discriminate between the criminal and the unfortunate. It was the preparation for that onward progress which counts its wisdom, as well as mercy, not to drive the criminal out of the pale of humanity. To one man it was principally owing that these terrible abuses were dragged to light. Mr. Oglethorpe, afterwards

general Oglethorpe—the philanthropist whose "strong benevolence of soul" is eulogised by Pope—the accomplished veteran whose life Johnson desired to write, and for whose earnest commendation of his "London," when he was friendless and unknown, Johnson was ever grateful—was Chairman of the Committee that penetrated into the dismal recesses of the Fleet prison, personally to examine into the condition of the prisoners. The Fleet was an ancient prison, in which the illegal punishments of the Star Chamber had been administered without control. When that jurisdiction was abolished in the reign of Charles I. it became a prison for debtors, and for those committed for contempts by the Courts of Chancery, Exchequer, and Common Pleas. Although the statutes of the 22nd and 23rd of Charles II. vested the government of all prisons in the judges of the higher courts and in justices of the peace, the Warden of the Fleet enjoyed a patent office, to be purchased by a large payment to some minister of the crown. John Huggins gave 5000*l.* to lord Clarendon for his patent; and John Huggins sold his patent for a like sum to Thomas Bambridge and Dougal Cuthbert, esquires. The committee of the House of Commons imputed the evil practices of this prison chiefly "to the venality of the warden's office." The worthy patentees had a tolerably profitable investment. By the payments of the prisoners for lodging, they made 811*l.* 4*s.* per annum; by the commitment and dismission fees, 766*l.* 18*s.* 8*d.*; by liberty of rules, 1500*l.*; by chaplain's fees, which they farmed upon a small payment to the chaplain, 813*l.* 16*s.*; by rents of various premises, 740*l.*; making a total of 4632*l.* 18*s.* 8*d.* per annum. A system of fraud and extortion was laid bare by the inquiries of the Committee, which showed how impossible it was for any but the affluent prisoner to obtain the humblest lodging and the coarsest food. Those without money were handed over to "the common side;" too happy if disease, engendered by filth and starvation, soon released them from their miseries. Those prisoners who refused to bear their oppressions without remonstrance, were put in irons—were confined in damp and loathsome dungeons. The case of captain John Macpheadris, who had been a flourishing merchant till the South Sea year, when, being surety to the crown for a friend, he failed, is narrated in the Report of the Committee with a pathos rarely excelled by writers of fiction. Macpheadris furnished a room, but refusing to pay an extravagant price for it, and offering what was legally due, Bambridge locked the prisoner out of his room, and forced him to lie in the open yard, called the Bare. He sat quietly under his wrongs, and getting some poor materials, built a little



hut, to protect himself, as well as he could, from the injuries of the weather." Bambridge was disgusted at his "unconcernedness." He ordered his officers to pull down the little hut; he would put the culprit who dared to be "easy" into the Strong Room to-morrow. Through a rainy night the wretched man lay on the ground. But this was comfort compared to the Strong Room. Loaded with irons he continued for three weeks, without a bed, in that dungeon. The irons were so closely riveted that his torture nearly brought him to the point of death, and he became lame for life. The Report of this case thus concludes: "The prisoner, upon this usage, petitioned the judges; and after several meetings, and a full hearing, the judges reprimanded Mr. Huggins and Bambridge, and declared that a gaoler could not answer the ironing of a man before he was found guilty of a crime; but, it being out of term, they could not give the prisoner any relief or satisfaction." Instance upon instance of similar cruelties came before the Committee. Huggins and Bambridge, with four of their agents and accomplices, were ordered by the House of Commons to be committed to Newgate, and to be prosecuted by the attorney-general. A bill was subsequently brought in to deprive Bambridge of his office. The inquiry into the prison of the Marshalsea disclosed similar enormities on the part of the keeper, who "hath arbitrarily and unlawfully loaded with irons, tortured, and destroyed, in the most cruel and barbarous manner, prisoners for debt under his care." Thumb-screws and iron skull-caps were here the received instruments of torture. But the horrors of "the common side" of the Marshalsea far exceeded those of the Fleet. Three hundred and thirty prisoners were crowded into a few narrow wards; forty or fifty being locked up, through the night, in a room not sixteen feet square. If they escaped the gaol distemper, famine destroyed them; for the prison allowance was insufficient to support life, and the donations of the charitable were intercepted by the scoundrels in authority. The Committee saw in the Women's Sick Ward many miserable objects lying, perishing with extreme want; and "in the Men's Sick Ward yet much worse." The prison of the King's Bench was found exempt from the most revolting of these abuses. The lord chief justice Raymond did not accept fees or presents from the marshal, and he did hear and redress the complaints of the prisoners.

In the Session of Parliament which commenced in January 1731, petitions were presented to the Commons from the magistracy of the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire, complaining "That the obliging grand-jurymen at the sessions of the peace, to make their

presentments in a language which few of them understood; and the suffering in any of the proceedings of the courts of justice, or in any of the transactions of the law, whereby the person or property of the subject may be affected, the use of a language not intelligible, and of a character not legible, but by the learned in the law, were great occasions of the delay of justice, and gave room to most dangerous frauds." The ancient practice of using a corrupt Latin for written pleadings had been abolished, with many other legal abuses, in the time of the Commonwealth. When the Restoration gave back the Monarchy, with much of its inherent good and a considerable portion of its trappings of evil, it was held wise and reverential to restore the old law language. During five reigns the people had borne this mischievous absurdity. Lord Chancellor King, the son of an Exeter grocer—one of "the people"—saw the necessity of attending to the prayer of the Yorkshire petitions. He directed a Bill to be introduced in the House of Commons to enact "That all proceedings in courts of justice shall be in the English language." The Bill was passed, after some opposition, such as is always at hand to resist what is dreaded as "innovation." In the House of Lords, the judges, speaking through the Lord Chief Justice, were decidedly against the change—difficulties would arise in translating the law out of Latin into English; law-suits would be multiplied, in regard to the interpretation of English words. The duke of Argyle contended that our prayers were in our native tongue that they might be intelligible, and why should not the laws, wherein our lives and properties are concerned. The complaint came from "the people"—from magistrates, from jurymen. There never was a period in our history, even in the darkest times in which the remonstrances of the middle classes against prescriptive abuses were not faithfully seconded by some of an aristocracy that did not stand, as a caste, apart from "the people." The Bill passed; and the Lords added a clause to provide that records and other documents should be written in a plain legible hand, such as that in which Acts of Parliament are engrossed. The tenacity with which some minds, even of a high order, cling to custom and precedent, is shown in the lament of Blackstone that the old Law Latin was disused. Lord Campbell adds, "I have heard the late lord Ellenborough, from the bench, regret the change, on the ground that it has had the tendency to make attorneys illiterate." There were two other complaints in the Yorkshire petitions which required the labour of a century to redress: "That Special Pleadings, by their intricacy and dilatoriness, rendered the prosecution of the rights of the subject difficult and expensive; that the Recovery of Small Debts, as the law then stood, was impracticable."



The king, in opening the Fifth Session of Parliament in 1732, adverted to the foreign policy by which peace had been secured, and the consequent ease which his subjects enjoyed. "This happy situation of affairs, I promise myself, will inspire you all with such temper and unanimity, and such a seasonable zeal for the public good, as becomes a Parliament sensible of the great blessings they enjoy." It was not probable that the royal recommendation of temper and unanimity would have much influence upon the violent spirit of party. There was a strong opposition to the Address, in which Pulteney took the lead. The great opponent of Walpole was not likely to be in a placid mood. In the summer of 1731 his name had been struck out of the list of Privy Counsellors by the king's own hand, and he was removed from all commissions of the peace. At that period the war of pamphlets and periodical works was conducted as fiercely by Bolingbroke and Pulteney as in the day when Swift headed the great battle against the Whigs. The organ of Walpole's bitter assailants was "The Craftsman." Pulteney had been visited with the anger of the Court, for publishing a private conversation between Walpole and himself, in which the king's minister had spoken very freely of his present master when prince of Wales. Neither of these rivals hesitated to violate the confidence of familiar intercourse in their party-quarrels. In the attacks upon Walpole the licence used was such as gentlemen of a later period would disdain to employ. The great minister was nicknamed "Sir Blue String"—"Sir Robert Brass"—"Iago." Caricatures, issuing from the "Craftsman's" publisher, set forth "Robin's Reign." He was "the harlequin of state"—Satan's minister. Franklin, the printer of the "Craftsman," was convicted of a libel. The mob huzzaed Pulteney, who had attended the trial. Never was such a season of quarrel and scandal. Lord Hervey and Pulteney fought a duel about an article in the "Craftsman," which is gone to the region of all worthless effusions of party-spite. Pope libelled lord Hervey, in a character which, for its brutal virulence, must ever be execrated, but which for its concentration of all the powers of satire will never be forgotten. As the supporter of Walpole in the House of Commons—as the confidential intimate of queen Caroline—Hervey is thus delineated:

"Whether in florid impotence he speaks,  
And, as the prompter breathes, the puppet squeaks;  
Or, at the ear of Eve, familiar toad,  
Half froth, half venom, spits himself abroad,  
In puns, or politics, or tales, or lies,  
Or spite, or smut, or rhymes, or blasphemies." \*

\* "Prologue to the Satires."

A pleasant world to live in, for statesman and authors!

The parliamentary history of 1732, imperfectly as the debates are reported, give us some notion not altogether inadequate of the vigour which characterised a British House of Commons, at a period of a strong government encountered by a powerful opposition. To us, who have escaped some of the dangers to the constitution which were then predicted to those whom Walpole contemptuously termed "patriots and boys," denunciations such as those of Pulteney against Standing Armies may appear trite and juvenile. Nevertheless, we cannot but admire the spirit which called them forth, when we look around, even at this day, upon other states. "The nations around us," said Pulteney, "are already enslaved, and have been enslaved, by those very means. By means of their standing armies they have every one lost their liberties." That is true now, as it was true then. But when he goes on to say that "it is impossible that the liberties of the people can be preserved, in any country where a numerous standing army is kept up," we ask, how has England preserved its liberties with a Standing Army? The answer is at hand. England never lost the safeguard of a free expression of public opinion. Vain were the attempts to prevent the publication of proceedings in Parliament. In 1729, Mr. Raikes, of Gloucester, was ordered to attend at the bar of the Commons, upon a complaint that he had printed speeches purporting to have been delivered in that House; and it was unanimously resolved, "that it is an indignity to, and a breach of the privileges of, this House, for any person to presume to give, in written or printed newspapers, any account or minutes of the debates, or other proceedings of this House, or of any Committee thereof; and that upon the discovery of the authors, printers, or publishers, this House will proceed against the offenders with the utmost severity." In 1638, William Pulteney, whose memory is of small historical value if disconnected with what we have learnt of his speeches in Parliament, was eager to join in that most solemn resolution against any publication of the debates, which compelled the use of fictitious names in "Debates in the Senate of Great Lilliput"—a device which Johnson made so famous in the Gentleman's Magazine." The jealousy with which parliamentary privilege was guarded made even "patriots" insensible to the value of a power of influencing public opinion legitimately through the press, instead of by the publication of virulent personal attacks upon the party opposed to them. Pulteney dreaded that the publication of speeches in Parliament, even if they were not misrepresented, would look very like making members "accountable without doors for what they say within." The boldness