

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE (Continued).

LORD CHANCELLOR.	FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY.	CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.	PRINCIPAL SECRETARIES OF STATE.
1757. Sir Robt. Henley—Lord Keeper—(created lord Henley, 1760).	— (July 2). J. H. Pelham, duke of Newcastle.	— (July 2). Hon. H. B. Legge.	1756. (Dec.) William Pitt, esq. (<i>vice</i> Mr. Fox, &c.
1758. " "	1758. " "	1758. " "	1758. " "
1759. " "	1759. " "	1759. " "	1759. " "
1760. " "	1760. " "	1760. William, viscount Barrington.	1760. " "
1761. " "	1761. " "	1761. William, viscount Barrington.	1761. (March 25). John, earl of Bute (<i>vice</i> lord Holderness).
1762. " "	1762. (May 29). John, lord Bute.	1762. Sir Francis Dashwood.	— (Oct. 9). Charles, lord Egremont (<i>vice</i> Mr. Pitt).
1763. " "	1763. Hon. George Grenville.	1763. Hon. George Grenville.	1762. (May 29). Hon. G. Grenville (<i>vice</i> lord Bute).
1764. " —Lord Chancellor, as earl of Northampton.	1764. " "	1764. " "	— (Oct. 14). George, earl of Halifax (<i>vice</i> Mr. Grenville).
1765. " "	1765. (July 13). Charles, marquis of Rockingham.	1765. William Dowdeswell, esq.	1763. (Sept. 9). John, earl of Sandwich (<i>vice</i> lord Egremont).
1766. (July 30). Chas., lord Camden.	1766. (August 2). Augustus Henry, duke of Grafton.	1766. Hon. Charles Townshend.	1764. " "
1767. " "	1767. (Sept. 12). William, lord Mansfield.	1767. (Sept. 12). William, lord Mansfield.	1765. (July 12). A. H., duke of Grafton (<i>vice</i> lord Halifax).
1768. " "	— (Dec. 1). A. H., duke of Grafton.	— (Dec. 1). Frederick, lord North.	— Hon. H. S. Conway (<i>vice</i> lord Sandwich).
1769. (Jan. 17). Hon. Chas. Yorke.	1768. " "	1768. " "	1766. (May 23). Charles, duke of Richmond (<i>vice</i> duke of Grafton).
1770. (Jan. 30). Great Seal in Commission.	1769. (February 10). Frederick, lord North.	1769. " "	— (Aug. 2). William, earl of Shelburne (<i>vice</i> duke of Richmond).
	1770. " "	1770. " "	1767. " "
			1768. (Jan. 20). Thomas, viscount Weymouth (<i>vice</i> general Conway).
			— Willes, earl of Hillsborough— <i>colonist</i> .
			— (Oct. 21). W. H., earl of Rochford (<i>vice</i> earl of Shelburne).
			1769. (Dec. 19). John, earl of Sandwich (<i>vice</i> lord Weymouth).
			1770. " "

CHAPTER VIII.

Foreign affairs.—Cession of Corsica to France.—The Falkland Islands.—First Partition of Poland.—War between Turkey and Russia.—Acquisitions of Russia.—Suppression of the Jesuits.—Home Politics.—Subscription to Thirty-nine Articles.—Test Act.—Thirtieth of January.—Repeal of laws against forestalling.—The queen of Denmark.—Death of the Princess Dowager.—The Royal Marriage Act.—Retrospect of Indian affairs.—East India Company's Regulation Act.—Teas, duty free, to the Colonies.

THE turbulence of home politics, and the threatening aspect of the colonies, left little inclination in the people to think much of foreign affairs. The cession by Genoa, in 1768, of Corsica to France, and the resistance by the Corsican patriot, Paoli, to the occupation of the island by French troops, excited interest in a few who could sympathize with heroic actions. Boswell wrote an account of Corsica. The cold Walpole advises Gray to read it: "What relates to Paoli will amuse you much."* The impressible Gray replies, "It has moved me strangely; all, I mean, that relates to Paoli. He is a man born two thousand years after his time." Corsica was subjugated in 1769, and Paoli became an exile from his country, seeking refuge in England. A month after Corsica was annexed to France, Napoleon Bonaparte was born at Ajaccio. In 1768 England was within a hair's-breadth of making war with France in the matter of Corsica. "Corsica a province of France is terrible to me," said Burke. The duke of Grafton did not go to war; but he sent secret supplies of arms and ammunition to Paoli, who said he could hold out eighteen months. Insurrections continued through 1770 and 1771. The French minister, the duke de Choiseul, who had annexed Corsica, and was anxious for a rupture with England, was dismissed from power in 1770. "My minister wishes for war," said Louis XV., "but I do not." If war had come, Corsica would most probably have been a British possession; Napoleon Bonaparte a subject of the British crown. He might have chosen England for the theatre of his rising ambition; have commanded a company of British grenadiers in the war of the French Revolution; and have won a green ribbon instead of an empire.

In 1770, whilst the influence of the duke de Choiseul was para-

* Feb. 18, 1768.

mount, Great Britain became involved in a dispute with Spain, which very nearly led to a war in which France would most probably have joined. The Falkland Islands—who cares now to enter into the details of a quarrel about a possession which Johnson calls “tempest-beaten barrenness?” These two islands in the South Atlantic were known by English navigators at the end of the sixteenth century. They were not colonised till the French, in 1764, formed a settlement in East Falkland. The British settled in West Falkland in 1767. The French at that time ceded their colony to the Spaniards; and the Spaniards, at a period of profound peace, in 1770, sent a force of five frigates, with sixteen hundred men, from Buenos Ayres, and drove the British from their fort at Port Egmont. Preparations for war were instantly made. The aggression of Spain was the chief topic of the speech with which the king opened the session of Parliament on the 13th of November. There were violent debates in both Houses, the opposition accusing the ministry of supineness and pusillanimity. Johnson wrote a pamphlet in defence of the government, which may be read, now the particular points of the quarrel have ceased to interest, for his forcible descriptions of the calamities of war, and his declamation against the folly of plunging two countries into hostilities upon a question of doubtful right. The Spanish government gave way to remonstrance. Mr. Harris, afterwards lord Malmesbury, was the British Chargé des Affaires at Madrid; and, although at one time war appeared inevitable, the Spanish court finally made restitution. Mr Harris had been recalled from Spain, in consequence of the language of the Spanish ambassador in London. He was twenty leagues from Madrid on his way home, when he met the messenger from St. James’s who was sent to say that the Spanish envoy had conceded the demands of the British government.* The sudden change was in consequence of the fall from power of the duke de Choiseul. England and Spain left the naked rocks and bogs of the Falkland Islands to their wild cattle; till in 1840, after an attempt at occupation by the republic of Buenos Ayres, they were again colonised by the English.

The first Partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, was made in 1772. On the 5th of August definitive treaties were signed between these powers, by which nearly a third of the Polish territory was divided amongst them. To Russia was assigned great part of Lithuania; to Austria, Galicia and portions of Podolia and Cracow; to Prussia, Pomerania, and the country of the Vistula. Prussia acquired by far the smallest share of the spoil in extent of

* “Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury,” vol. i. p. 61.

territory, but incomparably the most valuable, when she obtained Dantzic, and the best trading towns of the dismembered country. The events which led to this partition, or rather which were the excuses for it, were connected with the religious and political dissensions of the Polish nobles, priests, and commonalty. An elective monarchy was necessarily subject to the intrusive control of a powerful neighbour. After the death of John Sobieski, at the end of the seventeenth century, his successors Augustus II. and Augustus III. were little more than the representatives of the court of Russia. The influence of the Czarina, Catherine, procured the election of Stanislaus Poniatowski. The favourite of the profligate empress was lifted into a throne by the intrigues of one party of the nobles, supported by a Russian army. From 1764 to 1772 two factions were struggling about civil and religious privileges, whilst their country was more and more exposed to the danger of an entire loss of its independence. Poland could scarcely be called a nation, if by a nation we mean a community of various classes, with a large intermediate class between the highest and the lowest. Poland was a country of nobles and of serfs. When Russia was about to seize the territories which she coveted, Prussia demanded a share; and to prevent the opposition of the other great neighbour, Austria was propitiated with another share. Maria Theresa, personally, was opposed to the scheme; but her opposition was not of that nature which was likely to interfere with its completion. “I let things go their own way,” she said, “but not without the greatest grief.”

The indifference of the English government to what was considered by impartial observers “as the first very great breach in the modern political system of Europe,”* was manifested in the diplomatic communications of our court. Mr. Harris, now minister at Berlin, kept lord Suffolk well-informed of the negotiations between Prussia and Russia. The Secretary for foreign affairs receives the intelligence very coolly: “I have some reason to apprehend the terms and quantum of this curious transaction are not positively settled, though there is no doubt of the general plan and intention.”† Again: “His majesty does not consider the affair of such present importance as to justify acting to prevent it.”‡ Mr. Murray, ambassador at Constantinople, who had given some advice to the Porte on the subject, received a very severe admonition from the British government not to meddle with matters on which he had no instructions. Lord Rochford calls the partition of Poland an

* “Annual Register,” 1772, p. 2.

† “Malmesbury Diaries,” &c., vol. i. p. 70.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

"extraordinary and unexpected event:" but says, "I am to inform you that, although such a change suggests not improbable apprehensions that *the trade* of Europe may hereafter be affected by it, neither his majesty nor the other commercial powers have thought it of such present importance as to make a direct opposition to it."* The language of the British government only reflected the temper of the country. Burke describes this apathy: "We behold the destruction of a great kingdom, with the consequent disarrangement of power, dominion, and commerce, with as total an indifference and unconcern as we would read an account of the extermination of one horde of Tartars by another, in the days of Gengis Khan and Tamerlane." † Mr. Harris, writing to lord Suffolk in 1774, upon the completion of the Partition by fresh usurpation of territory, indulges a hope which was not to be fulfilled: "There is reason to believe that this affair once settled, that unfortunate Republic, after an uninterrupted series of discord, troubles, and disgraces, for nearly ten years, in which it has lost its liberty, its finest provinces, and all its consideration in the affairs of Europe, will be left quietly to reflect on its misfortunes, and from its insignificance be unmolested." ‡ Twenty-one years afterwards, Kosciusko fell; and what remained of Poland was divided amongst the first spoliators.

Intimately connected with the affairs of unhappy Poland was the war between Turkey and Russia. It commenced in October, 1768, under the avowed desire of the sultan, Mustapha III., to save Poland from the calamity of Russian interference in her domestic troubles. The sultan, however, lies under the charge of having proposed a partition of Poland between Turkey and Austria. The war was a serious calamity for the Porte. Its details have become more interesting for us, as the scenes of that conflict present us with the names so familiar in 1855. The war was for some time chiefly between the Polish confederates and their allies the Turks, against the Russian troops in Poland. But it soon assumed the more decisive character of a war for an extension of Russian dominion. The generals of each power, in the judgment of the king of Prussia, had no military skill. The battles were terrible sacrifices of life, without intelligent direction, though the Russians had more pretension to tactics. "To have a proper notion of the contest," said Frederick, "we must figure to ourselves a party of one-eyed people thoroughly beating a party of blind men." Eventually the whole country between the Danube and

* Appendix to Mahon, vol. v.

† "Diaries," &c., vol. i. p. 99.

‡ "Annual Register," 1772, p. 2.

the Dnieper fell into the hands of the Russians. The Crimea was overrun by them. They became masters of Kertsch, Yenikale, and Kaffa. The Turkish fleet was destroyed in the bay of Chesme, by a Russian squadron which had sailed from Cronstadt to the Mediterranean. The Russian admiral was assisted by English officers, every indirect aid having been given by the British government to Russia; which power, wrote lord Rochford, in 1772, "his majesty cannot but look upon as the natural ally of his crown, and with which he is likely, sooner or later, to be closely connected." There was an armistice after the Russian fleet returned to the Baltic, having been very efficiently resisted by Gazi Hassan, an adventurer who raised himself by his genius and daring to be capitan pasha.* Peace was concluded in 1774. The acquisitions of Russia by the peace of Kuchuk-Kainarji may be thus summed up: Russia obtained the Great and the Little Kabarda, the fortresses of Azof, Kilbarun, Kertsch, and Yenikale; the country between the Bog and the Dnieper; the free navigation of the Black Sea, and a free passage through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles; the co-protectorship over Moldavia and Wallachia; and the protectorship over all the Greek churches within the Turkish empire. The Khanat of the Crimea was declared independent, but it soon became a prey to Russia.

The suppression of the Jesuits, in 1773, "though it has been so long expected," writes Burke, "is so remarkable an event that it will stamp the present year as a distinguished era." † The event was expected, because the abolition of the society by Pope Ganganelli, Clement XIV., was a final measure of the proscription which had been carried on against them, for some years, by the Roman Catholic powers of Europe. They had been expelled from Portugal, in 1759, with many odious circumstances of severity. In 1764, the Society was suppressed in France, and their property confiscated. In 1767, the members of the Order were driven out of Spain. Clement XIII. strenuously defended the Jesuits. He believed that they were amongst the firmest supporters of the papacy, and the most faithful champions of religion. He would consent to no change in their constitution; and he was supported by the obstinacy of their chief, Lorenzo Ricci. ‡ The Bourbon courts had real or supposed injuries of the Jesuits to revenge. Madame de Pompadour, it is said, had been affronted by her confessor, a Jesuit, who exhorted her wholly to amend her life. The

* The sketch of this remarkable man in "Anastasia" is held to be perfectly accurate.

—Note by Lord Mahon, vol. v. p. 473.

† "Annual Register," 1773, p. 3.

‡ Ranke—"History of the Popes," vol. iii. p. 209.

king of Spain believed that they were plotting to put his brother upon the throne. Clement XIII. died in 1769. His successor had been raised to the papal throne by the Bourbon influence. But he was a man of liberal and moderate opinions; and he saw that the institution had outlived its uses as an instrument of papal supremacy, and was out of harmony with the prevailing opinions of his time. However predisposed against the Jesuits, he took several years for inquiry and counsel. On the 31st of July, 1773, he thus pronounced his decision: "Inspired, as we humbly trust, by the Divine Spirit, urged by the duty of restoring the unanimity of the Church, convinced that the Company of Jesus can no longer render those services, to the end of which it was instituted, and moved by other reasons of prudence and state policy which we hold locked in our own breast, we abolish and annul the Society of Jesus, their functions, houses, and institutions." When Ganganelli said "the Company of Jesus can no longer render those services to the end of which it was instituted," he expressed a truth of larger comprehension than their services to the papacy. They had, in spite of their political intrigues, rendered essential aid to the progress of knowledge. Their missions had done more for the spread of information as to the geography of distant countries, than for the conversation of the peoples amongst whom they went. Their success as educators had done more for the freedom of the human mind than their notions of papal authority for its enslavement. They had advanced literature and science amidst their incessant efforts to hold society in thralldom. They had waged unceasing war against Protestantism, and during that conflict the prevailing thoughts of Europe had been advancing, and had left them behind. "The general course of events, the development of modern civilization, the liberty of the human mind, all these forces against which the Jesuits were called to contest, were arrayed against them, and conquered them."* A recent writer has expressed this more tersely: "They stood in the way of the age, and the age swept them from its path."† The same acute thinker says: "They were the last defenders of authority and tradition; and it was natural that they should fall in an age when statesmen were sceptics, and theologians were Calvinists." Johnson, whilst most men exulted in their destruction, "condemned it loudly as a blow to the general power of the Church, and likely to be followed with many dangerous innovations, which might at length become fatal to relig-

* Guizot—"Civilisation en Europe"—Douzième Leçon.

† Buckle—"Civilization in England," vol. i. p. 783.

ion itself."* He was addressing a French abbé, and was perhaps right with regard to France.

There are subjects of home politics which ought to be fully treated in a special history of a particular era, but which must be slightly noticed in a work embracing the whole field of British progress. Thus, in the year 1772, when Wilkes was contending for the shrievalty of London instead of battling with a House of Commons; when the country was no longer agitated with Remonstrances and Addresses; when Woodfall was reporting the debates of Parliament without the terror of the serjeant-at-arms before his eyes,—there were interesting discussions in both Houses on petitions of some of the clergy and laity that Subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles might not be enforced at the Universities. But we cannot enter upon any detail of these proceedings. Nor can we do more than notice that the Dissenters then obtained a majority in the House of Commons for a repeal of the Test Acts, but were defeated in the Upper House. Time gradually matures into practical measures the theories, sometimes crude and undigested, by which social reforms are advanced. There has been, since 1772, a partial concession to the spirit of religious liberty on the subject of Subscription. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was amongst the earliest of those vast improvements which have made the age of queen Victoria so essentially different from the age of George IV. The constant agitation of questions like these gradually determines public opinion, and reforms are accomplished without violence or ill-will. Thus, in March, 1772, Mr. Montague moved for leave to bring in a Bill to repeal so much of the Act of the 12th of Charles II. as directs that every 30th of January should be for ever kept as a day of fasting and humiliation. When the debates were very meagrely reported, a joke was some times carefully preserved; and we learn from the Parliamentary History that Mr. Stephen Fox said he thought the ceremony of the day did no harm, unless,—addressing the Speaker,—"it obliges you, sir, to go to church once a year." In 1859, the fast of the 30th of January passed out of the Calendar by Act of Parliament; and the form of prayer, which was called "impious" in the debate of 1772, has vanished from our Liturgy. The motion was rejected. The strongest prejudice must, however, yield at last, and the most prejudiced know that time will settle these conflicts of principle. "I am against abolishing the fast for the 30th of January," said Johnson. "But I should have no objection to make an Act continuing it for another century, and then letting it expire."† The

* Mrs. Piozzi's "Anecdotes."—Note in Boswell.

† Boswell—March 23, 1772.

time he had contemplated had nearly run out when this solemn mockery could no longer be endured.

Upon a question of political economy, the Parliament of 1772 was in advance of public opinion. It was a period of scarcity. The price of wheat was 35 per cent. above the average. Harvests were deficient throughout Europe. Adam Smith represents the feeling of his time in saying—"In years of scarcity the inferior ranks of people impute their distress to the avarice of the corn merchant." The statute of Edward VI. enacted, that whoever should buy any corn or grain with intent to sell it again, should be reputed an unlawful engrosser, and be subject to various penalties. The statute of Charles II. permitted the engrossing of corn when it was cheap, but the buyer was not to sell again in the same market within three months. The statute of 1772 "For repealing several Laws therein mentioned against Badgers, Engrossers, Forestallers, and Regrators," boldly declares that these laws are "detrimental to the supply of the labouring and manufacturing poor of this kingdom." The preamble to the statute says, that "it hath been found by experience that the restraints laid by several statutes upon dealing in corn, meal, flour, cattle, and sundry other sorts of victuals, by preventing a free trade in the said commodities, have a tendency to discourage the growth and to enhance the price of the same." Nevertheless, the Common Law was not yet rendered inoperative by public enlightenment. In 1800, the clamours against corn dealers were as violent as in the days of the Tudors; and a merchant was convicted, before lord Kenyon, for regrating, that is, for selling thirty quarters of oats at an advanced price in the same market on the same day on which he had bought them.

The commencement of the year 1772 brought to George III. an accumulation of family anxieties. On the 29th of January, a courier arrived from Denmark with the intelligence that the queen of Denmark, sister of the king of England, had been sent as a prisoner to the castle of Kronberg. Caroline Matilda, the youngest of the numerous family of Frederick, prince of Wales, was born in 1751; and was married in 1766, to Christian VII., king of Denmark. She is described as very beautiful; of a sweet nature; one whose life would have been happy had she been united to a worthy husband. The king of Denmark was as debased in morals as he was low in intellect—a spiritless wretch, who had given up all care of his subjects to his favourite, Struensee. Verging towards idiocy, the king left his consort to transact state affairs in council with Struensee. The minister was rash and presumptuous; and provoked the hostility of a strong party of the court, who were led by

the dowager-queen, Juliana Maria, the step-mother of Christian VII. A formidable conspiracy was organized against Struensee; and Caroline Matilda was destined to be the victim with him, upon an accusation against her of conjugal infidelity. She had borne the king a son and a daughter, and had been recently confined with a second daughter. At midnight the king's chamber was suddenly entered; and he was required to sign an order for the arrest of his queen, of Struensee, and of his colleague in the ministry, Brandt. The king was told that they had entered into a plot to depose him; and in terror for his own personal safety, he hesitated not to resign his queen and his ministers into the hands of their enemies. Caroline Matilda was dragged from her chamber, refused access to her husband, and with her infant carried off to the castle of Kronberg. Struensee and Brandt were beheaded, after a pretended trial. Proceedings against the queen were suspended by the interposition of the government of George III.; and, after a captivity of four months, she was received on board a British man-of-war, but was not permitted to take her child with her. In the castle of Zell, in Hanover, she passed the remaining three years of her unhappy life. There is a record of M. Roques, the pastor of the French Protestant church at Zell, who was frequently consulted by the queen on the distribution of her charities, that on her death-bed she made a solemn declaration that she had never been unfaithful to her husband.

When this distressing news arrived in England, the mother of George III. was dangerously ill. The king, as Walpole relates, was advised to conceal this new misfortune from the Princess Dowager; but he replied, "My mother *will* know everything, and therefore it is better that I should break it to her by degrees."* On the 8th of February the king wrote this short note to lord North: "My mother is no more." Of the five sons of the princess of Wales, two had died—Edward, duke of York, and Frederick, the youngest son. William, duke of Gloucester, and Henry, duke of Cumberland, were at this time under the serious displeasure of their brother the king.

The Marriage-Act of 1753 especially excepted members of the royal family from its operation. George II. is represented to have said, "I will not have my family laid under these restraints." In 1771, the duke of Cumberland, then in his twenty-sixth year, became deeply enamoured of Mrs. Horton, the daughter of an Irish peer, Simon Luttrell, lord Irnham. The duke had been previously notorious for his intrigues; and a jury had awarded damages of

* "Last Journals of Horace Walpole," edited by Dr. Doran, vol. i. p. 4.

ten thousand pounds against him in an action for criminal conversation brought by lord Grosvenor. The letters of this very silly prince of the blood, produced on this occasion, were the public scorn. In October, 1771, the duke of Cumberland induced Mrs. Horton to accompany him to Calais, where they were married according to the forms of the English Church. The pair were forbidden the Court. What was the mortification of the king, what was the triumph of Wilkes, exclaims Walpole, "when it was known that this new princess of the blood was own sister of the famous colonel Luttrell, the tool thrust by the Court into Wilkes's seat for Middlesex?"* The duke of Gloucester, in September, 1766—he then being in his twenty-third year—had married the widow of the earl of Waldegrave. This lady was a natural daughter of sir Edward Walpole; and as the wife of the nobleman who had been governor to prince George, had been distinguished for her exemplary character. Walpole says, "The duke of Cumberland's marriage was a heavy blow on lady Waldegrave, and seemed to cut off all hopes of the king's permitting the duke of Gloucester to acknowledge her for his wife."† The duke of Gloucester's marriage was kept secret.

On the 20th of February the following royal message was brought down to both Houses of Parliament: "George R. His Majesty being desirous, from paternal affection for his own family, and anxious concern for the future welfare of his people, and the honour and dignity of his crown, that the right of approving all marriages in the royal family (which ever has belonged to the kings of this realm as a matter of public concern) may be made effectual, recommends to both Houses of Parliament to take into their serious consideration whether it may not be wise and expedient to supply the defect of the laws now in being; and, by some new provision, more effectually to guard the descendants of his late majesty king George the second (other than the issue of princesses who have married or may hereafter marry into foreign families) from marrying without the approbation of his majesty, his heirs, or successors, first had and obtained." The royal Marriage Bill was presented next day to the House of Lords. It made provision that no Prince or Princess, descended from George II.—with the exception of the issue of Princesses married abroad—should be capable of contracting matrimony without the previous consent of the king, his heirs, or successors. But it also provided that if any such descendant of George II., being above the age of twenty-five, should persist in a resolution to marry, the king's consent

* "Memoirs of George III.," vol. iv. p. 356.

† *Ibid.* p. 360.

being refused, he or she might give notice to the Privy Council, and might at any time within twelve months after such notice contract marriage, unless both Houses of Parliament, before the expiration of twelve months, should expressly declare their disapprobation of such intended marriage. After continued and vehement debates in both Houses, the Bill became law; and it still continues in force. Its provisions appear to be imperfectly understood. It is called "an encroachment upon the law of nature"—"an impious and cruel measure."* There is a constitutional appeal against an unjust exercise of the prerogative. Such an appeal has never been made; but it would most probably not be made in vain, if any case should arise which would justify Parliament in not supporting the sovereign in the assertion of an arbitrary power. However we may deplore the alleged necessity of excepting the highest in the land from the enjoyment of that individual liberty which belongs to the meanest subject, we cannot help repeating a question very pertinently asked, "What turn would English history have taken if this Act had never been passed?"† During the progress of the Bill, the duke of Gloucester's marriage was avowed. There is a very interesting letter of the duchess of Gloucester to her father, sir Edward Walpole, dated the 19th of May; the last debate on the marriage Act having been on the 24th of March. The following is an extract:—"When the duke of Gloucester married me (which was in September, 1766) I promised him upon no consideration in the world to own it even to you without his permission; which permission I never had till yesterday, when he arrived here in much better health and looks than ever I saw him; yet, as you may suppose, much hurt at all that has passed in his absence: so much so, that I have had great difficulty to prevail upon him to let things as much as possible remain as they are. To secure *my* character, without injuring his, is the utmost of my wishes; and I dare say that you and all my relations will agree with me that I shall be much happier to be called lady Waldegrave, and respected as duchess of Gloucester, than to feel myself the cause of his leading such a life as his brother does, in order for me to be called your Royal Highness. . . . If ever I am unfortunate enough to be called duchess of Gloucester, there is an end of almost all the comforts which I now enjoy, which, if things can go on as they are now, are many."‡ The domestic miseries of one generation are, happily, frequently put an end to in another generation. The son of William, duke of Glou-

* Massey—"George III.," vol. ii. p. 145. † "Quarterly Review," vol. cv. p. 479.

‡ "Last Journals of H. Walpole," p. 100.

cester, the brother of George III., married the princess Mary, the daughter of George III. *

In 1773, the Parliament turned from its long course of anti-popular contests, to look seriously at a matter of paramount national importance. The pecuniary affairs of the East India Company had fallen into great disorder. On the 2nd of March a petition was presented from the Company to the House of Commons, praying for the assistance of a loan of a million and a half sterling. In the previous session a Select Committee of the House had been appointed to inquire into the affairs of the Company. The necessity for such an inquiry was strongly urged, upon financial and moral grounds. The net revenues of Bengal had decreased; the natives were distressed and discontented; the Company's servants were arbitrary and oppressive. General Burgoyne, the mover of the Resolution for a Committee, made an eloquent appeal to the feelings of the House: "The fate of a great portion of the globe; the fate of great states in which your own is involved; the distresses of fifteen millions of people; the rights of humanity; are involved in this question." To understand the necessity for such an inquiry, we must take a rapid glance at the affairs of India, from the period when the French supremacy was utterly destroyed by the energies of Clive. †

In 1760, when the strong hand that had made the English masters of Bengal was withdrawn, the agents of the Company, regarding their own enrichment as the immediate business of their lives, and permitting their native factors to pursue a similar course of extortion, Meer Cossein, for whose elevation they had removed the Subahdar whom Clive had raised to power, displayed an inclination to be freed from his English friends. The differences at last came to an open rupture, and Meer Cossein's troops murdered the members of a deputation sent from Calcutta to negotiate with him. In 1763 war was commenced, for the purpose of deposing Meer Cossein and restoring Meer Jaffier. The Subahdar was finally overthrown, but not before he had taken a horrible vengeance upon the English, by murdering a hundred and fifty prisoners in the fortress of Patna. The tyrant fled to the Nabob of Oude. Their joint forces were subsequently defeated by the English under ma-

* "On the death of the late duke of Sussex, the fifth son of king George III., who had been married at Rome in 1792, by a minister of the Church of England, and shortly afterwards again in England, according to the rites of the Church of England, it was held that his peerage did not pass to the only son of that marriage, Sir Augustus D'Este; but that the statute extended to prohibit contracts for, and to annul, any marriage in violation of its provisions, wherever the same might be contracted or solemnized."—(*Blackstone's Commentaries*—Kerr's edit., vol. i. p. 215.)

† *Ante*. p. 31.

lor Munro. Shah Alum, the Great Mogul, who had been driven from his capital of Delhi by the Mahrattas, now sought the British protection. But in spite of victories, the rule of the stranger was one of oppression for the Bengalees; and the undoubted misgovernment of this period justified general Burgoyne, to call upon the Parliament to redress their wrongs: "Good God! what a call! the native of Hindustan, born a slave; his neck bent from the very cradle to the yoke; by birth, by education, by climate, by religion, a patient, submissive, willing subject to Eastern despotism, first begins to feel, first shakes his chains, for the first time complains, under the pre-eminence of British tyranny."

The misrule of the Company's servants in India was unchecked by an united central authority in England. The king's government had as yet no efficient control over Indian affairs. The Directors were quarrelling amongst themselves, and divided into knots contending for supremacy. To establish a just rule over the vast empire that was subject to their power and influence formed a small portion of their deliberations. In India there was no supreme authority; and the three presidencies had rival interests to uphold. The whole dominion of the English would have probably gone to ruin, if Clive had not procured an ascendancy in the Court of Directors, and once more sailed for Calcutta with extensive powers, as Governor and Commander-in-chief of Bengal. His very name soon operated upon the native princes. His judicious measures set some bounds to the rapacity of the Company's servants. He made them give pledges to accept no future presents from natives. He debarred high officers from carrying on private trade. He deprived military officers of that extra allowance in the field known as "double batta." For himself, he now cautiously abstained from adding anything to his large fortune by accepting such gratuities as he had received in the early portion of his career. He returned to England in the beginning of 1767, having laid the foundation of that better government which eventually made the British dominion a blessing instead of a curse to India. His biographer has said, "From Clive's second visit to India dates the political ascendancy of the English in that country. . . . From Clive's third visit to India dates the purity of the administration of our Eastern Empire." *

The successes of the Company in Bengal were now to be counterbalanced by defeats in Madras. Hyder Ali, a man of ability and daring, who had deposed the rajah of Mysore in 1761, was extending his dominions by conquests and seizures; and was securing his ascendancy by an energy which formed a striking con-

* Macaulay—"Essays."

trast to the supineness of the greater number of native princes. He became engaged in a contest with the English; and by his rapid movements, and his sudden attacks, was a most formidable enemy by land and sea. Having plundered and wasted the Carnatic, he appeared with five thousand horsemen before Madras, in 1769; and there concluded a treaty with the terrified Council, in the absence of their troops. The terms of the alliance which was then concluded were not onerous. Their moderation evinced the sagacity of this extraordinary ruler.

An arrangement was, in 1769, made between the Administration and the East Indian Directors. The Company were to hold the territorial revenues of India for five years, they paying £400,000 annually into the Exchequer. But in 1770 the resources of India materially failed. There was a terrible famine in Bengal, in which it is supposed that one-third of the inhabitants perished. In 1772, the Company declared a deficiency of above a million; obtained loans from the Bank of England to a large amount; and at last went to Parliament for aid, with the undoubted risk of provoking a more stringent inquiry into their affairs than had ever before been instituted. In 1773, an Act was passed, by which £1,400,000 was lent to the Company; the payment of £400,000 per annum was postponed; and the dividend of the proprietors was restricted to 6 per cent., until the loan should be repaid. By another Act the annual elections of directors were to be subject to regulations, such as prevailed till the very recent changes. A Governor-General was to reside in Bengal, to which presidency the other two were made subordinate. The first Governor-General, Warren Hastings, was named in this Act, as were the new Council. The appointments of Parliament were to continue for five years, and then the nomination was to revert to the Court of Directors, subject to the approbation of the Crown. One of the new council was Philip Francis; and this appointment has given birth to the theory that Junius ceased to write when he was propitiated by so great a bounty upon his silence.

The transactions of the government with the East India Company were completed by what was meant as a concession to the Directors. They had in their warehouses seventeen million pounds of tea, for which they wanted a market. Permission was given by Act of Parliament to export teas belonging to the Company to any of the British plantations in America, with a drawback of the duty payable in England. The colonial tax of three pence in the pound was to be paid in the American ports. Ships were freighted, and consignees appointed to sell their cargoes. Fatal boon, whose consequences no one saw.

CHAPTER IX.

Destruction of Tea in Boston Harbour.—Franklin before the Council.—Boston Port Bill.—Burke's speech against taxing America.—Chatham's speech.—Sentiments of the Americans.—State of Parties in America.—Leaders of the House of Commons.—Reception of the Boston Port Bill.—Military preparations.—Chatham's and Burke's efforts for conciliation.—Rapid growth of America.—English feelings on the American question.—Hostilities commenced at Lexington.—Ticonderoga and Crown Point taken.—Washington's view of civil war.—Principles involved in the struggle.

It was Sunday, the 28th of November, 1773, when there sailed into Boston harbour the English merchant ship Dartmouth, laden with chests of tea belonging to the East India Company. The Act of Parliament which allowed the Treasury to license vessels to export the teas of the Company to the American colonies, free of duty, was the signal for popular gatherings in Boston. Samuel Adams, in the "Boston Gazette," roused again that feeling of resistance which had partially subsided. The governor of Massachusetts, in October, wrote to lord Dartmouth, who had succeeded lord Hillsborough as colonial secretary, that Samuel Adams, "who was the first person that openly, and in any public assembly, declared for a total independence," had "obtained such an ascendancy as to direct the town of Boston and the House of Representatives, and consequently the Council, just as he pleases." The East India Company had appointed its consignees in Boston. On the night of the 2nd of November, summonses were left at the houses of each of these persons, requiring them to appear on a certain day at Liberty Tree, to resign their commission; and notices were issued desiring the freemen of Boston and of the neighbouring towns to assemble at the same place. The consignees did not appear; but a Committee of the Assembly traced them to a warehouse, where they were met to consult. They were required not to sell the teas, but to return them to London by the vessels which might bring them. They refused to comply, and were denounced as enemies to their country. Philadelphia had previously compelled the agents of the Company to resign their appointments. Town meetings were held at Boston, when strong resolutions were adopted. In this state of things, on that Sunday, the 28th of November, the first tea-ship arrived. The New England colonists preserved that strict observance of the Sabbath