CORRESPONDENCE

OF

CHARLES, FIRST MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

EDITED, WITH NOTES,

BY CHARLES ROSS, ESQ.

IN THREE VOLUMES.—VOL. III.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1859.

The right of Translation is reserved.

E45
C92
3

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

CHAPTER XIX.—*continued.*

The Archbishop of Cashel — Lord Longueville — Suggestions of the Lord-Lieutenant on the Irish representation — Writs of Habeas Corpus — Charge of undue lenity — Seditious meetings — Disturbed state of the country — Military patronage — Modifications of the plan of Union .. .. .. Page 1

CHAPTER XX.

Disposal of the State-prisoners — Popular disposition with respect to the Union — Sketch of the proposed measure — Repugnance of official people — The Earl of Ely — Mr. Saurin — Opening of the Irish Parliament — Debate in the Commons — Defeat of the Government — Proceedings of the Opposition — Riots in Dublin — Sentiments of the Roman Catholics on the Union — Spirit of disaffection — Lord Cornwallis charged with undue lenity — Rebellion Bill passed — Debate on the Maynooth Bill — Military insubordination — Refusal of the Escheatorship of Munster — Government appointments — Narrow escape of the Lord-Lieutenant — Lord Downshire — Irish militia — Proposed employment of Russian troops — Concessions to the Catholics — State of the British forces 27

CHAPTER XXI.

Hopes of a majority for the Union — Proposed expedition to French coast — Bonaparte offers to negociate — Mr. Grattan takes his seat — Opposition to the Union — Marquis of Downshire — Debates in Parliament — Napper Tandy — Alleged interference with a public meeting — Duel between Mr. Corry and Mr. Grattan — The Catholic Peers — Union Resolutions carried in both Houses — Limitation of Irish Peerage — Attempts on the King's life — Debates on Union Bill — Passed in the Commons — Lord Cornwallis's engagements to Supporters of the Union — Objections of the Duke of Portland — Remonstrance of Lord Cornwallis — The Duke's explanation — Royal Assent to Union Bill — Military Arrangements for Ireland — Creations and promotions in the Peerage — Compensation to Borough-proprietors 156

CHAPTER XXII.

The Catholic question — Intentions of the English Cabinet — Insuperable objection of the King — Rumour of a dukedom for Lord Cornwallis — Resignation of the Ministry — Lord Cornwallis prepares to leave Ireland — Memoranda circulated amongst the Catholics — The King's illness — Lord Hardwicke Lord-Lieutenant — Trial of Napper Tandy — Sir William Medows Commander-in-Chief — The Roman Catholic College at Maynooth .. .. Page 325

CHAPTER XXIII.

Expected French invasion — Lord Cornwallis appointed to the command of the Eastern District — Proceeds to France to negociate a Peace — His instructions — Interview with Bonaparte — Private Conference with the First Consul on taking leave — The Conferences at Amiens — Discussions with respect to Malta — The Fisheries — On the Compensation for the Prince of Orange — Society and mode of living at Amiens — Conclusion of the Definitive Treaty 377

CHAPTER XXIV.

Lord Cornwallis returns home — His views in regard to the defence of Ireland — Contested election for Eye — Lord Wellesley — Apprehensions of War with France — Colonel Despard — Affairs of Ireland — Rumours of invasion by Bonaparte — Indian Affairs — Mr. Pitt's conduct — Military arrangements — Letter to Lord Fingall — Lord Cornwallis accepts the Governor-Generalship of India for the third time 488

CHAPTER XXV.

Policy of Sir John Shore and Lord Wellesley — General approbation of Lord Cornwallis's appointment — His arrival at Calcutta — Instructions to Lord Lake — Irregular troops in the Company's service — Policy towards Native Powers — Lord Lake dissents from the views of the Governor-General — Decline of Lord Cornwallis's health — His death — Marks of universal esteem — His public conduct and private character 529

INDEX 565

CORRESPONDENCE

OF

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

CHAPTER XIX.—*continued.*

The Archbishop of Cashel — Lord Longueville — Suggestions of the Lord Lieutenant on the Irish representation — Writs of Habeas Corpus — Charge of undue lenity — Seditious meetings — Disturbed state of the country — Military patronage — Modifications of the plan of Union.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CASHELL TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Received Dec. 1, 1798.]

MY LORD, Bath, Nov. 27, 1798.

I have had the honour of receiving your Excellency's letter of the 19th of this month, informing me that His Majesty's Ministers are induced, by the unfortunate situation of Ireland, to think seriously of an Union between the two kingdoms. And your Excellency is pleased to add that in the event of the measure ultimately taking place, you shall hope to derive assistance from me. This being the first intimation I have had of such an intention being entertained seriously, and being quite ignorant of the terms and conditions intended to be offered, it is impossible for me to form such an opinion upon this very great and complicated subject, full of difficulty, and I fear of danger, to both kingdoms, as could enable me with any degree of propriety, to say at this time what part ought to be taken by a man, determined to promote as far as he is able what shall appear to him to be the true interests of his country. My past conduct is the best proof I can give of my wishes to support His Majesty's Government at all times, and I assure your Excellency with great truth, that I am as much disposed to afford every assistance in my power to your Excellency's administration, as I was to those of your Excellency's predecessors.

I have the honour, &c.,

C. CASHELL.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret.] Received Dec. 1, 1798.

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, Nov. 27, 1798.

Lord Castlereagh having informed Mr. Wickham that a writ has been moved for in the Court of King's Bench to bring up Moore,[1] the Rebel President of the Connaught Directory, now confined at Castlebar, and that it was intended to make a special return to the writ, His Majesty's confidential servants are particularly anxious in a matter of such moment involving questions of great delicacy, the discussion of which may materially affect the principles of the Common Law, and the maxims of state policy common to both countries, that your Excellency should communicate to me as soon as possible, as well the opinion which your Excellency and those whom you may have consulted on this occasion shall have formed on the whole subject, as the line of conduct you have determined to pursue, should the special return that it shall be thought advisable to make be overruled by the Court.

Your Excellency will, no doubt, feel the necessity of our receiving early information on this point, so as that the whole subject may be well and thoroughly considered by His Majesty's law officers here, as well as by his more confidential servants, and that your Excellency may receive instructions from His Majesty founded on their deliberate and united opinion; and particularly that we may be enabled to form a judgment how far, with relation to this particular affair, it may be for His Majesty's interests that the Parliament of Ireland should be assembled at an earlier period than had been hitherto proposed and intended. I have the honour, &c.,

PORTLAND.

LORD LONGUEVILLE[2] TO ALEXANDER MARSDEN, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR, Dec. 3, 1798.

When Lord W. was Lord-Lieutenant, the storekeeper of

[1] John Moore, eldest son of John Moore, Esq., of Moore Hall. He joined the French at Castlebar, and was made Colonel by Humbert, and also President of the Directory of Connaught, Aug. 31, in which capacity he issued paper money to a considerable extent, in the shape of assignats, "In the name of the French Government good for half a guinea; to be raised on the province of Connaught." His trial was stopped by the Writ of Habeas Corpus, and he appears to have died before any further steps could be taken. His father, who had been a merchant at Malaga, had an estate of about 2000*l.* a-year.

[2] Richard, 1st and only Lord Longueville, so created Oct. 5, 1795, and promoted to the Viscounty Dec. 29, 1800, b. Oct. 9, 1734, d. May 23, 1811; m. Nov. 8, 1756, Margaret, dau. of Richard White, Esq., who was grandfather to Richard, 1st Earl of Bantry. M.P. for Charleville, Clognakilty, Cork city, Baltimore, and Cork city again, from 1761 till made a Peer. He had considerable parliamentary influence, of which he made an unscrupulous use in obtaining patronage and effecting jobs. This and a few more of his letters have been selected from a large collection preserved in the Castle at Dublin, mostly addressed to Mr. Kippax, then Chief Clerk in the Secretary's Department.

Cork (Mr. Strettle)[1] was ill in a decline and went to Lisbon to recover. He wanted to sell the office for a trifle. I wrote to Lord Hobart; he answered me that selling was not in the practice of the Lord-Lieutenant or of him, but whenever the storekeeper died I should have the nomination of the office; and he adds, by way of consolation, that he was assured he could not recover. Mr. Strettle died at Bristol Wells lately. I now understand that application was often made to Lord Camden for leave to sell, which he repeatedly refused unless my concurrence was obtained; but on his departure, Mr. Lees[2] contrived to have it sold. Mr. Shaw[3] bought it for 1950*l.*, but in another name, which is put into the commission, as Mr. Shaw is collector.

Now I have a positive and sacred promise, under the Secretary of State's letter, for this office whenever it became vacant; but on Lord Camden's departure this engagement was broken, though he religiously adhered to it until going away, for Mr. Shaw told me so. It was Lees and Lord Shannon got the infamous act transacted.

I had obtained the promise for my opposition to Lord Shannon, in Lord W. and the M. of B.'s Government—I was doubly a purchaser; I had given a pecuniary as well as a parliamentary consideration for the patronage of Cork. Every man knows it cost me twenty thousand pounds at Cork to support His Majesty's measures and Ministers during and since the Regency business, and the only compensation I received was the patronage of that district: it was held inviolate to me until now. Mr. Pelham was not favourable to us who supported His Majesty during his illness, but positive engagements are not to be infringed upon, and I have Lord Hobart's letter that the appointment to succeed Mr. Strettle as storekeeper should be mine.

I have written to Lord Castlereagh to lay the transaction before the Lord-Lieutenant. I wait for his answer to write to Lord W., Lord Hobart, and Mr. Pitt, who has guaranteed the patronage so far to me that if the conveniency of Government was under the necessity of encroaching on it, I should have an equivalent elsewhere.

I must now request you to see Lord Castlereagh on this business.

I have suffered by the money I paid for Mallow, though I undertook it at Lord H.'s wish and the Lord-Lieutenant's desires, yet though it cost me half as much as Cork to nominate the

[1] Robert Strettle, storekeeper, appointed June 1780, d. June 1798.

[2] John Lees, created a Bart., June 30, 1804, b. Feb. 14, 1739, d. Sept. 1811; m. Oct. 20, 1766, Mary, dau. of Robert Cathcart, Esq., of Glandusk. After serving some time in the army, he came to Ireland as Private Secretary to Lord Townshend; was afterwards Secretary at War, and ultimately Secretary to the Post-office from 1784 till his death. He was father to the well-known Sir Harcourt Lees.

[3] Bernard Shaw, made Collector of Customs at Cork, June 24, 1796. A violent dispute between him and Mr. Todd Jones, an ex-M.P. and thorough demagogue, came afterwards before the Courts of Law and Parliament. See Hansard's Debates, Dec. 1805.

members and support the present Ministry, yet Lord Shannon got the vacant barrackmaster from Mr. Pelham.

I clearly see Lord Shannon will do all in his power to encroach on the engagements of Government to me; he is at the bottom of all this business, but a Government of power and justice will support me.

Most sincerely yours,

LONGUEVILLE.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 4, 1798.

The soldiers of the Bedfordshire have unanimously agreed to stay without restriction in point of time, and I hope, before the packet sails, to receive favourable accounts from the Suffolk and Worcestershire; the latter, however, have been worse accommodated than any of the regiments of English militia, and would be more excusable than the others if they expressed an impatience to return; but if the present inconvenience of their quarters (which we are taking every means to remedy) does not operate upon their minds, I think I can venture to answer that none of the other supposed grievances which have been stated to your Grace, will have the smallest effect.

I confidently expect good reports from the regiments in the south, whose quarters in general are excellent. The letter which I enclose from my friend Lord Dorchester, who is placed in the worst station of the whole, is very encouraging.

We have now nearly, I trust, escaped a danger which might have produced the most serious convulsions in this country, and I am still of opinion that we encountered it unnecessarily.

I should do great injustice to Sir John Blaquiere if I did not inform your Grace that we are much indebted to his firm and able conduct at the moment, and perhaps a little to his former hospitality, for our success with the Leicestershire and South Lincoln regiments, which contributed very essentially to give a favourable turn to the whole business, and I earnestly request that your Grace will have the goodness to mention Sir John Blaquiere's services on this important occasion to His Majesty.

Lord Carleton was with me on Sunday, and gave his sentiments very decidedly against the measure of Union, and Lord Pery, since my interview with him, has spoken in the same strain to Lord Castlereagh. There will probably be a good deal of violence at the meeting of the Lawyers' corps to-morrow; but the Attorney-General, who is rather of a sanguine turn, thinks he shall make a good battle.

Lord Castlereagh will set out for London on Friday, and we may perhaps by that time be able to form some judgement of the degree of opposition that may be expected in the capital, where the measure of Union will have the most formidable enemies.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Lord Castlereagh's letter to the Duke of Portland, November 30, shows the apprehensions entertained by the former, that some very intemperate course would be pursued by the corps of yeomanry, called the "Lawyers' Infantry Corps," commanded by Mr. Saurin, and composed of members of every branch of that profession. Nor was this alarm ill founded, for on that very day Mr. Saurin issued the following order:—

"Nov. 30, 1798.

"LAWYERS' INFANTRY.—The Corps is ordered to parade Sunday next at 12 at noon, at the new Court, in the new Regimentals. A punctual attendance is requested, as business of the utmost importance is to be transacted.

"(Signed) STEWART KING, Adjutant."

So many members of the corps expressed their disapprobation of the unconstitutional course of meeting as a military body for the discussion of political matters, that Mr. Saurin felt himself compelled to revoke his previous order:—

"Saturday, Dec. 1.

"The Parade is hereby postponed. The Barristers[1] are to attend at Chancery Chambers at 3 P.M. on business of the utmost importance."

(Signed as before.)

The result of this meeting is mentioned in the following letter:—

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Phœnix Park, Dec. 5, 1798.

Since I last had the honour of addressing your Grace on the subject of the Union, I have had an opportunity of extending my communications with individuals, and the general result enables me to confirm the opinion I had previously stated to your Grace, that the prevailing disposition among those with whom I have had conversation, is to entertain the question dispassionately, and to rest their decision upon the merits of the arrangements when detailed, rather than to reject the principle of the measure.

The opponents of the measure are desirous to prevent the discussion of the subject, and leave no means untried to commit the public in the first instance against the measure as subversive of the constitution, and as such not to be entertained. Pains have been

[1] Attorneys were included in the first notice.

taken to represent an acquiescence in its principle as a violation of the oath of a yeoman, in which he swears to support and maintain the "constitution of this kingdom as by law established."

The Bar have been most forward in their opposition, and have been this day assembled as a corps, it is understood, with an intention of taking up the question. Should that learned body be so intemperate as to set an example to the yeomanry at large, unconstitutional in the extreme, and dangerous to the public safety, I shall feel myself called on, in the outset, to meet this attempt to overawe the King's Government and the Legislature, with decision. . . .

I trust that the Speaker and Sir John Parnell will not have left London before Lord Castlereagh's arrival, as I consider it highly important that he should have an opportunity of hearing them state their opinions before the King's Ministers on the question. Some of the King's Irish servants appear to be amongst the most impracticable in their opinions, and I feel confident that your Grace will leave no means untried to impress these gentlemen more favourably before their return to this kingdom.

I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

P.S.—I am happy to inform your Grace that the good sense of the Bar has prevailed, it being the decided opinion of the majority that any deliberation on the question, or political measures, was highly criminal. A general Bar meeting is summoned, I understand, for Sunday next.

SUGGESTIONS OF THE LORD-LIEUTENANT AS TO THE REPRESENTATION OF IRELAND.

[No date. Probably Dec. 7.]

The Duke of Portland, in his despatch of the 25th (Nov. 1798), calls on the Lord-Lieutenant for his suggestions upon the future constitution of the representation for this kingdom, returnable to the Parliament of the Union, making it a preliminary condition that the number of Commoners shall not exceed 100, and that the present franchises in the several counties, cities, and boroughs, shall not be impeached or extinguished.

The Lord-Lieutenant, impressed with the wisdom of avoiding any infringement of chartered right, considers it not incompatible with this principle, and for various reasons highly expedient in the management proposed to follow the Scotch precedents, and to give

a preference to the county representation, as also to that of the great commercial towns over that of the close boroughs.

As no place can aspire to return more than one member, he considers that much real embarrassment would arise to the commercial interests of the trading towns, and well-founded objections be stated on the part of the counties, were they exposed to be left without a representative in the Legislature, specially charged with an attention to their local concerns.

The Lord-Lieutenant therefore proposes that every place now returning two members, should hereafter return but one.

That each county should return one member absolutely to the United Parliament.

That Dublin, Drogheda, Newry, Londonderry, Galway, Limerick, Cork, Waterford, and ,[1] should return one member absolutely.

That the University should return one member absolutely, making in all 42 members. That from the remaining 108 places now returning members, 54 should be chosen, making the gross number of representatives 96; and in order to avoid the cabal of delegating from amongst themselves, as in the case of the Scotch Peers, or of the uncertainty of selection by lot, which would be peculiarly inconvenient to official men, or of incorporation, which would be altogether impracticable in a representation so constituted as ours, that the boroughs should alternately choose a member to the United Parliament, classing them so that the different parts of the kingdom might be proportionally represented in each Parliament.

This would to a certain degree affect the value of borough property, and, it is to be presumed, might proportionally disincline their patrons to a Union. The Lord-Lieutenant is of opinion that means might be found, without resorting to the embarrassing principle of avowed compensation, so as to satisfy the private interests of at least a sufficient number of the individuals affected, to secure the measure against any risk arising from this consideration. At all events, he considers the reasons above stated for giving a preference to the representation of counties and cities to be so weighty, as to counterbalance any additional difficulty in reconciling the individuals to the arrangement.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. W. PITT.

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Dec. 7, 1798.

This letter will be delivered to you by Lord Castlereagh, who has possessed my entire confidence, and who is perfectly well

[1] Sic in orig.

acquainted with my thoughts on every subject that concerns our present situation.

That every man in this most corrupt country should consider the important question before us in no other point of view than as it may be likely to promote his own private objects of ambition or avarice, will not surprise you: but you will, I think, be pleased at the sensible line which the principal Catholics have adopted, and which makes me the less regret the narrow principles by which our present plan of Union is circumscribed. I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 8, 1798.

The inclosed letter from Thomas Grenville will show you that I have done all in my power to maintain his friendship, and I hope that I have succeeded. The particular obligations which I felt to Lord Castlereagh, who had concealed nothing from me, had pointed out all the characters with which I had to deal, and shown me where my predecessor had failed, and had been obliged to sacrifice his own judgement in order to follow worse counsels, by suffering some dangerous persons to gain an ascendancy over him; and in short, his Lordship's excellent character, and truly faithful conduct towards me in every respect, rendered me very unwilling to part with him, especially when it was doubtful who would be the person to succeed him.

The Marquis of B. has behaved very ill to me, but much worse to his country. . . .

I rather think that we shall carry the point of the Union in this country without very great difficulty. The Catholics are for it, and the principal persons amongst them, such as Lords Fingal[1] and Kenmare,[2] and Dr. Troy, titular Archbishop of Dublin, &c., &c., say that they do not wish the question of the Catholics being admitted into the representation to be agitated at this time, as it would render the whole measure more difficult; that they do not think the Irish Parliament capable of entering into a cool and dispassionate consideration of their case, and that they trust that the

[1] Arthur James, 8th Earl of Fingall, K.P., b. Sept. 9, 1759, d. July 30, 1836; m. Dec. 18, 1785, Frances, only dau. of John Donelan, Esq., of Castle Donelan. Created Baron Fingall in England June 20, 1831.

[2] Sir Valentine Browne, 6th Baronet, b. Jan. 1754, d. Oct. 3, 1812; m. 1st, July 7, 1777, Charlotte, dau. of Henry, 11th Viscount Dillon; 2nd, Aug. 24, 1785, Mary, dau. of Michael Aylmer, Esq., of Lyons. He claimed to be 5th Viscount Kenmare, which title had been conferred on his ancestor by James II. after his abdication, and therefore never allowed. But he was created Viscount Kenmare Feb. 12, 1798, and made Earl of Kenmare December 29, 1800.

United Parliament will, at a proper time, allow them every privilege that may be consistent with the Protestant establishment. You will easily conceive that this sensible and moderate conduct on their part has greatly relieved my mind.

Nightingall tells me that you agree in thinking that Colonel Littlehales will be a very proper person for Taylor's situation, and I think, all things considered, he will be likely to answer my purpose. I am much pleased at Nightingall's going with Maitland, and I think he really will turn out well, and make a figure in his profession.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THOMAS GRENVILLE, ESQ., TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY DEAR LORD, Charles Street, Nov. 27, 1798.

I delay not a moment to acknowledge your letter of the 21st instant, and have no difficulty to express myself without any reserve to you upon the subject of it, though I am almost deterred from doing so by the reflection on the very important business which must so entirely occupy your time and attention.

The day after that on which you had begun your journey to Ireland, General Ross called upon me with an intimation which I understood to be made to me at your particular request and desire, that, in case of Mr. Pelham's not returning to Ireland, I would accept the situation of Secretary there. My answer was to express how much I felt flattered by such a mark of your good opinion, how reluctant I had always been at former times to that employment, but how much I was impressed with that sense of public duty which in times like the present, so powerfully pressed upon every individual: and I further added, that when Mr. Pelham's intentions should be more known, would naturally be the proper time for an answer from me. The same wish was expressed to me on the part of Mr. Pitt, by Lord Grenville, at the same time, and my answer to him was to the same effect. It is perfectly true that at three different periods of my life I had refused to accept that office,[1] and had refused it to the solicitations of those who both in blood and friendship had the strongest claims upon me; but the gloomy prospect of affairs, the painful and arduous task which you describe as attaching at the present moment to that situation in

[1] The office of Chief Secretary in Ireland was offered to Mr. Grenville by his brother, Lord Temple, when he went to Ireland in 1782; again in 1787, when he returned as Lord Buckingham; and by Lord Fitzwilliam in 1795.

Ireland, are exactly the circumstances which did in my mind leave no option to those whose services could in any degree have now been thought useful; and I am not the less confident in urging this opinion to you, as having governed my conduct, when I with pleasure recollect how much it has distinguished yours. Nothing further remains for me to trouble you with upon the present subject, than to express to you my best thanks for the very flattering opinion which you are so good as to entertain of me, and which I should have much indeed regretted to have in any degree forfeited on my part. With the best and sincerest wishes that your Government in Ireland may succeed for the public safety, and for your own good fame, allow me to subscribe myself, with great esteem and regard,

My dear Lord,

Your most faithful and obedient servant,

THOMAS GRENVILLE.

LORD LONGUEVILLE TO CHARLES BERKELEY KIPPAX,[1] ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR, Dec. 8, 1798.

Many thanks to you for the trouble you have taken as to the house. A house would be preferred to lodgings; but the prices are high, and Mrs. White[2] likes a cheap house, and not to be bound but by the month or week.

I got Hartnell out: he and his friend the priest waited on me this day, *and desired I would remit* the enclosed bank-notes for your trouble.

They deem it too little; but as the man was a year in jail, and it cost him two guineas a-week, he is not at present in great plumage.

Ever yours,

L.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 10, 1798.

I received the honour of your Grace's letter of the 27th of November desiring I would communicate to your Grace as

[1] Charles Berkeley Kippax, Clerk in the Civil Department, Chief Secretary's Office, received at the Union an allowance of 121*l.* 14*s.* 3*d.* per annum for life, as compensation for fees extinguished; d. Jan. 6, 1802. Lord Longueville often wrote to him on various subjects; his usual business seems to have been to buy snuff for Lady Longueville, and lottery-tickets for the whole family.

[2] Frances Jane, dau. of Richard Hedges Eyre, Esq., d. 1816; m. 1760, Simon White, Esq. Their son Richard was created Lord Bantry March 31, 1797.

well the opinion of those whom I should consult, as to the line of conduct I should pursue respecting the writ of Habeas Corpus moved for in the Court of King's Bench, to bring up Moore, the Rebel President of the Connaught Directory, now confined at Castlebar, should the special return be overruled by the Court.

In answer to your Grace, I am to acquaint you that at the time the writ in Moore's case was originally moved, the state of the County Mayo was much disturbed, and many rebels were then out in arms, and his transmission to Dublin was liable to rescue; in consequence whereof His Majesty's law servants advised that until Moore could be conveniently brought up, a special return should be made stating "that he had been taken a prisoner by His Majesty's forces at Castlebar, where he was found with a commission in his possession from the commander of the French invading army, under which commission he had acted and exercised authority under the enemy, being at war with our Sovereign Lord the King: that he had continued so to act until he was made a prisoner, and that he still continued a prisoner to His Majesty's forces, and that in the then state of the county he could not be with safety conveyed to Dublin without a large military force."

Such was the return suggested at the close of the term; but the writ of Habeas Corpus has not, and probably will not be served, as the County of Mayo has been since reduced to a state of peace, and it is intended to bring Moore to trial before the civil power at the ensuing Assizes, and until that period he will be confined by a legal warrant.

Your Grace will therefore observe that under the circumstances I have stated, no question will arise in the case of Moore.

As to the delay of his trial, it arose from the peculiar circumstances that Lieut.-Colonel Crawford's presence was necessary to convict him, and at the time his trial was first ordered, the alarm of an attack on the south took place, whither I thought it right to despatch Lieut.-Colonel Crawford to act under Lieut.-General Lake, and the Lieut.-Colonel was there detained for a considerable time.

His Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor General have stated to me that they have thought it their duty, under all the difficulties of clashing jurisdictions, not to involve the executive power and the courts of law in any embarrassment on questions that might affect the principles of the Common Law; and this was the motive that induced their advising an obedience to the writ of Habeas Corpus issued in Jones's case. From the same motive they recommend an obedience to any writ of Habeas Corpus that may be served on the person having the custody of Moore.

They also suggest the necessity of an Indemnity Bill as soon as Parliament meets, and also the expediency of legalizing sentences of banishment hitherto pronounced by courts-martial and approved by me, as was done in the last Session.

As to proceedings by martial law which have been hitherto found necessary, or may unfortunately be found so in future emergencies, the Attorney and Solicitor General do not offer any opinion on the course to be taken in case General Officers should be served with writs of Habeas Corpus to hand over to the civil power rebels taken in arms, or traitors made captives among the forces of an invading enemy, but they wish that on reference to the law officers and servants of the Crown in both countries, some line of conduct should be agreed upon to meet the cases which may arise.

Such being the opinion of the Attorney and Solicitor General, I beg leave to state to your Grace that the country at present is in such a situation as will admit of civil trials to proceed as in ordinary times, except perhaps in the counties of Wicklow and Wexford; but that the peace of the country in general can by no means be left to the mere protection of the civil power, that military stations, guards, and patrols are in numerous districts necessary for the protection of the inhabitants from outrage, that many gangs of banditti infest different parts, and that the summary punishment of such banditti by martial law is clamorously called for.

If, therefore, the country continues in this state, which neither fully admits the continuance of martial law, and at the same time requires in certain districts summary trials and military protection, I am to suggest whether some legislative measure ought not to be proposed to obviate our difficulties. At the same time I must apprise your Grace that if the measure of an Union with Great Britain is to be brought forward, the utmost jealousy may be expected in Parliament with regard to any measure which is calculated to increase the power of the Executive Government.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The difficulties alluded to in the two preceding letters arose from the necessary interruption of the ordinary course of justice, during those months when the rebellion was at its height. It was absolutely necessary to make an impression upon the populace of Ireland by severe and immediate punishment, and no ordinary

Court of Law could have proceeded with the requisite dispatch: nor would any number of Courts which could have sat at one time, have been sufficient to meet the exigencies of the case. There was besides much reason to fear, that some individuals at least out of every jury would have been tampered with, or have been influenced by private feelings to give verdicts without any regard to real justice.

These circumstances rendered courts-martial the only effectual tribunals; and they were held in every district for the trial of rebels, apprehended in almost each case by the military, and against whom the witnesses were generally soldiers.

The sentences pronounced were always submitted for approval to Lord Cornwallis, and although he mitigated their severity whenever he could do so with propriety, the punishment of death was inflicted in very many cases. Between the landing of the French and February 1799, 380 persons had been tried by courts-martial —131 capitally convicted, and 90 executed. Yet the number of executions fell far short of what the "loyal party" expected and desired. Many persons in England as well as in Ireland, who were considered mild and temperate in their views, severely censured what they termed a "ruinous system of lenity:" nor was the British Government quite free from a participation in such feelings.

Various despatches and private letters contain hints as to the danger of sparing so many who had been guilty of atrocious crimes; and the pardon already mentioned, as granted to the 78 state-prisoners even upon the stringent conditions enforced, was pronounced to be at best an act of dubious policy. Lord Cornwallis was not however deterred from following a course which he considered to be at once the most expedient and humane. When the surrender of the French, and the vigorous measures of Government, had put an end to open rebellion except in a few of the mountainous districts, a great and important question arose, as to the disposal of the large number of prisoners remaining in confinement.

The Judges being now able to resume the regular circuits, required all prisoners to be delivered over to the civil power. The military authorities, in whose hands the captured rebels almost invariably were, resisted these demands, and, in order to evade them, the prisoner was often transferred from the charge of one military officer to that of another, or removed into a district still professedly under martial law. The friends of the prisoners, who thought, and justly thought, that they stood a better chance of acquittal

by jurors open to influences which could not be exercised on members of a court-martial, sued out writs of Habeas Corpus, compliance with which was insisted upon, sometimes in very peremptory terms, by the Judge. The military authorities, at a loss how to act, wrote to the Castle for instructions; and at the same time the Judges wrote to complain, that the illegal detention of prisoners by the military rendered it impossible for them to fulfil their duty of delivering the gaol.

There is extant a strong but temperate letter, dated October 25th, from Judge Downes;[1] who for the information of the Lord-Lieutenant, details facts which had occurred at the Assizes, opened at Waterford ten days previously. He stated, that six prisoners, who had been for several months in Waterford gaol, were (one about an hour before the Judge reached Waterford, the others after the Assizes had commenced,) removed by order of the General commanding the district, under a military guard to the Market House, in order to prevent their cases being inquired into by the Court. The prisoners by their counsel petitioned to be brought up for trial; and the gaoler, furnished by the Judge with proper authority, demanded each of them, but the military officer refused to give them up without an order from the General. In the case of one prisoner only, Richard Sanders, was the order of the Court obeyed: he was brought up for trial, and committed to the custody of the Sheriff: his counsel moved to have him discharged by proclamation, but as it clearly appeared that he had been committed under the Insurrection Act, he was left in custody.

Judge Downes, finding it impossible to proceed further with the other prisoners, adjourned the Assizes to December 3rd, and wrote to inform the Lord-Lieutenant of the circumstances which had prevented his delivering the gaol according to law. He then writes: "I lament much that this unfortunate clashing of the civil and military authorities has occurred, but consider it impossible for me legally to pass unnoticed the petitions and affidavits shortly alluded to; or not to endeavour to have the causes of imprisonment and detention of so many of the King's subjects legally enquired into."

The Judge, after referring to the mischief likely to arise from such opposition between the civil and military powers, concluded his long letter in these terms:—"The law cannot appear to the

[1] Mr. Justice Downes, b. March, 1756, d. March 2, 1826, unm. He was raised to the Bench Feb. 14, 1792, and, on the death of Lord Kilwarden, made Chief Justice of the King's Bench. He resigned in 1822, on a pension of 3000*l.* a-year, and was created Baron Downes Dec. 10 in that year, with remainder to his nephew, General Sir Ulysses Burgh, now 2nd Lord Downes.

public to be weak, without losing that respect which it ought to have with the people; especially if they shall feel only its terrors, and shall believe that it is not strong enough to extend benefits to them. I entreat your Lordship,[1] that I may not be considered as bringing any accusation against the Government or any military officer, but accounting to his Excellency for not having executed the commissions I carried, to the extent which the duties they imposed, and the powers they gave, seemed to me to require; and in the humble hope that his Excellency's wisdom may prevent hereafter acts likely to ensue if the civil and military authorities shall be permitted to clash, and direct such proceedings with respect to the prisoners I have named, as may be conformable to law and justice." The answer to this communication has not been found.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 12, 1798.

I have received your letter dated the 7th, and am very glad that the decision of the Board has been so favourable to poor Mrs. Caddy.[2]

It is rather distressing to me to be obliged to decide on Apsley's business, for the whole situation is so new and so irregular, and, unless sanctioned by the extraordinary circumstances, so improper, that it cannot be justified. Who could say that the same man should be Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and Master-General of the Ordnance in England? The only plea that can be stated, is that this person was pressed to take the Lord-Lieutenancy much against his will, and that he would rather have compromised to have given up the one, if he could have been permitted to have declined the other—and after all, it can only be considered as a temporary measure, and in great part as a military command. The question then is, whether Apsley during that time should be deprived of the Staff pay; and I confess that, when I consider that although his duties are certainly not laborious, he is obliged constantly to reside in or about town, and that he must have arranged a plan of life more expensive than he would have thought of doing for an office of 300*l.* a-year, and that he is obliged to continue that plan, in order to correspond constantly with me, as well as to be prepared to resume his former duties on the shortest notice, I think he would feel it hard if I was to determine that during the interval he

[1] Lord Castlereagh.

[2] Lieut.-Colonel Caddy having only brevet rank, Mrs. Caddy had no claim for more than the pension of a Captain's widow, but the Board gave her the pension of a Lieut.-Colonel's widow, and an additional allowance for each of her children.

should be deprived of his Staff pay. Do not think that because I am placed in the land of jobs, that I am become a jobber, but, although it may be a weakness, I must own that I am unwilling to pass a sentence, that would be felt as an act of unkindness by a man who has been so long attached to me as Apsley, and who has on all occasions manifested the most disinterested sentiments. I have never heard a word from him on this subject.

Parish holds here a civil office only—viz., Gentleman of the Chamber—and as there are now under my command in this country, three brigades and a troop of British artillery, there can be no question about him, and I am sure that he has saved more than fifty times his pay to the public.

The opposition to the Union increases daily in and about Dublin, and I am afraid from conversations which I have held with persons much connected with them, that I was too sanguine when I hoped for the good inclinations of the Catholics. Their disposition is so completely alienated from the British Government, that I believe they would even be tempted to join with their bitterest enemies, the Protestants of Ireland, if they thought that measure would lead to a total separation of the two countries. My thoughts may be more gloomy as a black north-east wind is blowing with great violence, and darkening the hemisphere; but I think from the folly, obstinacy, and gross corruption which pervade every corner of this island, that it is impossible that it can be saved from destruction. I tremble likewise for the spirit of enterprise which prevails on your side of the water, without troops, and in defiance of the seasons.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret.]

MY LORD, Whitehall, Dec. 12, 1798, 9 P.M.

. . . I cannot close this letter without assuring you, on the part of His Majesty's confidential servants, of their fullest approbation of the conduct you had determined to hold towards the Lawyers' Corps, had not their good sense very fortunately rendered it unnecessary; a circumstance upon which I very sincerely congratulate you, and concur with you in hoping may be productive of all the good effects you are disposed to expect from it.

I have the honour, &c.,

PORTLAND.

LORD LONGUEVILLE TO CHARLES BERKELEY KIPPAX, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR, Dec. 14, 1798.

I never felt myself injured so sensibly as by the late transaction. I have a positive grant of the office Mr. Strettle enjoyed whenever he died, under Lord Hobart's hand; Lord Shannon knew it, and yet he has been the person who has made Government act so meanly and unjustly, so Lord Castlereagh states, to me. Now I have written to Mr. Pitt and Lord W. to London, and two letters to Lord Castlereagh there, according to your advice; I shall wait the consequence with impatience.

I have stated that thief Pelham's misconduct to me in full terms to them all, and dwelt much on his giving Purefoy's[1] employment away without the promised equivalent elsewhere for the infringement of the engagement at Cork. Mr. Cooke is the man who opposes me, and, to the utmost of his power, serves Lord Shannon. I am afraid my letters to Lord Castlereagh may be stopped in Dublin, though they are directed to London. The Chancellor is the person who has made Cooke so violent and active for Lord Shannon. Lord Castlereagh in his letter to me knows nothing of the business, and he confounds it with Harrison's,[2] which he says is ordered. No Harrison appears, or any man for him. I wish you would appear for him and get it finished.

Now Strettle's office was given to me when he went to Lisbon given over. On his return Mr. Shaw gave him 1950*l.* for to appoint him deputy. He took chance, through Lees, to get the name of a brother inserted in the room of Strettle's. He failed unless I agreed to refund him. He then agreed with Mr. Harding,[3] a friend of Lord Shannon, and he allows Mr. Harding 200*l.* a year for his name and doing duty. On Harding's first application Lord Shannon wrote to him that the thing was impossible, as it was engaged to me, and desired him to think no more of it. On Lord Camden's departure, Lord Shannon wrote to Harding that he had contrived to get it for him, and get him appointed in the room of Strettle, who had nothing to say to the office, having sold all his right for 1950*l.* to Shaw. My letter from Lord Hobart states that whenever Strettle died I should have the employment for my friend. Of course I had no claim until his death, nor Government any knowledge of the pecuniary dealing. The office is now 1000*l.* a-year; it has increased by the war, as the merchants have not

[1] William P. Purefoy, Surveyor of Stores, appointed Nov. 1776, d. July, 1797.

[2] James Harrison, Port Surveyor, appointed June, 1799, d. Sept. 1, 1844.

[3] Thomas Harding, Storekeeper, appointed July, 1798, d. Dec. 16, 1823.

money to pay the duties, they store them, and their own cellars are made the stores, for which indulgence they pay most liberally. Lord Shannon has not acted as I expected; I have found the old adage true, "a reconciled friend is a double enemy." However, Government and that Mr. Pelham are more to blame than he is, for I well know he, Lord Shannon, will take all he can from the Government, and he cares not what scrape he brings them into.

Send me two new almanacks of different kinds, and anything new for Christmas.

What is become of Harrison? On the 4th of July, 1797, Lord Camden gave me Davis's[1] office for him. Davis recovered, and Lord Camden wrote to me that he would put Harrison into the office before he went away. Davis agreed, and now on the 14th of December, 1798, it remains uncompleted, and no account of Harrison, though I have often wrote to him.

Most truly yours,

LONGUEVILLE.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret and confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 15, 1798.

Your Grace will probably have seen in the papers an account of the violence which disgraced the meeting of the barristers,[2] and of the miserable figure which the friends of Union made on a division of 32 against 162.

The bankers and merchants are to meet on Tuesday next, and I do not expect a more favourable division on that occasion. In point of indecency of manners and language they cannot surpass the gentlemen of the learned profession.

Our reports of the reception of the measure in the North are not favourable, especially about Belfast, and the principal Catholics about Dublin begin to hold a much less sanguine language about

[1] Henry Davis, Port Surveyor, appointed Feb., d. June, 1799.

[2] The Union was violently opposed by almost all the barristers, except such as then held office under the Crown, or were in expectation of preferment. Of the 32 that composed the minority at this meeting, all but 5 had before the close of 1803 obtained their reward. Amongst them were numbered 5 Judges (Daly, Johnson, M'Clelland, Smith, and Torrens), 16 County Judges, 2 Officers in Chancery, 3 Commissioners of Bankrupts, and 1 Commissioner for the Board of Compensation. Some of the opponents of the Union used language little less than treasonable, but they so altered their tone that in a short time they obtained, what their legal talents fully entitled them to, the highest honours in their profession. Of these, Mr. Saurin has already been mentioned; Mr. Plunket was appointed Solicitor-General in 1803, and ultimately Chancellor; Mr. Bushe, Solicitor-General in 1805, and afterwards Chief Justice of the King's Bench.

the probable conduct of their brethren, and are disposed to think that, in this part of the kingdom at least, the greater number of them will join in the opposition to the Union.

From the above statement your Grace will see that violent convulsions may be expected in the progress of this business, which cannot be carried through Parliament without allowing on both sides of the water much time for deliberation and arrangement.

The necessity of keeping a considerable number of British troops here is obvious, and I should recommend that every means might be taken to induce some regiments of English militia to relieve those which are now serving in Ireland. But if that cannot be accomplished, I must caution your Grace against sending over as British troops, the corps of Scotch and English Fencibles which officers are now raising in this country.

I have understood that a memorial will be immediately preferred by the officers of the Sutherland Regiment of Fencibles, soliciting to be sent back to Scotland, and I shall be under the disagreeable necessity of consenting to a measure, by which a reduction of 1000 men takes place in that part of the force serving in this kingdom upon which I could, in every event, depend.

I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 21, 1798.

Some circumstances of importance have arisen since my last communication to your Grace, which render it necessary for me to lose no time in reporting to your Grace generally the information I have received.

It appears that in the counties of Antrim and Down several robberies and assassinations have recently happened. Meetings have been privately convened by the disaffected, and every measure pursued to inflame the minds of the people to acts of outrage and violence. Timber has been cut down in many parts, and carried away for the purpose of making pike-handles, and it is further stated to be the intention of many evil disposed persons to rise.

To add to this unfavourable prospect, there is scarcely a doubt but that nocturnal meetings of seditious people are regularly held in this metropolis, and that the seeds of rebellion are again spreading to an alarming height in many counties of this kingdom.

In the counties of Carlow, Kildare, Wicklow, and Wexford, there is every appearance, as I am informed, of an intended insurrection. In Tipperary, it is stated, that nightly committees are held, and robberies and murders are lately become more frequent.

By some I am apprised that a general commotion and tumult is to take place in Dublin and its vicinity on St. John's Day, by others on Christmas Eve. I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MOST REV. DR. TROY TO ALEXANDER MARSDEN, ESQ.

DEAR SIR, North King Street, Dublin, Dec. 24, 1798.

Rev. B. Murphy has returned the pass which you granted at my request for the reasons he assigns in his letter to me of this date which I enclose. You will observes he stiles me *Lord*.[1] I do not assume that title, or do I wish to be addressed under it, but I cannot hinder persons from miscalling me. I shall expect your instructions respecting the enclosed, and have the honour to remain, with compliments to Mr. Cooke,

Dear Sir, your faithful and humble servant,

J. T. TROY.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Received Dec. 24.]

MY LORD, Whitehall, Dec. 21, 1798.

. . . The King's servants are of opinion that not a moment should be lost in authorising and desiring your Excellency to state without delay to all the persons with whom you may have communications on the subject of the Union, that His Majesty's Government is determined to press that measure, as essential to the well-being of both countries, and particularly to the security and peace of Ireland, as dependent on its connection with Great Britain; that this object will now be urged to the utmost, and will even in the case, if it should happen, of any present failure, be renewed on every occasion until it succeeds, and that the conduct of individuals upon this subject will be considered as the test of their disposition to support the King's Government. . . .

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

[1] This letter is printed to show that the Roman Catholic prelates of those days disclaimed all titles of honour, and signed without adding any episcopal mark.

Marquis Cornwallis to the Duke of Portland.

[Secret.]

My dear Lord, Dublin Castle, Dec. 24, 1798.

The city and county of Dublin have for some short time past been in a state of inquietude and disturbance for which it is not easy to account. Nightly meetings are frequently held, insurrections are talked of, but no overt act of rebellion has been committed, nor have robberies and murders been more frequent than at any other period since my arrival in this country. The county of Meath is likewise disturbed, and the reports from Major-General Nugent[1] confirm the account which I transmitted to your Grace, Dec. 21st, of the state of Down and Antrim.

The county of Tipperary is much more agitated than it has been, and in Wicklow, Wexford, Kildare, and in most parts of the King's and Queen's Counties, Carlow, and Kilkenny, no Protestant or person suspected to be well affected to Government, can venture to sleep in a house that is not protected by the neighbourhood of the soldiery.

Mayo continues much as it has been since the landing of the French, but Westmeath has rather improved; and of the remaining counties in Ireland it can only be said, that they do not manifest such outward marks of disaffection as the others which I have mentioned above.

Various causes are assigned for the agitation which at present prevails in Dublin and its vicinity: some attribute it to a prophecy of an old saint, which foretold a revolution at the conclusion of this year; others, and with more probability of truth, think that there is an idea among the people that France will now make an effort in their favour, and I should think that it is from this last cause alone that we can account for the late appearances in Down and Antrim, where the predictions of an old Popish saint would not be likely to have much effect.

Under the present circumstances I have thought it advisable to postpone the march of the 2nd and 29th regiments to Cork, to which place the Duke of York wished them to proceed in order to

[1] Major-General, afterwards Field-Marshal, Sir George Nugent, Bart., G.C.B., Colonel 6th Regt., b. June 10, 1757, d. March 11, 1849; m. Nov. 15, 1797, Maria, dau. of Courtland Skinner, Esq., Speaker of the House of Assembly in New Jersey. He was much employed abroad. Governor of Jamaica, 1801 to 1804, and Commander-in-Chief in India from March, 1811, to Dec. 1814. M.P. for Charleville from March, 1800, to the Union, and in England for Buckingham town from 1790 to 1802, for Aylesbury from 1806 to 1812, and again for Buckingham from 1818 to Dec. 1832. His brother, Sir Charles Edmund Nugent, G.C.B., was Admiral of the Fleet, a singular instance of two brothers being at the same time in the highest ranks of their respective professions. They were grandsons of Robert, 1st Earl Nugent.

embark for Portsmouth, and I have stated to His Royal Highness my reasons for thinking that the removal of those regiments at this time, might be attended with dangerous consequences.

The clamour against the Union at Dublin, although exceedingly violent, has not yet reached, or at least affected, the lower orders of people, who hate both the British Government and their Irish rulers, but the latter, I believe, with more acrimony. They are, however, much more disposed to receive evil impressions than good ones, and will, I have no doubt, in a short time, for the sake of mischief, join heartily in the cry of *No Union*.

The meeting of the Catholics on Saturday last[1] broke up, as your Grace will have learned, without coming to any resolution. I had on Friday, as I mentioned to your Grace in my private and secret communication of the 21st instant, a conversation with Mr. Bellew,[2] a lawyer of that persuasion, who was to have made a motion hostile to the measure, and I prevailed upon him not to engage the people of his religion in any hasty steps. But I only spoke to him then as a sectarian, for he had already as a lawyer taken the part of violent opposition. He said to me that he thought the Catholics could not be expected to favour a plan from which they not only were to derive no advantage, but which was to place them in a worse situation than that in which they stood at present; and that if they were to be excluded from Parliament at the Union, he saw no prospect afterwards of their obtaining any participation of the Legislature; and I must confess that I did not find it very easy to answer this argument, as the claims of the Catholics will certainly be much weakened by their incorporation into the mass of British subjects, and the English Test Laws will form a strong barrier against their carrying the point for which they have so long contended.

Your Grace is so well acquainted with the dispositions of the principal persons of this country, that I hardly think it necessary to say, with respect to the probable success of our Parliamentary campaign, that if those who possess the borough interest believe that the British Government are determined to persevere in the measure of the Union, and that they will be able to carry it, they

[1] Dec. 22, at Lord Fingall's. In a letter to the Duke of Portland, dated Dec. 17, Lord Cornwallis speaks of another meeting of about thirty or forty Roman Catholics which took place at Lord Fingall's on the 13th. Lord Kenmare, who was not present, wrote to say he was in favour of the Union; some supported it on financial and commercial grounds. Lord Fingall neuter.

[2] William Bellew, 2nd son of Sir Patrick Bellew, 5th Bart., brother of Sir Edward Bellew, Bart., d. 1835, unm. He was one of the four first Roman Catholics who were called to the bar after the relaxation of the Penal Statutes. In 1801 Lord Cornwallis recommended him for an additional pension, making in all 600*l*.

will afford them the most hearty support; but if they should entertain doubts on either of these points, they will contend for the merit of having been the first to desert.

I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

P.S. I have just received your Grace's letter dated the 21st instant, and shall not fail to hold the language which it recommends, and which you will see, by what I have written above, to be absolutely necessary for our success.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 26, 1798.

I request that you will transmit to Mr. Biddulph[1] the enclosed letter to the Governor-General[2] in Council in Bengal, in which I have stated Mr. Biddulph's conduct towards my Indian Government in such terms as I think he justly merits. As Mr. Biddulph is a Member of Parliament, he may be looked up to by the young men of the settlement, who have chiefly gone abroad at a very early period of life, and consequently very ill-informed in regard to European politics. Nothing could be so prejudicial to themselves as well as to the general good order of the settlement, as to instil into their minds a spirit of party and of opposition to all Government. Liberty and equality is a most pernicious and dangerous doctrine in all parts of the world; but it is particularly ill-suited to the Company's servants in India, who are to thrive by minding their own business, and paying a due regard to the commands of their superiors in the service. I trust, therefore, to Mr. Biddulph's[3] honour that there will be a truce to his politics during his expedition to India.

I have nothing now to tell you from hence. The country, exclusive of the clamour against an Union, is in many places much agitated, and insurrections are talked of; but I trust that we have so good channels of information, that we should be able to

[1] Robert Biddulph, b. March, 1761, d. Aug. 1814; m. Dec. 1801, Charlotte, sister and co-heir of Richard Myddleton, Esq., of Chirk Castle, and in consequence took the name of Myddleton. M.P. for the county of Hereford in the Whig interest from 1796 to 1802. He made his fortune in India, under Lord Cornwallis, in contracts for bullocks.

[2] Marquis Wellesley.

[3] Mr. Biddulph, in acknowledging to General Ross, Jan. 3, 1799, the receipt of Lord Cornwallis's letter, says, "His Lordship's expectation of the most profound silence on my part as to European politics, shall certainly be fulfilled, as the impropriety and impolicy of a different line of conduct would not only disgrace his recommendation, but invalidate my claims."

secure the leaders before anything of a serious nature could take place.

There have, as yet, been no signs of opposition to the Union beyond the city and county of Dublin; but I am told that the Speaker's friends are going to call a meeting in the county of Louth, where his property lies. I have no guess about our strength in Parliament: many will, I have no doubt, lay by in order to join the side which may be most likely to succeed. Your suspicions about the conduct of Vienna are most mortifying; I can never feel any reliance on those German Courts.[1]

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT BROME.

MY DEAR BROME, Phœnix Park, Dec. 27, 1798.

It is possible, in the strange chapter of accidents in this world that it may be of some use to be in possession of the enclosed letter; if not, it may amuse you for a moment to read it, especially if it should come into your hands at a time when it may be snowing as fast as it does now at this place.

I am impatiently expecting a line from Culford to tell me how Jane[2] is going on; but it sometimes happens that with a north-east wind the packets cannot get out of the harbour at Holyhead.

Things go on here in the same melancholy way, rumours still circulate of intended insurrections, which greatly alarm and agitate people; but I believe that the foundations for these reports are either fabricated or greatly exaggerated. I am strongly pressed to use the same coercive means which so totally failed last year, but I cannot be brought to think that flogging and free-quarter will ever prove good opiates.

The violent and factious opposition to the Union continues in full force in and about Dublin, contrary to common sense and the substantial interests of the country, but common sense is not in the habit of operating strongly upon people's minds on this side of

[1] A treaty of alliance between England and Russia was at this time preparing; in fact, it was signed three days after the date of this letter. But Prussia held completely aloof, and fears were entertained that Austria would prove lukewarm. These fears, however, were unfounded, and the following campaign was for some time successful, though the timidity of the Aulic Council so crippled the efforts of the Archduke Charles that the French armies were allowed to escape when they might have been utterly destroyed. The disastrous campaign of Marengo was the consequence.

[2] Jane, eldest dau. of Viscount Brome, b. October 5, 1798.

St. George's Channel, and when the interests of the country and private advantage take opposite sides, the latter is pretty sure of obtaining the victory.

Give my kind love to Lady Louisa, and best compliments to all friends at Culford, and believe me to be,

My dearest Brome,

Your truly affectionate father,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE REV. B. GRISDALE.

DEAR GRISDALE, Dublin, Dec. 27, 1798.

I trust that I need not tell you that it will always give me sincere pleasure to do anything that would be agreeable to you, and to assist any person who is connected with you. It does not at all surprise me that Ross thought that I could, without much difficulty, give an ensigncy to your nephew, as I came over myself so much impressed with the idea that I should have a patronage in that line, that I wrote to some persons who had before applied to me to get them ensigncies, to say that I now hoped to have an opportunity of giving them commissions.

So much however have I been deceived, that I have not had the disposal of one ensign's commission since I have been in Ireland; there are but six regiments, and those are skeletons, on the Irish establishment: they have supernumerary officers in every rank, from the captain downwards, and there are besides, amongst these six regiments, four or five ensigncies (if any should become vacant) mortgaged to pay for the indemnification of adjutancies and quarter-masteries, which had been bought, and were not allowed to be sold.

My general engagements you will naturally suppose to be numerous; but I have four or five that cannot be superseded, and my prospect therefore of being able to serve your nephew must be very doubtful, and certainly very distant; I will however insert his name in my book.

Nothing can be more melancholy and distressing to my feelings than the wretched situation into which I have been forced, at the time that I foolishly flattered myself with quiet retirement and something like happiness; and after all I have no hopes that I shall either gain credit to myself, or render any service to the country.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL HARRIS.

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Dec. 27, 1798.

I have been earnestly requested by his friends in this country to introduce to you Captain Flood[1] of the 51st regiment, which corps, they say, is bound to Madras.

I had my difficulties in India; but they were trifling compared with those which attend the wretched station which has been imposed upon me.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The statements made by Lord Castlereagh induced the Government to alter considerably the original scheme of the Union; and the Duke of Portland, December 24, informed Lord Cornwallis that he thought Lord Castlereagh's plan preferable to the one he had himself suggested in his despatch of November 23, and he foresaw no difficulty in selecting the boroughs to be disfranchised, so as to leave only such a number as would admit of alternate representation. One hundred members, of which Dublin might have two, to be the maximum.

As objections had been taken to the election of Peers for one Parliament only, they might be chosen for life; the Crown, however, reserving the right of creating new Peerages. The Peers not in the House of Lords might sit in the House of Commons, but it would perhaps be advisable to confine them to English seats. The Spiritual Peers to be represented by one Archbishop and three Bishops in rotation.

Some plan to be devised for taking evidence in Ireland in Election Petitions and Local Bills.

Ireland to contribute a fixed proportion to the general revenue.

The Duke of Portland further suggested that on some day—say February 5—an address should be moved in each House expressive of their wish for a Union; and, in accordance with the Scotch precedent, requesting the King to appoint Commissioners to arrange the details.

[1] Captain Frederick Flood, d. at Madras Oct. 1800, only son of Sir Frederick Flood, Bart., M.P., 1812, for the county of Wexford, who, during the Corn-bill riots of 1815, like many other members, was attacked by the mob as he came down to the House, and called upon to state how he should vote. The Editor was under the gallery that night, and heard him, as soon as he could get into the House, describe the manner in which he had been insulted. He wound up the account, amid roars of laughter from the whole House, as may well be believed, with saying, "They asked me my name; I scorned to equivocate, and so I said it was Waters."

CHAPTER XX.

Disposal of the State-prisoners — Popular disposition with respect to the Union — Sketch of the proposed measure — Repugnance of official people — The Earl of Ely — Mr. Saurin — Opening of the Irish Parliament — Debate in the Commons — Defeat of the Government — Proceedings of the Opposition — Riots in Dublin — Sentiments of the Roman Catholics on the Union — Spirit of disaffection — Lord Cornwallis charged with undue lenity — Rebellion Bill passed — Debate on the Maynooth Bill — Military insubordination — Refusal of the Escheatorship of Munster — Government appointments — Narrow escape of the Lord-Lieutenant — Lord Downshire — Irish militia — Proposed employment of Russian troops — Concessions to the Catholics — State of the British forces.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO WILLIAM WICKHAM, ESQ.

[Most Secret.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Jan. 2, 1799.

Already we feel the want, and indeed the absolute necessity, of the *primum mobile*. We cannot give that activity to the press which is requisite. We have good materials amongst the young barristers, but we cannot expect them to waste their time and starve into the bargain.

I know the difficulties, and shall respect them as much as possible, in the extent of our expenditure; but notwithstanding every difficulty, I cannot help most earnestly requesting to receive 5000*l.* in bank-notes by the first messenger.

We propose sending round our emigrants to the river in a revenue cutter, from whence a passage to Hambro' may easily be obtained for them. This appears to expose you much less than their passing through England. I hope it will meet the Duke of Portland's approbation.

I shall trouble his Grace in a post or two with a memorandum about the leading State-prisoners; their removal from hence appears to me of very great consequence. If the difficulties which oppose it in the opinion of Ministers should not be insurmountable, I trust his Grace will endeavour to relieve us from this most inconvenient and dangerous possession.

Ever, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

Mr. Wickham, in reply, conveyed the opinion of the Duke of Portland and Lord Grenville, that, after the circumstances which

attended the arrest of Tandy and his associates at Hamburgh, none of the prisoners could be sent there publicly without the full consent of the Senate, and, even then, not above one or two at a time. But as the Duke of Portland was anxious to remove the difficulties under which the Irish Government laboured, he was ready to adopt the suggestion of confining the leading rebels in Fort George. Some doubt, however, being entertained whether such a step were legal, he thought it might perhaps be necessary to bring in a Bill to sanction the measure.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

Extract. [Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 2, 1799.

. . . The renewed activity of the disaffected has not yet been productive of any open effort. With what immediate view this attempt, which has been very general, was made to set the lower orders again in motion, it is difficult precisely to trace. I have no reason to believe that it was occasioned by any feelings arising out of the question of Union. In the north an idea of co-operation from abroad prevailed, and this expectation may have been connected with the preparations going forward in the Texel.[1]

The Catholics, as a body, still adhere to their reserve on the measure of Union. The very temperate and liberal sentiments at first entertained or expressed by some of that body, were by no means adopted by the Catholics who met at Lord Fingall's,[2] and professed to speak for the party at large. Whether it was their original sentiment to oppose the Union unless their objects were comprehended in it, or whether this disposition was taken up when they observed Government to be either weakly supported or opposed by the Protestants, it is difficult to determine. Certain it is they now hold off, which can only arise either from an original disinclination to the measure, or an expectation that Government will be driven to a compliance with their wishes in order to carry it. What line of conduct they will ultimately adopt, when decidedly convinced that the measure will be persevered in on Protestant principles, I am incapable of judging. I shall endeavour to give them the most favourable impressions, without holding out to them hopes of any relaxation on the part

[1] The Dutch fleet assembled under Admiral Storey; it surrendered to the English fleet under Admiral Mitchell, Aug. 31, in this year.

[2] Thirty-seven of the principal Roman Catholics met at Lord Fingall's, Dec. 13, 1798.

of Government, and shall leave no effort untried to prevent an opposition to the Union being made the measure of that party; as I should much fear, should it be made a Catholic principle to resist the Union, that the favourable sentiments entertained by individuals would give way to the party feeling, and deprive us of our principal strength in the South and West, which could not fail, at least for the present, to prove fatal to the measure.

The clamour against the Union continues in Dublin and its neighbourhood. The county is to assemble on Friday. There can be no doubt of the result.

I do not understand that, as yet, any steps have been taken for calling any other county meetings.

I understand Mr. Saurin was this day employed in soliciting the officers[1] of the different corps of yeomanry in Dublin, to sign a paper stating their determination to lay down their arms in case the measure of Union was brought forward. He was refused by Mr. John Beresford, who expressed his strongest disapprobation of the attempt. I much fear Mr. Saurin's conduct will render it necessary for me to submit, through your Grace, to His Majesty, the indispensable necessity of withdrawing from him those professional distinctions of which his former conduct has rendered him so deserving. . . . I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The portion of the despatch which is omitted, contains only the names of the towns in which the idea of a Union had been rather favourably received—in some with considerable cordiality: Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Wexford, Belfast, Derry, and Newry. Lord Cornwallis also adds that the Orangemen in the North had followed the example of the Dublin lodges, and declined to interfere as a body.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 4, 1799.

I stated some time since to your Grace the very important services which were rendered by Sir John Blaquiere in the transaction respecting the English Militia, and I believe that every

[1] The violence of some of the yeomanry corps was excessive. A few days after the date of this letter Sir William Worthington, commanding the Liberty Rangers, Dublin, ordered his corps to parade the following Monday, Jan. 21, with the King's colour, but, in lieu of the Regimental colour, a standard, on which was inscribed, "For our King and the Constitution of Ireland."

one who was acquainted with the disposition of the Leicestershire and Lincolnshire regiments at that period (which were the first to make their declaration), will admit that it was owing to his manly conduct, and the assistance and encouragement which he gave to the Duke of Rutland in particular, and in a great degree to Col. Sibthorpe,[1] that there is at this moment one regiment of English Militia serving in Ireland.

He has now taken the most fair and unreserved part on the question of the Union, and by the decided language which he has been in the habit of using in the House of Commons, and which I am told has a considerable effect, as well as by the hospitable meetings of Members at his house, he will no doubt be of infinite use to us in the arduous contest in which we are about to engage.

The great object of his wishes is an Irish peerage for Lady Blaquiere, which favour he is particularly desirous to obtain at present, and I am convinced that he will feel the obligation infinitely more if he gets it now, than if he is to wait till those who have contributed to promote the Union may look for consideration.

If your Grace should be inclined to dispose His Majesty to attend to my request in favour of Sir John Blaquiere, I think that his good offices in retaining the English militia may be assigned as a reason for granting the peerage to his family at *this* time, without opening the door to the importunities of other impatient candidates.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 5, 1799.

. . . Since my arrival I have made considerable progress in my communications. The decided language I am enabled to hold has the best effects, but we must nevertheless be prepared for a hard contest. The opposite party take credit (with what degree of accuracy I am not yet able to ascertain) for 113 pledged against the measure in the Commons, amongst whom they reckon two of our Commissioners of Revenue, Col. Wolfe[2] and Mr. G.

[1] Colonel Humphrey Sibthorpe, b. Oct. 3, 1744, d. April 25, 1815; m. July 23, 1777, Susanna, dau. of Richard Ellison, Esq., of Thorne and Seabrook Holme. M.P. for Boston from April, 1777, to March, 1784, and for Lincoln from March, 1800, to July, 1806.

[2] John Wolfe, of Forenaughts, Colonel of the Kildare Militia, b. 1754, d. 1816; m. 1776, Charlotte, dau. of Theobald Wolfe, Esq.,

Knox.[1] The former is to be with me this day, the latter is absent at Bath.

The clamour out-of-doors is principally to be apprehended, as furnishing the members within with a plausible pretext for acting in conformity to their own private feelings. There are two classes of men in Parliament, whom the disasters and sufferings of the country under the present system have but very imperfectly awakened to the necessity of a change, namely, the borough proprietors and the immediate agents of Government: the greater number of these will go with us, but they are reluctantly convinced, are lukewarm in the cause, and, if serious difficulties should arise, would in all probability prove themselves but hollow friends.

Much pains had been taken, and with considerable success, to make it a question of spirit with the young men to oppose the Union. Our principal strength is in the firm determination of the English Government, in the strength of our case in point of argument, and in having a sufficient number of advocates in the House of Commons to keep our ground in the debate. Our sincere adherents, supported by the English Government, I trust, will be sufficiently numerous to make it the interest of others to act with us. At all events they will form a party, which with encouragement (even should the measure now fail, which present appearances do not by any means lead me to apprehend) must sooner or later carry the question.

Lord Kilwarden's fears seem to connect themselves so naturally with Col. Wolfe's supposed opinions, that I cannot but consider them as in some measure political; yet the sentiments of his mind appeared adverse to the existing principle of connexion, and in favour of an Union.

Your Grace will learn with much satisfaction that more mature consideration has altered Lord Carleton's view of the subject, and that he is now (still condemning the time as improper) a declared supporter of the measure.

Lord Bective[2] has written a very handsome letter to the Lord

of Newtown. Nephew to Lord Kilwarden, Commissioner of Revenue from 1792 to 1799, when he was dismissed. M.P. for Kildare County, 1783; Killybegs, 1790; Carlow Borough, Feb. 1798 to the Union. He held the patent office of Registrar of Deeds.

[1] Mr., afterwards Right Hon. George Knox, 4th son of Thomas, 1st Viscount Northland, b. Jan. 14, 1765, d. June 13, 1827; m. 1st, Jan. 27, 1805, Anne, dau. of Sir Robert Staples, Bart.; 2nd, Nov. 27, 1812, Harriet, dau. of Thomas Fortescue, Esq. Commissioner of Revenue from 1793 till he was removed in 1799, but in pursuance of an arrangement made by Lord Cornwallis he was, March 16, 1805, appointed a Lord of the Treasury, which office he held till Feb. 1806. M.P. for Dungannon, 1790; for the University of Dublin from 1797 to 1807.

[2] Thomas, 2nd Earl of Bective, K.P., made Marquis of Headfort Dec. 29, 1800; b. Nov. 18, 1757, d. Oct. 24, 1829; m. Dec. 4, 1778,

Lieutenant, assuring him of his utmost support, and stating that he should consider Ministers as highly criminal, were they to neglect the present opportunity of proposing the measure. His Lordship has three friends in Parliament.

Sir Hercules Langrishe[1] resigns his first opinion, and will not separate from the British Government on a fundamental principle of connection.

I trust your Grace will feel the necessity of having a proper explanation with Lord Ely on the subject of his Peerage before he leaves London, or of authorising the Lord-Lieutenant to assure him of that favour in the event of the measure being carried.

The county meeting[2] has passed strong resolutions. I do not understand that the attendance was very respectable. Mr. Spencer[3] the lawyer took the lead in denying the competence of Parliament to entertain the Question, and was followed by Mr. Leeson,[4] a mad and democratic brother of Lord Miltown's,[5] and supported by an attorney connected with Mr. Curran.[6] It was expected that Mr. Grattan, who landed a few days since, would have taken a part, but he did not attend.

A requisition is handing about this day to the sheriffs to call an aggregate meeting.

I have the honour to enclose to your Grace a short sketch that has been thrown out to feel the public sentiment on the terms. I have not yet found a single objection stated by those to whom I have mentioned them.

The Speaker is expected in the next packet. I have had six

Mary, only dau. and heir of George Quin, Esq., of Quinsborough. One seat for the County of Meath, and two for the Borough of Kells, belonged to him. He sat for Kells from 1776 to 1790; Longford Borough to 1795; and Meath County from Jan. 1795 to Dec. following.

[1] Right Hon. Sir Hercules Langrishe, Bart., so created Jan. 28, 1777; b. 1738, d. Feb. 1811; m. May 31, 1755, Hannah, dau. of Robert Myhill, Esq., of Killarney. He held the various offices of Commissioner of Barracks, of Excise, and Supervisor of Accounts, between 1767 and 1775, then Commissioner of Revenue until 1801. From 1761 till the Union he was M.P. for Knocktopher, a borough of which he was almost the sole proprietor, receiving as compensation 13,862*l.* 12*s.*, whilst Sir George Shee's share was but 1137*l.* 10*s.*

[2] County of Dublin. This meeting was attended by few persons of any consequence. The Sheriff, Alderman Kirkpatrick, was in the chair; the resolutions were moved by Mr. Thomas Baker, of Carduff, and seconded by Sir J. J. W. Jervis; the other speakers were Mr. Rawlins, Mr. Leeson, Mr. Skeys, and Mr. Guinness.

[3] Joshua Spencer, b. about 1760, brother to Gen. Sir Brent Spencer, K.B.; d. 1829. M.P. for Sligo Borough from 1812 to 1815. He was a barrister of some eminence, and seconded the resolutions moved by Mr. Sauris at the Bar meeting.

[4] Hon. Robert Leeson, b. May 18, 1773, d. April 11, 1852; m. 1st, Aug. 17, 1795, Grace, dau. of Michael Head, Esq.; 2nd, Aug. 2, 1834, Harriet, sister of Sir Henry Burke, Bart.

[5] Joseph, 2nd Earl of Miltown, b. Dec. 1730, d. unm., Nov. 27, 1801.

[6] Mr., afterwards the Right Hon. John Philpot Curran, b. July 24, 1750, d. Oct. 14, 1817; m. 1775, Miss Creagh, dau. of Dr. Creagh. Master of the Rolls from 1806 to 1814, when he retired on a pension of 3000*l.* M.P. for Kilbeggan, 1783, and Rathcormack, 1790. His violent temper led him into several duels, in which he was uniformly to blame.

days the start of him: he is looked to by the Opposition as their great champion.

I have the honour, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

UNION.

We hear the following outline of a scheme of Union has been circulated within these few days in the higher circles.

Legislature.

Thirty-two Irish Peers to sit in the Imperial Parliament: twenty-eight Temporal Peers to be elected for life; four Spiritual Peers by rotation. Irish Peers, not elected, may sit in the Imperial House of Commons for British Counties and Boroughs only, as at present. The Crown to retain the power of creating Peers of Ireland, in order to preserve the Peerage from extinction.

The Irish Commoners who are to sit in the Imperial Parliament, not to exceed one hundred: one to be chosen for each county; one for each of the great commercial Cities and Towns. This arrangement would give 42; half of the 108 Boroughs to send one Member each for one Parliament, the other half one Member each for the next Parliament, and so on alternately.

The Capital and Cork might send two Members each: thus the Representation would amount to 98 Members.

Duties and Commerce.

Irish subjects to enjoy at all times the same Commercial Privileges as English. The duties between the two countries to be equalized, regard being had to the temporary protection of the Import manufactures of Ireland.

The present advantages enjoyed by the Linen Manufacture to be secured.

Debts and Revenues.

The Exchequer of Ireland to continue separate; Great Britain to be responsible for her own debt and its reduction; Ireland to be responsible for her own debt and its reduction.

The future expenses of Ireland in war and peace to be in a fixed ratio to the expenses of Great Britain.

When the Revenues of Ireland shall exceed her proportion of expense, the excess to be applied to local purposes. The Taxes producing the excess to be taken off.

WILLIAM WICKHAM, ESQ., TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

[Private and most Secret.]

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, Jan. 7, 1799, 20 m. past 5.

Immediately upon the receipt of your Lordship's letter of the 2nd instant, marked Most Secret, I waited on the Duke of Portland at Burlington House, who, without loss of time, wrote both to Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville on that part of the letter which seemed to press the most, and I have the satisfaction to inform your Lordship that a messenger will be sent off from hence in the course of to-morrow with the remittance[1] particularly required for the present moment, and that the Duke of Portland has every reason to hope that means will soon be found of placing a larger sum at the Lord-Lieutenant's disposal.

Believe me, &c.,

WILLIAM WICKHAM.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO WILLIAM WICKHAM, ESQ.

[Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Jan. 10, 1799.

I have only a moment to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 7th. The *contents* of the messenger's despatches are very interesting. Arrangements with a view to further communications of the same nature will be highly advantageous, and the Duke of Portland may depend on their being carefully applied.

I am, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 11, 1799.

. . . I feel it necessary to inform your Grace that a very unfavourable impression has been made within the two last days against the Union, partly by the arrival of the Speaker, but still more by its being generally circulated and believed in town, that both Lord Downshire and Lord Ely are adverse to the measure. There seems but too much reason to apprehend, from some expressions in a letter of Lord Downshire's to Lord Castlereagh, that his Lordship's opinion is at best unsettled on the subject, and by the inclosed copy of a letter from Lord Ely to a friend here, it is

[1] 5000*l*. The numbers of the notes are still preserved in the State Paper Office.

evident that his support can by no means be relied on. Your Grace will observe that Lord Ely's expressions are verbatim those of the Speaker, Lord Downshire, Lord Cork,[1] &c. It is reported that he means to bring Mr. Luttrell[2] forward, who has been peculiarly active in London against the measure, which, if true, is not only a proof of his Lordship's present sentiments, but of the school[3] in which they have been formed. It appears from his letter that he has been living with the Archbishop of Cashell,[4] from whom he would infallibly receive similar impressions. I need not press upon your Grace's attention the insuperable difficulties, so unexpected and so important a defection as this must occasion in the accomplishment of the measure. It not only transfers 18 votes in the Commons to the Opposition, but strikes a damp among the supporters of the measure which may operate in a fatal extent against us.

In stating these circumstances to your Grace I have most earnestly to entreat that every possible effort may be made on your side of the water to overcome the difficulties of these important characters, and to send us whatever assistance may be collected from thence.

I have already felt it a question of considerable delicacy to decide in what instances and at what period it was expedient to remove persons from office who have either taken a decided line against the measure, or who, without acting publicly, hold a language equally prejudicial to its success, and equally inconsistent with their connexion with Government. In the instance of Mr. J. C. Beresford, whose conduct has been very hostile at many of the Dublin meetings, the difficulty has been peculiarly felt. With a view of impressing our friends with the idea of our being in earnest, his dismissal seemed desirable; on the other hand, as we profess to encourage discussion, and neither to precipitate Parliament or the country on the decision, much less to force it against the public sentiment, there seemed an objection to a very early exercise of Ministerial authority on the inferior servants of the Crown.

[1] Edward, 8th Earl of Cork, K.P., a General; b. Oct. 21, 1767, d. June 29, 1856; m. Oct. 9, 1795, Isabella Henrietta, dau. of William Poyntz, Esq., of Midgham. One seat at Charleville belonged to him. He was the last surviving Peer who had sat both in the Irish and English House of Lords before the Union.

[2] Henry Luttrell, long well known in London society (a natural son of Lord Carhampton), d. unm. Dec. 19, 1851, aged upwards of 80. Author of 'Letters to Julia,' and other similar poems. He was returned in May, 1799, for Clonmines, which he represented till Feb. 1800. He was made Clerk of the Pipe Sept. 1800, and received 879*l.* a-year as compensation. Lord Carhampton was himself a violent Anti-Unionist, but afterwards changed his opinions. See letter of July 2.

[3] The Tottenham family; Lord Ely's paternal relations, who had always vehemently supported the independence of Ireland. Lord Ely was closely connected with the Ponsonbys, and in 1789 held the office of Postmaster-General, jointly with the Right Hon. William Brabazon Ponsonby, afterwards 1st Baron Ponsonby.

[4] The Archbishop ultimately voted for the Union.

I have therefore thought it expedient to proceed in the first instance with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has not been altogether punctual in his engagement with Lord Castlereagh, of being here on the 10th, and not being yet arrived; and shall then proceed according to circumstances, or such directions as I may receive from your Grace, with the inferior members of the Administration.

There certainly is a very strong disinclination to the measure in many of the borough proprietors, and a not less marked repugnance in many of the official people, particularly in those who have been longest in the habits of the current system. The secondary interests of course look to it as the destruction of their authority, and the leading interests as exposing them to fresh contests. These impressions, connected with the natural expectation which every individual forms of deriving some personal advantage by the change, make its accomplishment full of difficulty. The steady purpose of the English Government, and the natural authority of the State in this kingdom, will counteract these principles in a great degree; but weighty names may encourage a general resistance, which would certainly leave those who are supporters of the measure from a conviction of its necessity, in a minority. . . .

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 13, 1799.

In consequence of a letter which Lord Castlereagh has received from Lord Ely, I have thought it necessary to explain very clearly to him that he will not be allowed to shuffle on this occasion.

As it is possible from what I before stated, that you may already have brought him to reason, I have enclosed my letter under a flying seal, and leave the expediency of forwarding it to your Grace's discretion.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM THE EARL OF ELY.

London, Jan. 7, 1799.

We have bad accounts here of the state of the malcontents in Ireland. God grant that this mad scheme may not go too far for all the projectors of it to appease! I have not conversed with

a single person since I came here that has advanced a single argument in favour of it, and all the Irishmen I converse with are pointedly and decidedly against the measure. I can scarcely give credit to their bringing it on now.

I have kept my mind perfectly free from every prejudice for and against the subject, and I am so still; but no person has yet said a word to me on the subject of Union to make me think it an advantageous measure for either kingdom. Its great and only advocates are men who do not belong to us, or absentees who never again intend to visit Ireland.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE EARL OF ELY.

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 13, 1799.

Lord Castlereagh has communicated to me your Lordship's letter of the 7th instant.

I lament exceedingly that the outline of the proposed arrangement between the two countries was not sufficiently digested previous to your departure, so as to enable me to explain to your Lordship the general ideas of the King's Ministers upon this most interesting and important subject. As it is proposed, before any specific plan is submitted to Parliament for its consideration, that the measure should be previously gone into by Commissioners, your Lordship will have ample time to consider it in all its parts, before it can be brought to a final decision. The King, by the advice of his Ministers, feels it his duty to recommend to his Parliament in both kingdoms to direct their immediate attention to such measures as may appear to them best calculated to strengthen the connection, and to counteract the systematic attempts of our foreign and domestic enemies to separate them.

I am confident your Lordship's disposition to give effect at all times to His Majesty's anxious endeavours to promote the happiness and security of Ireland will determine you, without hesitation, decidedly to support the full and fair investigation of a measure of such magnitude, in order that it may be submitted, with every light that can be thrown on the subject by men of the most extensive information in both countries, to the mature deliberation of Parliament.

I think it my duty to acquaint your Lordship, that your opposition to a proceeding so reasonable in itself, and which His Majesty's Ministers consider as indispensable to the internal tranquillity of Ireland, and to the security of the empire, would be considered by the King's servants in both countries as an absolute

separation on the part of your Lordship and your friends from all connection with His Majesty's Government—an event which would be an equal subject of regret to me in my private and public situation.

I cannot conclude without most earnestly requesting your Lordship's presence as early as possible, and trust you will feel the indispensable necessity of losing no time in apprising your friends of your wishes and support of the King's Government.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 16, 1799.

I was so much occupied yesterday that I had not time to return an answer to your Grace's private and confidential letter dated the 10th instant, respecting Mr. Saurin.

It was with great pleasure that I read the respite which was allowed by the postscript, as His Majesty's commands transmitted in the letter were so pointed, that I should not have felt myself at liberty to have exercised a discretionary power of delay in carrying them into execution.

Mr. Saurin's conduct with respect to the Union has been exceedingly blameable, but as he did not actually carry into effect his intention of giving a military appearance to his opposition to the measure, and as, on discussing the matter with Lord Castlereagh, he appeared to be sensible of the impropriety of such conduct, I think it would not be for the advantage of His Majesty's service that he should be deprived of his silk gown unless he should resign his military commission.

Without sustaining any actual loss, he would become a more powerful enemy by receiving from numerous opposers of the Union the honour of having suffered martyrdom in the cause; and I am afraid that punishments which do not affect the purse will not convey much terror to the politicians of this country.

On my finding, from a conversation which I had with Sir John Parnell soon after he landed, that he was determined not to support the Union, I have notified to him his dismission from the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer; and I shall pursue the same line of conduct without favour or partiality, whenever I may think it will tend to promote the success of the measure.

Mr. Corry,[1] the member for Newry, is to succeed Sir John Parnell.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The letter of the 10th was written in a very different tone to the postscript which gave Lord Cornwallis so much pleasure. In it the Duke of Portland said, that he would have excused common opposition from Mr. Saurin, but that his conduct had been so extraordinarily improper that he had represented to the King the necessity of depriving him of the distinction he enjoyed as King's Counsel. "I am ordered to desire your Excellency to inform him that the King has no further occasion for his services. It is to be distinctly understood that it is because Mr. Saurin mixed up military and civil proceedings."

Before this letter was despatched, the Duke of Portland received one from Lord Castlereagh, written on the 7th of January, in which he said:—"Mr. Saurin called on me to-day. I had a very long conversation with him; I am inclined to think he will not persevere in his intention of laying down his arms." This communication produced the Duke's postscript to the effect that, "as Lord Castlereagh's letter just received gives hopes Mr. Saurin may be better advised, the execution of the above orders may be suspended."

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Jan. 21, 1799.

Here I am embarked in all my troubles, and employed in a business which is ill-suited to my taste, and for which I am afraid I am not qualified. We think ourselves tolerably strong as to numbers, but so little confidence is to be placed in professions, and people change their opinions here with so little ceremony, that no man who knows them can feel his mind quite at ease on that subject.

The demands of our friends rise in proportion to the appearance of strength on the other side; and you, who know how I detest a job, will be sensible of the difficulties which I must often have to keep my temper; but still the object is great, and perhaps the salvation of the British empire may depend upon it. I shall there-

[1] Right Hon. Isaac Corry, b. 1755, d. May 15, 1813, unmarried. His father was a considerable merchant at Newry, for which place Mr. Corry sat from 1776 to the Union; for Dundalk till 1802; for Newry again to Oct. 1806; for Newport, Isle of Wight, to April, 1807. Surveyor-General of the Ordnance, 1788; Commissioner of Revenue, 1789 to 1798; and Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1799 to 1804. He held the patent office of Surveyor-General of Crown Lands from 1799 till his death.

fore, as much as possible, overcome my detestation of the work in which I am engaged, and march on steadily to my point.

The South of Ireland are well disposed to Union; the North seem in a state of neutrality, or rather apathy on the subject, which is to me incomprehensible; but all the counties in the middle of the island, from Dublin to Galway, are violent against it.

The Catholics on the whole behave better than I expected,[1] and I do not think that popular tumult is anywhere to be apprehended, except in the metropolis.[2]

Taylor leaves me on Wednesday next, and a great loss he will be to me; but he will be exceedingly useful to the Duke of York. You may get a good deal of Irish knowledge from him. Littlehales has many good qualities, and is very industrious, but it is a great disadvantage to succeed Taylor.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 23, 1799.

Yesterday in the House of Lords, as soon as I had delivered to Parliament the Speech at the opening of the Session, the Earl of Glandore[3] rose, and expatiated with ability on the peculiar circumstances of this kingdom from its internal parties and divisions, on the similar circumstances which had formerly disturbed Scotland, on the happy effect of the Union upon that kingdom, on the natural tendency of two separate Legislatures to form distinct interests, and to become objects of speculation to foreign powers. He then moved an address, the chief object of which was to recommend to consideration the subject of a Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, in the words wherein it has been alluded to in my Speech from the Throne.

Lord Powerscourt objected to the Address upon the ground that the House was incompetent to entertain the principle of a Legislative Union, and that therefore the subject ought not to go into discussion at all, and his Lordship moved the following amend-

[1] The Roman Catholic Bishops met at Lord Fingall's on the 16th. In a letter of that date Lord Castlereagh says that his report of their proceedings was probably not very correct, as it came from Sir Boyle Roche. It afterwards appeared that the Bishops were inclined to be for the time neutral.

[2] On the 17th Mr. Cooke had informed Mr. Wickham that attempts were making to create a riot on the day of the meeting of Parliament.

[3] John, 2nd and last Earl of Glandore, b. May 25, 1753, d. Oct. 20, 1815; m. Nov. 26, 1777, Diana, dau. of George, 1st Viscount Sackville. He was, jointly with Lord Carysfort, Master of the Rolls from July 15, 1789, to April 18, 1801, when Sir Michael Smith received it as a judicial office. Lord Glandore had as compensation a pension of 1307*l.* a year.

ment, "That it is our most earnest desire to strengthen the connexion between the two countries by every possible means, but the measure of a Legislative Union we apprehend is not within the limits of our power. We beg leave also to represent to Your Majesty, that although this House were competent to adopt such a measure, we conceive that it would be highly impolitic so to do, as it would tend in our opinion more than any other cause, ultimately to a separation of this kingdom from that of Great Britain."

Lord Bellamont[1] approved of the latter part of the amendment, but requested the first part might be withdrawn, as he objected going into the question of competency. This produced a debate wherein Lord Yelverton, Lord Carleton, the Lord Chancellor, and other Lords supported fully and ably the competence of Parliament, and upon a question whether Lord Powerscourt's motion should be withdrawn, there appeared Noes 46, Ayes 19, and it was then negatived.

Lord Bellamont then moved a second amendment to expunge the following words: "And of consolidating as far as possible into one firm and lasting fabrick the strength, the power, and the resources of the British empire;" and to insert "so far as may be consistent with the permanent enjoyment, exercise, and tutelary vigilance of our resident and independent Parliament, as established, acknowledged, and recognized." This amendment produced a general debate. Before twelve o'clock the House divided, 52 to 16.

I am happy in being enabled to state that the general disposition shown by the House of Lords was in favour of an Union. Lord Ely did not divide, but went behind the Throne.

In the House of Commons a similar address to that in the Lords was moved by Lord Tyrone, and seconded by Mr. Fitzgerald,[2] Member for the county of Cork, who both spoke firmly and shortly their sentiments in favour of an Union, but called upon the House merely to give the subject a discussion, without pledging them to the principle.

Sir John Parnell followed, and opposed in a fair and candid

[1] Charles, 5th Lord Coote, and only Earl of Bellamont, to which rank he was raised Sept. 4, 1767, K.B.; b. April, 1738, d. Oct. 20, 1800; m. Aug. 20, 1774, Emily, dau. of James, 1st Duke of Leinster. During Lord Townshend's Lord-Lieutenancy, Lord Bellamont (then Lord Coote) took offence at not being immediately admitted to an audience for which he had applied, and upon Lord Townshend's return to England called him out in a very offensive manner. The Hon. Mr. Dillon was his second, and Lord Ligonier Lord Townshend's. The duel took place in Marylebone Fields Feb. 2, 1773. Lord Bellamont was severely wounded. Postmaster-General from July, 1789, to 1797.

[2] Robert Uniacke Fitzgerald, of Corkbeg, b. about 1750, elder brother of Sir John Judkin Fitzgerald, Bart., of Ultra-Protestant notoriety, m. Louisa Petitot, dau. of the Rev. Richard Bullen, of Currabinny. M.P. for Cork county from Feb. 1798 to July, 1806.

manner, without entering into topics of violence, the principle and the measure of an Union in general. He was followed by Mr. George Ponsonby,[1] who chiefly dwelt upon the incompetency of Parliament to entertain the subject, and made an animated appeal to the passions of the House, to support the national pride and independence; and he concluded with an amendment, "That the House would be ready to enter into any measure, short of surrendering their free, resident, and independent Legislature as established in 1782."

This produced a general debate, which lasted till one o'clock this day, when a division took place, in favour of the amendment 105, against 106; and then a second division took place, for the Address 107, against it 105. Upon the question being run so close, Mr. Ponsonby proposed fixing an early day for a debate on the principle, but Lord Castlereagh thought it prudent to inform the House that he should not persist any further in the measure at present. On being asked whether this declaration meant that he would not renew the question this Session, his Lordship said that he could not pledge himself so far, that it had been the object of Government to let the people know that it was their decided opinion, that a Legislative Union was the only measure which could heal the distractions of the country, and secure its connection with Great Britain, that in that idea they were unalterably fixed; he was not however desirous of forcing the measure with any precipitation, nor against the wish of the House. If however the state of this country and the public mind should change, he thought in such a case he should be justified in resuming the subject.

The debate was very general on both sides. On the side of Opposition, violent and inflammatory, especially with regard to the question of the competency of Parliament, which was generally denied by them, and there was an endeavour to control the House by clamour, which had an effect on some of our friends. The principal speakers in support of Government were Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Fitzgerald, member for Kerry, Mr. St. George Daly,[2] Mr. Corry, the Attorney and Solicitor General, Mr. Os-

[1] Right Hon. George Ponsonby, younger son of Right Hon. John Ponsonby, Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, a grandson of Brabazon, 1st Earl of Bessborough; b. March 4, 1755, d. July 8, 1817; m. May 18, 1781, Mary, dau. of Brinsley, 2nd Earl of Lanesborough. Excepting the trifling appointment of Counsel to the Commissioners of Revenue, he held no office until April, 1806, when he received that of Chancellor of Ireland, which he resigned April, 1807. He sat in the Irish Parliament for Wicklow Borough, 1778; Innistiogue 1783 to 1790; Galway Borough from 1797 till he was elected for Wicklow County (shortly before the Union), which he vacated when he became Chancellor. M.P. for Tavistock from Jan. 1808 to 1812, and then for Peterborough till his death. For some years he was leader of the Opposition in England, to the dissatisfaction of many of that party.

[2] St. George Daly, son of the Right Hon. Denis Daly, and brother of the Right Hon. Denis Daly, of Dunsandle, b. 1760, d. 1829; m. 1803, Louisa, sister of Sir Ralph Gore.

borne,[1] Mr. M'Clelland,[2] Mr. Smith,[3] Mr. M'Naughten,[4] Mr. Alexander,[5] Sir John Blaquiere, Mr. Conolly, Mr. Moore,[6] and General Hutchinson, and several country gentlemen made declarations in favour of the measure. The smallness of the numbers which supported the question, is attributed to the absence of many of Lord Ely's, Lord Downshire's,[7] and Lord De Clifford's[8] friends, and to several disappointments which took place just before the meeting of Parliament and during the debate. I have omitted to mention that the business in the House of Commons began by a motion of privilege on the part of Mr. George Ponsonby, who moved to vacate Lord Castlereagh's seat, on the ground that, although his Lordship had been appointed to the office of Chief Secretary by Lord Camden, and merely continued by me, he had received from me a new

Bart., of Manor Gore. Prime-Serjeant Jan. 28, 1799; Baron of the Exchequer June, 1801; Puisne Judge of the King's Bench Oct. 22, 1803, till Feb. 1822, when he resigned the appointment. M.P. for Galway Borough from 1797 to the Union.

[1] Charles Osborne, b. about 1765, d. Sept. 2, 1817. Commissioner of Appeal from 1790 to 1797, and Puisne Justice of the King's Bench from July, 1802, till his death. M.P. for Carysfort from 1790 till the Union.

[2] James M'Clelland, b. 1768, d. May, 1831; m. Dec. 1797, Charlotte, sister of Richard Thompson, Esq., of Armagassan. Solicitor-General, Jan. 1802; Baron of the Exchequer, Oct. 1803, till his death. M.P. for Randalstown from Feb. 1798 to the Union.

[3] William Smith (afterwards, Dec. 17, 1808, 2nd Bart.), b. Jan. 23, 1766, d. Nov. 1836; m. Aug. 13, 1787, Hester, dau. of Thomas Berry, Esq., of English Castle. The present (1858) Master of the Rolls is his son. He was appointed Solicitor-General Dec. 6, 1800, and Baron of the Exchequer Jan. 1801. M.P. for Lanesborough 1794, and Donegal Borough from 1797 till the Union. Baron Smith was in 1834 the subject of a violent attack made in the House of Commons by Mr. O'Connell, who, through the connivance of Government, carried a resolution intended to compel his resignation; but, eight days later, it was rescinded by a majority of 161 to 155.

[4] Edmund Alexander M'Naughten, b. Aug. 3, 1762, d. March 15, 1832, unmarried. Lord of the Treasury in Ireland, and then in England, from April, 1813, to July, 1830, and had the reversion of the Searchership of Cork. M.P. for Antrim County from 1797 to 1812; Orford to 1826; and Antrim again to 1830.

[5] Henry Alexander, b. 1763, d. May 6, 1818; m. 1807, a dau. of H. Rivers, Esq., of Spring Gardens. Chairman of Ways and Means in Ireland, for which office he received as compensation a pension of 500*l*. He afterwards filled the same situation in England, and then became Colonial Secretary at the Cape of Good Hope, where he died. M.P. for Newtownards, 1787; Askeyton, 1790; Derry City, 1797 to June, 1802; and then for Old Sarum to Nov. 1806.

[6] Stephen Moore, Esq., of Barn, b. 1748, d. 1829, unmarried. He held the patent office of Accountant and Comptroller-General from Feb. 27, 1796. M.P. for Lanesborough 1790, and for Kells from 1797 to the Union.

[7] Lord Downshire possessed eight seats certain: two for Hillsborough, Fore, and Blessington; one for Carlingford and one for Down County. His share of compensation was 52,500*l*. Lord Ely had also eight seats: two for Bannow, Clonmines, and Fethard; one for the County, and one for the Borough of Wexford. His compensation was 45,000*l*. Both these Peers possessed also considerable influence in other places; and, in order to swell the number of their adherents, they, according to a not uncommon practice, frequently bought seats from other Borough proprietors. It was by such purchases that Lord Longueville mainly obtained his strength.

[8] Edward, 18th Baron De Clifford, b. June 20, 1767, d. Sept. 30, 1832; m. Feb. 1789, Mary, dau. of Joseph, 3rd Earl of Mayo. His influence in Kinsale and Downpatrick was sufficient usually to secure the four seats, though they were not quite close. As each borough retained one seat no compensation was given. After the Union Lord De Clifford lost his influence in Downpatrick, but retained it in Kinsale.

appointment and office. After much debate the motion was withdrawn. It seemed to have been countenanced by the Speaker, who discovered strong partiality through the whole debate.

I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The sitting of the House was of unprecedented length.[1] It continued without intermission from about 4 o'clock P.M. on Tuesday, January 22, until 1 o'clock P.M. of the next day.

Including Tellers and the Speaker, 217 members divided: seven seats were vacant, and the absent members were 76, of whom 5 were present in the division on the 24th. Of the members who divided, 30 spoke for, and 45 against Government; and all contemporary letters and newspapers describe the debate as being one of singular vehemence, in which the natural warmth of Irishmen was displayed in no ordinary degree.

Before the debate on the Address began, Mr. Ponsonby attempted to prove that, by continuing under Lord Cornwallis in the office of Chief Secretary, to which he had been appointed by Lord Camden, Lord Castlereagh had vacated his seat; but this proposition was so manifestly untenable, that he did not venture to divide the House.

Lord Castlereagh, who had expected a very different result, transmitted a few days afterwards an analysis of the division to the Duke of Portland:—

Voted with Government on the Address, or on the Report	113
Friends absent	39
	152

Voted against, who had been expected to vote for (most of them having distinctly promised support)	22
Voted against, or absent enemies	129
Of these might be bought off	20
Vacancies	7

Out of 9 Commissioners of Revenue, 1 was a Peer, 1 was ill, 3 voted against, and only 4 with Government.

[1] The longest debates ever known in the Imperial Parliament were those on the Walcheren expedition in 1810; on the committal of Sir F. Burdett to the Tower in the same year; and on the Reform Bill in 1831. In the first the fourth division took place about 8 A.M. on the following day; the second also lasted fifteen hours; and in the last Mr. Fergusson found the House still sitting between 7 and 8 in the morning, when he came down to take his seat for the debate of the ensuing night.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 23, 1799.

The event of Tuesday's proceedings in Parliament will render it less necessary for me to state to your Grace in detail, the reasons which would have induced me under the advice of the confidential servants of the Crown, to recommend that the measure of Union should be brought into discussion upon the question of enabling the Crown to appoint Commissioners, rather than upon particular resolutions in the first instance.

The principles and tone upon which the question was taken up by its opponents will satisfy your Grace that if numbers were equally divided when entering into the discussion at all, the temper of the House was not prepared to come to any definitive decision.

I have only now to express my sincere regret to your Grace, that the prejudices prevailing amongst the members of the Commons, countenanced and encouraged as they have been by the Speaker and Sir John Parnell, are infinitely too strong to afford me any prospect of bringing this measure with any chance of success into discussion in the course of the present Session.

The conduct of the servants of the Crown, as well antecedent to, as during the debate upon the measure, gives rise to a consideration of very delicate policy.

I have felt it indispensibly necessary to remove Sir John Parnell and the Prime Serjeant, both originally declared opponents of the measure. Mr. George Knox, feeling himself similarly circumstanced, resigned his seat at the Revenue Board, which I have since offered to Mr. Fitzgerald, member for Kerry, a young man of excellent abilities; in last night's debate, Colonel Foster,[1] Commissioner of the Revenue, Major Cole Hamilton,[2] Commissioner of Barracks, Mr. Neville,[3] Commissioner of Accounts, and Mr. Ha-

[1] Hon. Thomas Henry Foster, only son of the Right Hon. John Foster (the Speaker), by his wife, Viscountess Ferrard in her own right, b. April 15, 1772, d. Jan. 18, 1843; m. Nov. 20, 1810, Harriet, dau. and sole heir of Chichester, 4th and last Earl of Massarene, whom she succeeded as Viscountess Massarene. Mr. Foster was made Commissioner of Revenue in 1798, but removed as above. M.P. for Dunleer from Jan. 1793 till the Union; for Drogheda from 1807 to 1812; and for Louth from Feb. 1822 till Feb. 20, 1824, when, on the death of his mother, he became Viscount Ferrard.

[2] Hon. Arthur Cole Hamilton, 2nd son of John, 1st Lord Mountflorence, b. Aug. 8, 1750, d. April 25, 1822; m. 1780, Lætitia, dau. and heir of Claudius Hamilton, Esq. Commissioner of Barracks, June 4, 1798; M.P. for Fermanagh county, 1783; Enniskillen, 1790 to 1802.

[3] Richard Neville, of Furnace, b. 1745, d. 1822; m. 1772, the only dau. and heir of Henry Bannermann, Esq., of Ceoline. M.P. for Wexford Borough from Oct. 1771 to th Union, and afterwards, with intervals, to Feb. 1819. Had been Teller of the Exchequer in Ireland, and soon after the Union

milton,[1] Cursitor of Chancery, voted with Opposition; Colonel Stratford,[2] Paymaster of Foreign Troops, withdrew previous to the division. In point of justice, no doubt could remain of extending to them an equal measure of treatment, but before I proceed to place the Speaker and so many others in general hostility to Government, I feel it necessary to consider how we shall stand in point of general strength in order to meet his very formidable and active opposition.

Lord Downshire and Lord Ely partake strongly of Opposition feelings as far as the Union is concerned; if they perceive the dismissals to be directed with a view to strengthen Government on this question, they will probably feel some jealousy of the principle, and be less disposed to support me in controlling the Speaker and Sir John Parnell.

I am not prepared at this moment to offer your Grace a decided opinion upon the most prudent course to pursue. To-morrow's business may furnish me with better materials to form my judgment upon, and I shall not fail to communicate the result to your Grace.

I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The tone of the British Government, both as to bringing forward the question of Union, and as to the steps necessary to be pursued in consequence of the division on the Address, was very decided. On January 17, the Duke of Portland wrote a despatch, suggesting some variation in the plan of appointing Commissioners, who were to receive instructions laying down general principles, the details of which were to be discussed at their first meeting.[3] The Duke further advised that no Commissioners at all should be nominated, until addresses in favour of the Union had been carried in both Parliaments, and he added: "But I cannot too strongly impress upon your Excellency's mind, the determination of His Majesty's Ministers to propose this measure without delay to the Parliaments of both kingdoms, and to support it with all the weight and energy

was restored to that office, which he held till his death.

[1] Alexander Hamilton, son of Baron Hamilton, b. 1765, d. March, 1809; m. 1795, Catherine, dau. of Thomas Burgh, of Donore, M.P. for Ratoath, 1789; Carrickfergus, 1790 to 1797; Belfast, 1798 to Feb. 1800. Cursitor in Chancery 1791 to 1799.

[2] Colonel the Hon. John Stratford, son of John, 1st Earl of Aldborough, and 3rd Earl Jan. 2, 1801, d. March 7, 1823; m. April, 1777, Elizabeth, dau. of the Rev. Frederick Hamilton, grandson of the 3rd Duke of Hamilton. M.P. for Baltinglass from 1768 to 1776; Wicklow County to 1790; then again for Baltinglass till the Union.

[3] See Defoe's 'History of the Union with Scotland,' in which it will be seen that the Commissioners in that case proceeded exactly on this plan.

of Government." On January 26th, after hearing of the virtual defeat of the plan suggested, he again wrote to Lord Cornwallis, leaving it entirely to his discretion to remove from or retain in office every person who had been hostile to the measure, though he expressed a fear that perfect justice on this point might injure the cause. In regard to Lord Ely's conduct, the Duke said that he considered it deserving of any punishment that could be inflicted, and he concluded by stating that whatever might be the result of the debate upon the report of the Address, and whatever course the Government might deem it desirable to take as to refraining during the existing Session from any further discussion on the subject, he was directed to desire the Lord-Lieutenant "to take care it should be understood that it neither is nor ever will be abandoned, and that the support of it will be considered as a necessary and indispensable test of the attachment on the part of the Irish to their connexion with this country."

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Jan. 25, 1799.

Yesterday, upon the report of the Address to the King, Sir Lawrence Parsons adverted to the statement which had been made by Lord Castlereagh at the close of the former debate, wherein his Lordship had stated that he should always preserve the subject of an Union with the British Parliament in his contemplation; however he should not press it while the sentiment of the House and of the country continued adverse. Sir Lawrence observed, that as this declaration evinced a determination of Government not to relinquish the project of an Union, but to take every advantage of circumstances in order to carry it, it became a matter of necessity for the House to come to a declaration on the subject. He then went into a general argument, and concluded by moving that the annexed paragraph should be expunged from the Address.

Lord Castlereagh followed, and with great animation deprecated the House pursuing a line of conduct which was attempted under the present measure of drawing the country gentlemen into a connexion and cabal with a party who were adverse to them in principle, and who wished to make them the dupes of their faction. He here most strongly alluded to the conduct of Mr. Ponsonby and his friends on their motions for arranging the Constitution according to the principles of the French Departments, and on their

secession from Parliament when they could not render it democratic.

His Lordship also alluded to the conduct of Mr. Bowes Daly,[1] who, in the lobby during the division on a former night, made an attempt to pledge the whole minority to act together as a party, and proposed that no person should ever accept any of the offices which should be vacated in consequence of the present question. He at the same time alluded to a meeting of the Bar, which had been held in the morning, when 116 barristers had returned thanks to the late Prime Serjeant, had resolved that none of them would accept his office, and had agreed to an address to the Chancellor and the Judges to preserve to him the precedence which he enjoyed by his office.[2]

His Lordship protested most strongly against the indecency and mischief of such proceedings, and with great effect. He stated that the declaration he had made with regard to not pressing forward the question under the present sentiment of the House, ought to be satisfactory, and that the persisting in any motion on the subject after such a declaration, could only tend to further the views of those who had shown on every occasion that they had more at heart the objects of their own ambition than the real interests of the country.

Mr. G. Ponsonby followed Lord Castlereagh, and endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, to clear himself from the charges of Lord Castlereagh, and the debate then took a general turn, and the merits of the question were spoken upon from each side of the House. In the course of the debate, Mr. Smith, son to one of the Barons of the Exchequer, delivered a very fine and complete argument on the general question of the Union, which made very great

[1] Right Hon. Denis Bowes Daly, b. about 1750, d. Jan. 28, 1822; m. July 10, 1780, Charlotte, dau. of the Right Hon. John Ponsonby, and sister of William, 1st Lord. Mr. Daly was Muster-Master-General from April, 1806, to March, 1807. M.P. for Galway Borough from 1776 to 1790; for the King's County to May, 1802; again for Galway Borough to May, 1805, when he was returned for Galway County, which he represented till 1818. His father, Hyacinth Daly, m. the heiress of the M'Coglans, commonly called "the Mawrs," ancient chiefs of Lower Delvin, and through her inherited the large estates of that family; estates said to have been transmitted in direct descent from father to son through a longer period than any other landed property in Ireland.

[2] On the first motion-day after this meeting, the Chancellor, as usual, called upon the counsel to move according to seniority. Mr. Saurin, who was entitled to precedence next to the Attorney and Solicitor General, refused to move before the late Prime-Serjeant. His example was followed by every barrister except Mr. O'Grady (afterwards Chief Baron and 1st Viscount Guillamore), and Mr. Beresford (afterwards 2nd Lord Decies. Thereupon the Chancellor, who had previously intimated his determination to call on no barrister a second time, declared that he should discharge every motion with costs; and if such conduct were repeated, he threatened to consider what further steps should be taken. This produced the due effect, and the Bar did not venture to persevere.

impression, and he was supported by Sir James Cotter,[1] one of Lord Shannon's friends, Mr. M'Clelland, Mr. Corry, Mr. St. George Daly, the Attorney-General, Mr. Martin,[2] and many other gentlemen.

The debate lasted until near six o'clock, when upon a division there appeared 109 for expunging the paragraph, and 104 against it; the Opposition had received the accession of three friends who had arrived in town; General Taylor changed his opinion during the debate; Mr. Charles Knox,[3] one of Lord Abercorn's friends, did not appear; and Mr. Conolly, Sir H. Langrishe, and Mr. Beresford were ill.

After the division, Mr. G. Ponsonby attempted to pledge the House by moving as a substantive Resolution the amendment which had been rejected the night before.

Lord Castlereagh protested against this measure as an unconstitutional attempt to bind the House. He stated, that in proposing the measure of an Union, he had merely complied with his duty to his situation and to his country, in bringing forward a measure which he and His Majesty's Ministers, under whom he acted, had considered to be the only one which could promise to restore and secure the tranquillity of Ireland, and secure its connexion with Great Britain. For the rejection of that measure the House was responsible. A time might come, and he believed it would come soon, when the country and the House would view it in a different light, and they would then repent the precipitancy and temerity of the Resolution which was proposed.

On this Mr. Fortescue,[4] member for the county of Louth, expressed shortly his determination to oppose Mr. Ponsonby's

[1] Sir James Cotter, Bart., b. 1748, d. Feb. 9, 1829; m. 1st, Anne, dau. of Francis Kearney, Esq., of Garretstown; and, 2nd, Isabella, widow of James Brereton, Esq., of Carrigalaney, and dau. of the Rev. James Kingston of Aglish. M.P. for Askeyton from 1761 to 1771, Taghmon to 1776, Mallow from 1783 to 1790, and Castlemartyr from hence to the Union.

[2] Richard Martin, better known as "Dick Martin;" b. 1754, d. Jan. 6, 1834, at Bougne; m. 1st, Miss Vesey, of Lucan, near Dublin; 2nd, Mrs. Hesketh, dau. of —— Evans, Esq. M.P. for Jamestown from 1776 to 1790, Lanesborough from 1797 till he was elected in 1800 for Galway County, which he represented till 1806, and again from 1818 to 1827, when he was unseated on petition, it being distinctly proved that the greater number of his tenants had polled three times in his favour, and that wigs and other articles of dress were provided for the necessary transformation of voters. It appeared also that he had been very indignant with some of his tenants who thought that voting *twice* was a sufficient strain on their consciences. When the Union Bill passed, he applied to the Commissioners of Compensation for the sum of 1000*l.* on the plea that he had given 2000*l.* for his seat, which he expected to hold for eight years, whereas he had only enjoyed it for half that time! It may be needless to say that such a claim was rejected.

[3] Hon. Charles Knox, 6th son of Thomas, 1st Viscount Northland; b. 1767, d. Jan. 30, 1825; m. Dec. 20, 1804, Hannah, widow of James Fletcher, Esq., and dau. of Robert Bent, Esq., M.P. Mr. Knox was M.P. for Dungannon from 1797 to Feb. 1799. He afterwards took Holy Orders.

[4] William Charles Fortescue, d. June 24, 1829, unm. He was 2nd and last Viscount Clermont, to which title he succeeded on the death of his uncle, William Henry, only Earl of Clermont, Sept. 30, 1806. M.P. for Louth County from 1795 till 1806.

Resolution. He said he had acted under the sentiments of his constituents, and if they should alter their opinion, he should change his own, and that he never would consent to bind himself against their possible opinions. Lord Cole[1] with much warmth protested against the Resolution on similar grounds; Mr. Acheson,[2] Mr. Maxwell,[3] Mr. J. C. Beresford,[4] and Mr. French,[5] followed with eagerness, and Mr. Ponsonby, feeling the temper of the House, withdrew it.

The several members who rose took an opportunity of declaring that their opposition was entirely confined to the question of Union, that they wished to separate in friendship with the Administration, and to give their usual support to all measures which might be necessary for carrying on the Government and for strengthening the connexion with Great Britain. The Address to me was then brought forward, and, the last paragraph being expunged, was agreed to by the House. I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] John Lord Cole, afterwards 2nd Earl of Enniskillen, K.P.; b. March 23, 1768, d. March 31, 1840; m. Oct. 15, 1805, Charlotte, dau. of Henry, 1st Earl of Uxbridge. M.P. for Fermanagh County from 1790 till he became a peer, May 22, 1803. Created, Aug. 11, 1816, Lord Grinstead in England.

[2] Hon. Archibald Acheson, afterwards 2nd Earl of Gosford, G.C.B. (eldest son of Arthur, 2nd Viscount, who was made an Earl Feb. 10, 1806; he refused that rank in 1800, when offered to him for his voluntary and strong support of the Union); b. 1776, d. March 27, 1849; m. July 20, 1805, Mary, dau. of Robert Sparrow, Esq., of Worlingham Hall. Governor-General of Canada from July 1, 1835, to March 30, 1838; created Baron Worlingham in England June 13, 1835. M.P. for Armagh County from 1797 to Jan. 14, 1807. His ancestor, Sir Arthur Acheson, father of the 1st Lord Gosford, was "the Knight" in Swift's poem, 'Hamilton's Bawn.'

"Thus spoke to my lady, the Knight, full of care,
'Let me have your advice in a weighty affair.'"

[3] Rt. Hon. Colonel John Maxwell, b. Jan. 18, 1767, d. Sept. 20, 1838; m. July 4, 1789, Lucy Juliana, dau. of Arthur, 1st Earl of Mountnorris. He took his maternal name of Barry about 1800. Lord of the Treasury in Ireland from 1810 to 1817, and then in England to May, 1823. M.P. for Newtown Limavady from 1797 till the Union, and for Cavan County from 1806 to July 23, 1822, when, on the death of his cousin, John James, 2nd Earl of Farnham, he succeeded to the barony.

[4] John Claudius Beresford, 3rd son of the Right Hon. John Beresford; b. Oct. 23, 1766, d. July 3, 1843; m. March 3, 1795, Elizabeth, dau. of Archibald Menzies, Esq., of Caldares. He held the sinecure office of Inspector-General of Exports and Imports in the port of Dublin for many years, but resigned it on the Union question. M.P. for Swords 1790, Dublin City 1797 to 1804, and Waterford County from Dec. 1805 to 1812. During the Rebellion he commanded a corps of yeomanry, many of whom were supposed to have acted with more vigour than humanity, and on the door of the riding-house where they assembled for duty was one day written, "Mangling done here gratis by Beresford and Co." To punish him, the Rebels, when they seized any of his notes (he was a banker in Dublin), burnt them, in order to ruin him!

[5] Arthur French, b. 1764, d. Nov. 24, 1820; m. Oct. 1784, Margaret, dau. of Edmond Costello, Esq., of Edmondstown. M.P. for Roscommon County from 1783 till his death. He is said to have refused an earldom offered to him if he would support the Union. His son was created Lord De Freyne.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 25, 1799.

. . . Your Grace will be informed by my official despatch of the fate of Mr. Ponsonby's attempt to commit the House. I consider the party as partially dissolved, but we must be prepared to find the Opposition considerably increased in strength.

Mr. J. C. Beresford this morning resigned his office, very liberally expressing his wish to relieve the Administration from all difficulties on his account, and desirous that the support which he intended to afford the Government on all other questions, might not be attributed in any degree to his wish to retain his situation.

Your Grace will recollect that I stated some time since that the Catholics stand aloof, apparently with a view of inducing Government to compromise with them, in order to gain popular strength in favour of the Union. Since the Opposition has assembled in force, I have reason to believe that a negotiation has been set on foot to connect them with the opposers of the measure.[1] There was every disposition in the leaders of the Opposition to follow up their victory with addresses to restore the dismissed servants of the Crown. The Bar entered into resolutions to give the Prime-Serjeant precedence as at present. They met with the proper rebuke this morning from the Chief Judges, particularly the Chancellor, in their respective Courts. I propose that the Parliament should adjourn for ten days, to give time for the re-elections, and for the arrangement of business. I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The lower classes of United Irishmen availed themselves of this opportunity to create a disturbance. The violence of the Anti-Unionists had, as Mr. Cooke anticipated, excited the mob of Dublin, who were easily induced to join in a popular demonstration. A general illumination took place, the houses of those whose votes had rendered them obnoxious were attacked, and the windows broken. In some few instances, indeed, opponents of the Union, among whom was Lord Powerscourt, equally suffered. The troops were called out; it became necessary for them to fire, and several persons were killed.

[1] Many of the Anti-Unionists (as Lords Charlemont, Farnham, Enniskillen, &c.) had hitherto been equally violent as Anti-Catholics.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 26, 1799.

Lord Kenmare has informed me that on the day of the meeting of Parliament the Ponsonbys and the part of the Opposition which was the least indisposed to the Catholics, had sent to the principal persons of that religion in the metropolis, to assure them that, if they would present a petition against the Union, a motion should be made, as soon as the question of Union was disposed of, in favour of Catholic Emancipation.

His Lordship says that although this proposition was not accepted, the same gentlemen have since the rejection of the Union assured the Catholics that they would now bring forward the question of Emancipation, and he expresses his apprehensions that himself and those of that persuasion who wish to keep their brethren quiet, will not have sufficient weight with them to prevent their entering heartily into the measure.

The proposal of Union provoked the enmity principally of the boroughmongers, lawyers, and persons who from local circumstances thought they should be losers, but it certainly has not affected the nation at large, nor was it disagreeable either to the Catholics or to the Protestant Dissenters. Very different will be the effect of agitating the question of Emancipation, especially when the Catholics are reminded that it was the intention of Government to continue to exclude them from a participation of privileges at the Union.

After what has passed in the discussion of the Union it will not be possible to object to the agitation of the question on the ground of temporary inexpediency, and it will be difficult under the present circumstances to throw out anything in debate, that might give them reason to expect more favourable consideration at a future period.

The late experiment, however, has shown the impossibility of carrying a measure which is contrary to the private interests of those who are to decide upon it, and which is not supported by the voice of the country at large; and I think it is evident that if ever a second trial of the Union is to be made, the Catholics must be included.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

WILLIAM WICKHAM, ESQ., TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

[Private.] Received Jan. 28.

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, Jan. 24, 1799.

. . . I now send your Lordship, by the Duke of Portland's direction, a dozen impressions of the Morning Post, which is the paper that appears to me upon the whole to contain the best report of Mr. Pitt's speech last night. It is, however, after all but a miserable sketch of the *most impressive* and one of the most judicious speeches I ever heard. It has I think completely decided the question on this side of the water, where people's minds were much afloat, naturally much alarmed by the accounts that have been lately received and industriously dispersed through the country, of the extent and violence of the Opposition in Ireland, and generally disposed to believe that the Ministry was not in earnest in this attempt. I believe Mr. Pitt did not wish to have spoken on this occasion to the extent to which he was obliged to go by Sheridan's speech, nor in fact did he at last mean to do anything more than remove the impression made by the most mischievous arguments used by that gentleman; but it was impossible to do even this without touching on the great question, and your Lordship will judge from the imperfect report of the newspaper how forcibly and at the same time how judiciously he handled it. . . .

Believe me, &c.,

WILLIAM WICKHAM.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Most Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 28, 1799.

I feel it my duty to call your Grace's attention, and that of His Majesty's other confidential servants, as well to the measures which are hereafter to be pursued in the government of this kingdom, as to the state of parties which is likely to arise out of the late discussion of the Union and the removals connected with it; trusting that the points which I shall have the honour of submitting will receive an early and full consideration, and that I shall receive with as little delay as possible, directions for the government of my conduct on the several delicate questions which may be brought into public discussion in the course of the present Session.

The question of Union was brought forward upon the principle

that two independent legislatures had a tendency to separate, that the independent legislatures of Ireland and England had shown that tendency, and that the effects of it were felt in divisions at home and attempts of invasion from abroad.

Parliament refuses to listen to the question of Union, at the same time wishes to continue and strengthen the connexion. The opposers of the Union, with a view of consolidating as far as possible their party, and at the same time of diminishing the motives which exist for the adoption of the measure, will probably bring forward separately several of the points which are relied on by the friends of the Union, in order to render either its adoption less necessary, or to embarrass Government by throwing upon them the onus of rejecting them.

The evils proposed to be cured by an Union are, religious divisions, the defective nature of the imperial connexion, and commercial inequalities. Additional motives in favour of the measure have arisen from an expectation that it would lead to a regulation in respect to tithes—the most comprehensive cause of public discontent in Ireland—and an arrangement in favour of the Catholic and Dissenting clergy.

These questions may and probably will be brought forward upon an Anti-Union principle, and the resistance of them by Government must tend to divide the Parliament and the kingdom into Unionists and Anti-Unionists. In the establishment of this party-principle the question of British and Irish authority will be strongly at issue.

The religious question will probably be first taken up. It is plain that upon a mere principle of pursuing power, ambition, and revenge, it is the interest of the Catholics to obtain political equality without an Union; for as the general democratic power of the State is increasing daily by the general wealth and prosperity, and as the Catholics form the greater part of the democracy, their power must proportionably increase whilst the kingdoms are separate and the Irish oligarchy is stationary or declining. The Catholics therefore, if offered Equality without an Union, will probably prefer it to Equality with an Union, for in the latter case they must ever be content with inferiority; in the former they would probably by degrees gain ascendancy.

In addition to the usual supporters of Emancipation, many of the Anti-Union party will now take up the Catholic cause, the better to defeat the question of Union. They will thus expect to detach the Catholics from Government, and to engage the mob of the whole kingdom against the Union.

Were the Catholic question to be now carried, the great argument for an Union would be lost, at least as far as the Catholics are concerned; it seems therefore incumbent on Government, whatever their inclinations might otherwise be, to prevent its adoption at present. Their resistance may be argued on the grounds that without an Union, the admission of the Catholics must increase rather than diminish religious animosities, by the alarms which it would give to the existing establishments—an evil which would be in a great measure if not altogether avoided, were the concession to take place connected with or after the Union.

I am of opinion that the measure, hereafter to insure its success, must be proposed on a more enlarged principle; but if the immediate object of Government is to resist the Catholic claims rather than to renew the question of Union, I much doubt the policy of at present holding out to them any decided expectations; it might weaken us with the Protestants, and might not strengthen us with the Catholics, whilst they look to carry their question unconnected with Union.

With a view to obviate some of the imperial embarrassments arising out of our present principle of connexion, a Regency Bill, making the Regent of Great Britain *ipso facto* Regent of Ireland, will probably be proposed. They may also make a parade of offering to contribute proportionably to general expenses. Farther than this I do not think they can attempt to go; and I should beg your Grace's ideas on the best mode of meeting these propositions for partial and imperfect accommodation.

The commercial question will be urged, and stated not to be necessarily connected with Union. It cannot be pressed at present, however, with a very good grace after the Parliament has refused even to deliberate on a question of imperial safety.

Your Grace must be aware that the party will carry the feelings of the country more with them upon the question of tithes than any other. They will press Government to bring it forward, and impute their refusing to do so, to a determination to force the question of Union by withholding from the people advantages which might be extended to them equally by the Irish Legislature.

They will also call upon Government to make provision for the Catholic and Presbyterian clergy, as they have been taught to expect it. How far this measure, which appears so necessary in itself, should be postponed and connected with the Union, it is for Ministers to decide.

I have endeavoured shortly to point your Grace's attention to the topics of which the Opposition will probably avail themselves,

and your Grace will observe their tendency to consolidate an Anti-Union party, contending on principles common to, but short of, those maintained by the friends of the measure.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Jan. 28, 1799.

You will have seen with sincere concern the unfavourable turn which things have taken with respect to the Union, and you will easily conceive the mischiefs which must follow.

Although all the persons who voted against that measure will not act together as a party, yet I have no doubt a formidable opposition will remain united, and that questions of tithes, emancipation, &c., &c., will be brought forward, which will tend to render Government odious to the Catholics if they are resisted, and if they should be granted, would render an Union at a future period impracticable.

The Catholics, notwithstanding their refusal to take any part as a body against the Union, still feel that their claims, even on that occasion, were to be resisted, and it is natural to suppose that they will soon be disposed to unite with those who apparently endeavour to obtain for them the immediate accomplishment of their wishes.

In the mean time we have every reason to believe that the French are meditating a serious attack, and from the most authentic channels we learn that the disaffected are more active than ever in swearing and organizing the southern provinces, to which quarter we have every reason to suppose that the next attempt will be directed.

For myself I see no hope of deliverance, but feel that I am doomed to waste the remainder of my life, and sacrifice the little reputation which the too partial opinion of the world had allowed me, in this wretched country, where nothing can prosper.

God bless you. Give my kindest compliments to Mrs. Ross, and believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

RIGHT HON. W. PITT TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.] Received Jan. 30.

MY DEAR LORD, Downing Street, Saturday, Jan. 26, 1799.

You will receive from the Duke of Portland an official despatch in answer to the accounts which came this morning of

the proceedings of the first day of your Session. I am certainly much disappointed and grieved to find that a measure so essential, is frustrated for the time by the effect of prejudice and cabal. But I have no doubt that a steady and temperate perseverance on our part will, at no distant period, produce a more just sense of what the real interest of every man who has a stake in Ireland requires at least as much as duty to the country and the empire at large.[1] You will, I hope, approve our own determination to proceed here on Thursday in opening the resolutions stating the general outline and principles of the plan. It may I think be done in such a manner as to show how much Ireland is dependent on us for every benefit she now enjoys, and to lay the strongest ground for resuming the subject in the Irish Parliament with better prospects, either in the course of the present Session (when the real merits of the question shall have been more fully stated to the public), or in the next; and at all events the measure is one which we cannot lose sight of, but must make the grand and primary object of all our policy with respect to Ireland. In this view it seems very desirable, (if Government is strong enough to do it without too much immediate hazard) to mark by dismissal the sense entertained of the conduct of those persons in office who opposed. In particular it strikes me as essential not to make an exception to this line in the instance of the Speaker's son. No Government can stand on a safe and respectable ground which does not show that it feels itself independent of him. With respect to persons of less note, or those who have been only neutral, more lenity may perhaps be advisable. On the precise extent of the line, however, your Lordship can alone judge on the spot; but I thought you would like to know from me directly, the best view I can form of the subject. We shall be impatient to hear what further may have passed in Ireland on Thursday, but whatever may have been the result, it will make no difference in our intention of proceeding here in the manner I have mentioned. We have no hesitation *now* in adopting the mode of moving specific resolutions, instead of only proposing to appoint Commissioners, because the great object now must clearly be to state distinctly, and to record the grounds and principles of our measure, and afterwards to avail ourselves of the impression which may then be produced upon the public, which, I am still sanguine enough to think will be a very strong one.

Believe me, &c.,

W. PITT.

[1] *Sic* in the draft from which this letter was copied.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 30, 1799.

I have this morning received your Grace's letter dated the 26th instant.

The subsequent proceedings in the Irish Parliament, with the details of which you will have been acquainted by Mr. Elliot, have not materially altered our situation, and only prove more strongly what was before pretty evident, that we can have no hopes of prosecuting the measure of Union with success in the course of the present session.

Under this conviction it appears to me to be absolutely necessary that we should make a declaration to that effect as soon as possible after the adjournment, as I can have no doubt that the Opposition will avail themselves of the alarm which the proceedings in the British Parliament may create, to press forward violent resolutions in order to pledge those members against an Union who have not yet voted, and who might, from considering the advantages held out by England, and from other circumstances, be induced before another session to think more favourably of the measure.[1]

It is likewise, in my opinion, incumbent upon us to take some immediate line with respect to the Catholics, for whose support I find, from a conversation which I this morning had with Lord Fingal, the Anti-Unionists are eagerly bidding. It has been suggested by some principal persons amongst them, that they may be induced not to separate themselves from Government, if they had reason to hope that a removal of all local disabilities would form a part of the Union, and that they would be satisfied to leave the question of the Test Laws to the future decision of the United Parliament.

It is for your Grace and His Majesty's other confidential servants, to consider how far you would intrust the Irish Government with a discretion to be exercised according to circumstances on the above point; and also if it should appear that the active co-operation of the Catholics in support of the measure of Union, could be obtained by holding out to them expectations of the favourable disposition of Ministers to an alteration of the Test Laws

[1] The Duke of Portland long persevered in urging Lord Cornwallis to bring the question of Union again under discussion, and it was not till early in March that he authorised the Lord-Lieutenant to declare formally that no further steps would be taken during the existing session.

in the United Parliament, whether you would approve of general expectations of such indulgence being held out to them.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The above letter from Lord Cornwallis crossed two from the Duke of Portland, referring to the same subject. In one, to Lord Castlereagh, dated January 29, he writes: "Catholic Emancipation must not be granted but through the medium of an Union, and by the means of an united Parliament."

On the 30th of January the Duke wrote again, that "Even if the Opposition try to bribe the Roman Catholics by promising Emancipation, the Government is unanimous in opposing it in the Irish Parliament, and Lord Cornwallis is to state that whatever the line may be which a Union may enable the United Parliament to adopt, to forward the benevolent intentions of His Majesty towards any part of His subjects, the opposition of Government to any such measure, as with reference to the Irish Parliament separately, must be uniform, and exerted to the utmost."

WILLIAM WICKHAM, ESQ., TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, Feb. 6, 1799.

. . . Arthur O'Connor's house, &c., have long since been given up. His uniforms, arms, &c., were detained as proofs of his intentions; but as he had *never paid for them*, some were returned to the tradesmen, others kept by the Law Officers. As to money, the individual notes were detained, but 1000*l.* advanced as a loan; but on his acquittal, *all* his money was returned, and the loan not called in.

Yours, &c.,

WILLIAM WICKHAM.

The above was written in consequence of an application made by Arthur O'Connor for the restitution of his property.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Feb. 13, 1799.

I last night received your letters dated the 3rd and 4th, which, on account of the weather, have been long on the road. I am sorry to say that our prospect here does not brighten; folly, intemperance, and profligacy are bitter enemies, and it is difficult to contend against them. The Speaker has placed himself at the

head of the Anti-Unionists, and will convert the blind passion with which they are precipitating themselves and their country into certain ruin, to the purposes of his private interest and ambition. A begging-box[1] is going round for him after the example of Fox, and I am afraid he is likely to retain a majority in the House of Commons, which he will conduct to the attack of the British Ministry. The United Irishmen look on with pleasure, and are whetting their knives to cut the throats of all the nobility and gentry of the island.

The whole of the South is prepared to rise at the moment that a French soldier sets his foot on shore, and the people in Connaught are houghing all the cattle and sheep, for what purpose God knows, except to ruin all the men of property, and destroy the supplies for our navy and colonies. How far a Militia composed of these very men, and, in spite of all my objections, almost entirely dispersed in the cabins of the country, can be depended upon to fight the battles of Great Britain, it is not difficult to determine.

The patriotic Irish gentlemen who are so enraged at the insolent interference of England in the management of their affairs, if ever they dare to go to their-country-houses, barricade their ground-floor, and beg for a garrison of English Militia or Scotch Fencibles.

That the French will persevere in their attempts to invade Ireland there can be no doubt, and if they should succeed, which God forbid! in establishing a war in this country, I shall be most happy to have you with me, and shall take immediate steps to effect it.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 14, 1799.

It is with much pain I am to acquaint your Grace that the lenient measures adopted by the Legislature at the instance of His Majesty towards the close of the last session, have not been productive of those good effects in recalling the people to a sense of their allegiance, which was due to, and might have been expected from, so merciful an interposition in their favour. The same spirit of disaffection continues to pervade the lower orders, and, though

[1] An attempt was made to raise a subscription for the Speaker. Mr. Beresford informed Lord Auckland (Jan. 26, 1799) that he was told Mr. Bowes Daly had prevailed on the house of Latouche to promise 1000*l*., and that it was expected a large sum would be raised. The scheme, however, totally failed. An advertisement appeared in the newspapers as early as Jan. 16 to notify that a subscription-list was opened.

the rebellion is less openly persisted in, it does not fail to show itself in various outrages and depredations, not less destructive, and infinitely more embarrassing than open insurrection. The province of Ulster is upon the whole more exempt from disturbance than any other portion of the kingdom, but even in this quarter the disaffected are not inactive, and in the county of Antrim during the last month the houses of several loyal persons have been by night entered and stripped of arms. In the other provinces the treasonable disposition exists in full force, and a general insecurity prevails. The mails and travellers are frequently intercepted and robbed, the roads being infested with banditti. The counties of Wicklow and Wexford remain disturbed. In the county of Cork the usual resistance to the payment of tythes continues, accompanied by the cruel persecution of those employed in collecting them; and in the West, the old system of houghing cattle has been of late revived, and carried to an extent which threatens the most serious consequences not only to this kingdom but to the empire.

The amount of the cattle destroyed is already very great. The evil pervades the counties of Galway and Mayo, and is likely, if not speedily checked, to extend itself.

I have made the necessary distribution of troops to repress as far as possible this mischief, but your Grace must feel how little it is in the power of the military to prevent the commission of crimes, perpetrated at night over the face of so extensive a district.

I have already had the honour of stating to your Grace the difficulties which had arisen in the exercise of the summary powers enjoined by the proclamation of May 24,[1] and approved by both Houses of Parliament—a difficulty which nothing but the interposition of the Legislature can solve, so long as the King's Courts are open.

Under the peculiar pressure of the present moment, I have, by the advice of the King's servants, directed a Bill to be brought into Parliament on this subject without loss of time, a copy of which I have the honour to transmit with this despatch.

I could have wished that the draft of a Bill of so much delicacy and importance had been revised in England before it was introduced here, but having understood from your Grace that the principle of the Bill was approved by Ministers, I have thought it inexpedient to delay a measure so indispensable to the public

[1] This proclamation by the Lord-Lieutenant (Lord Camden) and Council ordered all General Officers to punish, by death or otherwise, according to martial law, every person concerned in the Rebellion, or aiding or assisting it in any way. Forty Privy Councillors signed this proclamation, and on the same day addresses thanking the Lord-Lieutenant for it, were unanimously carried in both Houses.

safety, the rather as we shall be enabled to avail ourselves of any suggestions with which your Grace may favour me in the future stages of the measure.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Allusion has already been made to the difficulties caused by the collision between civil and military law. Those difficulties still existed, and the Bill mentioned in the foregoing despatch was intended to remove them. The leading Anti-Unionists endeavoured to induce their whole party actively to oppose the proposed measures, but the country gentlemen were so impressed with the inefficiency of the ordinary tribunals, that they refused to concur in such a course, and the Bill was read a second time, without a division, February 25. The Anti-Unionists next endeavoured to modify its provisions, but Lord Castlereagh declared that if the Bill were rendered less stringent, he would abandon it altogether as useless, and that no alternative would then remain but to close the Civil Courts, and have recourse to Martial Law alone.

Mr. Ogle, in the hope of exciting dissension, endeavoured to prove that Lord Cornwallis was deviating widely from the system adopted by Lord Camden, and Dr. Duigenan,[1] always an advocate for violent measures, used similar language, as, although himself a Unionist, he was actuated by strong personal hostility to Lord Cornwallis, with whose lenity and moderation he was much displeased.

The reply to those assertions was obvious. During Lord Camden's administration, rebellion was raging and therefore energetic measures were necessary; but when tranquillity was almost restored, a milder course might safely be followed. A motion to delay the Committee for one day was negatived, February 27, by 72 to 33, and the only amendment formally proposed was rejected the same evening by 121 to 18. Some discussion as to the details of the Bill took place with the British Government, by whom several alterations were suggested, and it received the Royal Assent March 25.

The principal provisions of the Rebellion Act were to enable

[1] Right Hon. Patrick Duigenan, Judge-Advocate, and afterwards Judge of the Prerogative Court, b. 1735, d. April 11, 1816; m. 1st, a dau. of Thomas Berry, Esq., of English Castle (another of whose daughters was the wife of Baron Sir William Smith); 2nd, Oct. 2, 1807, the widow of —— Hepenstall, Esq. Having no issue, he left his fortune to Sir William Smith. Dr. Duigenan was educated by his parents, who were in a low condition of life, for the Roman Catholic priesthood, but he became a Protestant, and entered as a sizar in Trinity College, Dublin, where he soon acquired distinction. His political views, especially against Catholic Emancipation, were always extreme. He was a member of the Committee of Compensation. M.P. for Old Leighlin from 1791 to 1797, and then for Armagh city till his death.

the Lord-Lieutenant to direct prisoners to be tried by martial law, whether the Courts of Law were sitting or not. The Courts-Martial were to be constituted and assembled as the Lord-Lieutenant might direct, and had power to inflict capital or any other punishment. No Court of Law could question any proceeding of theirs, if declared by the Lord-Lieutenant to be done under his authority, nor was any officer or soldier liable to be tried for any act done under the authority of this Bill.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret and Confidential.] Received Feb. 15.

MY LORD, Whitehall [about 12] Feb. 1799.

. . . I must in the first place acquaint your Excellency, that it is considered by us all to be a necessary and indispensable preliminary to the admission of any overture on the part of the Catholics, that the consent of the Protestant supporters of Government should be obtained, and that the sentiments of the Chancellor, Lord Waterford, Lord Shannon, and other personages of that description, and also of such of the country gentlemen as have pledged themselves in support of the question of Union, should be carefully and impartially collected respecting the propriety of opening any intercourse, or holding out any expectations of compensation for the assistance of the Catholics in the attainment of that measure. Previous, therefore, to any communications with the Catholics, it is thought right that your Excellency should inform yourself from the persons above mentioned, and particularly from the Chancellor, whether he would think it advisable, under the existing circumstances of the country, to give to the Catholics, by an article of the proposed Union, the capacity of being appointed to the offices reserved in the Act of 1793, upon the conditions alluded to in Lord Castlereagh's letter, or upon any others whatever; and whether, if such a concession can be made with safety to the State, and without offence to the Protestant interest in general, and particularly to that part of it which has proved its attachment to English government, and manifested its liberality and good sense by its support of the principle of a Legislative Union, the influence of the Catholics is sufficient to ascertain the success of the measure, and full security can be had for their performance of their engagements. . . . I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

P.S.—Some ambiguity might arise from the manner in which

the proposal stated in Lord Castlereagh's letter is worded, as the Test Laws in fact exclude Catholics from the enumerated offices as well as from Parliament. I conclude, however, that the idea is to admit them to office by an article of the Union, but to reserve the question of their sitting in Parliament to the decision of the United Legislature. It would, however, be material that this should be more precisely explained.

The Duke of Portland in the course of this month addressed several letters to Lord Cornwallis, in which he explains the view taken by Government of the Catholic question, and states his satisfaction at finding that he and Lord Cornwallis concur in their opinions upon that subject.

The Duke also alludes to the payment of the Roman Catholic Clergy and Dissenting Ministers, and says that any proposition of that nature "should meet with a favourable reception, and a general good disposition should be manifested to entertain and discuss it."

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 16, 1799.

I have the honour to acquaint your Grace that yesterday in the House of Commons Lord Corry[1] moved that the House should resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House to take into consideration the State of the Nation. The objects of this motion were to league the country gentlemen who had voted against the measure of Union in a general opposition to Government, and to enable the Speaker to deliver his sentiments upon the Union, and to answer the statement which had been made by Mr. Pitt.

His Lordship not having prefaced his motion with any particular statement of the object he had in view, Lord Castlereagh resisted it upon the grounds that after the declaration he had made that the subject of Union would not at present be brought forward by him, the motion was unnecessary; that if it was meant to bind the House irrevocably against the principle, it was unconstitutional; that it could therefore only tend to further the secret views of a party which was endeavouring to commit the country gentlemen against Government, to increase the impatience of the people, to weaken

[1] Somerset Lord Corry, afterwards, Feb. 2, 1802, 2nd Earl of Belmore; b. July 11, 1774, d. April 18, 1841; m. Oct. 20, 1800, Juliana, dau. of Henry Thomas, 2nd Earl of Carrick. Governor of Jamaica from Nov. 1828 to April, 1832. M.P. for the county of Tyrone from 1797 till he succeeded to the peerage.

the power of the executive Government by creating division, and to give spirits and confidence to internal traitors and foreign enemies.

Mr. George Knox, who resigned his office of Commissioner of the Revenue, took the opportunity of this motion to declare his determination to support Government upon every question but the direct question of Union, and said he should resist it as an effort of party. This gentleman is one of Lord Abercorn's friends, and I know that his Lordship, having considered that the conduct of the Speaker and the Opposition was directed with a view to overturn my administration, had written in the strongest terms to his friends to support it.

Mr. Tighe[1] supported Lord Corry's motion upon the grounds of the proceedings in the English Parliament, and the apparent determination of Ministry to proceed with the measure of Union, and it was upon this ground, and the necessity which was insisted upon by Opposition of counteracting the speeches and statements of the English Cabinet, that the debate on their side proceeded.

In the course of it, Lord Corry was called upon to explain what were his intentions if the House went into a Committee, as it had been objected that a Committee would open the door for every member to make what inflammatory speeches he pleased, and upon every possible subject he chose to bring forward. On this his Lordship stated that his sole design was to move an address to the King, in which the House was to profess its determination to stand and fall with Great Britain, but at the same time to assert the necessity of maintaining the present constitution of Ireland inviolable.

The debate continued till six o'clock in the morning, and was well supported by the friends of Administration. The temper of the House was moderate; the country gentlemen all asserted their disposition to support Government, except upon the measure of Union, and in general they wished it to be understood that the address was by no means designed to pledge the House irrevocably against an Union if the circumstances of the kingdom should materially alter.

The Right Honourable Colonel King[2] divided with Government, and his grand-nephew Colonel King[3] went away. Mr. Acheson and

[1] William Tighe of Innistioge, b. May 5, 1766, d. March 19, 1816; m. 1793, Marianne, dau. and coheir of Daniel Gahan, Esq., of Coolquiel. The boroughs of Wicklow and Innistioge belonged to him. He represented Wicklow Borough from 1790 to 1797, and Innistioge till the Union. His brother Henry was husband to the celebrated authoress of 'Psyche.'

[2] Right Hon. Henry King, brother of Robert, 1st Earl of Kingston; b. Feb. 18, 1733, d. Feb. 23, 1821; m. July 28, 1757, a dau. of Paul Annesley Gore, Esq. M.P. for Boyle from 1761 to the Union.

[3] Colonel the Hon. Robert King, 2nd son of Robert, 2nd Earl of Kingston; b. Aug. 12, 1773, d. Nov. 20, 1854; m. Dec. 9, 1799, Frances, dau. of Lawrence, 1st Earl of Rosse

Mr. Monsel[1] and Mr. H. Stewart,[2] who had before divided with Opposition, left them.

Upon the division there appeared 123 against Lord Corry's motion, 103 in favour of it.

I trust the effect of this division will be such as to enable me to carry forward the business of the session without much embarrassment, but the debate so much turned upon Lord Castlereagh's declaration that the question of Union was for the present asleep, that I can by no means draw any inference that the probability of resuming that question with advantage in the present session is in the slightest degree increased.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Feb. 23, 1799.

I am concerned to state to your Grace that this kingdom is growing disturbed in many parts, and, from the circumstances of preparation at Brest, I am induced to believe that the renewed activity of the disaffected is connected with the designs of the enemy.

In the counties of Mayo and Galway the evil disposition of the lower classes has taken a new direction: under the colour of an endeavour to lower rents, and to put an end to the practice of letting lands to intermediate tenants, or, as they are called, middlemen, the lower classes have combined and houghed cattle in the night-time to a very great amount in these counties, and these attacks have been accompanied with every species of barbarity. The slaughter of sheep and black cattle was so great, and the mischief was spreading itself so rapidly, that the county of Galway has been placed under the provisions of the Insurrection Act, and I thought it right, on the 20th instant, to issue orders for executing martial law with vigour, a copy of which I enclose to your Grace. I have mentioned the pretences for these outrages, but I have every reason to believe that they are connected with the system of United Irishmen, and that they are intended to prevent the supply of the navy with provisions; and I learn from the Prime Serjeant,

of the 2nd creation. A General. Created Lord Erris Dec. 27, 1800, and made Viscount Lorton May 30, 1806; M.P. for Boyle from May, 1798, till the Union.

[1] William Thomas Monsel, of Tervoe, b. 1755; m. Aug. 1776, Hannah, dau. of —— Strettle, Esq. M.P. for Dingle Icouch from 1797 to Jan. 15, 1800.

[2] Henry Stewart, M.P. for Longford Borough from 1783 to April, 1799.

who is just returned from his election at Galway, that the cattle of several landholders who were suspected of disaffection have been spared, and that Mr. M'Donald,[1] who headed the Rebels in Mayo, whilst the French were in Ireland, has been recently traced to the neighbourhood of the spot where the houghing of cattle first appeared.

From secret information I cannot but apprehend that an endeavour is making to re-organise Dublin in such a manner as to prevent meetings and consequent discovery, and there is reason to believe that parts of the counties of Down and Antrim are again ready for insurrection.

Robberies and murders continue frequent in various parts, and there is every symptom that the mind of the lower classes is in general much agitated and preparing for new mischief.

I am to expect much opposition to the Bill for legalising the exercise of martial law. Mr. Plunket,[2] Mr. Barrington,[3] Mr. Moore,[4] and other lawyers, are against the principle entirely. Some of the country gentlemen wish to have the Bill modified and restricted. I shall however trust that the measure will pass without being clogged by such restrictions as will render it inoperative.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] The person here meant was James Joseph Macdonell, son of Joseph Macdonell, Esq., of Canacan, a gentleman of good property in Mayo. James Joseph Macdonell was originally a merchant at Westport, but relinquished his business, and was called to the bar. He was delegate for Mayo at the Catholic Committee, which, with Byrne for its President, met in Dublin. He joined the French at Castlebar in 1798 with 1000 men, was made a General, and exerted himself actively as a leader. He escaped from Ireland before the surrender of Humbert, and went to France, and it is very doubtful whether the report of his return in the above letter was correct. He died in America about the year 1848.

[2] Mr., afterwards Right Hon. William Conyngham Plunket, created Lord Plunket June 1, 1827, b. July, 1764, d. Jan. 4, 1854; m. 1791, Catherine, d. of John M'Causland, Esq., of Strabane, M.P. Solicitor-General in Ireland, Oct. 22, 1803, and Attorney-General Oct. 1805, to May, 1807. Jan. 1822, again Attorney-General, and June, 1827, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and subsequently, Dec. 1830, Lord Chancellor. With the exception of three months (from Jan. to April, 1835), he held this office until June 22, 1841, when he was deprived of the seals by his own political friends to make room for Lord Campbell. M.P. for Charlemont from 1797 till the Union, Midhurst Jan. 1807, to 1812, and then for the University of Dublin till June, 1827.

[3] Mr., afterwards Sir Jonah, Barrington, Judge of the Admiralty Court, b. about 1764, d. April 8, 1834; m. June, 1789, a dau. of Edward Grogan, Esq., a silk-merchant, and sister-in-law of Lundy Foot. He was charged with embezzling the money of suitors, which, in virtue of his office, was lodged in his hands: in 1830 the case was brought before Parliament, and, by an almost unanimous vote in both Houses, the Crown was petitioned to remove him from the Bench—a solitary instance of the degradation of a Judge, since the tenure of the office has been "during good behaviour." M.P. for Tuam from 1790 to 1797, and Clogher from April, 1798, to Jan. 1800. He wrote a "History of the Union," and "Memoirs of His Own Times," full of wonderful statements, more amusing than trustworthy.

[4] Arthur Moore, b. about 1766, d. Jan. 6, 1846; m. July, 1791, Frances, dau. of —— Stoney, Esq., of Ballingarry; Prime Serjeant Dec. 29, 1802, and Judge of the Common Pleas from July 23, 1816, to Feb. 23, 1839. M.P. for Tralee from Feb. 1798 to June, 1802.

THE EARL OF CLARE TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

MY DEAR LORD, Ely Place, Feb. 25, 1799.

I send you a copy of the Statute for enabling the Provost and Senior Fellows of Trinity College to marry.[1] You will I hope agree with me that if I am to continue Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dublin, and a Visitor of Trinity College, that I have a right to expect from the Duke of Portland an acquiescence in any recommendation I may make of statutes which relate to the interior economy of the College; and I must repeat that on this subject I feel I have very strong reason to complain of something worse than neglect and inattention on the part of his Grace.

This most irksome and unpleasant office has been forced on me by the Duke of Gloucester;[2] and nothing short of a strong sense of duty on my part to the King's brother should have induced me to accept it. I have already had the misfortune of holding repeated visitations of the College, which I can assert with confidence have rescued it from ruin; and I do desire that it may be understood by the Duke of Portland, finally and explicitly, that I will continue to hold the situation of Vice-Chancellor of the University and Visitor of Trinity College, on no other terms than those which I feel I have a right to demand from him and from every other Minister of the Crown. I seek not to dabble in patronage, but after the labour which I have undergone, and which I must still submit to in keeping that seminary within any reasonable limit, I do expect that when I apply for any statute for its better government, my application will receive the attention which I feel it has a right to command. I cannot see any good reason why the Duke of Portland should interfere with me on a subject so peculiarly within my province, and which he cannot have the means of understanding.

Yours always very truly,

My dear Lord,

CLARE.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 28, 1799.

On Tuesday last the Bill for the more speedy suppression of the Rebellion was read a second time. Upon this Bill being

[1] The statutes (like those of the English Universities) prohibited the marriage of Fellows. The penalty attached to this rule was evaded by designating the wives of Fellows by their maiden names. Thus an invitation to dinner, &c., would run, "The Rev. Dr. A. and Miss B. request," &c.

[2] Chancellor of the University.

first introduced, an attempt was made to unite all the persons who had voted against the Union in opposition to it.

One principle privately urged was, that it gave a power to the Ministry to force that question; another that it degraded Parliament, and tended to prove that it was incompetent to manage the country; that it therefore should be considered as an Union question, and that if it were to be allowed to pass, it should be restricted in its operations, and its duration limited for a few months or during the Session of Parliament. I understand that the Speaker, Sir John Parnell, and Mr. Ponsonby, sounded gentlemen on those points, but it was found that so many of the country gentlemen felt it their duty to strengthen the Executive Power as much as possible, that all attempts to cement them in a regular opposition were impossible. Mr. Ponsonby therefore and Sir John Parnell kept a backward line, and it was determined by them not to divide on the principle of the Bill, but to let it go into Committee. This refusal of the country gentlemen to unite against this Bill, proves that all attempts to form a party against Government, with a view to overturn the Administration, have entirely failed, and that, however on some particular questions a considerable opposition may appear, there is not any probability of its being successful in any measure which is necessary for carrying on the King's Government.

The Attorney-General opened the debate in a speech of considerable length, in which he entered into the state of the country and the necessity of arming the Executive Government with a legal authority to exercise martial law, in order to prevent the clashing of jurisdiction with the Courts of Law.

The chief opposers were Mr. Barrington, Mr. Dobbs, Mr. Plunket, Mr. Ruxton,[1] who are barristers, and Sir Lawrence Parsons, who, though he voted for the Bill going into Committee, spoke against its principle with great violence. The tendency of the opposition went to modify the powers and to localise the operations of the Bill. Upon this Lord Castlereagh rose to defend its principle, and to declare that, if the Bill were to be modified, he would relinquish it. His Lordship stated that the sole object of the Bill was not to confer any new power or prerogative on the Crown, but to render its known powers compatible with the continuance of the jurisdiction of the Courts of Law. He admitted that the jurisdiction of the Courts of Law and of Martial Law could not constitutionally co-exist, and that it would be therefore necessary for the Government to shut up the Courts of Law, and to prevent all the

[1] There were two Mr. Ruxtons in Parliament, both for the borough of Ardee, which belonged to the family; the one mentioned in the text was William Parkinson Ruxton, b. 1767, d. Oct. 9, 1847; m. Jan. 18, 1802, Anna Maria, dau. of Thomas Fortescue of Dromeskin. M.P. for Ardee from 1790 to the Union.

ordinary administration of justice, or for Parliament to authorize Martial Law to be exercised in concurrence with their jurisdiction. His Lordship also stated broadly this principle, that upon every great emergency the Executive Government was bound not to wait for the previous sanction of the Legislature, but boldly to meet the emergency for the safety of the kingdom, relying upon its own responsibility, and trusting to the future approbation of Parliament; but that this principle disappeared when the emergency was not transitory, and when the mischief to be obviated was permanent, and that a new principle then arose, which was, that the Parliament never ought to suffer for any long period a continued deviation from the ordinary practice of the Constitution, but that it ought entirely to check such a deviation if improper, or to legalise it if necessary. Some observations having been thrown out by Dr. Duigenan and Mr. Ogle, that the system on which I had acted had been different from my predecessor in office, his Lordship entered into a satisfactory explanation on that subject. He contended that the true principles of conduct had been equally applied by my predecessor and myself; that the coercive measures which were pursued by Lord Camden were necessary, on the breaking out of a rebellion, for its suppression; and that I had continued the system of rigour whilst the force of the Rebels remained in any degree collected, but that when they were dispersed and subdued, I would have acted contrary to every principle of policy if I had endeavoured to drive the remains of the Rebels to desperation, and had not opened a door for their return to allegiance. His Lordship also showed, from documents which I had supplied, that in endeavouring to reclaim the minds of the people, and to attach them to the mildness of our government, I had not failed to apply on proper occasions a due measure of severity; and he exemplified this assertion by stating that since the French invasion 380 Rebels had been tried by martial law, that 131 had been capitally convicted, of whom 90 had suffered the punishment of death.

I understand his Lordship's speech had great effect upon the House, and that several members who had intended to have voted against the Bill withdrew their opposition. . . .

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO WILLIAM WICKHAM, ESQ.

SIR, Dublin Castle, Feb. 28, 1799.

I have laid before the Lord-Lieutenant your letter of the 2nd inst., together with that of the Chargé d'Affaires of His Prus-

sian Majesty, in which he desires to be informed whether the Government would agree to sending certain of the Irish Rebels to serve in the armies of the King his master, and what is the probable number of those who are fit for this purpose.

I request you will inform his Grace the Duke of Portland that there are many persons fit for service now in confinement in this kingdom, whom it is intended to send abroad; and that it appears to the Lord-Lieutenant, under all the circumstances, an eligible mode of disposing of them, to allow them to enter into the service of foreign princes not at war with His Majesty. His Grace will therefore be pleased to communicate this intention to Mr. Balan,[1] and request to know from him what number of men, not exceeding five hundred, would be taken, what mode should be provided for their conveyance, and at what port they should be delivered.

The men who are to be disposed of in this manner are for the most part Rebels who have been convicted and sentenced to be transported, and from the present state of the country the number of these is likely to be increased; but there are, besides, others who may probably choose to enter voluntarily into this service, to be released from their present confinement.

I have the honour, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 28, 1799.

The Earl of Clare, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dublin, has represented to me that it would be proper a new statute should be made permitting the Provost and Senior Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, to marry.

I enclose to your Grace herewith the draught of a statute for that purpose, and request you will lay the same before His Majesty, with my humble recommendation that His Majesty will be graciously pleased by His Royal Letter to establish the same as one of the statutes of the College.

And if His Majesty shall be graciously pleased to consent thereto, I request your Grace will move His Majesty for His Royal

[1] M. Louis Balan, Prussian Chargé d'Affaires, b. 1769, d. Jan. 12, 1807; m. 1800, Miss Elizabeth Barclay. The scheme alluded to was carried on for some time, and about 500 men were raised and sent to a small place near Waterford, named New Geneva, where some Swiss had attempted, but without success, to make a settlement. Of the corps thus formed a portion was sent abroad, but the plan was ultimately abandoned. Much correspondence passed throughout the year 1799 on the subject, but as it led to no practical result, it has been omitted.

Letter, directing Letters Patent to be passed under the Great Seal of this kingdom, for establishing the said statute as one of the statutes of the said College and University.[1]

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, March 3, 1799.

. . . Your Excellency observes to me that the lenient measures adopted towards the close of the last Session, have not been productive of the good effects expected from them. I therefore must represent to you the propriety of having recourse to measures of a different description, and of aiding your endeavours by the immediate interposition of the strong hand of Government. For this purpose, I should propose to you to seize in every quarter of the kingdom, and as nearly as possible at the same time, as many of the principal conspirators and their abettors, as are known to Government, and to secure them, as far as your means permit, in separate places of confinement; in which they should be kept from any intercourse with their associates, who, if it were possible, should be kept in ignorance of the place of their detention.

. . . I am to inform your Excellency that His Majesty's servants are unanimously of opinion, that the removal of the State-prisoners from Ireland is a measure which is indispensably and immediately necessary, and that the circumstances of the times will justify us to your Excellency in availing ourselves of the right, which you state to have been perfectly understood, of retaining any or all of those prisoners in custody so long as the war should last, or during the pleasure of Government, notwithstanding the evident leaning of your mind at the same time, to think that stipulation entitled to a relaxation which would hold out to them an earlier prospect of liberation from their imprisonment. We are also of opinion that the places suggested by your Excellency in your despatch of 13th September last, as those at which they might be safely stationed, are the very best that could be proposed.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

PORTLAND.

[1] The Duke of Portland, who had been adverse to this statute, gave way, and it was authorized accordingly.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 11, 1799.

I have received your Grace's *secret and confidential* letter dated the 3rd instant.

No precaution or exertion shall be wanting on my part to give efficiency to the vigorous means which have been taken by His Majesty's confidential servants to enable me, by powerful reinforcements from Britain, to counteract and repel the attempts which the enemy will most undoubtedly persevere in making to invade this distracted country.[1]

When I observed to your Grace that the lenient measures adopted towards the close of the last Session of Parliament, had not been productive of the good effects expected from them, I alluded only to the pardons and protections which were held out to those of inferior note who had been guilty only of joining in the rebellion, but had not been leaders, or committed any act of deliberate murder, provided that they returned to their duty and allegiance.

It was, however, far from my intention to admit, nor do I feel conscious that I have sanctioned one act of improper or impolitic lenity, or that, when the interposition of the strong hand of Government was required, it was in any instance ever withheld.

It is unnecessary for me to urge to your Grace any arguments in favour of the protections and pardons which were granted at the time I mention, not only because I conceive that the expediency of trying such a measure must be obvious, after the defeat and dispersion of the rebel force, but on account also of its having so perfectly coincided with the sentiments of His Majesty's confidential servants.

The seizure of persons suspected of being conspirators or abettors of treason has been invariably practised whenever the public safety has appeared to require it, and within these few weeks many of this description have been apprehended, particularly in the counties of Down and Antrim.

A clamour has, I know, been raised against this Government for not affording sufficient protection to His Majesty's loyal subjects; but I can venture most confidently to declare to your

[1] This refers to information received by Government, from sources worthy of credit, to the effect that a formidable expedition was preparing at Brest, destined to invade Ireland in March or April, and that the societies of United Irish were increasing in London to a very alarming extent. Happily the expectations of an invasion were not realized, as the expedition in question was ultimately sent to Cadiz.

Grace that this accusation is totally unfounded. A considerable portion of the yeomanry are kept on permanent duty, at a great expense, solely for this purpose, and the Irish militia and the Fencible regiments are in so dispersed a state as very materially to affect their discipline, and to render it exceedingly difficult to assemble a sufficient force to give early opposition to an invading enemy.

I am sanguine enough to believe that your Grace's apprehensions of any material change in the temper and disposition of the yeomanry in general are not well founded, and I should not conceive that the ill-humour which was occasioned by the agitation of the Union, would render those of the metropolis less anxious than formerly to defend their property, which must be exposed to great hazard by any convulsion that might destroy the existing Government.

Your Grace may be assured that I shall omit no means in my power to encourage and animate the whole body of yeomanry to a faithful and active discharge of their duty; but I never can permit them to take advantage of their military situation to pursue their private quarrels and gratify their personal resentments, or to rob and murder at their discretion any of their fellow-subjects whom they may think proper, on their own authority, to brand with the name of Rebels.

The determination of His Majesty's servants to remove the State-prisoners from Ireland, affords me very sincere satisfaction, and your Grace may depend upon my paying the strictest attention to your instructions on this subject.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 12, 1799.

I received the honour of your Grace's letter of the 3rd instant, conveying to me the opinions of His Majesty's confidential servants with respect to the Bill for rendering the exercise of martial law compatible with the continuance of the civil jurisdiction of the Courts of Law, and inclosing to me the draft of a Bill prepared by His Majesty's law servants in England, which your Grace recommends should be substituted in the room of the Bill introduced here, or the provisions of which you desire may be incorporated with it.

I am sorry that doubts should have arisen in the minds of His

Majesty's Ministers, that the Bill introduced by the Attorney-General had the slightest tendency to call in question the legality of the strong measures to which my predecessor was obliged to have recourse, for it appeared to me that the Bill having recited the authorities on which Lord Camden acted, and not having confirmed them by an enacting clause, did virtually acknowledge their legality to the fullest extent.

The enacting clauses of the Bill had only a prospective operation, and being coupled together, their clear and only intention was to allow the continuance of martial law in concurrence with the ordinary process of justice. Upon this principle alone the Bill was founded, and debated and agreed to in the Commons.

As however His Majesty's confidential servants are of opinion that the principles above stated, will more clearly appear and be more accurately carried into effect by adopting the provisions of the Bill your Grace has transmitted, such measures as were in my power have been adopted for that purpose.

When your Grace's despatch arrived, the Bill having passed the Commons was before the Lords, and the second reading had been delayed till I could have received your Grace's answer to my letter on this subject. Consultation was immediately held with the Lord Chancellor, the Chief Judges, and Lord Pery, as to amendments suggested. They were unanimously of opinion that as the Assizes were on the point of commencing, and attendance in the House of Commons was thin, it would be highly objectionable to withdraw the Irish Bill, in order to substitute the Bill transmitted by your Grace, but they agreed that all the material points of it might be easily incorporated by amendments. This business was undertaken and carried through by the Chancellor, and I have now the honour of enclosing to your Grace a printed copy of the amended Bill, and which I flatter myself will fully meet the sentiments of His Majesty's Ministers.

Your Grace will find that every point has been carefully taken up, in which the English Bill differs from ours, except as to that which limits and localizes the exercise of martial law.

The state of the kingdom is such, from the extended nature of the conspiracy, that acts of rebellion are breaking out from time to time in almost every part, and as the relief to be applied must often be immediate, the delay of waiting for a representation to be sent up to Dublin, and a regular Proclamation to be issued in consequence of specific documents being laid before the Council, might be ruinous. It has therefore been thought essential to the operation of the Bill not to restrict the prerogative in its operation,

but to leave it as free and uncontrolled as before, so that I should have the power during the continuance of the rebellion of acting with as much celerity and as universally, as the nature of circumstances may require. I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, March 14, 1799.

I have received your letter dated the 8th instant, with the enclosures respecting Huntley's journey to Scotland, and you may assure him that I have no objection to his returning to London, and staying there as long as may suit his convenience, unless he hears that the French are actually coming, and then I am sure that he will not require an order from me, to make him hasten over to join his brigade. The letter which he got from Moore was a circular one to all officers on this establishment.

It is most earnestly to be wished that you may succeed with the Scotch Fencibles, as the precarious tenure on which we hold the English militia makes me very uneasy. The Leicestershire regiment (Duke of Rutland's), which three months ago so handsomely agreed to stay without any limitation of time, have now desired to return to England, and have with difficulty been prevailed upon to remain here till the 1st of June. The Irish militia, besides their total want of all idea of discipline and subordination, from their being dispersed in small detachments over the whole face of the country, without officers or non-commissioned officers who are capable of taking any care of them, are certainly not to be depended upon, even in point of fidelity, in the event of a serious invasion of this country, and all that can be expected from the yeomanry is, that they will for a time, if no material disaster happens, keep the country from rising behind us.

Our militia regiments are daily offering their services in Britain, and several have extended them to Europe, and some to any part of the world. I have asked permission to bring in a Bill, to enable us to accept their offer as far as Britain and Jersey and Guernsey, and I really think that if two or three regiments were to be sent to England in the course of the summer, and taken notice of by the King and Duke of York, it would have a good effect, and it would certainly very much flatter the vanity of this country, which is one of its most powerful passions.

The South is now the part of Ireland that is by far the most

agitated, which looks as if that was the quarter to which the enemy meant to direct their next attack.

We are, I flatter myself, gaining ground with respect to the Union, and I am sanguine enough to think that by a change in the plan of representation, that great and salutary measure may, at no very distant period, succeed. I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, March 20, 1799.

We are, I trust, rather gaining ground in respect to the Union, but in the general indisposition and disaffection of the country, I cannot discover the smallest improvement. Our Parliamentary opposition is for the present at an end, and our Rebellion Bill, which was thought on your side of the water so strong a measure that we should not be able to carry it, went through the House of Commons with acclamation, and I am every day pressed to act upon it on a much larger scale than I approve.

Gardiner[1] is come over, and looks well, but is much changed from what we remember him both in manners and in spirits. I am to see him in private this morning, when I mean to propose to recommend him to the Duke of York for the Staff in this country, and to place him next in command to Lake in the province of Munster.

By the papers of the 16th, war on the Continent appears inevitable,[2] which may perhaps relieve us from the dangers which threaten us from the great preparations which are making at Brest and in the Texel. Our army is so dispersed over the face of the country, that it would be difficult for me to assemble in due time a sufficient force to oppose a powerful armament, and some of the Ministers think that I do not indulge the gentlemen of the country with sufficient detachments.

[1] Lieut.-General William Gardiner, brother of Luke 1st Viscount Mountjoy, b. Oct. 23, 1748, d. June 25, 1806; m. 1777, Mary, dau. of the Rev. Sir Richard Wrottesley, Bart. She had been a Maid of Honor. He had long served under Lord Cornwallis.

[2] The Congress of Radstaat had been sitting for some time, but both parties seemed more disposed to resort to arms than to trust to diplomacy. The Austrian army was stationed on the Leck, and the French crossed the Rhine towards the end of February. Although at the date of this letter no formal declaration of war had taken place, the French Ministers had, on March 14, been forced by the Austrians to quit Ratisbon and Munich. A large fleet was assembled in the Texel, under Admiral Story, and another at Brest, under Bruix, then Minister of Marine. A gale of wind forced Lord Bridport to raise the blockade, and the French sailed for Cadiz with 25 sail-of-the-line, drove away Lord Keith, who had only 15, and, forming a junction with the Spaniards, the united fleets, numbering upwards of 40 sail-of-the line, proceeded to Genoa. Lord Bridport, meantime, went to Ireland, where he had expected to find the French fleet.

The O'Connors, and about twenty of the principal traitors, are embarked for Fort George, where I trust they will not find many friends. This is not yet publicly known.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

What a sad misfortune the death of poor Horace Cornwallis! I am vastly sorry for the Bishop.

RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.] Received March 22.

MY DEAR LORD, Wimbledon, March , 1799.

I have received your letter of the 14th, and have communicated the contents to Lord Huntley in so far as it respects him. He is returned from Scotland.

I spoke to the Duke of York on the subject of the Scotch Fencibles, and I expect to learn from him immediately what number Sir Ralph Abercromby[1] thinks may be expected from thence for the service of Ireland. My own idea is, that you may get four or five regiments that can be depended upon, and I am not without hopes of getting you back the Sutherlands by forming them at once into a regiment of the Line, with proper officers. I hope likewise Huntley's regiment may be augmented, by authorizing him to enlist from his father's fencible regiment, which refused in that character to go to Ireland, I believe fully more from the fault of the officers than of the men. I shall leave no stone unturned to get you as large a supply of force as possible, on whose residence with you you can depend, in order to render you as independent of the English and Irish militia as possible. What you say of the Leicester militia does not surprise me. From the time that any of them stirred the question of coming home, I had little dependence on the rest remaining, and so I believe it will ultimately terminate.

Upon the subject of the Irish militia, it is really difficult how to dispose of those who have offered to serve out of Ireland. Mayo and Wicklow I understand are two of the best, but they have offered only their services in Great Britain. If one regiment would go to America, I think it might be very well disposed of in Canada or Nova Scotia; one might be sent to Minorca, one to Jersey, and one to Guernsey. O'Hara says he has too many Irish in Gibraltar already, and therefore we could not send one of them there. If

[1] Sir R. Abercromby then commanded in Scotland.

you think, in point of flattering the Irish, it was politically of use, we might with that view bring two of them to Great Britain, but except in that view we have certainly no use for them here. We are perfectly strong in point of home defence. Our weakness is in the want of regular and offensive force, and we shall feel it strongly if affairs take such a turn on the Continent as to render it expedient for us to take a post in Holland in co-operation with the King of Prussia. I cannot lay aside hopes of matters at last coming to that desirable issue.

This deficiency in our offensive force leads me to put the question to your Lordship, how far it is possible for you to prevail on the Irish Parliament to give us the power of recruiting into our regular regiments such volunteers from the Irish militia regiments as may be disposed to take a bounty for that purpose.[1] I understand from everybody that the men are excellent, and the defect in these militia corps arises from their being so badly officered. If that is the case, and if we could be permitted to fill up our regular regiments from them, it would at once give you a most efficient force in Ireland, for the regular regiments might be recruited up to 1000 strong. If you had ten such regiments together with the British Fencibles, I think you would then be safe, and altogether independent of either Irish or English militia. When I say independent of English militia, I mean it in no other sense, than that you would be independent of their caprice in coming away whenever they take it into their minds to wish to get home. I feel this to be so important a point to accomplish, that I cannot help recommending it to your serious consideration, and I shall be glad to hear from you on the different particulars of this letter with your first convenience.

I am very happy to observe what you say respecting the Union. It will certainly not improve our Houses of Parliament. In all other respects it will answer, and without it, Ireland is a country in which it will be impossible for any civilized being to live, and it will be such a thorn in our sides, as to render us for ever uncomfortable, let our own affairs be conducted as well and prosperously as it is possible for the wisdom of man to do.

Believe me, &c.,

HENRY DUNDAS.

On the back of the draft of this despatch, which was submitted to the King, is endorsed, in the handwriting of George III.—"I can

[1] This permission was obtained.

by no means encourage the idea of any of the Irish militia coming to Great Britain; it would with reason offend the English militia; some going to Jersey, Guernsey, or North America might be countenanced.—G. R."

The above despatch is copied from the draft found among the Dundas Papers, as the original does not exist. Neither has any trace been found of the reply of Lord Cornwallis.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 27, 1799.

. . . I am happy to inform your Grace (perhaps it is a tolerable indication on which side the strength is likely ultimately to lie) that Lord Ely has declared positively for the Union. The alteration intended in the plan for the representation has had its weight no doubt with his Lordship. I cannot but consider this determination, taken at the present moment, as a very favourable omen, and extremely important, notwithstanding it is clogged with some awkwardness. He has brought into Parliament a Mr. Shaw[1] and Mr. Luttrell. Lord Ely says that neither shall vote against us, and promises, if possible, to get rid of Mr. Shaw. I should hope the Lord-Lieutenant might succeed in persuading Lord Carhampton that his son had not sufficiently considered the question. At present his Lordship's efficient force is reduced to six.

I should submit to your Grace whether it might not be advantageous that Lord Downshire should be early apprised of the scheme of representation at present in the contemplation of Ministers. It might perhaps tend to reconcile him. His declaration in favour of the Union would have the most powerful influence. . . .

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, March 28, 1799.

The business of our Session of Parliament is nearly over, and I hope in a fortnight or three weeks to adjourn, until the

[1] Mr., afterwards Sir Robert Shaw, Bart., so created Aug. 17, 1821, b. Jan. 29, 1774, d. March 10, 1849; m. 1st, Jan. 7, 1795, Maria, dau. and sole heir of Abraham Wilkinson, Esq., of Bushy Park; 2nd, July 2, 1834, Amelia, dau. of Benjamin Spencer, Esq. (M.D.) of Twickenham. M.P. for Lord Ely's Borough of Bannow from March, 1799, till Jan. 1800, when he vacated his seat, and was elected for St. Johnstown, Longford, which he represented till the Union. He sat for the city of Dublin from March, 1804, to 1826.

return of the Bills shall enable me to prorogue. At all events I shall move to the Lodge in the Park in the course of next week, which is a great object.

The opinion of the loyal part of the public is, from everything that I can learn, changing fast in favour of the Union; but I have great reason to believe that the United Irishmen, who form the great mass of the people, are more organized and more determined than ever in their purposes of separation, and their spirits are at this moment raised to the highest pitch, in the confidence of soon seeing a French army in this country.

The dispersed state of our army renders our situation very embarrassing with respect to the foreign enemy; but I have made every possible arrangement to obviate the difficulty, and by fixing the corps and the General Officers that are to be *stationary* or *moveable*, in the latter of which the worst are not comprehended, I could assemble from 18,000 to 20,000 men, for the defence of Cork, Limerick, Province of Connaught, or Province of Ulster, within three, four, or, in one instance only, five days. I believe that I mentioned the intention of putting Gardiner on the Staff, to be under Lake in Munster. He is much the same as to manner and action, but much graver, and you will not be surprised that he does not open his mouth so much, when I tell you that he has lost all his teeth.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

The change of feeling in regard to the Union, mentioned in the foregoing letter, was caused principally by its having transpired that material alteration would be made in the details of the measure. Lord Castlereagh had, in the course of February, pointed out how many of the various classes affected by the plan originally proposed, might be conciliated. These were, 1st, Borough Proprietors, who might be compensated; 2nd, the primary, and, 3rd, the secondary interests in counties. If each county had but one member, the primary interests would still be predominant, though exposed to frequent contests, but the secondary must be destroyed. By retaining both seats all parties would be gainers, as a seat in the Imperial Parliament would be of greater value than a seat in the Irish House. 4th, Barristers, of whom there were fifty in this Parliament: they had always considered a seat in Parliament as the road to preferment. 5th, the purchasers of seats, who might receive compensation. 6th, individuals connected either by residence or property with Dublin.

Lord Castlereagh considered that 1,500,000*l.* would be required to effect all these compensations. The plan of Union proposed in 1800 embodied most of his suggestions, and the success obtained was owing to these judicious alterations.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, March 29, 1799.

I lose no time in answering your Grace's despatch of the 24th instant, which I had the honour of receiving by Sleater the messenger yesterday evening.

I sincerely congratulate your Grace upon the important event of the discussion which took place in the British House of Lords upon the subject of the Legislative Union with this kingdom, which you so truly represent to be satisfactory and decisive; and I cannot be surprised that when the sentiments of both Houses[1] of the Parliament of Great Britain have been so warmly expressed upon that subject, that you should wish that it should be considered here with as little delay as possible, and that this kingdom should not lose the advantage of that affection and liberality which is so conspicuously displayed towards Ireland.

And certainly if considerations of the utmost consequence to the final success of the great arrangement in question did not powerfully interfere, I should not hesitate entirely to accord with your Grace's sentiments, that His Majesty should immediately recommend the proceedings of the two Houses of Parliament of Great Britain to the Irish Legislature.

But as the mere object of time is not to be put in competition with the consideration of the final success of this measure, I must state those reasons briefly to your Grace which convince me that the revival of the question of Union here in this Session would be inexpedient.

1. Your Grace certainly does justice to the conduct of Lord Castlereagh, who undoubtedly stands clear from any pledge upon the subject; but I believe that many gentlemen are impressed with an idea that it is not to be at present revived, and the enemies of the measure would consider, however without ground, that a revival of the question at present would be a violation of Parliamentary engagement.

2. A great number of the Members of the House of Commons

[1] Resolutions on the Union were brought forward in the English House of Commons Jan. 31, and, after several discussions, were finally carried Feb. 14. The largest majority was 149, and the largest minority only 24, as the Whig party was much divided. The assent of the Lords was given on April 11, and the joint address presented April 29.

have commissions in the militia, and it is of essential importance that under the expectation of invasion which exists, they should be present with their regiments.

3. Some gentlemen upon whom Government have not any strong influence, and who are rather indifferent on the subject, would object to be called to Parliamentary attendance in the summer months, and their assistance might be lost at present, which, were the subject to be introduced at the ordinary period of commencing business, would possibly be obtained.

4. It could hardly be expected that those gentlemen who had voted against the very discussion of the question about two months ago, should so suddenly take a part in contradiction to themselves, and expose themselves to every insinuation and charge of inconsistency.

5. By the amendment which was made in the address, the Irish House of Commons, by strong implication, though not perhaps expressly, gave an opinion against the discussion of the subject of Union; and it is a great Parliamentary maxim, which cannot easily be dispensed with, not to introduce a second time in the same session any question which has been once negatived.

6. I will admit with your Grace that much good effect has resulted from the discussions in England, and I have reason to believe that a change of sentiment is gradually diffusing itself, but I by no means consider it as yet so general or so confirmed, as that it would be prudent to hazard its progress by reviving the activity and animosity of its opposers. Possibly as much benefit has resulted from the question being suffered to sleep for a time by the Irish Government, as by the satisfactory manner in which it has been debated in England.

7. I am also assured that the number of Parliamentary converts is not by any means as yet so numerous as to render a second discussion safe, and your Grace cannot but be aware of the ill consequence of a second defeat.

8. There has not yet been time or opportunity for arranging the details, or even satisfactorily describing the outlines of the plan with respect to the representation, which your Grace has approved on Lord Castlereagh's suggestion, or to form an estimate of the effect which that change would produce upon the country.

Under these reasons I should hope that there would not be any difficulty in postponing the recommendation of the question from the Throne until another session, which might be called so soon as circumstances would warrant.

The business of Parliament here is drawing towards a close, and I hope the House of Commons will not sit after the 13th of April; so that if the address upon the resolution of the two Houses of the British Parliament should be delayed a few days, His Majesty would not have any regular opening for mentioning the subject to his Irish Parliament, except in the speech which is to close the session, and I beg leave to suggest to your Grace whether a paragraph may not with propriety be introduced in it in which I may communicate by His Majesty's commands the proceedings which have taken place in the British Parliament,[1] may advert to the different conduct of the Irish House of Lords and Commons, of which, in consequence of their addresses, His Majesty has cognizance, and express His Majesty's hope that the time may not be distant when the only branch of the Legislatures of the two kingdoms which does not seem solicitous for the accomplishment of so beneficial an arrangement, may, upon a more patient and deliberate examination, come forward with earnestness for its adoption.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LIEUT.-COLONEL LITTLEHALES TO VISCOUNT DONOUGHMORE.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, April 1, 1799.

I was yesterday duly honoured with your Lordship's letter of the 28th ult., and having communicated its contents to Lord Cornwallis, with its inclosure, I have the pleasure to mention, that his Excellency enjoins me to return you his best thanks for the information therein contained.

Lord Cornwallis is exceedingly happy to learn from your Lordship, that with respect to the important and desirable measure of a legislative Union with Great Britain, the sentiments and opinions of respectable persons hostile to it, appear to be materially changed,—if not positively in its favour, at least to view it without much repugnance. This alteration in the minds of many is obvious in other parts of the kingdom, and is a confirmation of its wisdom and justice. It is by reflection only that its value can be really estimated. It gives his Excellency sincere satisfaction also to find from your Lordship's communication, that so large a proportion of the Catholics are unanimously for the adoption of the measure of Union.

I can assure your Lordship that the Lord-Lieutenant is by no

[1] This suggestion was adopted, and a paragraph to that effect was introduced into the speech with which the Lord-Lieutenant closed the session.

means disposed to act upon any anonymous information that may be laid before him, but his Excellency considers that it ought never to be disregarded; and within my own knowledge, many anonymous papers, wild and improbable as they appeared in the first instance, have, upon investigation, merited attention. Of the immediate circumstance to which your Lordship alludes I am ignorant; but no doubt, my Lord, you are persuaded that "no anonymous account will, in Lord Cornwallis's estimation, be considered sufficient grounds for criminating any individual, far less those of respectable character."

His Excellency most perfectly coincides in opinion with your Lordship, that "nothing is to be more guarded against than the application of the strong powers of coercion with which the Rebellion Act has armed the executive Government," and that in the very spirit of this impression, has Lord Cornwallis resisted a strong representation of the necessity of martial law, in the immediate county where your Lordship resides, in consequence of the magistrates and gentry being averse to have recourse to that sad alternative.

I have, &c.,

E. B. LITTLEHALES.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO WILLIAM WICKHAM, ESQ.

[Most Secret.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, April 2, 1799.

I have the honour of enclosing to you, for the information of His Grace the Duke of Portland, an abstract of some information received from Mr. McGuichen,[1] who is secretly employed, of Mr. Conway,[2] who was one of the Directory at Cork, and of James Hughes, who was one of the chiefs of banditti that infested the Wicklow Mountains.

From these documents, and the disturbances which have taken place in the country, it is evident that the state-prisoners were

[1] James M'Guichen, of Belfast, deeply connected with the Rebels, whose solicitor he was. Mr. Pollock, who was professionally employed by the Crown, wrote from Belfast to Mr. Wickham, July 22, 1798—"I have decisive evidence against M'Guichen, who was SOLE Attorney-General for the Ulster Executive, and *joint* for the National. He has been a most active and mischievous Rebel, and is a most dangerous man. I will either try him by a Court Martial or make him give evidence against those against whom we have not yet sufficient proof." Mr. Wickham, Aug. 2, directed M'Guichen to be taken up. He was accordingly arrested for high treason, but liberated on the condition of becoming a spy; and, besides a pension of 150*l.*, received from Government between March 1799, and Feb. 1804, 1460*l.*, as a reward for the correct and valuable information he gave whilst acting as agent and solicitor to the Rebels; d. 1817.

[2] Mr. Conway was a watchmaker at Cork. He offered to become a secret agent for detecting the leaders of the conspiracy. The information he gave was very valuable, particularly as confirming that already received from M'Guichen.

actively employed in keeping up the rebellion when confined here, that a new Directory is formed or forming,[1] and that the lower classes are kept in a state of readiness for insurrection.

Unless, however, the French land in very great force, I do not apprehend that any very serious rising will be effected.

The information given by Hughes with respect to his associates has enabled Government to take up already a great number of the most daring of his gang.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, April 6, 1799.

I have just received your letter dated the 2nd instant, and I think I can venture to promise to send two tolerably good militia regiments to Jersey and Guernsey without troubling you with any part of the Irish Militia in England.

You cannot feel more mortified than myself at the impossibility of getting some recruits for the army from the Irish Militia, but it was the opinion of every person with whom I ventured to converse on the subject, that it would be dangerous even to agitate the measure under the present circumstances of this country.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

E. COOKE, ESQ., TO WILLIAM WICKHAM, ESQ.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, April 12, 1799.

. . . Lord Castlereagh spoke well.[2] The Speaker did his best for four hours and a quarter, and had effect on his own friends; he threw away the scabbard—talked of Mr. Pitt with contempt—said his speech was a paltry speech—that he was the worst minister Ireland ever knew—that his plan of Union was a silly project, an idle vision, &c.; and he talked much of the power of Ireland to maintain herself independent, and went far on the doctrine of competency. . . .

[1] Although this new Directory was never fully organized, the spirit of rebellion was kept alive until, in 1803, it broke out under Emmett.

[2] In the debate on the Regency Bill, of which the details are given in the next letter.

Sir J. Parnell spoke in a rage, but not with effect. He said to the Speaker after the debate that he hoped they had gained the ground that was lost. I think the publication of the Speaker's speech will do good. It may be all easily answered except the obvious and irrefutable objection, *per se*, of removing Parliament to a distance.

The public mind is, I think, much suspended on the subject. There is little passion, except among the Bar and the few interested leaders in the Commons. The Protestants think, however, it will diminish their power, however it may secure their property. The Catholics think it will put an end to their ambitious hopes, however it may give them ease and equality. The Rebels foresee in it their annihilation.

Believe me, &c.,

E. COOKE.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD; Dublin Castle, April 13, 1799.

When the order of the day was read on Thursday last in the House of Commons for taking the Regency Bill[1] into consideration in Committee, Lord Castlereagh stated at length his objection to the principle and frame of the Bill, declaring, however, he would not oppose it if in the Committee it should be made adequate to meet the evil it was intended to remedy in every case. As soon as the House was in Committee, Mr. Fitzgerald stated his proposed alterations, which go merely to the person of the Regent and are silent as to his powers, and I enclose your Grace a copy of the Bill with the alterations he proposed. The Speaker then rose, and in a speech of upwards of four hours expressed his opinion on the subject of a Union with Great Britain. In the course of his speech he uttered much invective against Mr. Pitt, and was inflammatory in his statement of the power of Ireland to exist commercially independent of Great Britain. He was replied to with great ability by Lord Castlereagh. Mr. G. Ponsonby and Sir J. Parnell spoke with violence against the Union.

Little was said upon the subject of the Regency Bill. The Speaker said he conceived it to be hardly necessary.

The Attorney-General explained the constitutional law on the subject with clearness and ability.

[1] This Regency Bill was brought forward by Mr. Fitzgerald, the late Prime Sergeant, to meet any arguments that might be founded on the conduct of the Irish Parliament in 1788. The Act was supposed to place the power of nominating the Regent in the English Parliament. After this discussion the Bill was quietly dropped.

The subject is to be again debated this day, and Lord Castlereagh will move to reject the Bill on the Report.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

P.S.—I enclose a newspaper which will give your Grace a fuller idea of the debate than I could otherwise transmit.

Saturday Morning.

In the House to-day Mr. Fitzgerald requested that the Report of the Regency Bill might be deferred for a few days in order to make it adequate, if possible, and Lord Castlereagh consented, at the same time without holding out co-operation or support.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, April 14, 1799.

Colonel L'Estrange[1] reported to me yesterday that he had visited all the quarters of the King's County Regiment of Militia, and that, with the exception of about twenty men, the whole corps, consisting of upwards of six hundred, had most cheerfully consented to go to the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, and to remain until the 1st of May, 1800, on or before which day I authorised Colonel L'Estrange to pledge my honour that they should be relieved.

The proposition has not yet been made to the Light Infantry Company, which is serving under General Moore, but if that company should consent to go, I shall order it to join the regiment.

The men have agreed to embark at once for the place of their destination, without desiring to march through England, and they will be prepared for their departure in about three weeks, so that you will be kind enough to arrange the mode of their conveyance with the proper officers in England.

As the above regiment is quartered in the neighbourhood of Dublin, it will be a matter of much convenience to us, and probably prevent some desertion, if they embark from this port.

I have received the most confident assurances from several other colonels, but as Lord Westmeath's regiment was the first which offered to serve out of Ireland, I shall not fix on the second corps to go to Jersey and Guernsey until I receive his Lordship's report.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Colonel Piesley L'Estrange, of the King's County Militia (the regiment to which Captain Armstrong belonged), d. 1824; m. 1789, Grace, dau. of George Burdett, Esq., M.P.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, April 15, 1799.

I have this day transmitted to Crew an application for ten thousand stand of arms, and as several of the fencible corps are at present very ill-provided, and as I dare not place implicit confidence in the correctness of our official returns, I should wish that they may be sent to us in the most expeditious manner.

You write as if you really believed that there was any foundation for all the lies and nonsensical clamour about my lenity. On my arrival in this country I put a stop to the burning of houses and murder of the inhabitants by the yeomen or any other persons who delighted in that amusement, to the flogging for the purpose of extorting confession, and to the free-quarters, which comprehended universal rape and robbery throughout the whole country.

If this be a crime I freely acknowledge my guilt, but I can most confidently assure you, and I wish you could have an opportunity of talking to Taylor on the subject, that I have never suffered my private feelings to get the better of the great duty which I owe to the public, and that my conscience does not reproach me with a single act of improper or impolitic lenity.

The Speaker, as you will have seen, has made a speech suited to the temper and understandings of his audience, and has made a very powerful anti-Union impression. You must not be too sanguine on your side of the water upon the success of that great measure; the people in general here have no fixed principles or opinions, and a man who will acknowledge in the month of April that nothing but a Union can save Ireland is very likely to give his vote against it in May.

I have made Mary send my most hearty congratulations to Emily Fitzroy.[1]

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

I have placed Gardiner on the Staff, much to his satisfaction.

The following extract from a letter of Dr. Duigenan's to Lord Castlereagh, dated Dublin, Dec. 20, 1798, will serve as a specimen of the language used by some of the violent high Protestant party in speaking of Lord Cornwallis. After saying that all that the friends of the Union in Dublin could effect, had only been to pre-

[1] Emily, dau. of Charles, 1st Lord Southampton, b. Dec. 26, 1770, d. June 8, 1800; m. May 30, 1799, William, 2nd Lord Bagot.

vent the aldermen of Skinner's Alley and the Orange Lodges from taking part against it, he proceeds thus—

"In truth, my Lord, I must plainly tell you that the unaccountable conduct of the present Lord-Lieutenant, which has rendered him not only an object of disgust, but of abhorrence, to every loyal man I have conversed with since my return from England, has induced many persons to oppose a Union, who, if uninfluenced by resentment against the Marquis Cornwallis, would have given no opposition, if they did not support that measure. God Almighty send us a chief governor of more conciliatory manners, more understanding, and more knowledge of the real state of this unhappy, divided, and partly desolated country, and the disposition of its inhabitants."

Nor was the opinion of the Lord-Lieutenant's undue leaning to the side of mercy confined to the violent party in Ireland. It was also entertained in England, for Mr. Wickham, in a letter written to Lord Castlereagh on the 4th of March, said:—

"At present there is a general, I may say universal, persuasion that lenient measures have been carried too far, and it is a fixed opinion, accompanied by a disposition to attribute the calamities with which Ireland is now threatened, to a departure from the system adopted by Lord Camden."

To this letter Lord Castlereagh replied on the 6th, that exclusive of all persons tried at the assizes, Lord Cornwallis had decided personally upon 400 cases; that out of 131 condemned to death 81 had been executed; and that 418 persons had been transported or banished in pursuance of the sentences of courts-martial since Lord Cornwallis had arrived in Ireland.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, April 18, 1799.

When the Order of the Day for going into a Committee on the Bill for supporting the Roman Catholic Seminary at Maynooth was read on Tuesday last in the House of Lords, after Lord Farnham[1] had made some objections to the particular items of their expenditure, the Chancellor rose and entered at some length into a

[1] Barry, 3rd Baron, and, June 22, 1785, 1st Earl of Farnham of that creation, b. 1723, d. Oct. 17, 1800; m. 1st, Jan. 15, 1751, Margaret, dau. and co-heir of Robert King, Esq., of Drewstown; and, 2nd, Aug. 5, 1771, Grace, dau. of Arthur Burdett, Esq. M.P. for Cavan County from May, 1756, to 1761, Armagh Borough to 1768, and again for Cavan County till, on the death of his brother, Nov. 16, 1779, he became a Peer.

discussion of the propriety of continuing the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth on its present foundation and plan.

His Lordship stated that it appeared by the accounts of the trustees of that seminary, that it was their object to have at least two hundred students educated for the priesthood, at the expense to the public of 25*l.* a-year for each student. The principle of this plan was to make their whole education gratuitous, by which it would follow that the persons educated at Maynooth, not being obliged to advance anything for their education, would be chosen from the lowest classes of society, and the priesthood of Ireland would continue to be taken from the dregs of the people. He was therefore against the principle of the institution in its present state. His Lordship then adverted to the impolicy of making such institutions for the education of Catholic priests, whilst the Catholic hierarchy forbids all persons of that persuasion to attend any Protestant place of worship, to hear family prayer, or to resort to any Protestant place of education, on pain of excommunication.

His Lordship[1] then stated that on the original foundation of the College at Maynooth, he had conceived it was to be made a seminary for educating the Catholic gentry as well as priests, so that those educated for the priesthood, by mixing in habits with the sons of Catholic gentry, would be liberalized in their manners and sentiments, but he found that the whole institution as at present carried on was confined to the lowest classes, who are educated as in a convent for the priesthood alone.

After a speech to this effect, which also contained many severe remarks on the recent conduct of the Catholic clergy, his Lordship opposed the Bill going into Committee, and it was rejected by a majority of 25 to 1.

Neither myself nor Lord Castlereagh were aware that the Chancellor intended to throw out this Bill, though it was believed he was not a friend to it; and as his Lordship had taken this step without giving me notice, I thought it my duty to express in writing to his Lordship the embarrassments which his conduct has created.

Lord Castlereagh will immediately introduce a new Bill into the Commons on the subject of the Roman Catholic College, to make a provision for an inferior number of students than was proposed by the rejected Bill.

From the present state of the College of Maynooth such a measure will not be attended with any real inconvenience, as there

[1] See papers relating to Maynooth, 1801-2, where the opinions of Lords Hardwicke, Clare, and Kilwarden, are given at length.

are only sixty-one students at present, and the number which were provided for by the former Bill was two hundred.

This proceeding of the Lord Chancellor gave much offence to Lord Kenmare and the leading Roman Catholics, but I am persuaded that, under the explanation which has been given, no disagreeable consequence will arise.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The conduct of Lord Clare respecting the vote to Maynooth excited much animadversion. On April 18, he wrote to the Lord-Lieutenant, explaining his motives, and saying that he considered it essential for the public security that there should be a well-regulated academy in Ireland for the education of the Roman Catholics, and he assigned reasons why the Bill in question was not advisable. Lord Cornwallis replied the same day, and assured Lord Clare that he had never charged him with intending any serious mischief to the country, and added, that the House of Lords could give no reasonable ground of alarm to the Roman Catholics if they merely meant to reform abuses, restrain wasteful expenditure, and restrict the establishment of Maynooth to the original objects of its institution. But people in general put a very different construction upon this vote of the Chancellor's, and it was universally believed that the institution of Maynooth was to be done away with entirely, a belief which caused great exultation in many over-zealous Protestants. Lord Cornwallis anticipated the greatest evils from the prevalence of an idea which created such a state of feeling on the one side, as he was well assured that the minds of the Roman Catholics would thereby be inflamed and exasperated against Government. He therefore hoped that the Chancellor would suggest some mode by which the erroneous impression produced by his vote might be effectually removed.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, April 24, 1799.

. . . In answer to a letter from Mr. Pitt relative to an income-tax in this country, I threw out, by the Lord-Lieutenant's directions, for consideration, the expediency of calling the Parliament in October with a view to that measure. A session before Christmas would enable us to feel our ground with certainty. As to the Union, it clearly is of importance not to risk a second failure, as no other means occur by which the disposition of the House

may be ascertained, so as to enable your Grace and the King's Ministers to form your determination and to take your measures as to trying on the question, without being exposed on the one hand to act upon uncertain ground, or on the other, having your decision so long delayed as to waste a portion of the usual session after Christmas, which might otherwise be advantageously employed in the furtherance of the measure.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

DEAR JAMES, Phœnix Park, April 27, 1799.

I am apprehensive the feelings of Mrs. Cornwallis and your daughter may have been agitated last week,[1] and I shall be glad to hear that they are again composed; and indeed it will give me much satisfaction to let me now and then have a line from you. This wretched country remains much in the same state,—the seeds of disaffection, of hatred of England, and in particular (and, I am sorry to say, in general with more reason) of their own landlords, are as deeply rooted as ever, and frequently break out in various shapes, such as the murder of magistrates, or the houghing of cattle: our politicians of the old leaven are as much occupied with their dirty jobs as ever. Those who think at all of the great question of the Union, confine their speculation to the simple question of its either promoting or counteracting their own private views, and the great mass of the people neither think or care about the matter. Under these circumstances, you will easily conceive how unpleasant my situation must be, and how little I can flatter myself with the hopes of obtaining any credit for myself, or of rendering any essential service to my country. Sincerely do I repent that I did not return to Bengal.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 4, 1799.

Your Grace's despatch of the 1st, communicating the intelligence of the enemy's fleet having sailed from Brest on the 25th, was received this forenoon at 12 o'clock. I lost no time

[1] The death of Horace Cornwallis, before mentioned.

in making the necessary arrangements for giving them the best reception in my power, should they happen to escape the vigilance of Lord Bridport's fleet.

The Warwick and Suffolk regiments having been fortunately detained in the Bay by contrary winds, were this day disembarked, and will, if occasion should call for their services, form a valuable addition to my force.

I have directed the yeomanry throughout the kingdom to be placed on permanent duty, in order to guard against the early enterprises of the disaffected, on its being understood that the enemy are at sea.

From the arrangements which I have been enabled to make, and the general state of the army, I feel confident that I shall be enabled successfully to oppose the force which the enemy may be presumed to have on board; but should they succeed in effecting a landing, I confide in the assurances which your Grace gives me, that I may expect to be speedily and effectually reinforced from Great Britain.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 6, 1799.

I have just received the enclosed letter from Lieut.-Colonel ——, commanding the —— Fencible Light Dragoons, containing a printed address to the soldiers of that regiment from their Colonel, Lord ——. This very extraordinary production seems of so mischievous a tendency, and so well calculated to excite in the minds of the soldiery a spirit of insubordination, and to militate so entirely against the discipline of the army, that I lose no time in transmitting it to your Grace to be laid before His Majesty.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The preceding letter furnishes another example of the difficulties Lord Cornwallis had to encounter in the management of the army under his command. Generally his complaints were of the want of discipline in some corps of militia and fencibles; but in this case the regiment appears to have behaved with perfect propriety, and the Colonel alone to have been greatly to blame. Besides complaining of the conduct of Lord —— as an attempt to instigate the regiment to acts of insubordination, Lieut.-Colonel —— adds that the address was sent in large

packets, not to any officer, but to the Serjeant-Major. It would seem that Lord ——, being desirous that the regiment should return to England, informed the soldiers that he had endeavoured to effect that object in consequence of the expressed wishes of some of the officers, which he understood were in accordance with the feelings of the privates; and that he had been further moved by the "applications of their relatives in the county of ——, and by his knowledge of the hardships they had suffered in the summer." He stated that the King had been pleased to accede to his request, but had told him that in such case the regiment would be disbanded; a decision to which, though it involved him, Lord ——, in considerable personal loss, he did not object, as he thought it would be for the advantage of the regiment.

Lord —— expresses his surprise at finding that Lieut.-Colonel ——, in the name of the whole regiment, had informed the Lord-Lieutenant "that the order for the intended removal of the remiment to England was obtained solely on the application of Lord ——, without the knowledge, approbation, or consent of any individual in the regiment;" and that in consequence of this memorial the march of the regiment was countermanded. Lord —— concludes with saying, that he still believes he was authorised to take the step he did, and that he "feels no remorse at what he had done."

Lord —— resigned his commission almost immediately.

LIEUT.-GENERAL LAKE TO LIEUT.-COLONEL LITTLEHALES.

MY DEAR COLONEL, Cork, May 7, 1799.

Knowing how fast reports fly in this country, particularly when they can produce mischief, I think it right to inform you that the cause of this express proceeds from some of the Meath Militia. About fourteen of them forced the main guard at Mallow, liberated some prisoners of the regiment that were confined for treasonable practices, amongst whom was one serjeant, and effected their escape with them. Between ourselves, I am apprehensive this may be of some extent in that regiment. However, at present they are all quiet, and will, I trust, be kept so by the precaution taken. A soldier of the regiment has given much information, and I hope much more will soon come out.

The Lord deliver us from such troops, and send us better times!

Believe me ever, with regard, most truly yours,

G. LAKE.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, May 9, 1799.

You will easily conceive that from the time of our first hearing that the Brest fleet had sailed, we have thought it highly probable that their destination was against this distracted and wretched island, and this idea was confirmed by a letter which I received from Lord Bridport, dated the 30th, inclosing some papers which had been taken on board a French schooner which had been boarded in the night by an English lugger.

The wind has been till this day very adverse to the arrival of the French on our coast, so that there is no reason to be surprised that they have not yet appeared; but from the accounts which we receive from England, that there are no considerable number of land forces on board, and from the difficulty of their effecting any material enterprise without a great probability of their being obliged to fight Lord Bridport, I am rather inclined to believe that they are gone to the Mediterranean.[1]

It affords me the greatest satisfaction to observe the coolness and confidence which has been manifested on this occasion. There has indeed scarcely been a period since the rebellion, in which there has been less appearance of uneasiness and alarm: every man knows his post, the Generals have their respective orders under the different circumstances which may arise, and I have only moved a few battalions a little nearer to the most probable points of assembly.

Indeed, I am inclined to believe that the French armament could do as little mischief here as in any quarter to which they may have steered.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, May 14, 1799.

. . . The French are in my opinion certainly gone to Cadiz or the Mediterranean, and probably to both. The feelings of all the loyalists here are regret that they did not try us. These sentiments, however well founded, are highly satisfactory.

I am obliged to leave off abruptly.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] See Letter of March 20.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, May 16, 1799.

Lieut.-Colonel Cole[1] recently applied to Lord Castlereagh that he might be appointed Escheator of Munster, in order to vacate his seat upon his going abroad. It appeared in conversation that he intended to have his place supplied by Mr. Balfour,[2] who moved the resolutions against an Union at the county of Louth meeting, and suggested a recurrence to first principles if that measure should be carried. Mr. Tighe had before applied for the same office for one of his members, with a view to sell the seat on condition that the purchaser should not support an Union. These requests appeared to me of such a nature as to render it necessary for me to withhold my acquiescence from them. The Opposition, thinking that this conduct gave them an opportunity to accuse Government of using unfair means to promote the measure of Union, and to render them unpopular at the close of the Session, when a writ was yesterday moved for a vacancy in the borough of Kilmallock, brought forward the subject.

It was introduced by Mr. Dawson,[3] the Member for the County of Monaghan, who, after using much language of strong imputation, called upon Lord Castlereagh to state whether he had not refused the Escheatorship to Colonel Cole, who was ordered upon foreign service, because he understood the successor to him would oppose an Union.

The Prime Serjeant rose to state the impropriety of putting such an interrogatory, and expressed his hope that Lord Castlereagh would not compromise His Majesty's prerogative by giving the slightest answer to the question. Upon this a debate commenced, in which Mr. Plunket, Mr. Moore, Mr. Barrington,[4] Mr. Claudius Beresford took a warm part in censuring the conduct

[1] Hon. G. Lowry Cole, afterwards General Sir Lowry Cole, G.C.B., Colonel 27th Regt., b. May 1, 1772, d. Oct. 4, 1842; m. June 15, 1815, Frances, dau. of James, 1st Earl of Malmesbury. M.P. in the Irish Parliament for Enniskillen from March, 1797, to Jan. 18, 1800. In the Imperial Parliament he represented Fermanagh County from June, 1803, to Feb. 1823.

[2] Blayney Townley Balfour, b. May 28, 1769, d. Dec. 22, 1856; m. Oct. 1797, Florence, dau. of William, 1st Earl of Enniskillen. M.P. for Belturbet, Feb. 1800 to the Union. The resolution moved by Mr. Balfour was, "That if an Union be enacted by the legislature of this kingdom, either contrary to, or without the advice of the assembled freeholders and burgesses, the submission of the people of Ireland thereto will be a matter of prudence, and not of duty."

[3] Richard Dawson, b. April 16, 1762, d. Sept. 3, 1807; m. May 22, 1784, Catherine, dau. of Arthur Graham, Esq., of Hockley. M.P. for Monaghan County from 1797 till his death. His son succeeded to the Barony of Cremorne on the death, March 1, 1813, of his uncle, 1st and only Viscount Cremorne.

[4] Mr. Barrington in the course of this debate quoted a passage from a speech of Sir Boyle Roche, who, speaking of the Union, exclaimed, "He would have the two sisters embrace like one brother."

of Government, and particularly Mr. Geo. Ponsonby, who pronounced an invective upon Lord Castlereagh.

The Attorney-General, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Martin, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. M'Clelland, and several other Members took a forward part in support of Administration, and Mr. Dawson having in the close of the debate appealed a second time to Lord Castlereagh, his Lordship took the opportunity of saying that he never would be provoked by any taunting interrogatories to swerve from the line of duty that his situation imposed upon him; but that if at any time any question should be brought directly forward to impeach his conduct, he should at all times be ready to meet it in the fullest manner. He then observed upon the violent language which had been used, and exposed with great ability and success the conduct of Mr. George Ponsonby and his friends, so as to leave the best impression upon the House.

A division was called for upon the question moved in the course of the debate by Mr. Claudius Beresford, for an address to the Crown to grant a pension to Colonel Cole in order that he might vacate his seat. It was thought right to move the question of adjournment, to prevent so improper a motion being inserted in the Journals.

As the debate was not expected by Government the attendance was by no means full; and there voted—

For the Adjournment	47
Against it	32

The debate was very desultory, and much of it turned upon the question of Union in general. Our friends took the occasion of asserting that the sentiments of the country were changing upon the subject, and reference was made with success to the counties of Cork and Kerry, Galway and Tipperary, and to the sentiments of the North in general.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 19, 1799.

Your Grace will have learnt from my despatch of the 16th instant the substance of what passed in the House of Commons on Wednesday last, relative to the Escheatorship having been refused to Colonel Cole and Mr. Tighe. Hitherto this office has been

granted without any consideration of the politics of the individual soliciting it; but in the cases above alluded to, independent of my wish not to augment the number of our enemies on the Union, I thought there were special circumstances in each case which should make me hesitate to accede to the application, which circumstances perhaps my former letter did not sufficiently detail.

Colonel Cole desired to vacate in favour of Mr. Balfour, a gentleman of fortune in the county of Louth, who had some time since moved at the meeting of that county very obnoxious resolutions, denying the competence of Parliament to entertain the question of Union, and laying down a recurrence to *first principles* as justifiable if the Parliament should adopt a measure which had been recommended from the Throne. I thought it rather unreasonable that Colonel Cole, immediately after receiving a military favour from the King, should desire to have the prerogative employed to introduce into Parliament an individual who had publicly treated the recommendation from the Throne with such marked and unconstitutional disrespect.

Mr. Tighe, as I understand, openly professed his intention to sell the seat which he wished to vacate, but on condition that the purchaser should vote against an Union.

As this subject may possibly again be brought into discussion on the 1st of June, to which day Parliament stands adjourned, it would be very desirable that we should be furnished with such precedents as have occurred in Great Britain of a similar nature; and your Grace would confer a singular obligation by favouring me with such general suggestions as occur to you upon the expediency of refusing or acceding to similar applications in future.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The Escheatorship of Munster is, like the Chiltern Hundreds, a nominal office, given to vacate a seat in Parliament. Since the time of Lord North, the Chiltern Hundreds have never been refused, except in some such rare instance as that which occurred in 1842, when the Government declined to assist in carrying out the bribery compromises. In Ireland the case was somewhat different, and the Escheatorship was considered as a favour which the Lord-Lieutenant might grant or withhold on considering the circumstances under which the application was made. The details of one case are preserved in the Castle at Dublin. In February, 1798, Lord Lyttleton applied for the office in favour of his son, who, on account of bad health, wished to vacate his seat for

Granard, promising that his successor should support Government. The answer postponed a definitive reply, till the Lord-Lieutenant, Lord Camden, should have received "a specific assurance that, in consequence of Mr. Lyttleton's vacating his seat, no pecuniary consideration whatever, directly or indirectly, will be received from his successor." In the event of such a positive assurance being given, a promise was made that Lord Lyttleton's wishes would be complied with, but otherwise, "his Excellency would feel himself obliged, however reluctantly, to refuse the request." The new writ for Granard was not moved till January, 1800.

In reply to this despatch, and the one of May 16, the Duke of Portland intimated that on the whole it would be better in future to follow the rule usually adopted in England.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, May 20, 1799.

. . . We transmitted on Saturday night a report from a master of a Swedish vessel, which you will have seen, giving an account of the French fleet as far as the latitude of Lisbon, steering S.S.W. You will probably have other and more authentic information before this letter reaches you, but on the whole there can be no doubt of their being destined to Cadiz, and afterwards, I conclude, to the Mediterranean, where I should think they will commence their operations by the attack of Minorca. Our admirals[1] in that quarter are fortunately able men, or I should be very apprehensive for the consequences. They talk of the sailing of the Dutch fleet, but I cannot suppose that we have anything to fear from that quarter.

Our communication with the Secretary of State is now so expeditious, that I last night (Sunday) at ten o'clock,[2] received an acknowledgment of a letter dated from this Lodge at twelve o'clock on Wednesday.

It will be better that you should keep the 10,000 stand of arms in readiness for us, as the Ordnance Department here have neither means nor method of taking care of anything.

The political jobbing of this country gets the better of me: it has ever been the wish of my life to avoid all this dirty business, and I am now involved in it beyond all bearing, and am consequently more wretched than ever. I trust that I shall live to get out of this most cursed of all situations, and most repugnant to my

[1] Lord St. Vincent and Lord Keith.

[2] It was at this time looked upon as a great feat for a messenger to go to London and return to Dublin in four days and a half. The double journey may now be performed in less than thirty hours.

feelings. How I long to kick those whom my public duty obliges me to court! If I did not hope to get out of this country, I should most earnestly pray for immediate death. No man, I am sure, ever experienced a more wretched existence; and after all I doubt whether it is possible to save the country.

The leaders of the Opposition, who know and eagerly pursue their own little dirty interests, although they are so blind as not to see that they must be overwhelmed in the general wreck, have art enough to instil their own narrow and wicked sentiments into the thoughtless though selfish members, and in the hopes of getting 300*l.* or 400*l.* a-year at a distant period, they will hazard as many thousands which they at present possess.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 24, 1799.

. . . There is an Opposition in Parliament to the measure of Union, formidable in character and talents. Their numbers, though they have not proved equal to shake the Government, have, for the present, rendered the prosecution of the measure in Parliament impracticable. The removals[1] in contemplation cannot fail to consolidate their party, and to render their future exertions proportionally animated. An entire forbearance on the part of Government will probably be received rather as a mark of weakness than of conciliation, and perhaps deprive us of friends rather than procure converts. With the concurrence and advice of the King's confidential servants, I am prepared to employ every exertion in my power to bring it to a successful issue. He must be a bold, or rather a rash, man, who would answer for either the public or parliamentary temper of this country; but after weighing the subject with all the attention I am master of I see no reason to despair of a successful issue, though the period may be delayed. After having gone so far, and the principle in question having in fact been already acted upon, I see no other alternative but to pursue the most decided line of conduct. Hesitation may dissolve much of our present strength, which may not perhaps be composed of materials to resist the impression which might be created by an appearance of timidity on the part of Government.

[1] The intended dismissal from office of those persons who had opposed the Union. The details will appear subsequently.

I again beg leave to repeat, that, with your Grace's assistance, I am prepared and ready to do my best. I feel strongly the difficulties we have to encounter, but I do not despair of their yielding to the steady perseverance and united exertions of the Government in both countries.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, June 8, 1799.

Brome and Lady Louisa arrived yesterday safe and well, having been driven back to Holyhead on the 3rd, in a tremendous gale of wind. I am now sending home the troops to their former quarters, which had been moved towards the points of assembly on the sailing of the French fleet, and the country is becoming every day more quiet, but the ferocity of the Loyalists will not for a long time permit the restoration of perfect tranquillity. My occupation is now of the most unpleasant nature, negotiating and jobbing with the most corrupt people under heaven. I despise and hate myself every hour for engaging in such dirty work, and am supported only by the reflection that without an Union the British Empire must be dissolved. When it is impossible to gratify the unreasonable demands of our politicians, I often think of two lines of Swift, speaking of the Lord-Lieutenant and the system of corruption—

> "And then at Beelzebub's great hall
> Complains his budget is too small."[1]

I trust that no mischief can happen in the Mediterranean before our fleet is in sufficient force to counteract any attempt of the enemy. Our allies appear to have received some check on the Po,[2] but I hope it will not be of consequence enough to check Suwarrow in his glorious career.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] These lines are from Swift's poem entitled 'A Libel on the Rev. Dr. Delaney and His Excellency Lord Carteret, 1729':—

> "So, to effect his Monarch's ends,
> From Hell a Viceroy devil ascends,
> His budget with corruption crammed,
> The contributions of the damned,
> Which with unsparing hand he strows
> Through courts and senates as he goes,
> And then at Beelzebub's black hall
> Complains his budget is too small."

[2] The action here referred to must have been some affair of no importance. The insurrection was universal in the north of Italy, and the French under Scherer were almost uniformly defeated throughout the month of May by the Austrians and Russians under Melas and Suvarrow, who had effected a junction on the 14th.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. WILLIAM PITT.

DEAR SIR, Phœnix Park, June 13, 1799.

I have been earnestly requested by some of my old American friends to apply to you in favour of Mr. ——,[1] who was —— during a part of the war in that country, and who either is at present, or very lately was in custody, in consequence of some inaccuracies in his accounts and vouchers.

You will not, I trust, suspect me of intending gravely to defend the conduct and support the uprightness of the various public departments of the army during the American war, or to maintain that because others, at least as guilty, have escaped, —— ought not to be punished.

Without meaning however to insult your understanding by such attempts, or to expose my own weakness and folly by requesting you not to do your duty to the public, I hope I may state, without impropriety, that poor —— is a man of a very amiable private character, that in his official situation he only followed the inviting examples of the times, and that I think him an object for as much lenity as the nature of his case will admit.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, June 19, 1799.

I yesterday received your letter dated the 15th, inclosing the note from Lady Spencer,[2] and an official bulletin[3] was likewise sent to us from the Secretary of State's office. There seems now to be no cause of apprehension for our naval operations in the Mediterranean; and indeed, the only blow which could have been struck by the sailing of the Brest fleet, was against our fleet which formed the blockade of Cadiz, but by the able conduct of Lord Keith that has happily been averted.

We have certainly been gaining ground in Parliamentary recruiting, and in obtaining county declarations since the proroga-

[1] He had been at the head of a military department under Lord Cornwallis, whose compassion was moved by the state of his wife and large family. His case is often alluded to in the letters to General Ross.

[2] Lavinia, dau. of Charles, 1st Earl of Lucan, b. July 27, 1762, d. June 8, 1831; m. March 6, 1781, George John, 2nd Earl Spencer.

[3] The intelligence of the defeat of the French in the Grisons, and of the capture of the citadel of Milan, reached London in the morning of the 12th

tion, but still I dare not venture to speak with great confidence. Lord Downshire holds at best a very unsatisfactory language, and a man who has for many years exacted and enjoyed the exclusive patronage of the Crown in the provinces of the north must be a formidable enemy. To court a proud, ill-tempered, violent fellow, raised to any importance by the weakness of former Governments, and who, if he had the power, would in a week drive this wretched country again into rebellion, is a pill almost too bitter for me to swallow. If Lord D. declares against us, many of our recruits will insist on higher bounty. Nothing but a conviction that an Union is absolutely necessary for the safety of the British Empire, could make me endure the shocking task which is imposed upon me.

I have received a letter from Macleod, full of satisfaction and gratitude. Send me good accounts soon of Mrs. Ross.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Most Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, June 22, 1799.

I had the honour of receiving by express your Grace's despatch marked "Secret and Confidential," in answer to mine of the 24th of May. On so important a question of policy as that which I had the honour of submitting to your Grace, it is a peculiar satisfaction to my mind, that the line of conduct which the honour of the Crown appeared to me to require, and which the particular interests of the King's Government with relation to the question of Union additionally called for, should be so decidedly approved by His Majesty and his confidential servants.

I took an early opportunity of impressing the friends of my Government with the reasons which had induced me to recommend, and His Majesty to sanction, the removal of those gentlemen from his service, who not only differed in sentiment with my Administration on the question of Union, but who had in a manner not the most respectful refused even to discuss a measure which had been recommended from the Throne. . . .

Without troubling your Grace with names which cannot at present be mentioned without considerable explanations, I think I can with safety state that the supporters of an Union in the Commons have increased from 149, at which number they were stated in my

last despatch, to 165. The increase is partly acquired from the numbers stated as against—partly from the class reckoned as doubtful. Should my Lord Downshire persevere in his present indisposition to the measure, I trust he may at least be induced to leave his friends, as he did on the late occasion, to pursue their own line, in which case we should divide his strength, which does not in the present Parliament exceed seven votes.

Having stated to your Grace the result of our exertions as far as Parliament is concerned, I wish to give you some idea of the prospects we have out of doors. I feel the direction of the public sentiment superior in importance to every other object, and shall leave no effort unmade to turn it to advantage. Every publication of merit has been systematically and most extensively circulated, and certainly with the best effects. I have most earnestly recommended it to the friends of Government to exert themselves during the summer in their several counties, and have urged them, without risking popular meetings, to obtain declarations similar to those of Cork and Galway in favour of the measure. The effort necessary to procure these declarations has roused our friends to exertion, and inspired them with a proportionable zeal; and we find in the counties in which it has been successfully tried, that it has been not less useful in pledging individuals in favour of the measure, than in disposing the timid to declare themselves, and will not only encourage but justify our former opponents in Parliament in a change of conduct. . . .

I cannot conclude this despatch without submitting to your Grace some suggestions with a view to the prosecution of the measure. The period of bringing forward the question must necessarily depend on the future temper of Parliament and of the country. Should both be ripe for such a proceeding, I conclude your Grace would not consider it wise to hazard, by any delay, a change of sentiment, and that you would recommend the assembling of Parliament without loss of time. When that much desired moment may arrive it is impossible to foresee; but it appears to me desirable that every detail connected with the measure should be prepared without delay, and that all those points which will remain to be settled by Commissioners named on the part of the respective countries, after the general resolutions shall have been agreed to, should be privately reviewed and digested, under the direction of Ministers, by a very few of those persons who are likely afterwards to be employed in conducting the formal treaty. No delay need then occur in the execution of

the measure. The period of the conferences between the Commissioners, which is an awkward moment of suspense and cabal, both in and out of Parliament, would be materially abridged, and the persons so employed would guide the respective Commissioners more certainly afterwards to an unanimous decision, having had an occasion of forming common opinions, than if they were to enter into the treaty without any previous intercourse.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

In 1798 a Bill passed to enable the Lord-Lieutenant to grant pensions to the amount of 3000*l.*, as a recompense to persons who had rendered essential services to the State during the Rebellion. This sum was to be paid to the Under-Secretary, through whose hands it was (confidentially) to pass. By a warrant dated June 23, 1799, it was divided as follows:—

	£.
Thomas Reynolds, his wife,[1] and two sons	1000
Mrs. Elizabeth Cope, and her three daughters	1000
John Warneford Armstrong	500
Mrs. Ryan, widow of Daniel Frederick Ryan, who was killed by Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and her daughters	200
Mr. Francis Magan[2]	200
	2900
The balance, to pay fees, &c.	100
	£3000

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, June 26, 1799.

I cannot suffer the official recommendations to go over, without troubling your Grace with a private letter, explanatory of the motives which have induced me to submit the persons in question for His Majesty's approbation.

And first as to the Provostship which has become vacant by Dr. Murray's[3] death. After communicating with the Lord Chancellor, whose unremitting attention to the interests of the University made me peculiarly desirous of availing myself of his

[1] Mrs. Reynolds d. 1856. Thomas Reynolds, one of the sons, d. 1856. A. F. Reynolds, another son, b. 1794, d. July 23, 1856.

[2] He was a Catholic barrister, with little business.

[3] Rev. Richard Murray, D.D., d. Jan. 20, 1799. Made Provost, Jan. 1795.

Lordship's assistance, in submitting to the King a proper person to fill that station, I am induced to recommend the appointment of the present Vice-Provost, Dr. Kearney,[1] as under all the circumstances the most eligible. The situation of Provost might have been disposed of, at this moment, to more political advantage; but it appeared to me more for the interest of the University, and consequently for the character of Government, that the appointment should be purely with the view to the promotion of learning and good discipline within the College.

Your Grace will be enabled to trace in the inclosed sketch,[2] in which the connexions of the persons promoted are set forth, the motives which have determined me in their several appointments. I have endeavoured to make the vacancies which have occurred go as far as possible in meeting the wishes of our friends, and I have reason to believe they will contribute materially to strengthen Government in the principal departments.

Your Grace will observe that Mr. Burgh[3] is to be removed from the Treasury to the Board of Accounts. As this gentleman voted with us, it is my intention to make his present situation equal in point of income to that which he lately held; but I felt it indispensably necessary to have a Secretary at the Treasury, on whose zeal in the cause of Union I could place more dependence.

The only inconvenience I at present foresee as likely to arise from this arrangement, is the number of seats which will be vacant on the meeting of Parliament. Including two already vacant by successions in the Port of Waterford, the number amounts to fourteen, which will probably tempt the Anti-Union party to make an experiment on the opening of Parliament, whilst so many of our friends are excluded.

I am happy to have it in my power to state that the country in general continues in perfect tranquillity.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Rev. John Kearney, D.D., b. 1741, d. May 22, 1813. Made Provost on Dr. Murray's death, and Bishop of Ossory, April, 1806.

[2] Page 108.

[3] Thomas Burgh, of Bert, b. May, 1744, d. 1810; m. 1775, Anne, dau. and heir of David Agoin, Esq. Treasurer of the Ordnance, Comptroller-General, Secretary of the Treasury, Commissioner of Accounts, from 1779 to 1804, and Commissioner of Revenue from 1807 till his death. M.P. for Harristown, Oct. 1775 to 1776; Athy, to 1790; Kilbeggan, to 1797; Clogher, to Jan. 1800.

Office, and Value.	Persons to succeed.	In whose room.	Patrons.
Provostship .. 2300*l.*	Dr. Kearney	Dr. Murray, deceased.	
Commissioners of Revenue, 1000*l.*	Knight of Kerry ..	Colonel Ross,[1] deceased.	
	Mr. Vandeleur[2] ..	Mr. Wolfe, dismissed.	
	Mr. Townshend[3] ..	Mr. Knox, dismissed.	Lord Shannon.
	Colonel Longfield[4]	Colonel Foster, dismissed.	Lord Longueville.
Secretary of Treasury, 1000*l.*	Sir G. Shee[5]	Mr. Burgh, removed.	
Surveyor of Ordnance, 800*l.*	Lieut.-Col. Uniacke[6]	Sir G. Shee, removed.	Mr. Beresford and Lord Shannon.
Commissioner of Accounts, 800*l.*	Mr. Burgh	Mr. Neville, dismissed.	
Collector of Dublin Excise, 1200*l.*	Mr. Leigh[7]	Mr. Scott,[8] deceased.	Lord Ely.
Collector of Dublin Port, 1200*l.*	Mr. F. Hutchinson[9]	Mr. Jones,[10] superannuated.	Lord Donoughmore.
Collector of Wexford, 700*l.*	Mr. Boyd[11]	Mr. Leigh, removed.	Lord Ely.
Barrack Board, 400*l.* ..	Mr. Ormsby	Maj. C. Hamilton, dismissed.	Mrs. Bruen.[12]
	Colonel Gore[13] ..	Mr. Townshend, removed.	Lord Leitrim.[14]
Cursitor in Chancery, 500*l.*	Right Hon. Mr. Forward[15]	Mr. A. Hamilton, dismissed.	Lord Wicklow.[16]
Clerk of the Entries, 500*l.*	Mr. Carleton[17] ..	Colonel Longfield, removed.	
Inspector-General of Exports and Imports, 400*l.*	Mr. Marshall[18] ..	Mr. J. C. Beresford, dismissed.	
Treasurer to Catholic College .. .. .. 300*l.*	Mr. Knox[19]	Mr. Marshall, removed.	

[1] Right Hon. Robert Ross, d. Feb. 1799, unmarried. M.P. for Carlingford from 1761 to 1783, then for Newry till his death. Commissioner of Revenue from Dec. 1780 till his death. Uncle of Major-General Ross, who was killed at Baltimore.

[2] Mr. (afterwards Right Hon.) John Ormsby Vandeleur, b. 1765, d. Nov. 28, 1828; m. Nov. 17, 1800, Frances, dau. of Charles, 1st Marquis of Drogheda. Commissioner of Revenue, 1799 to 1802, and then Commissioner of Customs to 1822. M.P. for Carlow Borough, 1790 to 1797, then for Ennis to 1802.

[3] John Townshend, of Shepperton, m. Maria, dau. of Jonas Morris, Esq., of Barley Hill. Commissioner of Revenue to 1810. M.P. for Dingle Icouch, 1790 to 1797; Castlemartyr, to the Union.

[4] Colonel Mountiford Longfield, b. Aug. 22, 1746, d. June 8, 1819; m. June, 1778, dau. of —— Bateman, Esq. M.P. for Enniscorthy from 1783 to 1797, and for the city of Cork to 1818.

[5] Sir George Shee, Bart., so created Jan. 22, 1794, b. 1758, d. Feb. 3, 1825; m. July 2, 1784, Elizabeth Maria, dau. of James Crisp, Esq. Surveyor-General of the Ordnance, 1797 to 1799, then Secretary of the Treasury in Ireland. Under-Secretary of State from 1800 to 1803, and again from 1806 to 1807. M.P. for Knocktopher from 1797 to the Union. His share in the borough was valued at 1137*l.* 10*s.* out of 15,000*l.*

[6] Lieut.-Colonel Robert Uniacke, b. 1753, d. Oct. 9, 1802; m. Jan. 2, 1790, Constantia, dau. of Right Hon. John Beresford. Surveyor-General of the Ordnance from 1799 till his death. M.P. for Youghal from 1790 to the Union.

[7] Robert Leigh, of Rosegarland, d. 1803; m. Feb. 9, 1751, Arabella, dau. of Robert Leslie, Esq., of Glasslough. M.P. for New Ross from 1783 to Feb. 1801.

[8] Matthias Scott, brother of John, 1st Earl of Clonmell; d. March, 1799.

[9] Hon. Francis Hely Hutchinson, son of the Right Hon. John Hely Hutchinson, and

Baroness

Baroness Donoughmore, and brother of Richard, 1st Earl of Donoughmore, b. Oct. 26, 1759, d. Dec. 16, 1827; m. Oct. 16, 1785, Frances Wilhelmina, dau. and heir of Henry Nixon, Esq. of Bellmont. He retained the office of Collector of Customs till his death. M.P. for the University from 1790 to 1797, then for Naas to the Union.

[10] Right Hon. Theophilus Jones, b. 1723, d. Dec. 8, 1811; m. 1st, March 29, 1754, Catherine, dau. of Marcus, 1st Earl of Tyrone, and widow of Thomas Christmas, Esq., of Whitefield, and 2nd, 1768, Anne, dau. of Colonel Murray. Collector of the Port of Dublin from 1767. M.P. for Leitrim, 1760; Coleraine, 1769; Leitrim, 1776; Monaghan borough, 1783; Leitrim, 1797 to 1802.

[11] James Boyd, of Roslare, b. 1764, d. 1808; m. Elizabeth, dau. of Colonel Walter Hore. M.P. for Wexford borough, 1797 to Feb. 1800.

[12] Mrs. Bruen (Dorothea Henrietta), dau. of Francis Knox, Esq., of Rappa, and widow of Henry Bruen, Esq.; b. 1758, d. May 28, 1828; m. Oct. 16, 1787.

[13] William Gore, son of the Bishop of Limerick, d. Sept. 1, 1832; m. 1788, Maria, dau. of Richard P. Head, Esq., Commissioner and then Chairman of Stamps from Jan. 1802 to Oct. 1823. M.P. for Carrick from 1798 to the Union.

[14] Robert, 1st Lord Leitrim, so created Oct. 11, 1783, and made Earl of Leitrim Oct. 6, 1795, b. Nov. 25, 1732, d. July 27, 1804; m. May 31, 1765, Elizabeth, dau. of Clotworthy, 1st Earl of Massareene. He held the patent offices of Comptroller, Searcher, Packer, and Gauger of the Port of Dublin.

[15] Right Hon. William Forward, 2nd son of Ralph, 1st Viscount Wicklow, and of Alice, 1st Countess of Wicklow, b. 1758, d. Sept. 27, 1818; m. March 31, 1787, Eleanor, dau. of the Hon. Thomas Caulfield. On the death of his elder brother he became, Oct. 23, 1815, 3rd Earl of Wicklow. M.P. for St. Johnstown (Donegal), from 1779 to the Union. Cursitor in the Court of Chancery, and afterwards Treasurer and Receiver-General of the Post Office.

[16] Robert, 2nd Viscount Wicklow, and on the death of his mother, March 7, 1807, 2nd Earl of Wicklow, b. Aug. 7, 1757, d. Oct. 23, 1815, unm.

[17] Francis Carleton. Appointed Aug. 1799, d. Dec. 22, 1828.

[18] Robert Marshall. Appointed June 1799, superannuated Aug. 15, 1811, on 400*l.* a-year.

[19] Alexander Knox. For some time private secretary to Lord Castlereagh. He was the author of several works, principally on religious subjects.

Marquis Cornwallis to the Duke of Portland.

[Private.]

My dear Lord, Dublin Castle, June 28, 1799.

I have received your Grace's letter dated the 24th instant, respecting Sir Morton Eden's peerage,[1] and have given orders to have the purport of your wishes on this subject carried into immediate effect. Amongst the many engagements which I have been obliged to contract in the event of the success of the measure of a Legislative Union, I have promised to use my utmost influence to obtain an earldom for Lord Kenmare, and I trust if he should speak on the subject to your Grace, that you will encourage him in the hopes of succeeding in his request, which I do not think

[1] Sir Morton Eden, K.B., 5th son of Sir Robert Eden, Bart., b. July 8, 1752, d. Dec. 6, 1830; m. Aug. 7, 1783, Elizabeth, dau. of Robert, 1st Earl of Northington, and ultimately co-heir of her brother Robert, the 2nd and last Earl. Sir Morton Eden was engaged in the diplomatic service, almost without intermission, from 1766 to 1799, at the courts of Munich, Copenhagen, Dresden, Berlin, Madrid, and Vienna, latterly with the rank of Ambassador. Created Lord Henley Nov. 9, 1799.

unreasonable, and which would in my opinion serve His Majesty's interests in this kingdom.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, July 1, 1799.

I have received your letters dated the 26th and 27th ultimo, and am much obliged to you for the copies of your latest correspondence respecting our situation with Tippoo.

Forage of all kinds is dear in this country beyond all precedent, but I never meditated to turn to grass the horses of any regiments that could possibly be wanted for foreign service.

You may be assured that the three regiments which you mention, shall be kept in the best possible order; for the 5th and 7th I can answer, and I have no reason to apprehend that the 4th will be found deficient. If those regiments of heavy cavalry should be taken from this country, it will, in my opinion, be wise never to let them return, as they are mounted here at an enormous expense, and as light dragoons can render all the service that can be performed by cavalry in Ireland, viz., to escort, patrole, and prevent seditious meetings, all which duties can be at least as well executed by light dragoons, and at a much less expense to the country.

This country is at present quiet, but I am afraid that the calm is very much owing to the removal of the French fleet from Brest to the Mediterranean.

The language which Lord Downshire has held respecting the Union has done great mischief. There cannot be a stronger argument for the measure than the overgrown Parliamentary power of five or six of our pampered boroughmongers, who are become most formidable to Government by their long possession of the entire patronage of the Crown in their respective districts. You may be assured that the mass of the people of Ireland do not feel themselves in the smallest degree interested about the question of Union, and that it is in Dublin only where any popular clamour can possibly be excited.

I shall desire the commanding officer of the Wexford regiment to sound his corps about their willingness to go on actual service, and I should recommend your trying the same experiment with the King's County, which is gone to Guernsey. Both these regiments are strong in point of number, and composed of very able-bodied men, who would, I have no doubt, behave very well out of

their own country; and your employing them would infuse a spirit into the militia in general here, and would flatter the pride of the country.

I am, with very sincere regard, Dear Sir,

Most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

P.S.—If the Wexford regiment should hesitate about going on an expedition, I think from a letter which I have received from General St. John,[1] of which I enclose a copy, that there can be no doubt of our obtaining the services of the Louth, which is the best-disciplined of the whole, and commanded by the Speaker's son, who is a better soldier than a politician.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, July 2, 1799.

We have no thoughts at present of dissolving our Parliament, from which, I think, we could derive no possible benefit. The mass of the people of Ireland do not care one farthing about the Union, and they equally hate both Government and Opposition. It would, I believe, be impossible to excite any popular commotion against the Union in any part of the kingdom except in Dublin. But the favourers of the measure are lukewarm, and, although they think it may be of service to the State, are afraid that it may interfere a little with their own private views and interests, whilst there are some factious persons in almost every county who are violent against it, and who would not fail to propose a test to the candidates, and I believe there would be very few candidates with sufficient virtue and public spirit to induce them to refuse the test if they thought the taking it would save them fifty guineas in their election expenses. In the close boroughs a new election could make no possible difference. On the whole I am afraid that the great people on your side of the water are too sanguine about our success. I feel some difficulty in giving an opinion on the subject of small arms, mentioned in your letter of the 24th, but on the whole I incline to go on making

[1] Major-General, afterwards General the Hon. Frederick St. John, 2nd son of Frederick, 3rd Viscount St. John, and 2nd Viscount Bolingbroke, b. Dec. 20, 1765, d. Nov. 19, 1844; m. 1st, Dec. 8, 1788, Mary, dau. of William, 5th Marquis of Lothian; 2nd, April 6, 1793, Arabella, dau. of William, 6th Lord Craven; 3rd, Nov. 14, 1821, Caroline, dau. of J. Parsons, Esq. M.P. for the city of Oxford in the Parliament of 1818.

the inferior arms till we see the advantages of the present important campaign more consolidated, and the event of our projected expedition.[1] We ought not to want more arms soon in this country, but that is no reason that we may not do it. Tom Pakenham[2] is at present in the north, when he returns I will talk to him about that business; but although he is the best man at the Board, he is rather light-headed and has not much method. Lord C——,[3] the Master-General, takes no concern about the matter; he has sold Luttrellstown,[4] and means to vote for the Union which he has so loudly and indecently reprobated.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Phœnix Park, July 3, 1799.

I have read the letters and papers from India with the greatest satisfaction, and although war must always be attended with a degree of uncertainty, yet I think, let the negotiations with Tippoo turn out as they may, that you have a right to look to the ultimate event with confidence.

I find that the measure of employing some regiments of Irish militia is not likely to be approved on your side of the water, and shall therefore say nothing more on the subject, but I cannot help

[1] The expedition to the Helder.

[2] Hon. Thomas, afterwards Admiral Sir Thomas Pakenham, G.C.B., son of Thomas, 1st Baron Longford, and of Elizabeth, Countess of Longford, b. 1757, d. Feb. 2, 1836; m. Jan. 24, 1785, Louisa, dau. of Right Hon. Thomas Staples, and niece of Right Hon. Thomas Conolly (to whose estates her husband succeeded). He was successively Surveyor-General, Lieut.-General, and Master-General of the Ordnance, from 1789 till the department was consolidated with the English Board in 1803. M.P. for Longford borough from 1783 to 1790, Kells to 1797, and Longford again till the Union. He was one of the Government "whips" during the Union debates.

[3] Henry Lawes, 2nd Earl of Carhampton, a General and Colonel 6th Dragoon Guards, b. Aug. 7, 1743, d. Apr. 25, 1821; m. June 25, 1776, Jane, dau. of George Boyd, Esq. While Commander-in-Chief in Ireland, in 1796-7, a conspiracy was formed to assassinate him, and the ringleader, James Dunn, (Lord Carhampton's own smith), and Patrick Carty, were executed for the offence. Thomas and Garrett Byrne were deeply implicated in this affair. He was elected for Bossiney, May, 1768, while Mr. Luttrell, but vacated the seat in the following April to oppose Wilkes in Middlesex. Wilkes had on the poll a majority of 1143 against 296, but the House nevertheless, on the 15th April, resolved that Mr. Luttrell was duly elected. He sat again for Bossiney and Plympton to Feb. 1794, and for Okehampton from 1817 till his death. Lord Carhampton spent the latter years of his life at his beautiful residence Painshill in Surrey. This is probably the only place in England where within the memory of man wine in considerable quantities has been made from grapes growing in an open vineyard. The Editor has tasted this wine, which was of really good quality, and of the colour of pale sherry.

[4] Luttrellstown was bought by Luke White, Esq., who changed its name to Woodlands, which is now the residence of Colonel White.

thinking that you lose an opportunity of obtaining a more efficient force than can, at this moment, be procured by any other means.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret and most Confidential.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, July 8, 1799.

When I received your Grace's letter suggesting the propriety of moving His Majesty to confer at this time a British peerage on Lord Clare, I was not without apprehension that it might occasion some dissatisfaction on the part of Lord Ely, whom we have at length, with much difficulty, brought to promise to take a zealous part in promoting resolutions in favour of the Union in those counties where his property gives him a considerable influence.

From a conviction, however, that it would be highly imprudent to allow Lord Ely to obtain the principal object of his wishes before that measure is carried which tends to deprive him of great portion of his importance, and from a sense of the indelicacy of suffering the Chancellor to wait for a mark of His Majesty's favour until the day of general remuneration shall arrive, I do not hesitate to give my opinion in favour of Lord Clare's immediate promotion.[1]

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, July 8, 1799.

. . . . It was privately intimated to me that the sentiments of the Archbishop of Cashel were less unfriendly to the Union than they had been, on which I took an opportunity of conversing with his Grace on the subject, and after discussing some preliminary topics respecting the representation of the Spiritual Lords and the probable vacancy of the see of Dublin, he declared his great unwillingness at all times to oppose the measures of Government, and especially on a point in which His Majesty's feelings were so much interested, to whom he professed

[1] Lord Clare was created Lord Fitzgibbon, Sept. 24, 1799.

the highest sense of gratitude and the most perfect devotion, and concluded by a cordial declaration of friendship.

The Archbishop is looked upon in this country as a wise and able politician, and I consider the acquisition of his support as an object of no small importance.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, July 8, 1799.

I received a letter from Lord Mornington giving the melancholy account of poor Cherry's death, the day before I got your letter, and most sincerely do I lament his loss. Lord M. says that he is perfectly well, and that he has no doubt of a prosperous issue of all our affairs in that quarter. His letter is dated Feb. 21, Fort St. George. I have been for some time a little apprehensive that Suwarrow[1] was going too fast, and leaving too many fortresses behind him, and my uneasiness was much increased when I heard of the reinforcement that was landed at Genoa to join Moreau. Macdonald's[2] movement towards Mantua shows that my fears were not totally ill-founded, and I am much afraid that the termination of the campaign will not correspond with the brilliancy of its opening.[3] That army must have little to fear from the enemy, which undertakes at the same time to besiege Mantua and the citadel of Turin, and blockade the citadels of Tortona and Alessandria. I hope we shall not engage in any rash attempt near home that is likely to meet with some success at first, but must afterwards turn against us. The sanguine temper of my friends makes me tremble. Pakenham has returned, and I have directed Parish to obtain from him an accurate statement of the number and condition of the small arms in this country, with the demands that may be expected,

[1] Pierre Alexis Count Suwarrow, created Prince Italisky, born in the Ukraine Nov. 13, 1729, and (notwithstanding his great military services) died in a sort of disgrace May 18, 1800, the Emperor Paul having, in one of his fits of caprice, taken offence, because Suwarrow had neglected some trifling point of military etiquette.

[2] Etienne Joseph Jacques Macdonald, afterwards Duc de Tarento and Marshal of France, descended from a branch of the Macdonalds of Skye, who had settled in France, b. at Sedan Nov. 17, 1765, d. Sept. 24, 1840; m. 1st, Mdlle. Jacob; 2nd, the widow of General Joubert, dau. of the Marquis de Montholon; 3rd, 1823, Ernestine Therese, dau. of Jean François, Baron de Bourgoing.

[3] The allied armies had been very successful in Italy. They compelled the French to abandon the territories of Naples, Rome, Milan, and Piedmont, and by the close of the year Genoa alone remained to France. Matters took a different turn in Germany and Switzerland; gross mismanagements, chiefly attributable to the Aulic Council, lost to the Allies most of the advantages they had gained, and materially damaged the reputation of their armies.

which shall be transmitted to you. Send me good accounts soon of Mrs. Ross.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, July 10, 1799.

I have only time to assure you that I am most truly happy to hear of Mrs. Ross's safe delivery, and of your having a son,[1] and sincerely hope that the mother and child may do well. I must likewise propose myself for a godfather.

Brome and Lady Louisa join in hearty congratulations, and so does Mr. Gardiner, who happened to be with me when I received your letter.

Yours ever most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, July 12, 1799.

I yesterday received your letter dated the 8th, and have given immediate orders for the march of the 29th Regiment to Cork in order to be ready to embark for Southampton. You must send some ships to carry them and the 92nd, for we have not found it possible, at any price, to procure transports to convey troops up the Channel.

I will write to you very soon on the subject of the state of force in Ireland, considering the matter in the two views which you suggest; but there is no immediate hurry for this communication, as, after the departure of the 29th, there will not remain a single disposable regiment in Ireland fit for any service, either at home or abroad.

It is, however, by no means my wish at this critical period to lock up a single man uselessly in this country. If it should not be absolutely necessary, I hope Major-General Nugent will not be taken from me; his wise and steady conduct has gained him such universal respect, that, without offending them, he can in a great degree restrain the violence of the loyalists of the north, which, without due control, would soon drive the country into another insurrection.

We shall turn our most earnest attention to the possibility of

[1] The only child of General and Mrs. Ross, b. July 6.

obtaining men from the Irish militia before the meeting of our Parliament, but, from the conversations which I have hitherto had on the subject, I confess that I do not feel very sanguine.

I most sincerely congratulate you on Suwarrow's[1] victory, which appears to have been well-timed, as the state of affairs in Italy began to wear a doubtful aspect. I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, July 15, 1799.

Although we were prepared to receive good news, the accounts which came yesterday greatly exceeded my expectation. We are going presently to celebrate Suwarrow's victory by a *feu de joie*. The surrender of the citadel of Turin surprised me most, as it was formerly considered as one of the best fortresses in Europe.[2] If Lady Spencer's accounts are well-founded, I shall begin to hope that I shall once more see Europe in a state of peace, good order, and security.

Johnson,[3] Gardiner, and Eustace,[4] are all put off the Staff. It was a delicate business to make the selection, and after losing ten thousand of our best troops there was no good pretext for increasing our number of Lieut.-Generals. Johnson, although a wrong-headed blockhead, is adored for his defence at New Ross, and considered as the saviour of the south, and poor Eustace, after 43 years' service, is reduced to his company in the 33rd, and a small ten shilling government. Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, July 19, 1799.

In compliance with the request you made in your letter dated the 8th instant, I transmit a state of the force of which the army of Ireland will consist after the departure of the regiments

[1] The battles of the Trebbia, in which Macdonald was totally defeated, took place on the 17th, 18th, and 19th June.

[2] Turin surrendered June 20.

[3] Major-General, afterwards General Sir Henry Johnson, Bart. (so created Oct. 3, 1818), G.C.B., Colonel 5th Regiment, b. 1747, d. March 18, 1835; m. Rebecca, dau. of David Franks, Esq., of Isleworth. He had been on active service many years.

[4] Lieut.-General Charles Eustace, b. 1740, d. June 10, 1801; m. 1772, Alicia, dau. of Oliver M'Causland, Esq., of Stranorlair. He had been on Lord Cornwallis's Staff in America, and in 1800 was made Colonel-Commandant of the 2nd battalion of the 68th. M.P. for Clonmines, Feb. 1794; Fethard, 1797 to the Union.

which are on the point of leaving us, and the arrival of the 2nd West York and Carmarthen Militia, which are expected from England.

After what has passed, I need not tell you how little dependence is to be placed on the Irish militia serving in their own country, but, notwithstanding this circumstance, the firm and temperate conduct of Government has so tranquillized the whole island that we have little to fear from civil commotion, and I see no reason to apprehend that the force which will be left in Ireland after the departure of the regiments now ordered on foreign service, and of all the corps of English militia which came over in the year 1798, will not be sufficient to secure peace and good order throughout the kingdom.

As, however, it is probable that the regiments of English militia which have arrived in 1799, will desire to return in the course of the next summer, it will, in my opinion, be advisable to endeavour to replace them with troops of the same description; but in giving a speculative opinion of this nature, you must be sensible that I must speak with a great degree of uncertainty, as no person in times like the present can foresee what turn the temper of men's minds will take in the course of a twelvemonth.

On considering the security of this country on the 2nd point of view, namely, the apprehension of a foreign attack, I shall, in the first place observe, that at the period of the late threatened invasion the effective force amounted to about 52,000 infantry and 7000 cavalry, and that 19,000 of the former were selected as a moveable corps, to act upon different points as circumstances might direct.

Since that time about 10,000 infantry of the best quality have been withdrawn, and if the remainder of the English militia should have left us previous to the supposed appearance of invasion, our whole force, to be applied to every purpose, will not be greater than that which it was deemed expedient on the last occasion to appropriate solely to the preservation of order in the country, exclusive of the army which was held in immediate readiness to oppose the enemy in the field.

Having stated what has been thought necessary in order to give security and confidence to the well-affected, I have only to add, that, however favourable the present aspect of this country may be, it can hardly be expected to undergo so total a change as not to require a considerable reinforcement of troops of the best description, if at any time it should appear probable that an invasion would be attempted, and I should therefore recommend that

in addition to such a force of English militia as might be expected to come forward on the occasion, you should endeavour to keep a body of 4000 or 5000 regular infantry so much within your reach, as to be able to avail yourselves of it in time for the service of Ireland if the emergency should occur. I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

This letter was accompanied by a return of the strength of the army in Ireland. It included three regiments of English militia not yet landed; but two regiments of regular infantry, one of Irish militia, and all the regiments of English militia about to embark for England were excluded, as well as three regiments of heavy cavalry under orders for foreign service. The whole available force consisted of seven regiments of cavalry, seven infantry of the line, thirteen of English and Scotch militia, thirty-six fencible regiments, consisting both of cavalry and infantry, and thirty-five regiments of Irish militia. The whole amounted to 45,419 effectives, besides artillery, of which there is no return. Several of the fencible regiments, however, were not in a very efficient state, and the opinions entertained by Lord Cornwallis respecting some of the other corps have been already frequently expressed. All these statements clearly show how small was the force on which any real reliance could be placed. Lord Cornwallis was fully alive to the difficulties of his position, and on the 24th of July he wrote from Kilkenny Castle to the Duke of Portland in these terms:—

"The force remaining in Ireland is sufficient to preserve peace,—totally inadequate to repel foreign invasion."

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, July 21, 1799.

I received last night your letter dated the 16th, and have very little time this day to write, as I am preparing to set out tomorrow on a tour for three weeks to the south for the purpose of obtaining declarations, &c., in favour of the Union. On the whole we certainly gain ground.

The *expeditions*, as they are called, are a favourite service, and we must do all we can to forward the business. We could, I think, spare from one to two hundred Irish artillerymen, of good size and well-looking. Perhaps if they were sent with young officers, none of which should have a higher rank than that of captain, they might be usefully employed for the public service mixed with our artillery, and would, in the mean time, acquire experience, which

they very much want. I wish you would talk to Macleod about this plan, and desire him when he thinks of it to lay aside all prejudice.

I may perhaps now and then give you a short line during my expedition. I am much flattered by your kind acceptance of me for a godfather; give my kindest compliments to Mrs. Ross.

Yours ever most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

Let me know as soon as you can what you think about the detachment of Irish artillery.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Kilkenny, July 24, 1799.

I am got thus far on my tour in the most shocking weather that can be conceived at this season of the year. The good reception which I have hitherto experienced, makes up however for the severity of the elements. The two addresses which I this day received were expressive of the most earnest desire for an Union, and of the warmest approbation of the measures of my administration.

I have my fears about our Continental projects, and I am sorry that Mr. Dundas has again listened to malicious suggestions against the Ordnance, but there is no help for these things. Good luck and the weakness of our enemies may help us in the first instance, and I have no doubt on the latter point that Mr. D. will soon see his error and be ashamed of himself.

General Hewett to my great concern is, I am afraid, going to leave us, and to succeed Fox at Chatham; this will distress me beyond measure, as well from the loss of so able an assistant, as from the great difficulty I am under in fixing on a successor. I really know not what to do. I am afraid Raymond would hardly be equal to the task, and yet I hardly know how to pass over him.

Brome is with me, Lady Louisa remains at the park, where she has her friend Lady Castlereagh[1] for her next-door neighbour.

Believe me ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Emily, dau. and co-heir of John, 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire, b. Feb. 20, 1772, d. Feb. 12, 1829; m. June 4, 1794, Robert, Viscount Castlereagh.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CASHEL.

MY DEAR LORD, Castle Martyr, Aug. 2, 1799.

I find that our friends in the county of Tipperary are decidedly of opinion that a County Meeting should be called, and are under no apprehension about the success of the measure.

I have, therefore, only to request that your Grace will allow your respectable name to be subscribed to the requisition.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CASHEL TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY LORD, Cashel, Friday night, Aug. 2, 1799.

At eight o'clock this night I received a letter from the High Sheriff of the county of Tipperary, Mr. Hutchinson, inclosing a requisition for calling a meeting of this county for the purpose of considering the subject of an Union, to which I gave the inclosed answer No. 1, not then knowing your Excellency's final determination on that subject. But at a quarter past nine o'clock this night, about an hour after the High Sheriff's messenger had taken my answer, I had the honour of receiving your Excellency's letter from Castle Martyr dated this day, in consequence of which I have written a second letter to the High Sheriff, of which I take the liberty of enclosing a copy to your Excellency, being numbered 2, and written on the same sheet of paper as the copy of my first answer. This second letter I shall send to the High Sheriff very early to-morrow morning. I have, &c.,

C. CASHELL.

P.S.—The dragoon who brought your Excellency's letter will set out from hence early to-morrow morning.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Mount Shannon, near Limerick, Aug. 8, 1799.

I have just received by express from Plymouth the account brought by the 'Triton' of the sailing of the combined fleet from Cadiz on the 21st ultimo.

Although I can have no doubt that His Majesty's confidential servants will use every exertion to send reinforcements to this country if they should see any imminent danger of its being

attacked, I should be wanting in my duty if I did not strongly represent the expediency of their keeping a body of infantry within their reach, of a different species from that of which our present army in Ireland is entirely composed.

I propose to set out for Dublin very early to-morrow morning.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Just after the return of Lord Cornwallis from this tour, he very narrowly escaped being shot by one of his own sentries. On the evening of August 11 he was returning on foot to the Castle, and, having dismissed his Aide-de-Camp, was alone, when he was challenged by the soldier on duty. The challenge was probably unheard, no countersign was given, the sentry fired, and the ball passed close to Lord Cornwallis. It was strongly suspected that the soldier was a United Irishman, and, being perfectly acquainted with the Lord-Lieutenant's person and habits, had availed himself of a circumstance which would, in a military point of view, have justified him had his act been attended with fatal consequences. After this occurrence, his Staff would never allow Lord Cornwallis to go anywhere unattended.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Aug. 13, 1799.

I returned to town on Friday from my southern tour, and am happy to have it in my power to convey to your Grace the most satisfactory accounts of that part of the kingdom, as well in point of tranquillity, as in general good disposition towards the Government and cordial approbation of the measure of Union. This sentiment is confined to no particular class or description of men, but equally pervades both the Catholic and Protestant bodies, and I was much gratified in observing that those feelings which originated with the higher orders, have in a great degree extended themselves to the body of the people. . . .

Were the Commons of Ireland as naturally connected with the people as they are in England, and as liable to receive their impressions, with the prospects we have out of doors, I should feel that the question was in a great degree carried, but your Grace is so well acquainted with the constitution of the assembly in which this question is to be prosecuted, and must be aware how anxiously personal objects will be connected with this measure,

which goes to new-model the public consequence of every man in Parliament, and to diminish most materially the authority of the most powerful, that your Grace will feel, however advantageous it is for the Government to carry the public sentiment with it, that distinct interests are there to be encountered which will require all the exertions and all the means of Government to overcome, and which may still very much delay and impede the accomplishment of this great settlement.

Lord Castlereagh will state to your Grace more in detail my ideas on this part of the subject, and on which the early success of the measure will, under the present appearances, absolutely and entirely depend.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Aug. 14, 1799.

. . . Since I stated to your Grace my opinion in favour of an early session, several circumstances have occurred to induce me to doubt the policy of assembling the Parliament before Christmas. The principal object in doing so would be to lay on an income-tax, a measure Mr. Pitt considered the public exigencies to require, and which in policy he thought (an opinion in which at the time I strongly concurred) should precede the Union.

Since my despatch on that subject, and on a more mature consideration, the principal friends of Government, but particularly Mr. Beresford and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, have represented to me, for reasons which they will detail to your Grace, that under the natural difficulties which would for a length of time oppose themselves to the collection of the tax in this country, its produce would by no means at present counterbalance the advantage it would afford, both within and without doors, to the opposers of the Union. As the completion of this work is the great object to which all others should be subordinate, it is strongly their opinion that nothing should be at present attempted to sour the public mind; and they conceive that after the proportion of contribution is fixed between the two countries, and the general principle of the measure once secured, it may then be introduced with much less risk to the Union itself, into the Irish Parliament, as the most eligible mode of raising their supply, or, if that is thought inexpedient as delaying the measure too much, it may remain open for the united Parliament. Objections certainly attach to the

latter suggestion, but not in themselves so formidable to the success of the main question as risking a bye-battle in a country peculiarly ignorant, and liable to be strongly excited on a question coming home to their feelings. . . . I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Aug. 14, 1799.

I last night received your letter dated the 10th. The return of the combined fleets[1] from the Mediterranean has made a great change in our situation here, and I have written strongly to the D. of P. and Mr. Dundas, and have represented the absolute inefficiency of our present force to resist a serious attack. The country is now perfectly quiet, but we must not suppose that the spirit of disaffection and rebellion which pervaded every quarter of the kingdom is entirely annihilated, and that it would not soon revive on the appearance of a powerful support. Nothing can, in my opinion, be more imprudent than to hurry all the unformed regiments on immediate service, but it is exactly what I expected; and if they conduct themselves well under the Major-Generals whose names I read in the newspapers,[2] we must, like Nelson, attribute our success to the hand of the Almighty. If the new army which we have miraculously raised should be utterly destroyed by next Christmas, which I think highly probable, we shall then be fairly at an end of our offensive resources.

My reception in the country gives the lie completely to the nonsense that has been talked by the foolish absentees about my conduct, and which has been too much attended to by very great personages on your side of the water. Conscious of the policy as well as the rectitude of my conduct, I can laugh at the accusations and the accusers; but I must look serious when I see this country abandoned to its own weakness in order to make up brigades for the amusement of young Princes, and of foolish and inexperienced Generals.

Hewett will be a severe loss to me, but I hope to get General

[1] The combined fleets, after remaining some time at Genoa, where they held communication with Moreau, returned to the Straits of Gibraltar. Lord Keith (who, in consequence of Lord St. Vincent's illness, had assumed the command) was, with 31 sail-of-the-line, in pursuit of this very fleet, which, strange to say, he never encountered. The Spaniards, as well as the French, steered for Brest, and entered that port August 13.

[2] The newspapers of the day mentioned, among others likely to be employed, the Dukes of York, Cumberland, and Gloucester, Lords Chatham, Paget, and Charles Somerset, Sir R. Abercromby, Sir J. Pulteney, and Generals Knox, Moore, Coote, Burrard, and Doyley, most of whom were ultimately on the Staff.

Nugent to accept of the office of Adjutant-General, for which I believe he is perfectly qualified.

Give my kindest compliments to Mrs. Ross, and

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Aug. 14, 1799.

. . . It is due to the principal friends of Government, by whom I was received in my late tour, to state to your Grace that their exertions have been not less zealous than effectual in recommending the measure of Union to the public favour. Previous to my arrival at Kilkenny, Lord Ormonde had taken a most active part both in the county and city; and with the exception of Mr. Ponsonby's[1] friends succeeded most perfectly in his object. His Lordship was powerfully assisted by Lord Clifden.[2]

Lord Waterford's influence was most zealously exerted both in the county and city of Waterford; the former may be considered as unanimous; in the latter, a few of the Corporation excepted, connected with Mr. Alcock,[3] there is but one opinion. After the distinguished part Lord Shannon has taken throughout the whole of this transaction, it is scarcely necessary to assure your Grace that nothing was omitted in Cork, where his Lordship's influence is so deservedly extensive, which could serve the cause; and I am bound not less to acknowledge the very forward part Lord Boyle[4]

[1] Right Hon. William Brabazon Ponsonby (eldest son of the Right Hon. John Ponsonby, Speaker of the House of Commons, and son of the 1st Earl of Bessborough), b. Sept. 15, 1744, d. Nov. 5, 1806; m. Dec. 26, 1769, Louisa, dau. of Richard, 3rd Viscount Molesworth. M.P. for the city of Cork, 1768, for Bandon Bridge, 1776, and for the county of Kilkenny from 1783 till March 13, 1806, when he was created Baron Ponsonby in England. He was father of the late Viscount Ponsonby, and of Sir William Ponsonby, killed at Waterloo, whose posthumous son has inherited the Barony.

[2] Henry Welbore, 2nd Viscount Clifden, and 2nd Baron Mendip, b. January 22, 1761, d. July 13, 1836; m. March 10, 1792, Caroline, dau. of George, 3rd Duke of Marlborough. Clerk of the Privy Council from Sept. 15, 1785, to the Union, when he received a pension of 1354*l.* as compensation for the abolition of his office. M.P. for Heytesbury from May, 1793, to Feb. 1802.

[3] William Congreve Alcock, d. 1812, unm. M.P. for the city of Waterford from 1790 till 1802, when he was unseated on petition by Sir J. Newport. In 1807 he and Mr. Ram contested the county of Wexford with Mr. Colclough (whose uncle was hung for high treason in 1798) and Mr. Sheridan. Mr. Colclough, though warned that it would be considered a personal offence, canvassed the tenants of Mrs. Cholmondeley, widow of the Hon. and Rev. Richard Cholmondeley, who had given her interest to his opponents. Mr. Alcock, at the desire of his Committee, called him out. They met in presence of a large number of spectators, among whom were the High Sheriff and fifteen or sixteen magistrates. Mr. Colclough fell dead at the first fire. This affair was considered by the Government as too bad to be passed over, even in Ireland, and most of the magistrates were removed from the Commission.

[4] Henry, Lord Boyle, 3rd Earl of Shannon, May 20, 1807, and K.P., b. Aug. 8, 1771, d. April 22, 1842; m. June 9, 1798, Sarah, dau. of John Hyde, Esq., of Castle Hyde.

has taken on this occasion. In the city, Lord Longueville's influence, which is principally in the Corporation, co-operating with Lord Donoughmore's, which is of a more popular description, gave full effect to the natural sentiments of the place, which are warmly in favour of Union. And in mentioning Lord Donoughmore to your Grace, I should do him and his family very great injustice if I did not state the very efficient services they have rendered on this question to the King's Government. Our success in Tipperary is much owing to his Lordship's exertions, which have been zealously employed wherever they could be of use. Notwithstanding the activity of Mr. Smyth[1] and his friends at Limerick, the Chancellor and Lord Glentworth[2] have perfectly succeeded in attaching to the measure every person not of the Corporation, and the property of the county, through his Lordship's exertions, will be brought forward not less decidedly in its support.

I cannot pretend to enumerate to your Grace the many persons to whom I feel myself indebted for their conduct; but I owe it to Lord Llandaff[3] and the Attorney-General to attribute what has been effected in Tipperary in a great measure to their assistance. The decision of that county transfers five votes from the Opposition to our party. . . .

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Aug. 23, 1799.

The South Lincoln and Worcester regiments of Militia will embark for Liverpool in the course of a few days, and I have great

M.P. for Cloghnakilty June, 1793, to 1797, Cork county till Jan. 1807, and then for Bandon till the following May, when he succeeded to the Peerage. He had the reversion of the valuable sinecure of Clerk of the Pells after the death of Charles, 1st Earl of Liverpool.

[1] John Prendergast Smyth, b. 1742, d. unm. May 22, 1817, created Lord Kiltarton May 15, 1810, and made Viscount Gort Jan. 22, 1816, with remainder to his sister's son, Right Hon. Charles Vereker. M.P. for the borough of Carlow from 1776 to 1782, and for the city of Limerick from 1785 to 1795, when he was replaced by his nephew, Colonel Vereker, afterwards 2nd Viscount Gort.

[2] Edmund Henry, 2nd Lord Glentworth, b. Jan. 8, 1758, d. Dec. 7, 1844; m. Jan. 29, 1783, Alice Mary, dau. and heir of Henry Ormsby, Esq., of Cloghan, Mayo; made Earl of Limerick Feb. 11, 1803, and created Lord Foxford in England Aug. 11, 1815. M.P. for the county of Limerick from 1786 to July 4, 1794, when he succeeded to the Peerage. His father, the 1st Lord Glentworth, was Bishop of Limerick, and younger brother of Viscount Pery, whose entailed estates descended to Lord Limerick.

[3] Francis, 1st Lord Llandaff, K.P., so created Sept. 20, 1783, and made Earl of Llandaff Nov. 14, 1797, b. 1738, d. July 30, 1806; m. 1st, Sept. 6, 1764, Ellis, dau. of James Smyth, Esq. (son of the Bishop of Down and Connor); and, 2nd, June, 1784, Catherine, dau. of Clotworthy, 1st Earl of Massareene. M.P. for the county of Tipperary from 1768 till he became a Peer. He inherited the estates of George Mathew, Esq., of Thomastown, of whose great, but singular, hospitality so graphic an account is given by Swift.

reason to believe that the Bedfordshire, Lancashire, and Dorsetshire Regiments will desire to return to England in the ensuing month.

The orderly behaviour of the British regiments in their quarters, and their conciliating manners towards the people of this country, form so striking a contrast to the conduct of the Irish Militia, and impress the inhabitants with so favourable an opinion of the manners and disposition of their fellow-subjects in the sister-kingdom, that, exclusive of any consideration for the defence of this island, in a political view I regret their departure. . . .

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Aug. 23, 1799.

I have received your letter dated the 17th, and am much disappointed at hearing nothing by the arrival of the Monday's mail of the fate of the expedition fleet. We have had scarcely anything but gales of wind since Sir R. Abercromby sailed.

I enclose copies of Lord Howe's letters to me, and my answer in respect to Lieut.-Colonel Hay.[1] I have acted in this business to the best of my judgment, and I hope in the best manner for the good of the service.

Brome and Lady Louisa left me yesterday: they have again had a blustering, but, as the wind was quite fair, I hope a short passage.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT HOWE TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY DEAR LORD, Seymour Place, Aug. 15, 1799.

As your Lordship may probably have seen in the Gazette the promotion of Major Hay of the Royal Engineers to Lieut.-Colonel's rank in the army, which was the first and only intimation I have had of it, and which has taken place so much to the prejudice of his seniors in the corps, many of them now employed on foreign service, I wish to submit whether any steps should be taken by me in justification of those officers who have been past over, or that it must rest, or that in so delicate a matter it may

[1] Lieut.-Colonel Hay, R.A., brother of Sir James, 5th Bart., b. 1762, killed at the Helder Aug. 27, 1799; m. 1784, Barbara, dau. of John Craigie, Esq., of Glendoick. He left a posthumous son, b. Aug. 29, 1799, who is now (1858) the 6th Bart.

not be more advisable any representation should come from your Lordship.

I have the honour, &c.,

HOWE.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT HOWE.

MY DEAR LORD, Phœnix Park, Aug. 1799.

I have almost on all occasions set my face against any partial brevets in the royal regiment of Artillery and corps of Engineers, as they tend to create great uneasiness and discontent in corps where the promotion is made in regular succession by seniority; and on this ground, when Major Hay returned the second time from the West Indies with Sir Ralph Abercromby, I absolutely refused to suffer Sir Ralph to obtain for him the rank of Lieut.-Colonel, although his request was countenanced by His Royal Highness and Mr. Dundas.

But although I have always acted, and shall always as long as I am concerned continue to act upon this general principle, and am sensible that it is a delicate matter to depart from it, yet I do not think that any rule respecting rank can be made absolute and invariable, without its being in some degree prejudicial to the service and discouraging to the exertions of those who are placed entirely out of the reach of all extraordinary favour.

Major Hay has been now for the third time selected to attend Sir Ralph Abercromby, to whose lot the most difficult and irksome part of the service in the present war has principally fallen. That General Officer represented to me that Major Hay was to go with him on very important service as Commanding Engineer, that he expected a junction with troops of other nations, and that from his want of rank he might often be prevented from availing himself of his services, and expressed a hope that I would not a second time put a negative on his promotion.

Under these peculiar circumstances, I did not feel that either in respect to Major Hay, Sir Ralph Abercromby, or the general good of His Majesty's service, I could be longer justified in withholding my consent.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Aug. 24, 1799.

Lord Fingal is going for some weeks to England, and I have taken the liberty of desiring him to wait upon your Grace.

He is a man of an excellent character, and perfectly well disposed towards Government, but he has not a sufficient energy of mind to take in any material degree a leading part in the councils of the principal Catholics in Dublin and its neighbourhood, from whom I am afraid little more is to be expected than neutrality on the question of Union.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Aug. 26, 1799.

I have just received your letter dated the 20th, and in confirmation of your conjectures respecting the expedition, I have seen an account from the Admiralty stating that our fleet was steering for the Texel on Friday the 16th.

In answer to the representations which I have made on the situation of this country, I have received strong assurances that care will be taken to keep a body of troops in readiness to reinforce me if occasion should require it. From what quarter this body of troops is to come I confess I have no conception.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Sept. 4, 1799.

We have received all the public information[1] which was known in London on Saturday night, and as far as a judgment can be formed from such imperfect accounts, I confess that I am not very sanguine. I lament poor Hay very much, who has left a wife and several children, and I am afraid but ill provided for.[2] The force destined to serve in Holland, which is one of the most considerable in number of our national troops that has ever been employed on the Continent, has now no Engineer of rank or character. Should not the Ordnance say something to the Duke of York, even if H.R.H. should make no application? I should have thought that Twiss,[3] who is certainly our best, should have the direction, with some assistants who would be more able in point of bodily fatigue. I told Macleod that his commanding any

[1] The accounts which had reached London up to Saturday, Aug. 31, only communicated the landing of the British troops at the Helder in very bad weather. The despatches did not arrive till Tuesday, Sept. 2.

[2] Mrs. Hay received a considerable pension on the Civil List.

[3] Lieut.-Col. Twiss did go to Holland.

horse artillery appeared to me to be out of the question, as well as his being attached to the service of any army abroad; and that I could think of no other means in which the overture from the Duke could be in any degree accepted on his part, unless by offering to make a temporary visit, to assist in communicating the arrangements to the Artillery Department when any great siege or operation that particularly regarded that corps should be in contemplation. In his answer he appeared to be satisfied that he could not with propriety leave his present situation.

I have given an office of about 400*l.* a-year to Ormsby's[1] son, the lawyer,[2] who is an able man and a good speaker, and I am going to give a small living (which is peculiarly convenient to him) to his son who is in orders.

We have succeeded at a county meeting of Galway, the fullest ever known, and have carried an address, and instructions to the Members.[3] I prefer, in general, resolutions of the men of property to county meetings, but when the Members have voted against the Union, and are not *unwilling* to be corrected, they are necessary. Give my kindest compliments to Mrs. Ross, and

Believe me ever most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

WILLIAM ELLIOT, ESQ., TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

DEAR SIR, Bayham Abbey, Sept. 11, 1799.

. . . The King told the Duke of Portland that when Lord Downshire was last in his closet, he (Lord D.) said at the conclusion of his audience, that a Union would be the only means of saving Ireland. The Duke conceived the interview to have been about nine or ten months ago.

Yours, &c.,

WILLM. ELLIOT.

Lord Downshire, in a speech on the Union, Jan., 1800, admitted that he had once been favourable to such a measure, but he dated the change in his sentiments much further back than 1799. In fact the subject of the Union had been mooted more than once. In 1776 it had been almost decided that it should be submitted to

[1] James Ormsby, b. 1737, d. 1809; m. 1762, Jane, dau. of Captain Stephen de Gualy.

[2] Charles Montagu Ormsby, created a Baronet, Dec. 19, 1812, b. April 23rd, 1767, d. March 3, 1818; m. June, 1794, Elizabeth, dau. of T. Kingsbury, Esq. Appointed Recorder of Prince of Wales Island, Oct. 7, 1806, when that office was first created.

[3] The Hon. Richard Trench and Joseph Henry Blake. The latter had voted for the Union, the former against it, but he altered his opinion in the following year.

the Irish Parliament, and it had been settled that Lord Rochford should be sent over as Lord-Lieutenant to carry it into effect.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Sept. 16, 1799.

I yesterday received your letter dated the 11th. You are very much mistaken if you suppose that the principal points of information from abroad are communicated to me. No man in Britain or Ireland enjoys less of this kind of confidence than myself. Mr. Dundas, once or twice, when he has written to me on other subjects, and chiefly to induce me to part with troops, has opened a little the plan of attacking Holland; but from no other person of the Cabinet have I received the most distant hint of what was going forward.

I confess that I am by no means in spirits on the general state of the war in Europe. Suwarroff has been twice nearly defeated, although that is the most promising quarter. The Austrians are certainly not getting forward in Switzerland, and I feel the greatest apprehensions for the event of the invasion of Holland. In the mean time the southern part of this wretched island is again getting into a bad state, no doubt from encouragement received from France. The counties of Waterford and Tipperary are reported to be in a state of preparation for an immediate rising; and Lake, by the advice and at the instance of the magistrates, has placed them under the rules and penalties of the Insurrection Act. In the mean time our force is daily decreasing; the Lancashire and Dorsetshire are about to leave us, and I have no sanguine hopes of their being replaced. I received likewise a despatch on Saturday, desiring that I would assemble our Parliament to obtain men from the militia; but as we think we can, under tolerably legal sanction, give one fourth of our militia without any fresh powers, and it would hardly be prudent or easy to prevail on Parliament at this moment to part with more, I have postponed any procedure on the measure until I receive further directions, and have sent after Lord Castlereagh, who was already on his way to London, to state the objection to our calling the Parliament together at this time.

I have received a few lines from Abercromby requesting my protection and assistance for poor Hay's family. In our official line our means are limited: I would willingly join with him in any other steps to serve them.

About five or six days ago I wrote to Lord Howe to say, that

considering how large a British force was to be employed in Holland, and how very essential the services of an able officer of Engineers must be in a country so circumstanced, I thought that Lieut.-Colonel Twiss ought to be appointed Commanding Engineer, with such assistants as would relieve him from the most laborious parts of the duty, to which I apprehended his constitution would be unequal. I confess that I shall not think that our department can be said to have done justice to the service unless this measure is adopted.

On Tuesday last we had a report from Galway that a sugar ship had arrived at that port from Madras, giving an account of the capture of Seringapatam, &c., &c.; and I heard that an officer had arrived at Dublin at a very early hour in the morning, and gone over in a small vessel to Holyhead. I did not, however, feel quite confident, but at night they brought me a letter which that officer had that morning put into the post-office, directed to me from Lord Mornington, giving a short account of the complete success of the Mysore war. I am still, however, very anxious to know a thousand particulars about it. This is indeed a great event, and perfectly secures us in that part of the world; for I think, even if Zemaun Shah[1] could get to India, that he could not succeed when deprived of any co-operation from Tippoo.

Sir Sydney,[2] although perhaps the story is a little coloured, seems to have acted most heroically.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Sept. 17, 1799.

. . . The great exertions of Colonel Moore,[3] whose conduct I cannot too highly commend, gave me reason at one time to

[1] Zemaun Shah was the sovereign of Caubul, to which were then attached Khorassan, Cashmere, and other Provinces. He had always been a bitter enemy to the English, whose territories he repeatedly proposed to invade, and had been in close alliance with Tippoo. In 1801 he was deposed by his half-brother Mahmood, who put out his eyes and placed him in close confinement in the Balla Hissar at Caubul. He was released in 1803 by his whole brother Shah Soojah, who dethroned Mahmood. Before his capture Zemaun hid the famous Koh-i-noor in the wall of his apartment, but on his release gave it to Shah Soojah. Zemaun ultimately became a pensioner of the Indian Government, and received 24,000 rupees a-year till his death, Sept. 1843.

[2] Captain, afterwards Admiral, Sir Sydney Smith, K.B., b. 1764, d. May 26, 1840; m. 1809, a dau. of — Hearne, Esq., and widow of Sir George Rumbold, Bart., at one time Resident at Hamburgh. M.P. for Rochester from Nov. 1802 to July 1806. His father, Captain Smith, was A.D.C. to Lord George Sackville at the battle of Minden, and was one of the principal witnesses for the defence.

[3] Colonel Francis Moore of Kilmersdon, in the county of Somerset, b. 1749, d. 1810; m. 1766 a daughter of Joseph Howell, Esq., of Elm.

hope that the soldiers of the Bedfordshire regiment might be induced to extend the period of their service in this country; but these flattering appearances soon vanished, and their change of sentiments was so sudden and violent, that they could hardly be prevailed upon to wait with patience until vessels could be procured to carry them to England.

Having so very lately left the south of Ireland in a state of apparent tranquillity, your Grace will easily conceive that my astonishment was equal to your own, when the reports of disturbances in the counties of Waterford and Tipperary first reached me; but the spirit of disaffection is so deeply rooted in the minds of the people of this country that it will require time as well as a total change in the system and constitution of the Government before it can be eradicated.

In the mean while every accidental circumstance that can encourage hope of success will be laid hold of as a signal for commotion; and the expected departure of the two English regiments, in addition to the general confidence with which the rebels have been inspired by the return of the combined fleet to Brest,[1] must be considered as the immediate cause of the present mischief. . . .

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Sept. 18, 1799.

I have had a conversation with the Chancellor, who has no doubt of our right to reduce 5000 of our militia, and agrees with me in thinking that in the first instance a greater diminution than 5000 cannot be proposed.

Your Grace will observe that the question of assembling our Parliament immediately, is still open to the decision of His Majesty's Ministers, and whatever may be their final instructions, I shall use my utmost exertions to carry them into execution. In the mean time I do not see that any mischief can arise from a short delay, and our hands will be afterwards strengthened by the example of the British Parliament. It is with great concern that I have learned that the idea which occasioned so much trouble and difficulty last year, of the right of the English militia to return within a month after the meeting of Parliament in England, has again been entertained by the regiments composing the garrison of Dublin; that it has been a matter of conversation among the

[1] The French and Spanish squadrons.

officers, and that assemblies of the non-commissioned officers have been held on the subject: but I do not yet know the full extent of the evil.

The accounts which we have this day received from the south are more favourable; and though there is certainly much mischief working in the country, I have no apprehension of an immediate rising.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The English Parliament had been called together to enable Government to obtain men from the militia; and the Duke of Portland had, more than once, expressed a strong hope that a similar course would be pursued in Ireland. Lord Cornwallis strongly objected to the measure, and on his representations the idea was abandoned.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Sept. 22, 1799.

It was the wish, and indeed the direction, of the Ministers in England, that we should call our Parliament by proclamation, as you have done, in order to obtain their sanction to procure 10,000 men from our militia. We were of opinion that the immediate meeting of our Parliament might put to some hazard the success of our great measure of the Union, which is now daily gaining ground, as well in, as out of Parliament; and that, however objectionable the Irish militia may be, as a force to which the defence of this country ought to be entrusted, yet in the present reduced state of our troops of other descriptions, we could not immediately part with so great a proportion as one-half of our militia, without leaving the country in so unprotected a situation, that all the gentlemen would abandon their country houses; but as it was the opinion of our principal lawyers that five thousand men, which the last Act of Parliament authorised Government to add at their discretion to the militia force, might by the same discretion be reduced when Government thought fit, without further application to Parliament, we have submitted this expedient to the Cabinet, as one from which all the good purposes which could prudently be derived from the other plan, might be obtained, without the inconvenience and hazard of calling our Parliament together at this time.

Our Chancellor, Lord Castlereagh, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer are all in England, and may be consulted.

The success of our army in Holland is an object of such infinite

importance, and the assistance of a capable engineer will be found so essential on various occasions, in that difficult country, that I thought it indispensable to send Twiss; I have written strongly about him to the Duke, and recommended to H. R. H. to avail himself of his judgment rather than of his bodily labour. . . .

I request that you will assure Mr. Bramston[1] of my perfect esteem and regard, and that I should most gladly oblige him, if it was in my power, but my list is so overloaded, that if I was now to put his young friend upon it, I should in all probability only lead him to hopes that could not be realized. If however he will let me know his precise age, I shall be able to judge whether he has any possible chance of success.

This country is getting quieter than it was a little time ago, but the great reduction in our force, and the neighbourhood of the combined fleets, encourages the disaffected, and keeps an evil spirit alive, which was in all appearance perfectly subdued, and the violence of the Loyalists adds fuel to the flame.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY LORD, Whitehall, Sunday, Sept. 22, 1799.

. . . I lose no time in acquainting your Excellency that the reasons given by you against calling the Parliament of Ireland at this moment, have so entirely convinced the King's servants of the impolicy of such a step, that their acquiescence in that advice is complete, and that the opening of your session will consequently depend upon our receiving an intimation of your wishes for that purpose.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Phœnix Park, Sept. 26, 1799.

. . . I think the plan which you mention of making an immediate augmentation to the militia would be most advisable; the Colonels will cry out that they are to be made crimps and drill sergeants for the army, but there is no help for it, and I trust that the precedent of England will make it go down. . . .

[1] Thomas Berney Bramston, Esq., b. Dec. 7, 1733, d. March, 1813; m. Jan. 10, 1764, Mary, dau. and heir of Stephen Gardiner, Esq., of Norwich. M.P. for the county of Essex from April, 1779, to June, 1802. The present (1858) Member is his grandson, and is the sixth in succession from father to son who has represented the county.

There is certainly mischief working in various parts of the country, and Marsden thinks in Dublin and its vicinity. In the mean time, the same wretched business of courts-martial, hanging, transporting, &c., attended by all the dismal scenes of wives, sisters, fathers, kneeling and crying, is going on as usual, and holds out a comfortable prospect for a man of any feeling.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Sept. 27, 1799.

It is determined, and I think very wisely, that our Parliament should not meet at present, and they wait in England to have some conversation with our Chancellor, before they finally decide upon the measure of taking 5000 men without any further Parliamentary sanction; but I believe it will end in making an augmentation at present of the Irish militia, and waiting till the regular meeting of Parliament, to get 10,000 men for the Line. The English militia now serving here, will probably all assert their right of returning to England within a month after the meeting of British Parliament.

We must, I think, at first have success in Holland, but I confess that I do not see how we can derive any permanent good from it, unless the King of Prussia would take a part with us.

I did not expect much military patronage when I came over, but I could not foresee that I should actually have none: and it is the point of all others on which I have been the most pressed by those who think they have a right to ask favours in this country. I have given, in fifteen months, the following commissions,—one ensigncy in the 2nd, two in the 92nd, one cornetcy in the 5th dragoons, since reduced, and have removed one lieutenant from the 13th infantry to the 6th dragoon guards. The regiments of infantry have all of them two, and some of them three supernumerary Captains, and many of the officers of the 5th dragoons are seconded on the regiments of cavalry. The above statement holds out but little prospect for your nephew.[1] You will, I am sure, believe me when I say that I sincerely wish it were otherwise.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Afterwards Lieut.-General John Ross, C.B., Colonel 46th Regt., d. July, 1839; m. Oct. 2, 1811, Katherine, dau. of General Sir Robert Brownrigg, Bart.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Most Secret and Confidential.]

MY DEAR LORD, London, Oct. 14, 1799.

The determination which has been just taken by the King's confidential servants, to recommend it to His Majesty to order the most immediate means to be taken for withdrawing the army under His Royal Highness the Duke of York from Holland, is of too much importance in every point of view for me consistently with the confidence and respect which are due to your person or situation, not to make you the earliest communication of it. To your Excellency, who will have contemplated the operations of this army with a military eye, and who will have estimated the price of the victories it has obtained and the possible extent of their effects, the advice which was unanimously submitted to His Royal Highness by all the Lieut.-Generals serving under him, will be likely to appear to you to have been wise and judicious, as you would probably have agreed with them in deeming it unsafe for him to hazard himself in a position that could be turned, and that it was necessary for him to reoccupy his original position at Zuyp. Should this be your opinion, I shall have little doubt of your approving that which has been thought expedient to lay before the King. For if the present safety of the troops required this falling back to the post I have mentioned, the difficulty of their advancing at this season of the year in a country so strong, and where the roads are so nearly impracticable for carriages, and particularly for artillery, the difficulty of being supplied with provisions, which is very great and must necessarily increase daily, the improbability of their being reinforced in such a manner as to have enabled them to have made any effectual forward movements, the loss to which they were daily exposed, and were actually on the point of suffering by sickness, as well as those to which the particular nature of the country exposed them in every attempt they might make upon the enemy, and even more than all these considerations, the means which the enemy possessed of receiving constant reinforcements of which they had already had but too much experience, and which were facilitated and increased beyond all calculation by the unfortunate and unexpected events which have taken place in Switzerland,—will appear to your Excellency to have justified and to have required the measure which has been resolved upon. But besides those which I have stated, it was impossible not to advert to the opportunity which the disasters which have happened on the Continent afford to the enemy of resuming their old plan of invading

Ireland, a contingency which as it would have been unpardonable in us not to have had in view, it would have been still more so to have deprived ourselves of the means, or at least weakened our powers of obviating, by having such a force locked up as it must have been out of our reach.

For these reasons, therefore, we have felt it our duty humbly to represent to His Majesty to order the return of this army, and to recommend it to be distributed between his kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Islands of Guernsey and Jersey, which last have been thought of principally as the quarters of the Russians, but if you would like to have the 5000, or any part of the number which you are authorised to take, the arrangement may, I dare say, be made without any difficulty. . . .

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Most Secret and Confidential.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Oct. 19, 1799.

On my return last night from my excursion to the North, I received your Grace's letter dated the 14th instant, and entirely concur in opinion with His Majesty's confidential servants, on the subject of withdrawing the army under H.R.H. the Duke of York from Holland, most sincerely hoping that its removal may be effected without any further material loss.[1]

Your Grace may be assured that I shall use every means in my power, to counteract the attempts which the disaffected will undoubtedly make to poison the minds of the ignorant and unwary, and to misrepresent and vilify the measures of Government.

From long experience I have learned duly to prize the merit and valour of British troops, and greatly to prefer them to those of any other nation whatever. I should not therefore in a military point of view hesitate a moment, in requesting that the force destined for the defence of this country may be British.

But exclusively of my partiality for our national troops on the supposition that we were to contend with an invading enemy, there are other considerations which would determine my choice on the present occasion. If the Russians were to be sent over to us, their soldiers would be told that they were going to a country that was

[1] The Duke of York, after a short campaign, which, however creditable to the troops, had produced no beneficial result, found it impossible to advance far from the Helder towards Amsterdam. An armistice, preparatory to evacuating the country, was signed at Alkmaar the day before this letter was written.

in a state of rebellion, and if any parties of them should be called upon to support some of our loyal, but in my opinion indiscreet magistrates, who see no remedy for our evils but that of scouring the country and hunting down rebels (forgetful that they are creating more than they can possibly destroy) these troops, unacquainted with our language, and with the nature of our Government, would give a loose to their natural ferocity, and a scene of indiscriminate plunder and murder must ensue.

It would likewise expose us to a clamour which our enemies would most industriously excite, that the Union was to be forced upon this kingdom by the terror and the bayonets of barbarians.[1]

Whilst I am writing on the subject of our military establishment, I think it proper to observe that I do not wish for more cavalry, as that is a species of force that can rarely be employed to any material effect in a country so rugged and so enclosed as Ireland.

I shall take an early opportunity of giving your Grace an account of my tour to the North, which has on the whole proved very satisfactory.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Oct. 22, 1799.

Although a change of political circumstances and the temper of the times will often affect the general opinions of the multitude, and it is therefore unsafe to trust entirely to appearances, yet from my reception in the North there is certainly reason to entertain very sangune hopes of the good disposition of the people in that part of this kingdom towards the very important measure of a legislative Union with Great Britain.

At Dundalk, which was the first place that I visited, I received according to my expectations an address in favour of the Union from the Corporation, which is pretty much under the influence of Lord Roden; but to my surprise, another address to the same effect was presented by the priest in the name of and attended by several

[1] There are extant two letters of the same date as the above, written to Lord Castlereagh (who was then in London) by Mr. Elliot and Colonel Littlehales. Both express in the strongest language Lord Cornwallis's objections to the proposal of substituting Russians or Germans for British troops, whose services were required elsewhere. The evacuation of Holland removed any necessity for such an experiment, and the intention was ultimately abandoned.

of the Roman Catholic inhabitants. At Armagh, where the Primate[1] is all-powerful, the corporation, clergy, &c., came forward, and everything passed smoothly, but the point of difficulty was the arrangement of matters at Belfast, for as the corporation of that great and opulent town is entirely in the hands of Lord Donegal,[2] it was necessary in some manner to obtain a public mark of approbation from the inhabitants at large.

Mr. May,[3] Lord Donegal's father-in-law, who was a most active and zealous agent for us, doubted whether he could obtain a respectable signature, as he found that several persons, who professed to be friendly, were not inclined to set their names to any paper. He proposed therefore that the corporation should give a public dinner, and that it should be explicitly understood that no person was expected to come but those who were friendly to the Union. The Bishop of Down[4] expressed a desire to be present at the dinner, and said that he should not object to moderate toasts that were favourable to the measure; but Mr. May told him in my presence that he should be glad of his company to meet me in private at his house, but that he could not be invited to the public dinner unless he declared himself a friend to the Union. In consequence of this explanation his Lordship and a Dr. Halliday,[5] declined coming to the dinner, which was attended by one hundred and fifty of the principal merchants and inhabitants of Belfast. And on that occasion, as well as at a ball the subsequent night, I received from all persons the strongest assurances of loyalty and good disposition to the measure in agitation.

The Bishop was perfectly civil and proper in the general tenor of his behaviour, and we parted very good friends.

At Antrim, Coleraine, Newtown Limavady, and all the places

[1] Dr. William Newcome, b. April 19, 1729 (old style), d. Jan. 11, 1800; m. 1st, 1767, Susanna, dau. of Sir Thomas D'Oyley of Chiselhampton; 2nd, Jan. 27, 1772, Anna Maria, dau. of Edward Smyth, Esq., of Fermanagh County. Dr. Newcome was a Fellow of Hertford College, Oxford, and tutor to Mr. Fox and to the Right Hon. Henry Conway, during which time he lost his arm by an accident. He accompanied Lord Hertford when the latter went to Ireland as Lord-Lieutenant, and was by him made Bishop of Dromore, 1766, and successively translated to Ossory by Lord Harcourt, April 1775, and to Waterford by Lord Buckingham, Oct. 1779, and made Archbishop of Armagh by Lord Fitzwilliam, Jan. 1795.

[2] George Augustus, 2nd Marquis of Donegal, K.P., created Lord Fisherwick in England July 9, 1790, b. Aug. 13, 1769, d. Oct. 5, 1844; m. Aug. 8, 1795, Anna, natural dau. of Sir Edward May, Bart.

[3] Mr., afterwards (Nov. 15, 1811) Sir Edward, May, 2nd Bart., b. about 1753, d. July 23, 1814, unm. M.P. for Belfast from May, 1800, till his death.

[4] Dr. William Dickson, b. 1745, d. Sept. 19, 1804; m. Miss Symmes. He was Chaplain and Private Secretary to the Duke of Portland when Lord-Lieutenant in 1782, and, through his influence, was, in the following year, made Bishop of Down and Connor.

[5] Alexander Henry Halliday, M.D., a physician at Belfast, and a great private and political friend of Lord Charlemont, with whom he held a constant correspondence; b. 1728, d. May 28, 1802; m. 1st, Martha, dau. of Randal M'Collom, Esq.; 2nd, 1775, Ann, dau. of Campbell Edmonstone, Esq., Lieut.-Governor of Dumbarton Castle.

through which I passed, addresses were presented, and the words "*principal inhabitants*" were always inserted, as well as *the Corporation*. At Londonderry my reception was cordial and flattering beyond expression. The county as well as the city addressed; the town was universally illuminated, and "success to the Union" resounded from every quarter. From thence I made an excursion to Strabane and Lifford, where the corporations and *principal inhabitants* expressed the most decided sentiments in favour of the Union.

From the county of Donegal, I have every reason to expect an address, as well as instructions to their members[1] who last year voted against us.

Your Grace is well aware of my reasons for keeping clear of the county of Down, and after my complete success in the northern counties I did not care to hazard anything that might tarnish the triumph which I had obtained, by attempting to bring forward the small counties of Monaghan, Cavan, or Fermanagh, in all which we had powerful enemies; an hour, however, after I left Lord Caledon's house, the corporation and principal inhabitants of the town of Monaghan arrived with an address in favour of the Union.

Lord Conyngham,[2] who is a most zealous friend, made an attempt on the Speaker's town of Drogheda, and obtained the support of some members of the corporation and many respectable inhabitants; but I did not think the prospect sufficiently promising to encourage him to persevere. I cannot express in terms sufficiently strong my obligations to Mr. Alexander, member for the city of Derry, who attended me throughout the greatest part of my tour, and was always most usefully and actively employed.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Oct. 24, 1799.

My northern tour has answered my most sanguine expectations; at Dundalk, the first place that I visited, exclusive of the

[1] Alexander Montgomery, brother of the Colonel Montgomery who was in the American service, and was killed in the attack on Quebec early in the American war; b. 1720, d. Nov. 1800, unm. M.P. for Donegal county from 1769 till the Union, when he retired. He was called "Black Montgomery" to distinguish him from the M.P. for Monaghan county, also Alexander Montgomery.

Henry Vaughan Brooke, b. 1742, d. Dec. 1807, unm. M.P. from 1777 to 1783 for Donegal borough, and for the county from 1783 to 1807.

[2] Henry, 3rd Lord and 1st Earl Conyngham, K.P., made Marquis Conyngham Jan. 22, 1816, and created Lord Minster in England July 17, 1821; b. Dec. 26, 1766, d. Dec. 28, 1832; m. July 5, 1794, Elizabeth, dau. of Joseph Denison, Esq.

address from the corporation, which is under the influence of Lord Roden, I received an unasked and unsought-for address from the Roman Catholic inhabitants, in favour of the Union. I did not enter the county of Down, lest that proud leviathan, Lord Downshire, should call it a declaration of war, but I was received with open arms at Belfast, and throughout the whole counties of Antrim and Derry the cry for an Union is almost unanimous, and I have great reason to believe that the members for the county of Donegal will be instructed to vote with us, and Black Montgomery says that he shall obey his constituents.

The county of Waterford and a part of Cork and Tipperary are in an unpleasant state; meetings are held, and illegal oaths tendered, and the disaffected are very busy in working mischief; I cannot however believe, notwithstanding the daily reports which I receive of intended risings, that an insurrection will be attempted unless the rebels have good reason to expect foreign assistance.

By private letters which I have seen from Holland, our troops in general seem to have been in the greatest confusion in every action, and on many occasions to have behaved exceedingly ill. There may be some exception in the corps belonging to Abercromby's division. Considering the hasty manner in which they were thrown together, and the officers by whom they were commanded, this is not surprising. Would to God they were all safe on board, I dread the retreat and embarkation. Twiss will be of service on the latter occasion. David Dundas will never be like Cæsar—the favourite of fortune; hitherto, at least, that fickle dame has set her face very steadily against him. They promise to send me some regiments, but I do not feel very confident. The measure of suffering the Guards to participate in the recruits to be obtained from the Militia, has, I hear, occasioned much confusion, and will prevent a great number from entering into the Line.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Oct. 25, 1799.

. . . The armistice in Holland,[1] although it is not, perhaps, the most brilliant way of getting out of the scrape, has

[1] This armistice, which was preliminary to the Convention signed at Alkmaar on the 19th, allowed the Allied troops to embark without molestation. The stipulations were, that they should quit Holland by Nov. 30, leave behind all the Dutch artillery they had taken, and release 8000 French or Batavian prisoners captured antecedent to this expedition: among these Admiral de Winter was included by name.

relieved my mind from much anxiety, and has insured to us some army, if we are not bent upon throwing it away.

What an extraordinary event is the return of Buonaparte! I wish that fellow had died in Egypt.

The telegraph accounts from France appear to be so little worthy of credit, from the gross blunders which they acknowledge, that I do not much regard the newspaper pages filled with stories of their victories.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Nov. 2, 1799.

I have received your Grace's letter dated the 25th ultimo, and I shall pay due attention to what you state respecting Lord Grenville's sentiments and feelings on the subject when Napper Tandy[1] and his associates arrive. Napper Tandy is a fellow of so very contemptible a character that no person in this country seems to care in the smallest degree about him. If any of his companions should appear to be men of abilities or consequence, and likely to be dangerous to the state, it may be necessary that they should be sacrificed to the justice and for the future security of their country. The notorious crimes of Tandy leave no room for hesitation about his banishment.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Nov. 7, 1799.

Our last accounts from England are dated the 31st, and you will easily imagine that during the tremendous gales which have prevailed for some days past, I have suffered considerable uneasiness about the removal of our troops from Holland, our fleet in the Bay, &c.

The march of the Archduke[2] from Switzerland into Germany

[1] Napper Tandy, who had early engaged in the rebellion, escaped from Ireland and was by name excluded from the Act of Amnesty. He, with Blackwell, Corbett, and others, went to Hamburgh, where, at the instance of Sir James Crawford, the Resident, he was, by order of the Senate, arrested Nov. 24, 1798, and sent to England. Lord Grenville, then Foreign Secretary, thought that this arrest was rather an infringement upon the law of nations, and felt himself consequently in an awkward position. The further proceedings in this case appear under the proper dates in 1800.

[2] This retreat, which is now known to have been the result of orders from Vienna, produced the most ruinous consequences. By weakening the Allied armies, it enabled Massena to defeat Korsakow in the battles fought near Zurich towards the close of September, in one of which General Hotze (one of the best of the Austrian Generals) was killed.

has most completely marred one of the finest campaigns that ever was made. The order for this movement, it is said, came from Vienna, and I hope we are not implicated in any part of the guilt, but we cannot avoid bearing a very considerable share in the ruinous consequences of the measure.

The vast increase of the establishment of the Guards, and loss of the only opportunity of completing the regiments of the line which cannot recruit, in order to give the men to the Guards who can, does not appear to be founded in good sense or economy. These things are, I am afraid, hastily done, on the suggestion of idle and unthinking young men.

I am likewise apprehensive that we shall get the city of Hamburgh into a scrape by the surrender of that contemptible fellow Napper Tandy, who is a man of no consequence, and the value of whose capture cannot amount to the price of the rope that will hang him.[1]

There is at present no appearance of serious mischief in this country, nor do I think that we have anything to apprehend, unless the French should make us a visit. The Union is, I trust, making progress; the great body of the people in general, and of the Catholics in particular, are decidedly for it, and from what I hear of the liberal disposition of the British Government, I think if we can once bring the Parliament of Ireland to enter into a discussion of the terms, it cannot fail of success.

Give my kind compliments to Mrs. Ross, and

Believe me ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

SIR RICHARD MUSGRAVE,[2] BART., TO E. COOKE, ESQ.

[Received Nov. 10.]

DEAR SIR, Exmouth, Nov. 1, 1799.

I beg leave to assure you that I have not renounced my opinions on Irish politics, as they were founded in principle. But

Suwarrow also on his arrival found himself deprived of the expected support, and, after his celebrated attack on the Devil's Bridge, and the disastrous retreat through the Mutterthal, he was so disgusted with the conduct of the Austrians that he refused any longer to co-operate with them, and shortly afterwards returned with his whole army to Russia. Thus were the successes of the Allies in Italy, and the advantages previously gained in Germany, rendered nugatory.

[1] The French Government remonstrated in very indignant terms with the Senate of Hamburgh for having given up Tandy and his companions.

[2] Sir Richard Musgrave, Bart., b. 1757, d. April 6, 1818; m. Dec. 20, 1780, Deborah, dau. of the Right Hon. Sir Henry Cavendish, Bart. He was a very vehement politician, and his 'History of the Rebellions in Ireland' is deeply imbued with his own anti-Catholic views. He did ultimately obtain the office of Receiver of Customs in Dublin, worth 1200*l.* a-year. M.P. for Lismore from March, 1778, till the Union.

I must confess that I was very jealous at seeing Government confer considerable favour on some persons who were not in Parliament—on others who were but a short time in it—and on others who either opposed them with intemperate zeal or did not evince an earnest desire to serve them. Lord Camden informed me in the year 1797 that the Duke of Portland had recommended me to him for an appointment, and though Government had more to dispose of from that period to the present than for ten years before, I have not been considered, and I could not even learn that Administration had in contemplation to serve me. I rested entirely on their honour, but I was informed by some persons of respectability, who were connected with Government, that I had no chance of receiving a favour from them unless I made terms and obtained a specific promise beforehand, and that without doing so I may wait *dum defluit amnis*. From my zeal on all occasions to promote peace and good order, to refute those opinions and to decry those baneful principles which have desolated many parts of Europe, I flatter myself that the public would not consider me as unworthy of an appointment. It would make my mind easy if I were certain that such an appointment as I would accept was intended for me when the question of the Union will be determined. I am extremely glad to find that the mass of the people regard that measure in its true light.

I am, dear Sir, your faithful and obedient servant,

RICHD. MUSGRAVE.

P.S.—My History of the Rebellion is far advanced.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Nov. 16, 1799.

I have not had time to acknowledge the receipt of your letters dated the 31st, 1st, and 9th. Matters are here going on pretty well; my government is certainly not unpopular in the country at large, and I have done some small matters to assist the capital against our threatened famine[1] that will, I think, take off

[1] The harvest had generally failed, and the price of corn being lower in Ireland than in England, the distilleries in the former country were in active work. As early as October fears had been entertained that severe distress must be felt, especially in Dublin. On account of the higher price of corn in England, Mr. Pitt was very unwilling to allow any exportation from that country, but, after much correspondence, Lord Cornwallis succeeded in obtaining several thousand sacks of flour, as a temporary and partial relief. He also issued on the 11th Nov. proclamations prohibiting the making of cakes, rolls, muffins, or anything but household bread. The exportation of corn was prohibited, and a bounty of 10*s.* offered on each of the first 40,000 barrels of flour imported and sold in open market, and 5*s.* for the next 20,000. The exportation of potatoes was also forbidden.

a good deal of the asperity of the mob-opposition to our great measure. The greatest difficulty which I experience is to control the violence of our loyal friends, who would, if I did not keep the strictest hand upon them, convert the system of martial law (which God knows is of itself bad enough) into a more violent and intolerable tyranny than that of Robespierre. The vilest informers are hunted out from the prisons to attack by the most barefaced perjury the lives of all who are suspected of being, or of having been, disaffected; and, indeed, every Roman Catholic of influence is in great danger. You will have seen by the addresses both in the north and south that my attempt to moderate that violence and cruelty which has once driven, and which, if tolerated, must again soon drive, this wretched country into rebellion, is not reprobated by the voice of the country, although it has appeared so culpable in the eyes of the absentees. I am told that I am to receive immediately the 15th, 16th, 36th, 46th, 52nd, and 62nd regiments, making upwards of 8000 men, and a detachment of about 1200 men who have been transferred from the militia to the Guards. How these latter are to be commanded I know not, but I should suspect that it will not be in manner to make them very efficient.

I shall be much disposed to countenance such means as may be proposed for improving the establishment of military artificers.

I have received a long letter from Dundas in which, amongst other things, he speaks of the expedition to Holland, which he does not seem to view in so unfavourable a light as it has appeared to others. I ventured in my answer to recommend that any future attempts should be well-weighed, as this was the last army that we could have any prospect of raising during the present war, and hinted that Sir Ralph Abercromby would be a safe man to talk with on those subjects.

I am, my dear Ross, most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private and Confidential.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Nov. 22, 1799.

Although it was not my intention to write to your Grace on the subject of the Union arrangements until I had an opportunity of discussing the matter fully with Lord Castlereagh, yet there is one point which, however trifling it may seem in itself, appears to me so likely to be productive of much mischief that I feel it to be

my duty to lose no time in submitting my sentiments upon it to your Grace's serious consideration. The matter to which I allude is the withholding the elective franchise in the choice of the representatives of the Irish peerage from the Roman Catholic peers, although the right of voting for a member of the House of Commons is enjoyed by every person of that religion who is possessed of a freehold of forty shillings a year. The number of Catholic peers is so small[1] that the question, abstractedly considered, can be of very little consequence either to themselves or to the state; but at a time when a respectable part of the Roman Catholic community in this kingdom is almost universally coming forward in favour of the Union and of Government, without taking advantage of the times to prefer any additional claims for their own sect, it must be a most mortifying and provoking circumstance for them to observe that this very Government which they support, is disposed to deny them the full enjoyment of those privileges which have in principle already been conceded to them.

I most earnestly hope that your Grace and His Majesty's other confidential servants will see this matter in the same light with me, and that you will allow the Roman Catholic peers to vote for the representatives of the peerage, on their taking the same oaths that are required from the electors of their communion when they give their votes for members of the House of Commons. I have had a most difficult line to pursue, but amidst the violence of factions and religious prejudices I have gone steadily to my point, and I think I may now venture to say that I have, in a great measure, gained the confidence and good-will of the Catholics without losing the Protestants. But if the former see cause to believe that I am disposed to adopt the ancient system, or that I am a man of straw, without weight or consideration, things will soon revert to their former course, and I shall, perhaps, be the most improper man to hold my present station.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Ragley, Nov. 28, 1799.

I have to acknowledge, which I do with a very sincere and grateful sense of your Grace's constant recollection of my wishes, your letter of the 22nd inst. I earnestly hope that the effect of

[1] Then only six—the Earl of Waterford and Wexford (Earl of Shrewsbury); Earl of Fingall; Viscounts Taaffe (in the Austrian service), Southwell, and Kenmare, and Lord Trimleston. Viscount Gormanston did not establish his right to the peerage till August, 1800.

Mr. Pitt's conversation with my Lord Downshire may be what we all wish it, but I have my fears that his Lordship has already gone too far with the Opposition to lend us any active assistance. As matters stand I should be well pleased to compound for the neutrality.

Your Grace and Mr. Pitt will, I trust, both have an opportunity of satisfying Lord Clare's feelings in respect to the line hereafter to be pursued towards the Catholics before he leaves London. Of course no further hopes will be held forth to that body by the Irish Government without specific directions from your Grace, and I fairly confess I entertain very great doubts whether any more distinct explanation than has already been given would at present be politically advantageous; it is enough to feel assured that we are not suffering them to form expectations which must afterwards be disappointed, under the disadvantage of having dexterity, if not duplicity, imputed to Government in the conduct of the measure.

The more I consider the terms of Union which you are prepared to offer to Ireland, the more confident I feel that the measure must ultimately succeed. I shall have a strong case to state to the Irish Parliament; I wish I could appeal to an audience solely intent upon the *publick question.*

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Nov. 29, 1799.

. . . Supposing that all peculation is at an end in the Engineer line, which I believe is now nearly, if not entirely, the case, that branch of the service, which requires more education and study than any other, is the most confined in its prospects of honour or emolument. Even the least capable of the colonels ought to receive the average value of a regiment of infantry; and not only the man who, by survivorship, arrives at the situation of chief engineer, but the efficient man who performs the duties of it, should receive nearly the double of that allowance. An arrangement of this kind cannot perhaps be undertaken at this time, but something more must be done for Morse.[1] Not knowing precisely what Sir W. Green receives I cannot say what the former should have, but perhaps it might be fair to fix it at 100*l.* a-year less than the chief engineer. I wish you would put this into some shape, and either speak to Lord Howe from me, or enable me to write to him on the subject.

[1] Lieut.-General, afterwards General, Robert Morse, Colonel-Commandant of Engineers, b. 1743, d. July, 1811.

The proposed arrangements for the Union are, in general, likely to give satisfaction; but our ministers suffer themselves to be so totally guided by the narrow-minded prejudices of the Protestant party, that they have excluded the Roman Catholic peers (six in number) from voting for the representative peers, although every Roman Catholic freeholder of forty shillings a-year has for some years past enjoyed the privilege of voting for a member for the county. Of the six peers there are but two who are men of consequence, and those are excellent men, of most conspicuous loyalty. But it is not the character of the persons, or the thing itself, abstractedly considered, that is of consequence, but the use that our enemies will make of it. Will not the Roman Catholics (seven-tenths of the community) be told in all the speeches and pamphlets, "You see by this specimen what you are to expect; the first striking feature of the measure is to curtail the little privilege you enjoy—fools as you are, to have suffered yourselves to be the dupes and tools of such an Administration," &c.

I have written to the D. of P. on the subject in very strong terms, but I doubt whether it will have much effect, as I do not believe that my opinions on Irish matters are in high esteem in the Cabinet. I do not understand Sir Ralph Abercromby's going to Scotland without passing by London and going to Court. Is anything wrong in that quarter?[1] Every revolution[2] that happens in France must be so far useful, as it tends to discredit the plan of putting down established governments; but I should doubt otherwise whether the Consular will be more favourable to us than the Directorial Government.

With kindest compliments to Mrs. Ross, I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 9, 1799.

The consideration of the general tenor of the papers containing the outline of the plan of the Union, as well as the reports of Lord Castlereagh, have afforded me much satisfaction; and I was peculiarly glad to learn from him that the Cabinet Ministers had made up their mind on the subject of the future encouragement to be given to the Catholics.

[1] There was no coolness on either side. The not going to Court was simply the consequence of Sir Ralph being compelled to go to Scotland on business.

[2] The Revolution of the 18th Brumaire (Nov. 9) had just made Bonaparte First Consul.

I have no doubt of the wisdom of not only withholding the grant of any immunities to them, but of avoiding all promises or engagements until the business shall be completed, provided that their support can be obtained under such circumstances; and I really believe it may, because, as I observed in my former letter to your Grace, they have a confidence in the liberal sentiments of Government.

But this opinion makes me feel more sensibly the mischief that is to be apprehended from the proposed resolution of excluding the Catholic peers from the privilege of voting for the representatives, which I so strongly deprecated. This measure, the good purposes of which, in any shape, I cannot discover, will undoubtedly be considered by the whole body of Catholics as tending to deprive them of a right which they actually possess, and must, consequently, excite their most serious jealousies and apprehensions, and will induce them to insist on previous assurances, and to bargain at Dublin Castle for those favours which it is so desirable they should receive as the spontaneous grace of His Majesty and the British Government.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 11, 1799.

I have delayed troubling your Grace with any observations from hence, till I was enabled to form some judgment of the present state of our party. We have made *some* acquisitions, and I see no reason at present to apprehend any defection amongst those whom we have hitherto considered as friends. What Lord Ormonde's ultimate line of conduct may be I cannot presume to judge, having already been much deceived in the opinion I had formed of him. His Lordship fortunately wrote to Lord Cornwallis in the tone of his communication to me, which gave his Excellency an opportunity of sending him an answer which I think he will not be much inclined to show, even to his confidential advisers, but which, if he does make public, will not afford much encouragement to others to approach Government in the same way. Mr. Pitt's letter, which your Grace was so obliging as to obtain for me, enabled me perfectly to satisfy Lord Ely, without making any positive promise as to the marquisate. His Lordship is satisfied to leave himself in the hands of Government—a mark of confidence which relieves us from much embarrassment, and augurs well as to his Lordship's determination

to give the measure a fair support. Some of his seats are at present unfortunately vacant, and General Loftus is desirous of retiring. I have written earnestly to request his assistance, at least on the opening of Parliament, when we shall be comparatively weak, there being at present no less than 22 seats vacant, which will be filled by our friends. Allow me to request your Grace's influence on this occasion, and also permit me to forward through you a letter to Sir R. Musgrave, whose address I am unacquainted with. A few words from your Grace in the envelope will secure his attendance.

I have written to Lord Darnley,[1] earnestly to press for the assistance of his friends; perhaps your Grace may find a favourable opportunity for urging it. I am peculiarly solicitous that our friends should assemble on the first day, as the Opposition intend to move an amendment to the address deprecating the agitation of the question of Union. Much will depend on a first impression, and between infirm, absent, and members who have vacated, there are above 30 friends who cannot be brought forward.

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

Secret. [Received Dec. 14, 1799.]

MY LORD, Whitehall, Dec. 9, 1799.

I have the honour to send your Excellency herewith by the messenger Gurnett, a set of the proposed Resolutions and Articles of the intended Union, with the latest corrections which have been made in them.

You will probably have been in daily expectation of receiving these papers from the time of Lord Castlereagh's arrival in Dublin; but I have not lost a moment in transmitting them to you since they have been returned to me by the several persons to whose consideration it was deemed necessary and expedient to submit them.

I am still unable to put into your Excellency's hands the documents and vouchers which are referred to in these papers, but they are preparing with all the dispatch which is consistent with the accuracy with which it is necessary they should be made out; but your Excellency shall be informed as soon as they are ready, and no time shall be lost in forwarding them to you.

A mail from Hamburgh has arrived to-day, but brings nothing

[1] John, 4th Earl of Darnley, b. June 30, 1767, d. March 17, 1831; m. Sept. 19, 1791, Elizabeth, dau. of the Right Hon. William Brownlow. He had the borough of Athboy.

new of any consequence. I will therefore only detain the messenger while I assure you of the sincere regard and respect with which

I have the honour to be, &c.,

PORTLAND.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private and most Secret.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 17, 1799.

Since I last had the honour of addressing your Grace, we have been making the best preparations in our power for the approaching contest; as far as we can make up our lists, we reckon at present on 180 supporters. I cannot absolutely state the above numbers to be secured beyond the possibility of disappointment, but, making allowances for the trifling discontents inseparable from party, I do not *at present* perceive any disposition which should lead us to apprehend any considerable defection. Of the remaining 120 members, I consider 85 as decidedly hostile, and 35 whose politics are not yet distinctly ascertained. Amongst the latter description I reckon Lord Downshire's and Lord De Clifford's friends; I am yet without any answer from the latter, which does not lead me to augur so favourably of his intentions as the nature of his communications to me when I was in London seemed to authorise. If your Grace can use any means on your side of the water to prevail on him to declare himself, it would have an important effect.

Your Grace, I trust, will not be surprised at my requesting that you will assist us in the *same way*[1] and to the *same extent* as you did previous to Mr. Elliot's leaving London. The advantages have been important, and it is very desirable that this request should be complied with without delay.

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 24, 1799.

. . . I was, as you may believe, much gratified by the flattering token of remembrance and regard which I have received from the Indian army.[2] I yesterday received a map

[1] The sum first sent was 5000*l.*

[2] After the capture of Seringapatam, March 16, 1799, the army voted an address to Lord Cornwallis, and presented him with the sword and turban of Tippoo, and the sword of a Maratha Chief, brought to England by General Harris in 1800.

marking out the partition of territory. Our holding Seringapatam *isolé* is certainly awkward, but as the old town of Mysore stands a little to the southward of it, I conclude that it appeared difficult to make a Rajah of Mysore, and withhold from him the old capital. There are many objections to our setting up a phantom,[1] but it would have occasioned great jealousy if we had kept the whole to ourselves, and there were obvious reasons for our wishing to keep as much extent of coast as possible. It was likewise, I conclude, thought to be prudent to prevent as much as possible the Marattas and the Nizam from extending their territories down the Peninsula, where they might become troublesome neighbours to the Carnatic and to our possessions on the Malabar Coast, which extend nearly to Goa. At present any army that invades *our* Rajah of Mysore will have our territories on both flanks.

I have not heard of Lord Downshire's having declared open hostility from any other quarter, and I am pretty confident that he has made no notification to his own members. I do not, however, feel very bold; every day produces some symptoms of defection, and I hope our friends in England will be prepared for the worst.[2] I have met with very little countenance or kindness, especially from my *official* correspondent, and yet if I had suffered those in whom they put their trust to pursue the course they wished, the whole country would have been against us. Nightingall is to be employed somewhere with Maitland.[3] I have written in the greatest haste.

Yours sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] As it was thought necessary to place a native prince on the throne of Mysore, to govern such parts of the territories as were not divided between the Company, the Nizam, and the Marathas, the nearest male heir of the Hindoo dynasty dethroned by Hyder, was selected; but he was bound to follow the advice of the British Resident, in whom virtually the whole authority was vested. Mysore has ever since maintained an enviable superiority over almost all the other native states in tranquillity and prosperity.

[2] The letters of, and subsequent to, Feb. 5, 1800, prove that these fears were not groundless. Among those whose defection is mentioned was Mr. Bagwell, with his two sons. This was quite unexpected, as, during Lord Cornwallis's tour through the south of Ireland, in the summer of 1799, the cordial reception he received at Mr. Bagwell's residence gave him every reason to expect the support of that gentleman, from whose house he wrote in a very sanguine spirit.

[3] This is an allusion to a contemplated attack upon Bellisle and other parts of the French coast. Colonel Maitland was appointed to command the expedition, consisting of about 4000 men, drawn partly from England, and partly from Ireland. The vessels containing the troops were to meet in the Channel, and, at Colonel Maitland's request, the naval part of the expedition was placed under the command of Sir Edward Pellew. The proposed arrangements were to be kept a profound secret. To divert the attention of the French, a landing was to be effected in Quiberon Bay, before the vessels proceeded to their real destination. Frequent allusions to this secret expedition will be found in subsequent letters.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

[Private.]

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 28, 1799.

. . . Lord Darnley, who is just come over, and who assumes the inconvenient character of a doubtful, hesitating friend, pressed me most strongly to make Mr. —— storekeeper at Chatham, and after I had, as I thought, in a long conference, satisfied him of the utter impossibility of my making such a promotion, I received a letter from him again strongly urging his request, and transmitting a letter addressed to him by Mr. —— stating that the objections made by Lord Howe were merely used as a pretext, that the present Board of Ordnance paid no attention to any claims but those of interest, and quoting the appointments of —— and —— as instances of the grossest corruption. I thought it best to take this up in a most angry tone; I taxed Mr. —— (and with great justice) with uttering the most daring falsehoods, explained the appointments of —— and ——, and added that by making Mr. —— storekeeper at Chatham, I should deserve the obloquy which he now so unjustly endeavoured to fix upon me; and I said that nothing but Lord D.'s having marked his letter *private* should prevent my calling Mr. —— to a public account. Whether this will make Lord D. an Anti-Unionist is a doubtful question; it is a sad thing to be forced to manage knaves, but it is ten times worse to deal with fools. Between the one and the other I entertain every day more doubt of our success in the great question of Union; we have a lukewarm, and in some instances an unwilling majority; the enemy have a bold and deeply interested minority, which will, I am afraid, even after our friends are reckoned, run us much nearer than most people expect.[1]

I have received no answer to two letters which I have lately written to the D. of P. about the votes of the Catholic Lords at the election of the Representative Peers. My opinions have no weight on your side of the water, and yet I am kept here to manage matters of a most disgusting nature to my feelings, merely, I believe, to prevent my interfering with others in military commands. God knows, I wish for no such interference, and look only with the most ardent wishes for a peaceable retirement.

Believe me ever most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] The expectations expressed by Lord Castlereagh in his letter of Dec. 17th, of 180 friends, were, as will be seen, much too sanguine.

RIGHT HON. WILLIAM PITT TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

DEAR DUNDAS, Downing Street, Tuesday, Dec. 31, 1799.

I have been in hopes from day to day to send you the promised materials on the subject of my last letter. But the enquiry has been retarded by fresh points arising in the course of it, and by Sir Charles Grey's having been part of the time unwell. I hope that it will now soon be completed, and I trust the result will lead to a plan very conformable to the general ideas you have mentioned. You may be assured that I will not allow my mind to be captivated by any project that is not thoroughly examined and weighed in all its parts, and I am more and more convinced that the great view of the expedition ought to be directed to gaining possession of Brest, and that for this purpose a preliminary step (either accompanying or preceding the expedition to the Peninsula, if the latter should ultimately be found advisable) must probably be the capture of Bellisle. If the Royalists are then in as much force as we have every reason to expect, and we are able ourselves to act on a large scale, I really think there is the fairest prospect that Brest must, in the course of the summer, be in our power. With this view, however, I still think it will be a great point if possible to obtain an addition of 10,000 or 15,000 disposable infantry beyond the number which we can at present count upon as likely to be realized. From my last conversations with the Duke of York I find our regiments of regular infantry in Great Britain and Ireland may at present be put at about 35,000 men, to which may be added 7000 Guards, 3000 French, and in the spring 10,000 or 15,000 recruits from the British and Irish Militia, making altogether about 60,000 infantry, exclusive of Russians or Dutch, and exclusive of our Fencible infantry, nearly all of which has, I understand, volunteered for general service. This latter force of Fencibles I think amounts to about 15,000 or 16,000 men, and would make a most valuable and important addition, but I doubt whether any large part of it could be spared from Ireland, without having some others to substitute in its place, as we could hardly trust the internal safety of that country to a small body of regular cavalry, with Irish Militia and Volunteers. If it were possible to raise 10,000 or 12,000 additional Fencibles for Ireland, they might be in readiness in the course of the summer to supply the place of those now there, and I really think we should then have an army amply sufficient for our object. I will mention this idea to the Duke of York, whom I am to see on Thursday, and shall be very

glad to know as soon as I can what you think of it, as, if you think it practicable, no time ought to be lost.

Having said all that is material for the present with respect to means of war, I have now to tell you (what does not in any degree supersede the former consideration) that to-day has brought us the overture from the Consul in the shape of a letter to the King, a copy of which I inclose. It is, as you will see, very civil in its terms, and seems by the phrase which describes the two countries as being both more powerful than their security requires, to point at being willing to give up at least a part of the French conquests if we do the same as to ours. It is, however, very little material in my opinion to speculate on the probable terms, as I think we can have nothing to do but to decline all negotiation at the present moment, on the ground that the actual situation of France does not as yet hold out any solid security to be derived from negotiation, taking care at the same time to express strongly the eagerness with which we should embrace any opening for general peace whenever such solid security shall appear attainable. This may, I think, be so expressed as to convey to the people of France that the shortest road to peace is by effecting the restoration of Royalty, and thereby to increase the chance of that most desirable of all issues to the war, but at the same time so as in no degree to preclude us from treating even with the present Government, if it should prevail and be able to establish itself firmly, in spite of Jacobins on the one hand and Royalists on the other. This is my present view of the subject, and is very conformable to what seemed Grenville's opinion (in a conversation I had with him yesterday before the letter had arrived), as well as to that of Lord Spencer and Windham, who are the only members of Government I have seen since. I am afraid we must return some answer before I can hear from you, but I think you will not see anything to object to in this line.

Yours, ever,

W. P.

CHAPTER XXI.

Hopes of a majority for the Union — Proposed expedition to French coast — Bonaparte offers to negociate — Mr. Grattan takes his seat — Opposition to the Union — Marquis of Downshire — Debates in Parliament — Napper Tandy — Alleged interference with a public meeting — Duel between Mr. Corry and Mr. Grattan — The Catholic Peers — Union Resolutions carried in both Houses — Limitation of Irish Peerage — Attempts on the King's Life — Debates on Union Bill — Passed in the Commons — Lord Cornwallis's engagements to Supporters of the Union — Objections of the Duke of Portland — Remonstrance of Lord Cornwallis — The Duke's explanation — Royal Assent to Union Bill — Military arrangements for Ireland — Creations and promotions in the Peerage — Compensation to Borough-proprietors.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO JOHN KING,[1] ESQ.

[Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin, Jan. 2, 1800.

. . . I am impatient to hear from you on the subject of my letter to the Duke. We are in great distress, and I wish the transmiss was more considerable than the last, it is very important that we should not be destitute of the means on which so much depends. . . .

Ever yours, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MEMORANDUM in MR. KING'S Writing.[2]

It was sent this day to Lord Castlereagh. I ventured so far as to observe to Lord Castlereagh that the fund was good security for a still further sum, though not immediately, if it could be well laid out and furnished on the spot. I trust I did not go too far.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Jan. 4, 1800.

I enclose two more applications which I have received for advancement in the civil branch of the Ordnance. Mr. Clowdes-

[1] John King, b. April 18, 1759, d. Feb. 23, 1830; m. 1792, Harriet Margaret, dau. of Charles Moss, Bishop of Bath and Wells. Under-Secretary of State, 1792 to 1806; then Secretary of the Treasury to July, 1806; and then Comptroller of Army Accounts till his death. M.P. for Enniskillen, Feb. to July, 1806.

[2] The memorandum in Mr. King's writing was addressed to the Duke of Portland.

ley's[1] father was the man who *verily believed* that the French troopers had a design against his life when they gave him fourteen cuts on the skull.

I have made up matters with Lord Darnley, and he has engaged me to promise that ——'s imprudent letter (which, by the bye, Lord D. ought not to have shown) shall not be remembered in bar to his future prospects. Colonel Brownrigg has signified the Duke of York's wish for our forming a corps of riflemen, by enlisting fifteen men from each corps of Fencibles serving in Ireland, and mentioned Nightingall for the command. I have given assurances of my ready obedience, without expressing my approbation, but have apprised Brownrigg privately of Nightingall's obligations and engagements to Maitland. I conclude that by this time there are at least forty kinds of rifles at the Horse Guards, and that when the important point is settled we shall look to you for arms.

We have within these few days brought some of our wavering friends to an explicit and favourable declaration, and I begin now to think that even on the first day, when so many of our friends will be out of Parliament, we shall have a considerable majority.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

RIGHT HON. WILLIAM PITT TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

DEAR DUNDAS, Holwood, Saturday, Jan. 11, 1800.

I was in hopes long before this to have been able to write to you fully on the project relative to the French coast, but Sir Charles Grey has continued so much indisposed that I have not been able to see him again, and have not received from him anything like a full and deliberate opinion. I find, however, that both he and Colonel Twiss entertain at present a very unfavourable opinion of the strength of the post proposed to be occupied, and Sir Charles seems also to entertain (as it was very probable he would) a very strong and obstinate prejudice against the Chouans and every description of French, which makes him apparently unwilling to estimate impartially their real strength. Under these circumstances I see no prospect of our having at present any such report as would justify encouraging the scheme, and I shall therefore endeavour to keep the whole subject in suspense till your return, when the whole plan of the campaign must be an

[1] He was Clerk of the Cheque at the Powder Mills at Faversham, and he asked for the appointment of Ordnance Storekeeper at Chatham.

immediate object of full discussion. I am afraid we shall find great difficulty in arranging any scheme which will be attended with advantages as important as ought to result from the employment of so large and expensive a force as that which we possess, or are bringing forward; and operations on a small scale, and in quarters not decisive, though better than absolute inactivity, are not suited to the present crisis, in which I feel, as you do, that we must make our impression in the course of the ensuing campaign, or we shall find our means fail us.

Bellisle is certainly, for one operation, very advantageous, if upon further examination it proves to be attended with no insurmountable obstacles from additional works and defences since the former expedition. But that once accomplished, I see nothing that remains but mere demonstrations, or at most flying and predatory expeditions (which may alarm and distract, and be of some benefit as a diversion both to the Austrians and the Royalists, but will be of no real consequence in themselves), unless upon full consideration we think our force sufficient to justify risking a great army either in Brittany (with a view of taking Brest with the aid of the Royalists), or between the Seine and the Somme, for the purpose of occupying at least the district between the two rivers, and carrying terror to the capital, even if we do not advance thither. Either of these enterprises, if prosperous, will decide the fate of the war in our favour; but it must be confessed that the failure of either would be nearly as decisive against us. In these circumstances I do not feel that the attempt can be justified, unless on full examination, and with the best military opinions we can procure, the chances in favour of success strongly preponderate; but if that should be the case, some unavoidable risk from the contrary chances ought not, I think, to deter us, and you will, I believe, be of the same opinion.

I hope the answer to Bonaparte[1] has appeared to you conformable to the general ideas I had stated to you, and in which I was very glad to find you so entirely concurred. I hope, too, that you

[1] On the 5th Nivose, An VIII. (Dec. 25, 1799) Talleyrand transmitted to Lord Grenville an autograph letter of Bonaparte to the King, to which Lord Grenville replied Jan. 4, 1800, saying that England could see no sufficient guarantee of security to herself and her allies in the propositions of France, and therefore that His Majesty had no course but to pursue those exertions of a just and defensive war, which, however, his regard for his subjects would not allow him to continue beyond the necessity in which they had originated. Though the letter was couched in very unconciliating terms, Talleyrand replied on the 14th, still pressing for negociations, and proposing Dunkirk or any other frontier town as the place where plenipotentiaries might meet. The correspondence was closed by a second note from Lord Grenville, dated Jan. 20, stating that, as the previous conduct of France was systematically defended in the French notes, His Majesty could see no hope of such a peace as would justify him in entering into negociations.

have not been disappointed in your expectation of getting rid of your sore throat on such easy terms, and that we shall see you quite well by the end of the week in which Parliament meets. We must of course lay the letter from Bonaparte, and our answer, before the House on the Tuesday or Wednesday; but I mean to put off all discussion upon them till the Monday following, which will be the 27th, in order to give you full time, without breaking in on your original plan. We must determine in the mean time exactly what line to hold respecting the production of any papers or information on the subject of the expedition to Holland. There will be some difficulty in the selection, but I continue to think we must give enough to clear away all possible doubts about the sufficiency of supplies, medical assistance, and transport for bringing the troops back. Pray let me know your ideas, as some questions will probably be asked, though perhaps no motion made, before you return.

Ever yours,

W. P.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE RIGHT HON. WILLIAM PITT.

[Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Jan. 13, 1800.

The Articles of Union having now been gone through by our leading friends, I can venture to assure you that the arrangement affords them all the fullest satisfaction. The question of expense they consider as most satisfactorily and liberally settled between the two countries, and the only alteration they seem to wish is the introduction of some words in the clause which I have the honour to enclose, which may more distinctly explain, on the face of the resolution, the particular circumstances which would warrant the substitution of common taxes in lieu of proportionate contributions. From a communication Mr. Corry had with the gentleman who makes calculations for your Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, I am inclined to think you will not find it difficult hereafter to estimate the value of the debts of the two countries, however they may vary in rate of interest, price of capital, and period of extinction; if you can estimate their value, and that their values are proportionate, or so nearly so as that the excess on either side may be conveniently defrayed by separate taxes, the declaration may be made without disturbing the present system of the Funds in either country, as the arrangement only goes to affect the question of in what proportion the respective countries shall contribute, and need not interfere with the applica-

tion of the Funds when raised. It is worth considering whether, as the value of the respective debts may be proportionate within a period of twenty years, that clause which precludes the declaration till after the first period of revision, should not be omitted, and the general principle be left to regulate itself.

I have the honour, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 13, 1800.

The death of the Primate, which I have notified to your Grace by this day's mail, has produced a very earnest solicitation from the Archbishop of Cashel, with whose character and abilities your Grace is, I believe, perfectly well acquainted. I had likewise an application a few days before from the Archbishop of Tuam[1] to succeed to the Primacy in the event of the decease of the late Primate, whose health has been for some time declining, although his dissolution was not so suddenly expected.

I assured the Archbishop of Cashel that I should request your Grace to lay his pretensions before His Majesty. But I informed him at the same time, that I believed His Majesty would consider the appointment of too great importance to admit of his attending in the disposal of it to the ordinary course of recommendation, and that the nomination would come immediately from the Crown.

If the King should think proper to give the Primacy in the line of Irish Bishops, I do not think that he can, without much inconvenience, pass over the claims of the Archbishop of Cashel, nor do I know any other candidates whose merits would justify such a supercession; and it is my duty to add that his Grace of late has conducted himself in a manner to give him strong political claims for the support of this Government.

But should His Majesty, on the contrary, select one of the English Bishops from the Irish Bench for that high station, according to the practice which has obtained for many years, I should conceive that the Bishop of Ferns[2] would be the properest

[1] Hon. William Beresford, 3rd son of Marcus, 1st Earl of Tyrone, of the 2nd creation, b. April 16, 1743, d. Sept. 6, 1819; m. June 12, 1763, Elizabeth, sister of John, 1st Earl of Clare. Consecrated Bishop of Dromore 1780, Bishop of Ossory 1782, and Archbishop of Tuam 1795; created Lord Decies Dec. 21, 1812.

[2] Euseby Cleaver, b. 1745, d. Dec. 1819; m. 1788 Catherine, dau. of the Right Hon. Owen Wynne of Hazlewood. Consecrated Bishop of Cork, March, 1789, translated

object for his choice, and that no man would fill that high office with more respectability.

I have stated my sentiments on this subject without any personal bias from acquaintance or connection, and with no other view but to assist His Majesty, according to the best of my judgment, in making such a choice as would be most suitable to his own disposition and to the dignity of his Government.

I am, &c.,
CORNWALLIS.

HENRY ALEXANDER, ESQ., TO THE RIGHT HON. THOMAS PELHAM.

MY DEAR MR. PELHAM, Jan. 15, 1800.

My silence has been founded on the uninterrupted calm that has prevailed in mine and the adjoining counties for these some months past. I have taken an immense farm and procul negotiis. I kept them at a distance from my ——.[1] Donegal and Derry, where my property and little influence exist, have come forward with great unanimity.

Dublin is much and seriously, although I think, at present, not mischievously, agitated. Our Parliament adjourns after the Militia business is disposed of. Grattan, I hear, is to be introduced at or after 12 to-night,[2] until which period the debate is to be prolonged. I pity from my soul Lord Castlereagh, but he shall have something more than helpless pity from me,—but he has a phalanx of mischievous talent and a host of passion, folly, corruption, and enthusiasm to contend with. The Catholics yesterday came to some absurd resolutions. To-morrow the Guild of Merchants meets, and the day after, I understand, they are to communicate all rights to the Catholics. Grattan has, you know, the confidence of 40,000 pikemen. The passions of the Bar and many of the country gentry give them a favourable accolade. Men will believe what they wish, and we shall have hot work.

However, we are better upon the whole than last year. I believe the Minister stronger in point of votes—but with Ponsonby, Grattan, Bushe, Plunkett, &c., to agitate the mob, and Foster and Parnell to obstruct public business, much is to be laboured.

I leave my letter open for contingencies.

I am (at 4 o'clock) yours truly,

Going to the Lords at nine. H. ALEXANDER.

June the same year to Ferns, and made Archbishop of Dublin, 1809.

[1] Sic in orig. The transcript in the State Paper Office, from whence this letter has been copied, is evidently full of blunders.

[2] He was elected for Wicklow borough; and Lord Castlereagh, Jan. 10, informed Mr. King that Mr. Grattan had paid 2400*l.* for this seat.

Sir L. Parsons has moved an amendment to the Address, or that part of it stating the existing unity of the kingdoms as it actually exists, and adding that the assertion of our birthrights to legislative independence to your Parliament in '82 contained sentiments which we are now called on to repeat. His speech was founded on all the injuries for 600 years sustained by Ireland, the necessity of meeting a packed Parliament before the packing was completed, of crushing the coiled snake before it made its leap, talked something of petty Scotch and English politicians, and figuratively of a puny miner capable of blasting the work of giants—ob invidiam. He was seconded by Savage,[1] Member for the county of Down. Lord Castlereagh rising to reply gave the Speaker an opportunity of creating a laugh by asking if the noble Lord meant to second the Baronet. Lord Castlereagh replied in a very manly style, prophecied that the seceders from Parliament would soon feel they owed a momentary co-operation to motives that would die away. And he has chosen, like a man, rather to throw the glove maker than pick it up.

Mr. David Latouche[2] has made a most discreet, sensible, and wise speech, which is so extremely suitable to his age, character, and situation, and derived such consistency from them, that he has silenced the leaders of Opposition until wild unnoticed treasons coming from unmeaning men shall have time to give a spirit to their leaders. Parnell is busy at the Post, Ponsonby just called in by Bushe to listen to Martin—a most thankless office—but they must bring him to the Post.

John Claudius Beresford, Lord Cole, and Geo. Ogle all admit that cases might occur where an Union might be eligible, but deny the present necessity. The late Prime-Serjeant has spoken during my writing this letter, but without much effect. Ogle's speech has annoyed the Opposition. He says that he will not consider men's motives, but that he will co-operate with them, with or without *virtue*, to defeat this measure. The agony of George Ponsonby fit for a painter.

The House as yet in good humour from the very great influence of Latouche's speech, and Lord Cole's manly, good-humoured,

[1] Francis Savage, b. 1767, d. 1823; m. 1st, Miss Crawford, of Crawfordsburn; 2nd, Dec. 19, 1806, Harriet, dau. of Henry Thomas, 2nd Earl of Carrick. He was returned on Lord Downshire's interest for the county of Down in 1797, and sat for it till May, 1812. His daughter by his first wife married Colonel Forde, and his widow, Lady Harriet Savage, also married Colonel Forde.

[2] Right Hon. David Latouche, b. 1729, d. Aug. 1817; m. 1762, Elizabeth, dau. of George Marley, Bishop of Waterford. M.P. for Dundalk from 1763 to 1767, Longford borough to 1783, and Newcastle till the Union. His grandfather, David Dignes des Pompières de la Touche (of an old family in the Blesois, driven from France by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes), fought at the battle of the Boyne in the regiment commanded by Colonel Caillemotte, who was mortally wounded, and died crying out to his men, "A la gloire, mes enfans, à la gloire."

but professedly loyal style of opposition, and sincere, I am sure, on his side.

Young Bagwell,[1] the collector's[2] youngest son, has in a maiden speech, and rather eloquent in point of composition, supported the measure, which is, I presume, the voucher for his family, who are doubted to this minute.

As I know not how I may be useful, I return, and

Yours again,

(10 at night.) H. ALEXANDER.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Jan. 16, 1800.

After a debate of eighteen hours in the House of Commons upon an amendment proposed by the Anti-Unionists to the Address —*To maintain the independence of the Irish Parliament as settled in* 1782—the division was: For the amendment, 96; against, 138. Majority for Government, 42.

Mr. Grattan took his seat in the latter part of the debate, between 7 and 8 o'clock this morning, and made an inflammatory speech, which was most admirably answered by Corry, and G. is thought to have done more harm than good to the Opposition. I am assured that we had the advantage in speaking as well as voting; and considering the number of our friends that were out of Parliament on account of their having accepted offices, things certainly look very favourably. Lord Downshire and De Clifford were both against us: Lords Darnley is with us, but neither of his Members came over to vote.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Thursday, Jan. 16, 1800.

The House divided at 10 o'clock this morning, after a sitting of eighteen hours, on an amendment to the Address deprecating the discussion of Union. It was moved by Sir Lawrence Parsons and seconded by Mr. Savage, Lord Downshire's Member for the county of Down. The Ayes were 96, the Noes 138;

[1] Richard Bagwell, 2nd son of John Bagwell, Esq., d. April, 1826; m. 1808, Margaret, dau. of Edward Croker, Esq., of Ballynaguard. He represented Cashel from March, 1799, till Nov. 1801, when he took Holy Orders. Dean of Clogher from 1806 till his death. His support of the Union alluded to here lasted only till the 5th of February following.

[2] The "Collector" was Benjamin, the youngest brother of Richard Bagwell, and not his father, as here stated. He died some time after, unm.

Majority 42, which, considering the number of our vacancies,[1] and some disappointments, I consider to be a satisfactory issue to our first contest. I am happy to be enabled to inform your Grace that our friends acted with great energy and ability in the debate: the Attorney-General in reply to Mr. G. Ponsonby; the Prime-Serjeant to Mr. Bushe and Mr. Plunkett; and Mr. Corry to Mr. Grattan,[2] who presented himself at the bar at 7 o'clock in the morning, having been elected for Wicklow at midnight. He appeared weak[3] in health, but had sufficient strength to deliver a very inflammatory speech of an hour and a half, sitting. Mr. Fox[4] made a very able speech against the amendment in the course of the debate. Lord Downshire appeared on the Opposition side of the House. His Members, with the exception of Mr. Annesley[5] and Mr. Johnston,[6] voted in the minority. Finding them determined not to take a part against the question, he desired they might withdraw. Lord de Clifford's three Members[7] voted against

[1] Twenty-six writs were moved that day, and thirteen more on the 17th, 18th, and 20th of January. A very large majority of the Members returned to fill up these thirty-nine vacancies supported Government.

[2] Mr. Grattan was elected for the borough of Wicklow on the death of Mr. Gahan, father-in-law to Mr. Tighe, to whom the borough belonged.

[3] Mr. Cooke, on Jan. 17th, writes to Mr. King—"Mr. Grattan took his seat apparently ill and weak, but this was all acting." The election had been timed by Mr. Grattan's friends, so as to prevent his taking his seat until the unusual hour mentioned above, when he was supported into the House, apparently in a fainting state, by the Right Hon. W. B. Ponsonby and Mr. Arthur Moore. Like the Eastern astrologers, they watched for a fortunate moment, and entered just as Mr. Egan was dilating on the exertions of Mr. Grattan in 1782. The scene was well got up, but the trick was too palpable, and produced but little effect.

[4] Luke Fox, b. 1755, d. 1819; m. 1790, Anne, dau. of Richard Annesley, Esq., of Ross, and a niece of Lord Ely. Justice of the Common Pleas from Dec. 4, 1800, to July 23, 1816. On the 31st of May, 1804, Lord Abercorn in the House of Lords brought charges against him, with a view of obtaining his removal from the Bench. They were partially heard the following year, and on June 19, 1806, Lord Grenville moved to postpone the consideration of them *sine die*, although no part of the defence had been heard. Notwithstanding the opposition of Lord Eldon and others, the motion was carried by 25 to 16. M.P. for Clonmines, 1797 to 1799, then for Mullingar till the Union.

[5] Right Hon. Richard Annesley, 2nd son of William, 1st Viscount Glerawly. On the death, Dec. 19, 1802, of his brother Francis Charles, he became 2nd Earl of Annesley; b. April 14, 1745, d. Nov. 9, 1824; m. Sept. 25, 1771, Anne, dau. and heir of Robert Lambert, Esq., of Dunlady. Commissioner of Revenue and Excise from Dec. 30, 1785, till 1810; also one of the Commissioners of Compensation. M.P. successively for Coleraine, St. Canice, Newtownards, Blessington, and Middleton, from 1767 till the Union.

[6] Robert Johnston, b. 1747, d. March, 1833; m. Susan, dau. of — Evans, Esq., of Queen's County. He was Counsel successively to the Barrack and Revenue Boards, for which he received 1382*l.* Compensation. He was in 1801 made a Judge of the Common Pleas, but was in the summer of 1806 forced to retire under the following unpleasant circumstances:—In Nov. 1803 Cobbett published in his 'Political Register' a letter signed "Juverna," which contained a libel on Lords Redesdale and Plunkett, then respectively Chancellor and Attorney-General of Ireland. For this Cobbett was prosecuted and convicted in May, 1804, and then, to save himself, he named the author of the letter, Judge Johnston, who, after much litigation, was convicted in the King's Bench in England Nov. 23, 1805; but, upon his engaging to quit the Bench, a *nolle prosequi* was entered, and he retired on a pension. M.P. for Hillsborough from 1790 until compelled by Lord Downshire to vacate in 1800, when he was returned for Philipstown, and sat till the Union.

[7] Lord De Clifford brought four members into Parliament. Clotworthy Rowley, M.P. for Downpatrick from 1771 to the Union. He was a barrister, and had been a Captain

us. The temper of the House was very much altered for the better, and the conduct of the Speaker perfectly correct; the town quiet. I trust this first success will cement our party; it is still composed of loose materials, much more intent on the personal than the public question, and so far may be embarrassing in a detailed struggle.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 18, 1800.

I yesterday assembled the Colonels of Militia,[1] and met on the whole as good-humoured an acquiescence in the wishes of Government as could reasonably be expected in the present situation of things. Lord Downshire was the only person who showed any violence on this occasion.

I have good reason to hope that I shall obtain a considerable proportion of the militia men for general service by giving four guineas more bounty to recruits of that description, and allowing an ensigncy for forty volunteers instead of sixty. We shall now proceed immediately to carry His Majesty's commands into execution; and as this measure will for a time render the whole militia force of this kingdom in a great degree inefficient, I cannot help expressing my opinion, that every exertion should be used on your side to send over without loss of time the whole or a part of the regular forces destined to serve in this country; and I think this step the more necessary as some of the Opposition, since their defeat in the House of Commons, are endeavouring to raise a popular clamour in Dublin and the adjacent counties.

The Sheriffs, attended by a great concourse of people, of whom many were yeomen, carried this day an address of thanks to Mr. Grattan; and it is not impossible that dangerous tumults may arise before the measure of Union has gone through all its stages

in the army, b. 1731, d. March 25, 1805; m. 1766, Letitia, dau. and co-heir (with Lady De Clifford) of Samuel Campbell, Esq., of Mount Campbell. William (eldest son of Clotworthy), M.P. for Kinsale from 1790 to 1802, d. Feb. 25, 1812, unm. With the exception of about a year he held various Commissionerships from 1797 to 1806. Commissioner of Customs from 1807 till his death. The second son, Captain, afterwards Admiral, Sir Josias, Bart., so created June 2, 1813, K.C.B.; d. Jan. 10, 1842, unm. M.P. for Downpatrick from 1797 to the Union, and for Kinsale from June, 1821, to 1826. The third son, Captain Samuel Campbell, afterwards a Rear-Admiral, b. 1774, d. Jan. 1846; m. Sept. 16, 1805, Mary, dau. of — Thompson, Esq., of New Park; 2nd, 1830, Mary, only dau. of Edmund Cronin, Esq., of Newtown, Kildare, afterwards Commissioner of Compensations. M.P. for Downpatrick from 1797 to 1802, and then for Kinsale to 1806. Captain Josias Rowley does not appear to have voted on the 6th of Feb. 1800, when the great division on the address took place.

[1] With reference to volunteering for the line, which the Duke of Portland had strongly urged.

of discussion. In justice to the Speaker I think it right to mention that he declares against all popular violence.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 18, 1800.

The debate and division on Wednesday has certainly had the best effects in giving our party confidence in their own strength. I find the tone of the House improved, and the Opposition much embarrassed by Grattan's introduction. The aggregate meeting, with the sheriffs at their head, carried up addresses both to the Speaker and to him this forenoon. I should imagine the former will not much relish running in couples with Mr. Grattan: their names are joined together on a green breast-ribbon as friends of the people, Grattan having the precedence: in short, his coming into Parliament has been of singular advantage to us, as it has disgusted to a degree the most respectable of our opponents.

Lord Downshire has insisted on Mr. Annesley and Mr. Johnson resigning their seats, and means to proceed actively with his opposition. He told Mr. Cooke this evening that he had consented to go on with the party, provided the lawyers kept themselves within bounds; their intention is to call forth the popular feeling, if possible, and with this view they are to employ themselves during the recess in their respective counties. . . .

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin, Jan. 20, 1800.

. . . The Opposition have had several meetings since their defeat on Wednesday. Lord Downshire, I understand, presided yesterday at Lord Charlemont's, when it was decided to call as many counties as they have influence in. A requisition has accordingly been sent to the sheriff of the county of Down; the meeting will probably be called at short notice, and I fear the decision will be adverse to our wishes: however, Lord Londonderry goes down to-morrow, and will use his best endeavours to counteract our opponents.

The Speaker is much irritated by the weakness of his party and its inconvenient constitution; his conversation is full of complaint, but means nothing; he pointedly recommends moderation out of doors—I wish he had earlier set the example within: at present his deportment is every thing I could wish it.

There is a very wicked handbill in circulation to-day, calling on the yeomanry to rise in arms and save the country. What degree of inflammation may be excited by these efforts, it is as yet impossible to foresee; but your Grace will feel that the speedy arrival of the troops from England may have a very beneficial influence in preserving the public temper, and in giving confidence to our friends.

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Jan. 21, 1800.

I am afraid that our friends in England will think all our difficulties at an end, because we had a majority in the House of Commons; but they are mistaken if they suppose that a measure so deeply affecting the interest and passions of the nation can be carried against the voice of the people. The Opposition see this, and are now turning their whole exertions to work on the public mind, and to raise the popular clamour to the highest pitch. Grattan, degraded as he is in the opinion of the respectable part of the community, has great weight with the Roman Catholics in Dublin, who are disaffected to British Government, and detest British connexion. Lord Downshire has called a meeting in the county of Down, where the unlimited exercise of all the powers and patronage of Government for many years, has enabled him to establish a dangerous authority: other leaders of Opposition are preparing to follow his example.

The aid of the yeomanry, who are mostly Orangemen, is called for by inflammatory handbills, and it is asked of them, whether 60,000 Irishmen with arms in their hands, will tamely stand by and see the constitution of their country destroyed? You will easily imagine that I am not idle on my part, but my Cabinet friends have shown so total a want of confidence in me, and have so eagerly seized every opportunity of reprobating my conduct in severe, if not in acrimonious terms, that I am almost afraid to appeal to the general goodwill of the people at large, which I have the vanity to think I possess.

Under these circumstances, and without the arrival of a single

corps of the promised reinforcement from England, I am obliged to undertake the measure of drafting the Irish militia, which, if it has no worse effect, will at least render that force inefficient for a considerable time.

I am glad to find the Duke of York has given up the idea of having corps of riflemen, and I wish he would turn his thoughts to the means of rendering the movements of the regiments more simple, and a little more active.

Lord Darnley's Members are on the road, and, as he is very friendly, I should wish to make his friend Clerk of Survey at Chatham.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 21, 1800.

Since my last communication to your Grace of the 18th instant, every means have been taken by the Anti-Unionists to inflame the minds of the people. The Guild of Merchants[1] have entered into strong resolutions against the measure of the Union, couched in the most insidious language, urging strenuously a coalition of all sects in opposition to it, and offering their warmest thanks to "their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens" in Dublin, for their manly and patriotic conduct. The most seditious and artful handbills are now in general circulation, calling upon the yeomanry, Orangemen, and Catholics, to form one solid and indissoluble bond of opposition to the Union; and one of these productions is peculiarly addressed to the passions of the yeomanry, by stating that no Government can wrest the Parliament from 60,000 armed and tried men.

These circumstances strongly confirm the expediency of hastening the departure of the forces which are destined to serve in this country, and it might not have a bad effect if one or two of the regiments were to pass over from Liverpool to Dublin; but I do not think this object of sufficient importance to suffer it to embarrass the measures which your Grace may have already taken, or to occasion any probable delay in the arrival of the troops. I am concerned to mention that the county of Antrim is much agitated

[1] The Corporation of Dublin was composed of Guilds, as the Corporation of London is of Companies; but the Guilds had neither the power nor the wealth of the London Companies. Each Guild returned a certain number to the Common Council, but in unequal proportions. The Guild of Merchants was the most numerous and powerful, and certainly the most violent.

and convulsed by bands of robbers. I have, however, taken such steps as I trust will restore quiet in those parts, and tranquillise the minds of the loyal inhabitants, who are at present in a state of alarm.

It is also painful to me to inform your Grace that the practice of houghing has recommenced in the county of Galway, and that the General commanding in that district reports that upwards of two hundred sheep were mutilated about the 16th of this month, with some cattle.

The resolutions for authorising volunteers to enter into the Line from the Militia, passed unanimously yesterday in the Commons: the House is adjourned until the 3rd of February, and I entertain hopes that during the recess, the colonels of the Militia, or many of them, will join their respective regiments, and contribute in person to promote the important measure of obtaining recruits from their respective corps to serve in the Line.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

DEAR JAMES, Dublin Castle, Jan. 24, 1800.

Our division against the amendment to the Address was to the full as good as we expected. It was necessary that an adjournment should afterwards take place, on account of the number of seats that have been vacated. There can, I think, now be no doubt of our Parliamentary success, although I believe that a great number of our friends are not sincere well-wishers to the measure of Union. Pride and self-interest will, I am afraid, generally be too hard for patriotism.

In Dublin and its vicinity the people are all outrageous against Union; in the other parts of the kingdom the general sense is undoubtedly in its favour: it is however easy for men of influence to obtain addresses and resolutions on either side.

I have submitted the nomination of the new Primate to His Majesty's determination, stating that, if it should be thought proper to give it to an Irishman, the Archbishop of Cashel could not be passed over; but that if, according to the late practice, it was to be given to an English Bishop on the Irish Bench, the Bishop of Ferns (Cleaver) was the most respectable candidate. I am afraid that the new Bishop,[1] whom I shall be obliged

[1] George de la Poer Beresford, Dean of Kilmore, was eventually, Jan. 7, 1801, nominated Bishop of Clonfert; he was translated to the See of Kilmore in 1802. He was the 2nd son of the Right Hon. John Beresford; b. July 19, 1765, d. Oct. 16, 1841; m. 1794, Frances, dau. of Gervais Parker Bushe, Esq., of Kilfane.

at this time to recommend, will not do me so much credit as Young.

I am very sorry to hear that the Admiral's complaint in his eyes is so troublesome, and truly feel for the melancholy situation to which it must reduce a man of his habits; but you may be assured that I will take no notice of it to him. Your account of poor Lord Lilford[1] gives me the most sincere concern.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Jan. 25, 1800.

. . . I send you a curious *Consular Edict*, which the Opposition have issued. Where these gentlemen found 38 county members to invest them with authority I know not. They are using their best endeavours to consolidate an Opposition which, at least, may have sufficient strength to embarrass the details; and a subscription is going forward, not only amongst the party in Parliament, but in the city, to form a stock-purse. They have already humbugged two of our friends, who had vacated by acceptance of office, out of their seats in Parliament: one for Kilbeggan,[2] the other for Enniscorthy.[3] The patrons of the boroughs, being adverse, availed themselves of some flaw in the agreement, and are likely to return two very troublesome lawyers in their room. . . .

I shall be anxious to hear from you on the above subject, and not less *on a wish*[4] expressed in a former letter, which is the more pressing from the intelligence I send you.

Ever, my dear Sir, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

[1] Thomas, 1st Baron Lilford, so created Oct. 26, 1797, b. May 4, 1743, d. Jan. 26, 1800; m. March 31, 1772, Mary, dau. of Galfridus Mann, Esq., of Egerton, whose elder sister Catherine had married the Bishop of Lichfield. Lord Lilford was M.P. for the county of Northampton from Nov. 1774 till he became a Peer.

[2] Sir Francis Hopkins, Bart., so created July 25, 1795; b. Aug. 20, 1757, d. Sept. 19, 1814; m. 1811, Eleanor, dau. of Skeffington Thompson, Esq. M.P. for Kilbeggan from 1797 to Jan. 1800. Having voted against the Union, he took the Escheatorship of Munster, in order to make way for a Unionist, but Mr. Lambert, the owner of the borough, returned Mr. Goold, a barrister, who was most violent against the measure.

[3] Robert Cornwall, M.P. for Enniscorthy, was made a Commissioner of Barracks. He had some influence in the borough, which he had represented since 1797, but Lord Lismore, whose power was greater, brought in Mr. Peter Burrowes, also a barrister, and a decided anti-Unionist. These two disappointments somewhat counterbalanced the previous arrangements of Lord Castlereagh, who had, in the course of the first week in January, prevailed on four anti-Unionists to vacate their seats, in order that Unionists might be returned.

[4] A further advance of money.

SIR, Dublin, Jan. 20, 1800.

A number of gentlemen of both Houses of Parliament, of whom 38 represent counties, have authorised us to acquaint you that it is their opinion that petitions to Parliament, declaring the real sense of the freeholders of the kingdom on the subject of a Legislative Union, would at this time be highly expedient: and if such a proceeding shall have your approbation, we are to request you will use your influence to have such a petition from your county without delay.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient humble servants,

DOWNSHIRE,
CHARLEMONT,
W. B. PONSONBY.[1]

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 25, 1800.

I received the honour of your Grace's despatch of the 9th of December, transmitting a set of the proposed Resolutions and Articles of the intended Union, with the latest corrections which had been made in them.

These papers have been communicated by me to His Majesty's confidential servants, and I have the satisfaction to acquaint your Grace that their approbation of them is general and cordial.

As, however, objections to some of the provisions in the Articles have been suggested, I think it right to state them for the consideration of His Majesty's Ministers.

In regard to the Parliamentary article, the opening left for the creation of new Peers for that part of the United Kingdom called Ireland, is considered as injurious to the rights of the existing Peers, and different from the precedent of Scotland. It is stated that so soon as the 28 Representative Peers for Ireland shall be elected, the consequence of the remainder will be almost at an end; and that it would be entirely lost, if it were not for the consideration that the gradual extinction of the Peerage would raise the importance of the remaining part. Whereas, if new Peers are to be created, they would probably be selected from characters of high consideration at the time when it would be the object of

[1] This circular was at the time supposed to be the production of Sir John Parnell.

Government to make Representative Peers; and thus the claims of all the old Irish Peers, and particularly of those whose personal pretensions were not of high importance, would be annihilated. This objection weighs particularly with Lord Kilwarden and the Archbishop of Cashel.

His Grace also does not approve of the rotation of Spiritual Peers, which he conceives rather derogatory to the dignity of the Bench, and is of opinion that the representation of the Spiritual Lords should consist of the four Metropolitans, who, from the nature of their office, and from their triennial visitation of the different dioceses of the kingdom (which is regularly performed), are necessarily best acquainted with the situation of the Church of this kingdom.

The Archbishop of Cashel also wishes that the article for incorporating the Protestant churches of Great Britain and Ireland should be made a fundamental article, and so expressed as in the Articles of the Scotch Union.

The article respecting Contribution has given general satisfaction, but it is wished that the circumstances under which a common system of taxation might begin, should be more strictly limited. As the resolution is worded, the Imperial Parliament, after the period of 20 years, may declare that the system of common taxation should commence whenever they are of opinion that the respective circumstances of the two countries would admit it; and it is conceived that advantage would be taken in argument from so wide a discretion being left to the Imperial Parliament. It is suggested therefore that a limitation should be placed to so great a discretion, and that the period of common taxation should not commence till either the separate debts of the two kingdoms shall be liquidated, or the values of their respective debts be to each other in the proportion of their respective contributions.

Lord Castlereagh has written to Mr. Pitt upon this subject, and I have the honour of submitting to your Grace[1] a copy of the 14th clause in the Contribution article, with the introduction of those amendments which are here recommended.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] The proposed alterations in the articles were numerous, and as only some of them were adopted, it is unnecessary to insert them.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 27, 1800.

I have the honour to enclose to your Grace a copy of a circular letter,[1] bearing the signatures of Lords Downshire and Charlemont, and Mr. William Ponsonby. . . .

Whether this extraordinary production has had any influence on the minds of certain persons it is difficult to determine; but the utmost activity and exertions are making to convene county meetings; and in addition to Down, those of Lowth, Meath, Cavan, and others, are, by requisitions to the respective sheriffs, to be assembled for anti-Union purposes, and every engine is at work to irritate the minds of the people, and to carry the opposition to the measure beyond constitutional bounds. I have just been informed that Lord Downshire, in conjunction with Sir Lawrence Parsons and Mr. Bowes Daly, have called upon the sheriff of the King's County for a meeting, which he has refused. . . .

Mr. Saurin is to be brought into Parliament by Lord Downshire, and two or three barristers of most violent dispositions are in like manner to be elected.

The minds of the people of Dublin are still inflamed, and the ferment that exists amongst all descriptions of persons in this city is exceeding great.

In this situation of affairs, and at this crisis, your Grace cannot be surprised at my again expressing an anxious hope for the speedy arrival of the reinforcement of troops which have been long expected. I am far from entertaining any serious apprehension myself, or in any degree wishing to create anxiety or uneasiness in the breasts of his Majesty's Ministers; but I understand that many of our timid and lukewarm friends are very clamorous for the force which they have been for some time since led to suppose would soon reach this country, and in the state of irritation of Dublin, I feel it my duty strongly to press the necessity of their being sent as early as possible.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] See Lord Castlereagh's Letter of Jan. 25.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Jan. 29, 1800.

. . . It is said that a very considerable sum[1] has been subscribed, as it is professed, for the purpose of buying seats to resist the Union. If I can believe a member of Parliament who has now a seat vacant, 4000*l.* was offered him for the return in Mr. Curran's favour. Two lawyers of very dubious principles, Mr. Burrows[2] and Mr. Goold,[3] have been returned for two seats which we had reason to count upon. This reinforcement to the democratic party in the Opposition will not operate unfavourably.

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Jan. 31, 1800.

Beatson[4] and Allan[5] both mentioned to me Lord Wellesley's plan for placing the whole coast of Malabar under the Madras Government, but the latter, with whom I had most conversation on the subject, did not seem to expect that the public would derive much advantage from it. Amongst other objections, it would, I think, make the Governor of Madras too great a man for his situation at the head of a subordinate government. My sentiments, however, have been so little regarded, and I have met with so much discouragement on every occasion, that I feel the greatest disinclination to offer any opinions unless they should be called for, especially in opposition to a plan recommended by Lord Wellesley. I must, however, in justice to Dundas, say that he is the only man in the Cabinet from whom I have received the smallest attention.

[1] The Opposition boasted that they had collected 100,000*l.* Lord Castlereagh, in another letter to Mr. King, says—"Lord Downshire is said to have given 4000*l.*; Mr. White, the loan contractor, 3000*l.*; Lord Lismore, 3000*l.*, and others considerable sums. Possibly the payments may not keep pace with the signatures." It is however certain that large sums were spent in direct bribery.

[2] Peter Burrowes, Esq., b. 1750, d. 1841. Judge of the Insolvent Court from 1830 till his death. M.P. for Enniscorthy from Jan. 1800 till the Union. Mr. Burrowes was only withheld from moving some very violent resolutions at the Bar Meeting by deference for Mr. Saurin.

[3] Thomas Goold, Esq., b. about 1768, d. July 16, 1846; was made a Sergeant, 1823, and a Master in Chancery from 1832 till his death. M.P. for Kilbeggan from Feb. 1800 till the Union.

[4] Afterwards Major-General Beatson, for some time Governor of St. Helena, b. 1759, d. Oct. 15, 1830; m. 1806, Davidson, dau. of David Reid, Esq., Commissioner of Customs in Scotland. He wrote an account of the Mysore campaign of 1798, and a description of St. Helena.

[5] Afterwards Major Sir Alexander Allan, b. 1764, d. Sept. 14, 1820, unm. A Director of the East India Company from 1814 to his death. M.P. for Berwick from April to July, 1806, and from 1812 to 1820.

The clamour against the Union is increasing rapidly, and every degree of violence is to be expected. As none of the English regiments have yet arrived, I have been under the necessity of ordering the Lancashire volunteers (Lord Grey de Wilton's),[1] from Youghal to Dublin; this will create much alarm and abuse, but the apprehensions of our friends rendered the measure absolutely necessary. The Roman Catholics, for whom I have not been able to obtain the smallest token of favour, are joining the standard of Opposition, to which they have been much impelled by the imprudent speeches and the abuse cast upon them by our friends.

I have been much more concerned than surprised at Lord Grenville's answer; from my knowledge of the man, it was just what I expected. Government has now lost the firm ground on which it has stood since the negociations at Lisle, which has proved so advantageous to them as in fact to silence all opposition, and we are now once more placed in the awkward predicament of not being able to treat. How Ministers will be able to reconcile their present conduct with the steps which they took in '97, I cannot well conceive; Lord G. will not venture to say that what was done in '97 was against his inclination.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Phœnix Park, Jan. 31, 1800.

. . . You will naturally wish to be informed how numbers are likely to stand on our next division; as far as I can calculate, the Opposition may divide 111; they talk of more, but it is not within my knowledge; if our friends attend well we may produce 175.[2] After the general principle is disposed of, we shall be able to judge of the consistency of the party; if they can keep together, they may give us trouble.

We propose naming the first discussion at the interval of a week from the statement; if the feelings of the House call for more time we shall relax, so as to give ten days: only six days was given on the proposition in 1785; ten days will be ample for entertaining the general principle which has been so long before the public.

Every endeavour is made to excite the country. I understand

[1] Thomas, 1st Baron Grey de Wilton, so created May 15, 1784, and made Earl of Wilton June 26, 1801; b. May 14, 1749, d. Sept. 23, 1814; m. Sept. 11, 1769, Eleanor, dau. and co-heir of Sir Ralph Asketon. He was the head of the Egerton family.

[2] The largest number which divided, including tellers, was 162, but four friends were locked out.

from Lord Londonderry, who has just returned from the co. Down, that the prevalent idea amongst the people is, that when the Parliament is taken away that *Irish law* will be at an end, and all their leases broken; they are told, to induce them to sign against the measure, that the reason so many gentlemen are for an Union is, that they may new-let their estates at advanced rents. . . .

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 3, 1800.

Lord Castlereagh has not been quite well for some days, and he has therefore thought it most prudent to defer the business, which was to have come on this day, till Wednesday next. I am sorry to say that Lord Oxmantown[1] has returned from the county of Longford, where, by some misunderstanding, or I rather think unwillingness, on his part, a county meeting was not called; and he this morning told me, that he found the sense of the people so adverse to the measure of Union, that Sir Thomas Fetherstone,[2] the county member (who was with us last time), would be under the necessity of voting against it. This is very unpleasant. From the report however of Lord Londonderry, it does not appear that Lord Downshire has much reason to plume himself upon the success of his meeting in the county of Down; where, although he was supported by the rabble, he met with little countenance from the gentlemen and respectable freeholders, most of whom signed a protest in favour of the Union.

It will, I think, be necessary to remove Mr. Rowley, the friend of Lord De Clifford, and Mr. Reilly,[3] one of Lord Downshire's members, from the Board of Accounts; but as that step need not be taken immediately, I should be glad to know the sentiments of his Majesty's Ministers upon the subject.

The Archbishop of Cashel is particularly anxious that the article for the Incorporation of the English and Irish Church should be expressed as a FUNDAMENTAL part of the Union; and he like-

[1] Laurence, 1st Viscount Oxmantown, b. July 26, 1742, d. April 20, 1807; m. June 11, 1772, Jane, dau. of Edward, 1st Earl of Kingston. Created Baron Oxmantown Sept. 25, 1792, made Viscount Oct. 6, 1795, and Earl of Rosse Feb. 10, 1806. In the latter title he was succeeded by his nephew, Sir Lawrence Parsons, often mentioned in this Correspondence.

[2] Sir Thomas Fetherstone, 2nd Bart., b. 1759, d. July 19, 1819; m. 1782, Catherine Elizabeth, d. of George Boleyn Whitney, Esq. M.P. for St. Johnstown from 1783 to 1796, and then for Longford county till his death.

[3] John Reilly, Esq., of Scarvagh, b. 1745, d. Aug. 3, 1804; m. 1773, Jane, dau. of Colonel Lushington, of Sittingbourne. Commissioner of Public Accounts from 1789 to 1800. M.P. for Blessington from 1783 to the Union.

wise most strongly pressed the insertion of the enclosed clause, to which neither Lord Castlereagh or myself saw any objection; and which we could not refuse without putting him much out of humour, as he had an absolute promise from me of a seat in the House of Lords for life.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Six P.M.—The House has adjourned till Wednesday, without a word being said. C.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Feb. 4, 1800.

The business of our House of Commons was put off yesterday on account of Lord Castlereagh's indisposition, but I believe he will be able to attend to-morrow. The indefatigable exertions, aided by the subscriptions, of the anti-Unionists, have raised a powerful clamour against the measure in many parts of the kingdom, and have put the Capital quite in an uproar, and I am sorry to say, some of our unwilling supporters[1] in Parliament have taken advantage of these appearances to decline giving any further support. God only knows how the business will terminate, but it is so hard to struggle against private interests, and the pride and prejudices of a nation, that I shall never feel confident of success until the Union is actually carried.

In the mean time, I must confess that my spirits are fairly worn down, and the force which I am obliged to put on them in public, renders me more miserable when I retire.

The D. of Y. has, through Brownrigg, asked my opinion on the formation of a corps of riflemen of 600 or 800 men in this country, to be taken either from the Line or the Fencibles. Unwilling to weaken the regiments of the Line, I have proposed that 15 or 20 men should be enlisted for general service from each regiment of Fencibles, and have submitted my opinion, with the utmost deference, that only a tenth part of the corps should be armed with rifles, and that the others should be trained as light infantry, and brigaded for the present with the light companies of the Irish militia. I quoted the instance of Colonel Wormb in America, who solicited that the rifles should be taken from a great proportion of his Yaghers, and that they should receive firelocks instead.

[1] The unwilling supporters of Government were many. Some deserted for bribes, some for fear of constituencies, others because they thought the Union would not be carried. Subsequent letters give details of a few of these secessions.

We are getting men fast from the Irish militia, and almost all for general service. But unluckily they sent over parties from regiments for restricted service, in post-chaises two months ago, at a most enormous expense, and those of the regiments for general service named by the Duke of York have not yet arrived.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Not one regiment has yet arrived from England, and our whole militia during this period of volunteering is in a state of perfect confusion. This situation I foresaw, and warned them against it in England two months ago.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 4, 1800.

. . . I enclose to your Grace a copy of a letter of a very extraordinary nature, which has been transmitted to Lord Castlereagh from Captain Boyd[1] of the Downshire regiment of militia. I also send a copy of an anonymous communication upon the same subject, stating that Lord Downshire had sent a petition to the officers, non-commissioned officers, and soldiers, to be signed by them against the Union. I have in consequence of these reports directed Major-General Sir Charles Ross[2] to proceed to Carlow, and to investigate this singular transaction in the most ample manner. Should it appear upon due enquiry, that Lord Downshire has actually solicited any part of the Downshire militia to signify their disapprobation of a legislative Union with Great Britain, I shall, without hesitation, supersede him in his command of that corps. . . .

Several members of the House of Commons have represented to me the ferment which now agitates the public mind, and their personal apprehensions. Your Grace may be assured of my exertions to prevent outrage or commotion; but in the present temper of affairs, I am not prepared to say that dangerous tumults will not arise in the progress of the discussion of the measure, and it is

[1] Captain, afterwards Major, David Hamilton Boyd, b. Sept. 12, 1758, d. Jan. 7, 1825; m. Catherine, dau. of — Jenkins, Esq.

[2] Major-General, afterwards General, Sir Charles Ross, 6th Baronet, Colonel 37th Regt., son of Sir John Lockhart, a distinguished naval officer, who took the name of Ross on succeeding to the estates of his maternal uncle, General the Hon. Charles Ross; d. Feb. 8, 1814; m. 1st, 1788, Matilda, dau. of General Count Lockhart, of the Austrian service; 2nd, April 15, 1799, Mary, dau. of William Robert, 2nd Duke of Leinster. M.P. for the Wick Boroughs from April, 1786, to May, 1796, for the County of Ross till July, 1806, and for the Selkirk Boroughs to May, 1807.

with real concern that I express my fears that some defections may take place among those from whom we had a right to expect support.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Lord Downshire had transmitted to Carlow, where his regiment of militia was quartered, the draft of a petition against the Union; and the writers of the letters referred to—Captain Boyd of the Down Militia, and "Jeffry Foresight"—asserted that officers and privates, whether freeholders or not, even those who were under age, were indiscriminately called upon to sign it. The soldiers, as might be expected, were in many cases ignorant of the contents of the paper presented to them for signature. Some imagined it was a petition in favour of the Union, and others that it was a request *that the Union should not be carried out of the country.* Sir Charles Ross closely investigated the allegations contained in these letters, and reported them to be perfectly correct; and Major Matthews, who commanded in Lord Downshire's absence, admitted their truth, in conversation, though he refused to answer in writing the questions officially put to him by Sir Charles Ross.

Lord Cornwallis immediately transmitted this report to England, to be laid before the King, although Lord Downshire, aware of the impropriety of his conduct, earnestly requested it should be withheld, assuring Lord Cornwallis that he had never appealed to his regiment, as soldiers, on the subject of the Union. The Lord-Lieutenant, however, feeling that the discipline of the army and his own influence in Ireland were alike at stake, urged that Lord Downshire should not only be dismissed from the command of the regiment, but that he should be also removed from the Privy Council.

The King was highly indignant at Lord Downshire's conduct, and by his command the Duke of Portland, on Feb. 12, directed that Lord Downshire should be informed that His Majesty had no further occasion for his services as Colonel of the Down Militia, or as Governor of the county of Down, and moreover that his name should be struck out of the Privy Council. The Duke of Portland also conveyed His Majesty's orders that Major Matthews should be dismissed from the regiment.

In England an impression prevailed that Lord Downshire should have been tried by a court-martial, or that a Parliamentary inquiry should take place. Lord Castlereagh, in a despatch to the Duke of Portland, pointed out the difficulties which attended the

latter course, as many friends of Government would object to a vote of censure, however blameable they might consider the conduct of Lord Downshire, and the delay which an inquiry would necessarily occasion would be highly objectionable in a case where an immediate decision was necessary.

Lord Cornwallis, in a despatch of Feb. 7, assigns his reasons for thinking a court-martial unadvisable, and the English Cabinet ultimately gave their entire approbation to the decision of the Irish Government.

There was much correspondence on this subject. A few only of the letters that passed are inserted.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 5, 1800, 6 o'clock, P.M.

It is with much concern that I have to report to your Grace the desertion of Colonel Bagwell,[1] the member for the county of Tipperary, and of his two sons.[2] In an interview which I have just held with him, he endeavoured to excuse his desertion, by stating that the principal part of the respectable freeholders of the county of Tipperary have signed resolutions against the Union, many of whom had before instructed him to support that measure. I tried in vain to dissuade him from his dishonourable purpose, and I am apprehensive that his example will have a bad effect.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The violent language used by the anti-Unionists had again excited the passions of the mob, who, as the members were returning home after the debate of the 5th, attacked those who were obnoxious, and endeavoured to throw the carriages of some into the river. The infliction of any very serious injury was however prevented by the energy of Major Sirr, who personally seized one of the ringleaders, named Brocas, a custom-house officer and a member of the yeomanry corps.

Brocas being brought the next night before the House of Com-

[1] Colonel John Bagwell, b. about 1754, d. March 4, 1806; m. 1774, Mary, dau. of Richard Hare, Esq., and sister of William, 1st Earl of Listowel. By her he had four sons, William, Richard, Benjamin, and John. Colonel Bagwell was M.P. for Tipperary county from 1790 till his death.

[2] Mr., afterwards the Right Hon. William Bagwell, b. 1776, d. unm. Nov. 4, 1828. Muster-Master-General from 1807 till his death. M.P. for Rathcormack from 1797 till the Union, then for Clonmell to 1819, and Tipperary county to 1826.

mons, on the complaint of the Prime Serjeant, was committed to Newgate for a *breach of privilege!* and released on the 19th of February.

In consequence of this disturbance, detachments of cavalry were ordered to patrol the streets, and thus any repetition of such acts of violence was effectually prevented.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 6, 1800, ½ past 1, P.M.

The House of Commons has just adjourned upon the question for taking His Majesty's message into consideration for a legislative Union with Great Britain, after a debate from four o'clock yesterday afternoon, to one o'clock this day. On a division there appeared for the question 158, against it 115; a majority consequently of 43 were in favour of the Union.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The division above alluded to was the largest ever known in the Irish House of Commons.

The whole number of members was 300. Including the Speaker and the tellers, 278 were present on this occasion, and, including vacant seats and pairs, only 22 were absent.

The largest division ever known in the Imperial Parliament, took place on the 4th of June, 1841, when Sir Robert Peel moved a vote of want of confidence in Lord Melbourne's Administration:—

Ayes, including Tellers	314
Noes	313
Speaker	1
	628
Paired	22
	650

Eight members only were absent, and they, it was understood, stayed away intentionally, neither wishing to negative the proposition, nor to support the Government. These were Mr. Basset, Helston; Mr. Fielden and General Johnson, Oldham; Colonel Fitzgibbon (now Earl of Clare), Limerick county; Mr. Harland, Durham; Sir G. Heathcote, Rutland; Mr. Heathcote (now Lord Aveland), Lincolnshire; and Sir R. Howard, Wicklow county.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Friday, Feb. 7, 1800.

The lateness of yesterday's sitting, and the degree to which I was myself fatigued by the debate, disabled me from writing to your Grace before the departure of the express. The result your Grace is apprized of, and I am sorry that the division on our part was so short of what we had every reason to expect. The enclosed statement will explain the particulars of our reduction and of the increased strength of our opponents.

Colonel Bagwell's desertion was altogether unexpected; he had engaged in the strongest manner to give the measure his unqualified support, and the objects he solicited were promised.[1] His change of conduct is attributed partly to fear and partly to expectations given him by the leaders of Opposition in the event of their influence being established. Sir R. Butler,[2] Mahon,[3] and Fetherstone were taken off by county cabals during the recess, and Whaley[4] absolutely bought by the Opposition stock-purse. He received, I understand, 2000*l.* down, and is to receive as much more after the service is performed.

We have undoubted proofs, though not such as we can disclose, that they are enabled to offer as high as 5000*l.* for an individual vote, and I lament to state that there are individuals remaining amongst us that are likely to yield to this temptation. A not less formidable principle we have to contend against is the effect produced by their system of intimidation on the minds of our timid and lukewarm friends. The Opposition have shown their determination to rouse the disaffection of the country, and to hunt the

[1] What these promises were cannot now be traced, but they were of course cancelled by Colonel Bagwell's vote.

[2] Sir Richard Butler, 7th Bart., b. July 14, 1761, d. Jan. 16, 1817; m. Aug. 23, 1782, Sarah Maria, dau. of Thomas Worth Newnham, Esq., of Coolmere. M.P. for the county of Carlow from 1783 to 1790, and from 1795 to 1802.

[3] Lieut.-Colonel Thomas Mahon, afterwards, Jan. 4, 1819, 2nd Lord Hartland, Colonel in the army, Lieut.-Colonel of the 9th Light Dragoons; b. Aug. 2, 1766, d. Dec. 8, 1835; m. Oct. 16, 1811, Catherine, dau. of James Topping, Esq., of Whatcroft Hall. M.P. for the county of Roscommon from Jan. 1800 to June, 1802.

[4] Thomas Whaley, of Chapel Whaley (brother to the Countess of Clare), b. 1766, d. Nov. 2, 1800; m. June, 1800, Mary Catherine, dau. of Nicholas, 1st Baron Cloncurry. He was elected for Newcastle 1785, before he was of age, which was not unusual in Ireland, and sat for it to 1790, and for Enniscorthy from 1797 to June, 1800. He acquired the sobriquet of "Jerusalem Whaley," in consequence of a bet, said to have been of 20,000*l.*, that he would walk (except where a sea passage was unavoidable) to Jerusalem and back within twelve months. He started Sept. 22, 1788, and returned June 1, 1789. The lawless behaviour of the yeomanry corps which he commanded obtained for him another and less agreeable appellation, "Burn-Chapel Whaley." His residence in Stephen's Green was in 1855 converted into a nunnery. Sir J. Barrington states that 4000*l.* was paid to Mr. Whaley by Mr. Gould, M.P. for Kilbeggan.

people at the Government, and have not confined their efforts to the people alone; both Yeomanry and Militia are held forth to shake the constancy of our friends. Your Grace is fully apprized of the case of the Downshire Regiment.

I trust the firmness the Lord-Lieutenant has shown will dissolve this dangerous combination, and keep a party sufficiently strong together to accomplish the great object in view. Nothing but energy can prevent the Government from being trampled upon.

The tone of the debate was much what we were accustomed to last year, and the Speaker's manner, though far from indecorous, certainly marked with renewed hopes. I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

Changed sides, making a difference of 14 *in the relative numbers.*

Colonel Bagwell (County Member).	Colonel Mahon (County Member).
— Bagwell.	Sir T. Fetherstone ,,
— Bagwell.	— Whaley.
Sir R. Butler (County Member).	

Did not vote the first night.

— Edgworth.[1]	Colonel King.
Hon. G. Knox.	Colonel King.
Sir B. St. George.[2]	

New Members.

Burrowes.	Fortescue.[3]	Osborne.[4]	Saurin.
Balfour.	Goold.	Reily.	Shaw.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

DEAR JAMES, Dublin Castle, Feb. 8, 1800.

Our situation is critical; twelve of our supporters deserted to the enemy on the last division, one was bought during the

[1] Richard Lovell Edgworth, best known as the father of Maria Edgworth, b. 1744, d. June 13, 1817. He had successively five if not six wives, including two sisters. He had voted against the Union Jan. 22, 1799, stating at the same time that he thought the measure most advisable. On the night above alluded to he made a most extraordinary speech, beginning with the strongest arguments in favour of the Union, and ending in a violent philippic against the measure and the Government. M.P. for Johnstown from 1797 to the Union.

[2] Sir Richard Bligh St. George, 2nd Bart., b. June 5, 1765, d. Jan. 1852; m. 1st, Feb. 10, 1799, Harriet, dau. of Mr. Justice Kelly; 2nd, April, 1807, Bridget, dau. of Theophilus Blakeney, Esq., of Abbert. M.P. for Charleville from 1783 to April, 1789, and then for Athlone till the Union.

[3] Chichester Fortescue, of Dromiskin, b. Aug. 12, 1777, d. Nov. 25, 1826; m. Aug. 1809, Martha Angel, dau. of Samuel Hobson, Esq., of Waterford. M.P. for County Louth from 1795 to 1806. The Barony of Clermont was revived in the person of his eldest son, Feb. 11, 1852.

[4] Mr. afterwards Sir Henry Osborne, 10th Baronet, d. Oct. 27, 1837; m. 1780, dau. of Daniel Toler, Esq., M.P. for Tipperary. M.P. for Enniskillen from Feb. 1800 to the Union.

debate (Jerusalem Whaley, the Chancellor's brother-in-law). The enemy, to my certain knowledge, offer five thousand pounds ready money for a vote. If we had the means, and were disposed to make such vile use of them, we dare not trust the credit of Government in the hands of such rascals. I have suspended Lord Downshire from the command of his regiment until H. M.'s pleasure shall be known, for sending the Anti-Union petition of his friends in the county of Down to be signed by the officers and soldiers. He came to me to remonstrate, but I told him my mind in strong language and he went away as meek as a lamb.

How it will end God only knows! I think there are not more than four or five of our people that can be either bought off or intimidated, but there is no answering for the courage or integrity of our Senators. . . . Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 11, 1800.

I have the honour to acquaint your Grace that yesterday a debate upon the first Resolution, preliminary to the Articles of Union, took place in the House of Lords, and about half-an-hour after three this morning, the principle in favour of Union was carried by a majority of 49. The numbers were as follows:—

In the House 53 for; Proxies 22 . . .	75
In the House 19 against; Proxies 7 . .	26

I am to state to your Grace that the Chancellor exerted his great abilities in a speech of four hours, which produced the greatest surprise and effect on the Lords and on the audience, which was uncommonly numerous.

His Lordship was supported by Lord Glentworth, Lord Kilwarden, Lord Carleton, the Archbishop of Cashel, Lord Donoughmore, Lord Carysfort,[1] Lord Longford,[2] and Lord Glandore.

The opposers in debate were Lord Charlemont, the Marquis

[1] John Joshua, 2nd Baron and 1st Earl of Carysfort, K.P., b. Aug. 12, 1751, d. April 7, 1828; m. 1st, March 18, 1774, Elizabeth, dau. of the Right Hon. Sir William Osborne, Bart.; 2nd, April 12, 1787, Elizabeth, dau. of the Right Hon. George Grenville. Master of the Rolls in Ireland from 1789 to 1801, when he received a compensation of 1367*l.* per annum for the loss of his office. M.P. for East Looe from Jan. to Nov. 1790, and for Stamford till he was created Baron Carysfort in England, Jan. 21, 1801.

[2] Thomas, 3rd Baron and 2nd Earl of Longford, K.P., b. May 14, 1774, d. May 24, 1835; m. Jan. 23, 1817, Georgiana Emma Charlotte, dau. of William, 1st Earl of Beauchamp.

of Downshire, Lord Dillon,[1] Lord Farnham, Lord Powerscourt, and Lord Sunderlin.[2]

In the course of his speech the Chancellor was particularly pointed against the undue means which were used by Opposition to influence the country, and to intimidate and even to bribe Members of Parliament, and particularly alluded to the printed letter of Lord Charlemont, Lord Downshire, and Mr. Ponsonby, and using the public ridicule he accuses this Consular Government of having a Consular Exchequer, and he called on them to deny the fact, and if they could not deny it, to say to what honest or honourable use such an Exchequer could be applied.

Lord Charlemont simply denied his having bribed any man. Lord Downshire expressed his detestation of such means, and disowned his connexion with those who were engaged in them, if such things could be. His Lordship spoke, I understand, seemingly under a great depression, and complained that his conduct had been misunderstood and misrepresented, and he avowed his attachment to his Sovereign and to his Administration in Great Britain, talked of his having injured his constitution and spent his fortune in the service of Government, and expressed the hardship he felt that on account of his differing with Government on the measure of Union at this time, he should be considered as unfriendly to the Government of the country, and as a factious man. Upon the subject of Union he stated that he had been a zealous friend to that measure before the year 1782; he owned he had not been possessed of sufficient political foresight to conceive that such advantages would have followed from the settlement of 1782 as had taken place. He thought that the Irish Parliament had been the great instrument of putting down the rebellion, and that they ought not to be degraded for such services. He thought the time unfit for the discussion, and that as Ireland had taken advantage of Great Britain in the last war, it appeared that England was retaliating. His Lordship condemned the conduct of the Irish Parliament at the time of the Regency. He thought *that* would have been a right time for Ministers to have introduced the question of Union, and he added that if a period of tranquillity and peace were to arrive,

[1] Charles, 12th Viscount Dillon, K.P., b. Nov. 6, 1745, d. Nov. 9, 1813; m. Aug. 19, 1776, Henrietta Maria, dau. of Constantine, 1st Lord Mulgrave. He was the first of his family who was not a Roman Catholic. Many of his relatives served in foreign armies, especially in France, where his brother Arthur, well known as Le Beau Dillon, was guillotined April 13, 1794.

[2] Richard, 1st and only Lord Sunderlin, so created July 5, 1785, said to have been descended from the O'Connors, Kings of Connaught; b. about 1746, d. April 14, 1816; m. 1778, Philippa, dau. of Godolphin Rooper, Esq., of Great Berkhampstead. M.P. for Granard from 1768 to 1776, and for Banagher from 1783 till he was made a Peer.

and that if the subject of Union were then to be brought forward and submitted to the impartial consideration of the nation, he would give it his best assistance.

Lord Kilwarden's speech was particularly calculated to have an effect on the citizens whose representative his Lordship had been, and will, I hope, be attended with the good consequences he intended.

I have every reason to be fully satisfied with the conduct of his Majesty's supporters in this debate, and of the good effects it may produce.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 11, 1800.

. . . The debate and division last night in the Lords was everything we could wish it. The Chancellor spoke for four hours with his usual ability, and made Lord Charlemont prove pretty distinctly by his defence to the charge, that a Consular Exchequer did exist for the corruption of Parliament. Lord Carleton also spoke, as did Lord Kilwarden, both with great effect and decision. Further proceedings are postponed in that House for a fortnight.

I cannot at present report to your Grace with any precision what further desertions we shall experience—two or three who were very precarious, I trust are secured. The firmness with which Lord Cornwallis has conducted himself, and the steps taken both within and without the House to repress mob-interference, have given our friends better confidence.

The corporation and merchants have addressed both Mr. Latouche and Sir W. G. Newcomen;[1] I have reason to believe that they will receive the answers we could wish. . . .

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 12, 1800.

Lord Castlereagh yesterday moved in the Committee of Supply the Army Estimates for the ensuing year, the particulars

[1] Sir William Gleadowe, Bart., an eminent Dublin banker; d. Aug. 21, 1807; m. Oct. 1772, Charlotte, dau. and sole heir of Charles Newcomen, Esq., of Carrickglass, when he took the name of Newcomen. M.P. for the county of Longford from 1790 to 1802. She was created Baroness Newcomen, July 30, 1800, and made Viscountess Dec. 4, 1802.

of which I shall transmit to your Grace in my next despatch. No observation was made upon them, and they will be reported on Thursday.

As the House was going to rise, Mr. Ponsonby complained that the Union papers had not been delivered, and begged that the debate on the principle of that measure might be postponed for a few days. This delay in the delivery of the papers has taken place through the management of the Speaker, for the accounts were printed at the time Lord Castlereagh delivered his speech on opening the subject. It appearing to the House that none of the papers had been delivered till that morning to any Member, Lord Castlereagh thought it reasonable to consent to alter the day of debating the general principle to Friday.

Mr. Maxwell was discontented and proposed Monday; an altercation took place for some time, and the members of Opposition having a large dinner in the neighbourhood, they sent for their friends to come to the House. The supporters of Government had gone home to dinner. Upon a division at seven o'clock whether the debate should take place on Friday, the numbers were equal—47 on each side—when the Speaker stated that as the question was not upon the principle of the measure, and as the House had decided against taking it into consideration on Monday, he should vote for its being considered on Friday. I hope this division will make our friends more cautious of leaving the House.

This day a debate is expected upon a complaint of Sir Laurence Parsons that a meeting of the freeholders in the King's County had been interrupted by military force.

This complaint is utterly unfounded, and I hope will give our friends an opportunity to expose the means which are used of inflaming the people.

I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Most Private and Confidential.] Received Feb. 12.

MY LORD, Whitehall, Feb. 9, 1800.

I have had the honour of receiving to-day by express your Excellency's despatches of the 4th, 5th, and 6th instant, containing, together with the result of the debate on your message to the House of Commons respecting the Union, some intimations with regard to desertions that have already happened, and which may be expected, and which make me feel it incumbent upon me to lose no time in assuring your Excellency that although the comparative numbers in the division on Thursday do not exactly correspond

with the expectations which we had entertained of them, there is nothing in the appearance of the strength of the enemy which seems to warrant an apprehension of the ultimate success of the measure, or which on motives of policy or expediency can call upon his Majesty's Government to lay it aside for the present. But on the contrary justice to individuals, as well as to the interest of the empire, requires that no means should be omitted, no exertion neglected, that can ensure this measure, and there is no assistance of any kind which the Government of this country can afford your Excellency that you may not depend upon, as it is the unanimous opinion of those concerned in the administration of it, that it is essentially necessary to the security as well as to the prosperity of both kingdoms.

I forbear entering into a repetition of the assurances which your Excellency has been repeatedly and uniformly authorized to give to those who might be disposed to support the Union, or of the language which it has been recommended to you to hold upon the subject. I am persuaded that your Excellency will persist and persevere in it, and that nothing is omitted on your part to encourage those who are well affected, to confirm the wavering, to convert those who have been misled, and to interest all in the completion of an event which involves the happiness of them and their posterity, and the glory and stability of their country. With respect to Lord Downshire, should his conduct be such as it has been represented by Captain Boyd, I dare say your Excellency would be of opinion that it would be as improper to leave him in the government of the county of Down and in the Privy Council as in the command of the regiment of which he is Colonel. . . . Such an opportunity of showing the spirit and decision of Government could not but have a most beneficial effect on the further progress of the discussions on the Union, and on the temper and feelings of the kingdom in general. With respect to those gentlemen whom your Excellency has intimated that it may be necessary to move from the Board of Accounts, I will only observe that His Majesty's Ministers, with whose sentiments on the subject you have expressed a wish to be acquainted, have that reliance on your judgment, firmness, and discretion, that they are persuaded that whatever line of conduct your Excellency may adopt as to the time or manner of dismissing those gentlemen, or the continuance of them in their present situations, will be the best calculated for forwarding the great measure of the Union, and maintaining the dignity and character of His Majesty's Government.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Feb. 13, 1800.

I have received your letter dated the 6th, and although I agree with you in thinking that I ought to represent the unkind and mortifying manner in which I have been treated, yet, as it proceeds principally from the Minister with whom I immediately correspond, who is not perfectly under the control of those to whom I have attached myself, and proceeds perhaps rather more from awkwardness of expression than design on his part, I do not feel at present disposed to take any steps in the business. I remember[1] hearing Mr. Pitt say that he had written a private letter to Lord Camden, when the latter was in my situation, to soften a very severe one which had been sent by the Duke of Portland. You will hear a great deal of my conduct towards Lord Downshire. Whether the measure may appear strong in England, I cannot say, but it is perfectly suited to the genius of Ireland. The turn which it has given to the public mind is astonishing, and all our friends say that by this act of vigour I have saved the country and carried the Union. The debate on that measure which was to have come on yesterday, has been unavoidably postponed till to-morrow, when I think our majority of 43 is more likely to increase than to be diminished. Only one regiment (46th) and four detachments of three companies each, of different regiments, have arrived during this week of strong easterly wind, and we are consequently much reduced in efficient force, at a very critical period; but I have taken care to have a strong garrison in Dublin, the head-quarters of sedition, by bringing up the Lancashire Volunteers.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The case of Tandy came before the Court of King's Bench Feb. 7, the Attorney-General arguing that he was only bound to identify his person in order to his instant conviction. The prisoner was brought to the bar on the 12th, and pleaded that having been arrested at Hamburgh before the expiration of the time allowed him to surrender, he had been prevented availing himself of that privilege. The trial took place a few days later, and a verdict, of which Lord Kilwarden expressed his approbation, was given in favour of Tandy. He was therefore sent to Lifford to be tried for high treason. A similar course was necessarily adopted in regard to the other prisoners.

[1] See Mr. Pitt's memorandum on the Duke of Portland's Despatch of Nov. 4, 1798.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 13, 1800.

I have the honour to acquaint your Grace that yesterday in the House of Commons, a charge was brought forward and investigated against Mr. Darby,[1] the High Sheriff of the King's County, and Major Rogers,[2] of the British Artillery, who commanded in Birr, for having attempted to prevent a meeting of the freeholders in that town, on Sunday the 2nd instant, assembled to petition Parliament, and for having intimidated and threatened to disperse the meeting by military force.

The charge was brought forward by Sir Lawrence Parsons, member for the county, and Opposition hoped to prove not only the charge, but that the attempt to prevent and intimidate the meeting was by the orders of Government, and they intended to make use of the circumstance as a topic to inflame the public mind, and to produce effect upon the House on the next debate with regard to Union.

An examination took place which lasted till twelve o'clock, when it appeared to the general satisfaction of the House that there was no attempt whatever to prevent the meeting, but on the contrary, that the High Sheriff, though he conceived such a meeting on a Sunday illegal, allowed it, lest any advantage should be taken from his interference to inflame the people; and that the measures taken by Major Rogers were by the express directions of the Sheriff, who had desired him to hold himself in readiness in case a tumult should happen. It further appeared that Major Rogers had received express orders from me not to interfere with the civil power, but to allow the meeting to assemble without interruption.

When the examination closed, Sir Lawrence submitted that the facts being ascertained the persons charged might withdraw. It appeared however to the friends of Government, that it was absolutely necessary to vindicate the conduct of the High Sheriff and Major Rogers, and to vote an express approbation of their conduct, and Sir John Blaquiere moved a strong resolution accordingly.

Much debate and altercation ensued, it being the object of Opposition to support Sir Lawrence, who had placed himself in the awkward predicament of having brought forward a groundless and unsupported accusation. As to the conduct of the persons accused

[1] Verney Darby, of Anna Villa, Collector of Cavan, b. 1754, d. Dec. 16, 1818; m. Anna Maria, dau. of — Macquay, Esq. M.P. for Gowran, May, 1800, to the Union.

[2] Major Henry Rogers, R.A. Left the service in 1804.

the House was unanimous, and they only differed as to the degree of approbation which should be given. At length Mr. Plunkett moved an amendment to insert in the vote of approbation, "that the conduct of the High Sheriff and Major Rogers was not calculated to prevent the exercise of the right of petition." This amendment appearing to give additional strength to the original resolution was adopted, and the resolution, expressive of the fullest approbation of the High Sheriff and Major Rogers, passed without a division, and with very few dissentient voices.

There was much heat in the debate, and Opposition complained of the severity which was used against them by the friends of Government: our supporters, being exasperated at the attempt which had been made to fix a stigma on Administration, had assumed a high tone which I hope may have good effect hereafter.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Received Feb. 15.]

MY LORD, Whitehall, Feb. 12, 1800.

. . . Pressed as I am in time, and confident besides of your Excellency's firmness and determination to persist in carrying through the great measure of Union, I must, notwithstanding, not omit to repeat my assurances to your Excellency of the fullest support of His Majesty's Government, and to authorize and instruct you to declare that no disappointment (which, however, the goodness of the cause and your exertions will not suffer me to apprehend) will ever induce His Majesty or his servants to recede from or to suspend their endeavours, but that it is His Majesty's fixed and unalterable determination to direct, session after session, the proposition of Union to be renewed to Parliament, until it is adopted by the good sense of the nation, which His Majesty is persuaded cannot by any acts be long misled to oppose the only certain means to secure its tranquillity, and establish its prosperity and glory upon a permanent basis.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 15, 1800.

I have received your Grace's letter of the 12th instant, conveying to me the King's commands, to signify to Lord Downshire that His Majesty has no further occasion for his services as

Colonel of the Royal Downshire regiment of militia, or as Governor of the county of Down, and directing me to strike his Lordship's name out of the list of Privy Council,[1] for which purpose His Majesty's letter was enclosed.

Also conveying to me His Majesty's opinion that Major Mathews[2] should be removed from his commission in the Downshire regiment.

In consequence of those His Majesty's commands thus signified by your Grace, Lord Castlereagh immediately signified His Majesty's pleasure by my directions to Lord Downshire. And I beg leave to express the satisfaction I feel that His Majesty so fully approved and confirmed the decision I had made, and that I am fully supported by your Grace and His Majesty's Ministers in a measure, which I conceived to have been decisive as to the success of my administration and of the great measure which has been confided to my management.

I am happy to add that the conduct I pursued with regard to Lord Downshire has been attended with the best consequences, and has received the general approbation of the friends of Administration, to whom it has given fresh spirit and confidence.

I shall signify forthwith His Majesty's pleasure to Major Mathews.

I feel my resolution confirmed by the additional assurances your Grace has given me of the continued and persevering support I may expect from His Majesty's Ministers. It is a sentiment I do not fail to impress upon the friends of Administration, and I think it is extensively and beneficially felt.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 15, 1800.

. . . The circumstance which was made a plea for delay, namely, the printed articles not having been delivered out to the members, was owing I find to a piece of management of the Speaker's; they were all previously printed by my directions, and sent to the vote office of the House of Commons for circulation. The Speaker ordered a new edition to be printed, forbidding the officers of the House to circulate those that had been prepared—an expedient which could

[1] Lord Downshire's name was struck out of the list of the Privy Council Feb. 18.

[2] George Matthews, b. Oct. 24, 1756, d. April 19, 1839; m. Miss Ecklin, sister of Charles Ecklin, Esq., of Ecklinville.

have been resorted to for no other purpose than furnishing his friends with an argument for delay.

I am happy to inform your Grace that the misunderstanding[1] which has for some time separated Lord Enniskillen and his family from Government, is altogether at an end, and I believe (on the question of Union excepted) that Lord Cornwallis has not a warmer political friend at this moment than his Lordship. His conduct on the militia business, and the strong and marked disapprobation which he has shown of the late proceedings of the Opposition, made Lord Cornwallis particularly desirous of removing the impression which Lord Enniskillen had received. His Excellency found this the less difficult to accomplish, as the cause of complaint was not that the Lord-Lieutenant had passed a censure on his conduct and that of the court-martial, for this he admitted he was perfectly authorised to do; but that the censure had been published, not through the usual military channel of General Orders, but by his Excellency's directions in the public prints, which Lord E. conceived to be an unusual disrespect.

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 15, 1800.

When the House met yesterday, the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved the order of the day for going into a committee on the Lord-Lieutenant's Message and Resolutions of the British Parliament.

Objection was taken to the Speaker leaving the chair, and many of the members of Opposition who had not yet delivered their sentiments spoke against the principle of Union. The friends of Government reserved themselves for the committee. About 12 o'clock Mr. Balfour stated he had not received the papers which were necessary for the investigation of the subject, upon which Mr. Ponsonby moved the question of adjournment.

The House divided at this unexpected hour, for the adjournment 98, against 123. Mr. George Ponsonby then rose to state that several members were in the same situation with Mr. Balfour, and resisted going into the committee, and a debate ensued on the principle of delay; Government attributed this attempt to mere management, and a mere wish to procrastinate. At length, about 2 o'clock the House divided on a question to adjourn the debate

[1] The misunderstanding arose out of Whollaghan's trial, already mentioned.

till Monday. The House was now nearly full, and upon a division there appeared for the adjournment 110, against it 157. The object of Lord Castlereagh being now attained, which was to prove that our majority was increasing instead of diminishing, and that no impression whatever had been made upon the members since the last debate, his Lordship grew less anxious to press what appeared objectionable to many respectable members whom he wished to conciliate; and his Lordship after some further debate proposed to the House, that if it should be agreed fairly, that on Monday no resistance should be made to the Speaker's leaving the chair, and no attempt be further made to defer the division on the main question, he would consent to adjournment. This candour produced its effect, and I have now the satisfaction to hope that the principle of the measure of Union will be carried on Monday by a majority equal to that which appeared last night.

I have the pleasure to add, that all idea of resisting the question by force seems to be given up in the House. There have been many declarations that if the question shall be carried, it shall be supported in the country. It appears also that all the late attempts to seduce or intimidate our friends have failed. The city of Dublin went so far as to address Mr. Latouche, Sir William Newcomen, and Mr. Neville,[1] to oppose the measure of Union, but their answers have been firm and decisive. I do not hear of any disposition to real discontent and resistance in the country.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 18, 1800.

I have the satisfaction to acquaint your Grace, that the preliminary resolution to the articles of Union was this day carried in the Commons at 11 o'clock, after a debate of eighteen hours. The question was upon a motion of the Speaker, that the chairman should leave the chair, which was negatived by 161 to 115. Majority 46. When the main question was put, the Speaker said he would not trouble the House to divide again.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer opened the debate with an able argument, in which he chiefly confined himself to the principle of the measure. In enumerating the causes which led to the

[1] Mr. Neville was partner in the bank of Finlay and Co., in Dublin. He voted against the Union in 1799, but for it in 1800.

necessity of an Union, he adverted to the inflammatory conduct of men of education and property, and particularly to the speeches and writings of members of Parliament; particularly he alluded to Mr. Grattan, and quoted many passages from his address to the citizens of Dublin, which he conceived had contributed to the late rebellion.

Mr. Grattan having been attacked by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on a former night, uttered a prepared personal invective against him.

Mr. Corry replied with much ability and great spirit, entering fully into the whole of Mr. Grattan's conduct, and accusing him of living in familiarity with rebels, and being a conniver at their plans to overthrow the country. Mr. Grattan replied in a strain of still more bitter and more personal invective, using Parliamentary trick to convey against the Chancellor of the Exchequer, epithets the most opprobrious and foul, and such as it was not possible for a gentleman to submit to. This altercation made such impression in the House, that the debate went on for several hours without attention. About 11 o'clock, Sir John Parnell rose and went into the detail of the measure, on which he commented with severity, but was ably answered by Lord Castlereagh. He was followed by the Speaker, who in a speech of two hours of much ingenuity, violence, and address, endeavoured to prove the whole system as destitute of advantage to Ireland in finance, and ruinous to her in commerce, and particularly in the article of cottons. Lord Castlereagh answered the Speaker, and I am informed with much ability and effect: the debate then proceeded on the general principle, without much entering into details. The chief objections have been made against the representative plan as far as it relates to the peerage, and the compensation for boroughs, which is naturally a subject for clamour.

I shall state particulars on these subjects as early as I can be enabled.

The committee sit again on Friday, and there does not seem a design in the House to delay. Mr. John Claudius Beresford pressed for dispatch, and the idea did not seem objected to.

As soon as the altercation between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Grattan ended, he sent General Cradock[1] with a message to him.

[1] Major-General Cradock, Quarter-Master General in Ireland, afterwards a General, Colonel 43rd Regt., and G.C.B.; created Lord Howden in Ireland Oct. 19, 1819, and in England Sept. 7, 1831; b. Aug. 12, 1762, d. July, 1839; m. Nov. 17, 1798, Theodosia, dau. of John, 1st Earl of Clanwilliam. M.P. for Castlebar from 1790 to 1797, for Middleton in 1799, and for Thomastown in 1800. Governor of the Cape of Good Hope

They went out during the sitting of the committee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was wounded on the first fire in the arm: by direction of the seconds they fired again, after having presented and kept back their fire twice, and the affair was then properly terminated.

I am sorry to say that Mr. Corry's wound may confine him, as the ball entered his arm a little above the wrist, and was taken out at the elbow. Upon the whole I must congratulate your Grace upon the important decision of the day, which I trust is a prelude to the final success of the great measure in which I am engaged.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Feb. 18, 1800.

After a debate of twenty hours we carried the first proposition in the committee—"That a Legislative Union of the two kingdoms was desirable," by a majority of 46. There was no appearance of defection amongst our supporters, so that I trust the measure will be carried.

Corry very unwisely made another attack on Grattan, who had rather the advantage afterwards in his replies, with respect to abuse, and then wounded him (Corry) in the arm, in a meeting in the Phœnix Park. This is unlucky, and tends rather to raise Grattan, who was as low before as his enemies could wish. I write in great haste.

Most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 20, 1800.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer was well enough yesterday to appear in the House of Commons, and to move the ordinary

from 1811 to 1814. It is said that the Speaker endeavoured to prevent this duel, but the parties with their seconds (Mr. Metge, M.P. for Tallagh, and General Cradock), left the House at daybreak, for a field near Ball's Bridge. Mr. Corry was wounded in the arm at the first fire, and it was settled to exchange shots again, when, to quote the words of Mr. Plowden, "Mr. Grattan kept his man accurately covered, and reserved his shot to make it more secure." The seconds, however, interfered, and both parties fired at the same time, without effect. It had been previously decided that if either of the combatants were killed or disabled, his opponent should be considered as having paired with him. An immense mob had assembled, and so great was the frenzy of the people that, had Mr. Grattan fallen, Mr. Corry would probably not have left the ground alive. The Sheriff, who was present, would not interfere officially, but endeavoured to effect an amicable arrangement.

resolutions of supply, which were passed without observation. Sir Lawrence Parsons rose to make an explanation with regard to a rumour which had been circulated of his having given to me a written opinion in favour of an Union, which he declared to be unfounded.

Lord Castlereagh replied to him, and stated that he conceived "that the opinion alluded to had really been given; that soon after my arrival in Ireland he had made an offer to state his sentiments on paper; that a few days afterwards I received from him, as I supposed, a memoir[1] on the subject of the system best calculated for this country, which, being hurried at the time, I had locked up; that upon looking over my papers I had found this memoir, which strongly recommended a Union upon fair and equitable principles, that the memoir was not signed by Sir Lawrence nor in his handwriting, but the writer described himself as commanding the King's County regiment, and alluded to points of discipline on which Sir Lawrence had conversed with me." Sir Lawrence endeavoured to explain away this statement, but did not actually and peremptorily deny his having sent me the memoir. I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Received Feb. 21.]

MY LORD, Whitehall, Feb. 17, 1800.

. . . Lord Downshire's fall was his own act, and it was necessary to make the example; your Excellency will lament that necessity as sincerely as those who are most intimately connected with him; but at the same time you will be entitled to the comfort of thinking that nothing has been omitted on your part to prevent it, and that notwithstanding your lenity and forbearance, the dignity of Government has been duly sustained, and its character preserved in a manner that must be highly gratifying to its best and truest friends. . . . I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 22, 1800.

The Archbishop of Cashel and Doctor Duigenan have represented to me that they do not consider the article for incorporating

[1] This memoir must have been destroyed with the great mass of Lord Cornwallis's papers relating to the Union, as it cannot be found.

the two Churches of England and Ireland, an adequate security for the Church of Ireland.

They state that by the articles of the Scotch Union a specific treaty is entered into between Scotland and England to preserve the Church of Scotland, and that the article proposed in the present treaty does not make a specific engagement between Great Britain and Ireland to preserve the Church of Ireland in a similar manner as was done at the time of the Scotch Union.

To remedy what they deem a defect they propose that an Act of Parliament shall be passed on the subject, to be hereafter incorporated with the Act of Union, and I have the honour of enclosing to your Grace the draft of an act which has been laid before me by Doctor Duigenan.

I at the same time suggest to your Grace whether their object may not be better accomplished by adding to the 5th Article as it now stands, the following words:—

"And that the continuance for ever of the said United Church as the established Church of the said United Kingdom shall be deemed and taken to be a fundamental Article of the Union."

I suggest these points to your Grace from a wish to consult as much as possible the particular feelings of supporters of the measure, and I am to express my hopes that you will convey to me the sentiments of His Majesty's Ministers as speedily as possible.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Feb. 22, 1800.

The Opposition suffered us to carry three resolutions last night without a division, which is a proof that they do not think their numbers are increasing, and, on the whole, our prospects rather improve. I have by a little management got over the coolness which subsisted between the Castle and the Cole family, and Lord Enniskillen and myself have shaken hands and dined together; and I have likewise cultivated some of the most loyal and respectable Anti-Unionists with success. This will not operate on their votes whilst the measure is pending, but I trust that we shall have votes enough to carry it without them. It will, however, greatly facilitate its execution after it has been sanctioned by the decision of Parliament, and will, in some degree, have the effect of the question's having been carried by a greater majority.

The continental prospects appear to me to be very bad, not-

withstanding all that the Ministers say about them, and I do not see how the Russians and British[1] are to be employed to advantage.

By your last accounts I trust there are hopes of poor Digby; I feel much for the anxiety which Mrs. Ross must suffer; remember me kindly to her.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 25, 1800, 10 A.M.

I have the pleasure to acquaint your Grace that last night the 7th Article of Union, which relates to Contributions, passed in the Committee of the House of Commons. When the Speaker left the chair, the House happening to be thin on account of members being absent at dinner, the Opposition took advantage and divided against leaving the chair, 47 to 56. I trust this little manœuvre may induce our supporters to be more attentive, as it proves no advantage will be missed by the adverse party.

Lord Castlereagh opened the debate, and entered into a full examination and refutation of the Speaker's argument on the former night, wherein he had endeavoured to show that if the Union had taken place before the war, this kingdom would have been more in debt by ten millions. His Lordship showed the fallacy of this statement with great force and perspicuity, and established to the satisfaction of the Committee the positions he had laid down in his original speech. The Speaker defended for some time his statement, but was at length obliged to shift his ground.

He was followed by Sir John Parnell, who was answered in a speech of detail by the Chancellor of the Exchequer with much ability.

Mr. J. C. Beresford moved an amendment to the first section of the Article to make the interest of the debts of the two kingdoms reciprocally payable at the Bank of England or Ireland, but after some conversation his motion was withdrawn.

Mr. George Ponsonby and Mr. O'Hara[2] spoke against the principle and provisions of the Article, which was well supported by Mr. Johnson. The rest of the debate went upon general topics, and was not material. About 12 o'clock Col. Barry moved that the Chairman should leave the chair, when the Committee divided, Ayes 108, Noes 150. The Committee then proceeded.

Mr. J. C. Beresford moved that Ireland should contribute in

[1] The Russians, when Holland was abandoned, were sent to Jersey.

[2] Charles O'Hara, b. about 1745, d. Sept. 31, 1822; m. a relation of John King, Esq., Under-Secretary. A Lord of the Irish Treasury from 1806 to 1807. M.P. for Armagh borough from Dec. 1769 to 1776, Dungannon to 1783, Sligo county till his death.

the proportion of two-twentieths, when Mr. Plunkett entered into a detail of the reasons which led him and his friends to object to amending the resolutions and to confine their opposition to the principle; that their object was to defeat the measure, to decline any responsibility, to avoid giving it any sanction, to leave it encumbered with all its imperfections that the public might be convinced of its ruinous tendency and join in reprobating it; and he made a strong appeal to Lord Castlereagh not to press the measure against the sense of the people.

Mr. J. C. Beresford said it was his object to defeat the measure if possible, but if he could not do that, he wished to make it as favourable as possible. His amendment was then put and negatived, and the whole resolution was then passed without a division.

Lord Castlereagh then gave notice he should proceed upon Wednesday on the Commercial Article. The state of the division will show to your Grace that there is little alteration in the state of the House. Some of our friends were indisposed, and two or three out of town; it was the same case with Opposition. There has not been hitherto any real variation in numbers on either side. Before the debate Lord Corry sent a proposal to Lord Castlereagh, that if his Lordship would postpone any proceedings till next session, the Opposition would give Government the fullest support, and that if the country should at that period appear to be in favour of an Union they would give it a fair assistance. Lord Castlereagh received the offer with the utmost civility and of course declined it as inadmissible.

The three first Articles were yesterday debated and passed in Committee in the House of Lords. Lord Farnham, Lord Bellamont, and Lord Blayney,[1] spoke against the principle. It was not thought necessary by the Chancellor, after what had passed on a former night, to enter into general debate, and the Committee divided at an early hour; 48 for, Noes 20.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Private and Secret.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Feb. 27, 1800.

. . . I see no prospect of converts; the Opposition are steady to each other. I hope we shall be able to keep our

[1] Andrew Thomas, 11th Lord Blayney, Lieut.-General in the army, b. Nov. 30, 1770, d. Apr. 8, 1834; m. July 5, 1796, Mabella, dau. of James, 1st Earl of Caledon. M.P. for Old Sarum, Dec. 1806, to April, 1807.

friends true. A few votes might have a very injurious effect. We require *your assistance*, and you *must* be prepared to enable us to fulfil the expectations which it was impossible to avoid creating at the moment of difficulty. You may be sure we have rather erred on the side of moderation. . . .

Believe me, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Feb. 28, 1800.

I told you that I had written a kind letter to Duncan,[1] but I believe you are well aware of the impropriety as well as the inutility of my interference on the subject of Lord Mornington's plan[2] for annexing the Malabar country to the Government of Madras unless Mr. Dundas chose to write to me on the subject; and even in that event it would be a delicate thing to combat the sentiments and wishes of the man who is in fact solely responsible for the conduct of all affairs in that quarter of the globe. You know that Mr. Dundas's character is not entirely exempt from jealousy, especially on the subject of India, and God knows I have enough to do without engaging in a controversy which I am not sufficiently prepared to support, and running the hazard of placing myself in an awkward situation with Dundas, to whom I feel myself under considerable obligations, and who has throughout behaved in a more fair and friendly manner to me than any other member of the Cabinet.

As Duncan has not addressed directly to myself his wishes that I should take a part, I shall be much obliged to you if, when you write to him, you will state the difficulty of my coming forward in the business.

The Opposition here still remains united, and seems determined to employ every means to protract the business, whilst we feel the greatest difficulty to call forth any exertion, or even to procure a tolerable attendance from our languid friends. The Speaker plays all the game for them, and counts the House exactly at four, before which time all the opponents take care to withdraw, and will not suffer any man to stir to call in such careless members as may be in the lobby or porch. Every mode of retardment is afterwards adopted, and on the commercial clauses a great number of the

[1] Jonathan Duncan, Governor of Bombay, whose name has been repeatedly mentioned in preceding letters.

[2] These plans were carried out, and the Malabar district was annexed to the Government of Madras soon after the close of the Mysore war.

most violent anti-Union manufacturers are to be called, whose examination will take up many days. The hopes of the party are to prevent our getting the business through both Houses before the Assizes, when they will endeavour to put the whole country in a flame.

We receive in the mean time, through various channels, accounts that are entitled to a considerable degree of credit, that the enemy meditate, within a very short period, a serious attack on this country. We are at present rather in an unprepared state on account of the draft from the militia, but I shall put an end to that business, and reassemble the light infantry battalions on the 10th of next month.

We have obtained 6300 men, almost all of them for general service, and shall probably get 1000 more. I shall direct our Board of Ordnance to apply for the rifles.

I am obliged to leave off. I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

EDWARD COOKE, ESQ., TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Secret.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, March 1, 1800.

. . . When can you make the remittance promised? It is absolutely essential, for our demands increase. Pray let Lord Castlereagh know without delay what can be done by you.

Faithfully yours,

E. COOKE.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 5, 1800.

Mr. George Ponsonby brought forward yesterday his promised motion respecting the present state of the sense of the nation upon the subject of the Union.

He adverted to the expressions in my message to Parliament wherein notice is taken of the numerous declarations in favour of the measure. He endeavoured to deduce from it that His Majesty had declared that the concurrence of the will of the people was necessary to warrant Parliament in effecting such a change, or, as he called it, transfer of the constitution—that the will of the people could only be known to Parliament from their petitions, and that there were on the table of the House petitions from 26 counties and several great towns, also from the corporation and guilds of the metropolis, against the measure—that these petitions were

signed by 110,000 persons—that they fully declared the sense of the people—and that it was therefore the duty of the House to lay them before His Majesty, and to represent to their Sovereign the true wishes of the people.

He then read three motions, a copy of which I have the honour to enclose, and moved the first of them.

Mr. Ponsonby was replied to by Lord Castlereagh with great and confessed ability. His Lordship entered fully into a detailed state of the public mind from the time the question was first moved. He showed that when the people were left to themselves there was a general disposition to acquiesce in the measure, and among the loyal and well-informed classes to approve it; and that the public expressions adverse to the measure had been brought forward by manœuvre and artifice.

His Lordship then stated that 74 declarations had been made in favour of an Union by public bodies in the kingdom, that 19 of them proceeded from the freeholders of counties, and many of the remainder from the chief towns and corporations, and he contended that in these declarations would be found the expression of the sense of the loyal and propertied part of the community, rather than in the petitions before the House.

His Lordship combated with success all Mr. Ponsonby's positions. He showed that if the sense of the people had in former periods been taken against the sense of Parliament the constitution would have been lost. He shewed the great measures of the Settlement of the Crown at the Revolution, and of the Union of Scotland, were carried by small majorities relying upon the goodness of their cause, and he appealed to his supporters to adopt that steadiness and consistency which had distinguished the great characters of those two periods.

His Lordship lamented that he could not move a direct negative to Mr. Ponsonby's first resolution, as it contained a truism, and he therefore moved the question of adjournment.

A general debate followed, which lasted till past six in the morning, when the House divided; for adjourning 155, against 107.

Your Grace will observe from the numbers that no variation has yet taken place in the state of parties. The absence of a few members from either side was owing to accidental circumstances. I am to observe, however, that Mr. G. Knox did purposely decline dividing with Opposition, and I believe the two Mr. Rowleys, who are Lord de Clifford's members.

There was much altercation in the course of the debate among

the county members respecting the petitions and the state of the country, which were in general favourable to our friends.

Towards morning Mr. Saurin, one of Lord Downshire's members, renewed the argument on the competence of Parliament, and having advanced positions leading to resistance, he was ably answered by Mr. Fox.

Upon the whole the temper of the House was good; the effect hoped for by Mr. Ponsonby was not produced, and the supporters of Government evinced that they were decided and steady.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MR. PONSONBY'S MOTION.

1st. That it is a constitutional exercise of the right of the subject to petition this House upon any measure depending therein.

2nd. That it appears that petitions have already been presented to this House during the present session from twenty-six counties in this kingdom, from the cities of Dublin and Limerick, the towns of Belfast, Drogheda, Newry, and several other towns, against the measure of a legislative Union with Great Britain.

3rd. That these Resolutions be laid before His Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant, with an humble address, requesting His Excellency forthwith to transmit the same to be laid before His Majesty.

EARL OF FINGALL TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY LORD, North Earl Street, March 7, 1800.

Your Excellency will not, I hope, consider it an unreasonable intrusion if, in the present advanced state of the question of legislative Union, I shall take the liberty to lay before you an application on behalf of the Catholic peers of Ireland, that they may be allowed to exercise the right of voting for those peers who shall be returned to the Imperial Parliament, without being called on to take any other oath than that which, by the law passed in 1793, every Catholic freeholder is obliged to take to enable him to vote for his representative. This oath of course every Roman Catholic has taken since the period I mention, but I allude to it as it was framed at the time when the elective franchise was granted to the Catholic body. To point out to the discernment and justice of your Excellency the singular hardship to which the Catholic

peer will be alone subjected, unless allowed this privilege, is, I am sure, needless. He will be the only person deprived of a right which I believe the British Constitution acknowledges every freeholder ought to have—that of voting for the person who makes the laws by which he is bound. It is, I trust, equally unnecessary to represent to your Excellency that the conduct of the Catholic peers does not, they hope, give room for excluding them from rights enjoyed by those of the lowest orders of their own persuasion. They flatter themselves the test of experience proves them not unworthy the singular favours which, with the warmest gratitude, they will ever acknowledge to have received from their most gracious and beloved Sovereign. Forbearance has, however, my Lord, been at all times as conspicuous in the conduct of the principal Catholic nobility and gentry of Ireland as their loyalty, their attachment to their king and constitution, and their love of British connexion. The Catholic peers, therefore, my Lord, do not wish by any means to press at this time a claim which shall be considered as likely to embarrass the great national measure now depending, from which they expect such benefits for their country at large, and looking forward with the most unbounded confidence to the magnanimity, liberality, and sound policy of the future Imperial Legislature, venture to promise to themselves and the whole Catholic body many more considerable and extensive advantages.

Under these impressions it is far from the wish of the Catholic peers to urge at this moment an application which shall be deemed untimely. They would rather, however unpleasant to their feelings, remain in the awkward state of exclusion; but they trust your Excellency will consider it only fair and honourable, as well as a duty they owe posterity, to have addressed you at the present time on this subject, which they beg leave to recommend to your Excellency's liberality and well-known attachment to justice, and for which, on behalf of the Catholic peers, I humbly solicit your Excellency's favour and protection.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, for the Catholic peers and myself, with every sentiment of respect and high consideration,

Your Excellency's very humble and obedient servant,

FINGALL.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, March 7, 1800.

I have received some intimation that our friends in England do not conceive we are pressing the business of Union with suffi-

cient rapidity, and as I am apprehensive that some inconsiderate person here may have endeavoured in private letters to raise that sentiment, I wish to do away all possibility of misconception on the subject.[1]

It will be in the first place considered that we have a minority consisting of 120 Members well combined and united, that many of them are men of the first weight and talent in the House, that 37 of them are Members for counties, that great endeavours have been used to inflame the kingdom, that petitions from 26 counties have been procured, that the city of Dublin is almost unanimous against it, and with such an Opposition so circumstanced and supported, it is evident much management must be used, and that Government must avoid putting itself in the wrong, and incensing that part of Opposition which is disposed to moderation. It is evident, also, that such an Opposition having real pretences for delay, on account of any precipitation in Government, could at once harass, protract, and influence.

It is further evident that upon a final settlement of the concerns and commerce of the kingdom, it is impossible upon any principle of common propriety and decency, to prevent those persons from being heard at the bar whose private situations and interests are really to be affected by the measure, and that Government would lose all character for consistency and justice were they to refuse admitting their cases to be heard. Under these impressions I have endeavoured so to manage as to prevent improper delay, to preserve decorum in our proceedings, and to manage the temper of Opposition and the public with success. I have also by this conduct been enabled to confirm the sentiments of our supporters, and to interest them in the success of a measure which they found could be supported by argument and debate, and which improved in public estimation by discussion. Our friends have accordingly submitted to the severest attendance ever known in the history of Parliament with unexampled patience: and by feeling they are gaining characters, they have acquired consistency and steadiness.

We have given ourselves no rest or relaxation whatever. Our sittings have never broken up earlier than 12 at night, and have frequently lasted till 12 in the day. Many of our friends are really confined on account of illness contracted by attendance.

We have established the principle: we have passed four

[1] Mr. King replied on the 11th that the Government were perfectly satisfied with the progress of the measure, and that no one who was acquainted with the subject imagined there was any unnecessary delay, and the Duke of Portland repeated that assurance the following day.

articles. On Monday I intend going through the Parliamentary article, and when I receive Mr. Pitt's sentiments on cottons, I shall endeavour to close the commercial article, but before that period it is impossible. The Church and the last article will take up little time. I am sure all our friends must be sensible of my anxiety to press forward; but if I were to irritate by imprudent precipitation, and give ground to the Opposition which they feel the want of, I should not only accuse myself, but feel that the most impatient advocates of the measure would shift their ground to blame me. I must also observe that the Opposition have hitherto adopted a conduct which cannot fairly be imputed to the mere object of delay. The inquiry they have instituted may have this effect; but hitherto they have not protracted examination except in the articles of cottons and calicoes, and the peculiar circumstance of those manufactures fairly justified a full and detailed examination. On other points, viz. silk and sugar, their examination was short and by no means vexatious.

Believe me, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 9, 1800.

. . . Colonel Barry, who manages the opposition to the commercial article, said he would bring forward evidence as to the state of the glass and iron manufactures to-day, and that he intended to call evidence to every article of manufacture which was to be affected by the Resolution, at the same time he disclaimed every intention of delay. . . . The House was ordered to be called over on Colonel Barry's motion.

Sir John Parnell, as the House was rising, made some observations as to the sense of the people, and gave notice that he would in the course of next week bring forward some further motion upon that subject. He was, however, apparently so much intoxicated that it is impossible to say whether he was serious in the declaration he made.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.] Received March 10.

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, March 6, 1800.

As Mr. Pitt hopes he shall be able to write to Lord Castlereagh on the subject of the duties on cotton in the course

of this day or of to-morrow at latest, I have no other object in writing to you than to relieve you from any anxiety which the suspense you may have been in with regard to them may have occasioned, by informing you that it will be left to your Excellency to make the best bargain you can for this country in conceding this point to the wishes of the Irish; but at the same time you will take occasion to observe to them, that if there should be any article on which our manufacturers should think it necessary to insist upon a similar species of protection to this, which is now required for the cotton manufacturers of Ireland, the Irish will not be considered as having any right to complain of the British manufacturer, should he be treated with the same sort of indulgence.

It is, however, certainly to be wished that cases of this kind should occur as seldom as possible in the course of this arrangement; but I cannot help adding that such is the importance of its accomplishment, that it is not a consideration of a little more or a little less duty that can prevent it, or even be suffer'd to retard its progress.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, March 10, 1800.

So violent a spirit has arisen amongst the Lords, and even amongst those who are the best friends of Government, against the reservation of the power of creating Irish Peers after the Union, that it is the general opinion of His Majesty's principal servants here that the clause cannot be carried.

The language amongst the Peers is, that they cannot abandon the interests of their posterity, that the persons hereafter to be created will be men of weight and consequence in England, who will always succeed to the vacancies in the representation, and that the families of the ancient Peers will be reduced to a state of insignificance and contempt.

Modifications have been suggested, such as imposing a restriction on the Crown not to fill up more than one out of two or three vacancies until the whole shall be reduced to a certain number, either 112 or 140, constituting by that means the Representation a fourth or a fifth part of the Peerage.

It is, however, doubted by many whether any modification will go down, and whether the chance of reserving so restricted a power in the Crown may be worth the contest. Your Grace and His Majesty's Ministers will determine whether the clause shall

take its chance of success in its present shape, or whether any alterations shall be made to endeavour to render it more palatable. And as the time presses, I must request that you will convey your sentiments to me with all convenient dispatch.

The Archbishop of Cashel is very desirous that the spiritual Peers should be always represented by the four Archbishops, who are, he says, from their stations more capable of giving an account of the state of the Church throughout the whole kingdom than any other four prelates. He likewise represents the inconvenience that several of the Bishops with the smallest incomes will suffer by going to London to attend Parliament, and the trifling object it will be to them to have a seat for one year in six in the House of Lords.

His Grace had my promise, when we came to an agreement respecting the Union, that he should have a seat in the House of Lords for life; but as he may be elected as a temporal Peer to represent that body, no inconvenience will arise in consequence of that engagement; and as this question is not in other respects attended with the same hazard and difficulty as that of the creation of temporal Peers, your Grace may safely determine upon it according to your opinion of its merits.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The English Cabinet manifested the greatest reluctance to yield upon the question respecting the limitation in the number of the Irish Peers. So late as the 7th of February, the Duke of Portland wrote to Lord Cornwallis declaring that the unlimited right of creation must be maintained, and that the Ministers could on no account advise the King to give way on this point.

The Duke's main argument was, that it made another step in the class of honours, and that the bestowal of an Irish Peerage might often obviate the necessity of creating an English Peer.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, March 11, 1800.

Your Grace has not taken the smallest notice in any of your letters to me of the vacant Primacy; but rumours have not only reached me, but others in this country, of its having been offered to persons in England.[1] I confess that I hope there is no

[1] The Primacy, after having been offered to several other English bishops, was, Nov. 25, 1800, conferred upon the Bishop of St. Davids, the Hon. William Stuart, son of John, 3rd Earl of Bute; b. March 17, 1755, d. May 6, 1822; m. May 3, 1796, Sophia Margaret Juliana, dau. of Thomas Penn, Esq., of Stoke Pogis. He had been consecrated Bishop of St. Davids in 1793.

foundation for these reports, as I think it would have a very bad effect at this time to send a stranger to supersede the whole Bench of Bishops, and I should likewise be much embarrassed by the stop that would be put to the succession amongst the Irish clergy at this critical period when I am beyond measure pressed for ecclesiastical preferment.

The Archbishop of Cashel's conduct of late has, as I before observed to your Grace, been unexceptionable; but if it should be thought improper to appoint an Irishman, and especially a political Irishman to that high station, a more respectable candidate could not easily be found than the Bishop of Ferns.

There are likewise other respectable Prelates on the Irish Bench, and I trust that His Majesty will not find himself under the necessity of looking to any other quarter on the present occasion.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 12, 1800.

Last night in the House of Commons, after some altercation respecting a petition which had been obtained from Cork against the Union, and which was proved not to be the sense of the respectable part of that city, a debate took place on the committal of the Bill for continuing to the 24th of next month the Act establishing martial law.

After a tedious debate in which some of the members of Opposition endeavoured to couple the measure with the question of Union, the committal of the Bill was carried by 140 to 55. This division will show to your Grace that the Opposition are not united in any general system of embarrassing Government. Lord Castlereagh then proposed that the Bills should be committed on Thursday, to which Mr. Ponsonby objected as he had given notice for a motion for that day. Colonel Barry suggested that as the Bill of last year had nearly elapsed, that it might be committed forthwith, which idea was taken up and moved by Lord Castlereagh. Sir John Parnell, Mr. Dawson, and Mr. Ponsonby, objected to the measure as precipitate, but Lord Castlereagh thought it right to persevere. Upon this Opposition continued a harassing conduct till three o'clock in the morning, when, finding their numbers diminish to 22, they left the House, and the Committee was gone through.

An extraordinary circumstance took place about two in the

morning as the House was going into Committee. Mr. Sinclair, a lawyer, cried out from the gallery, "Now let the greatest assassin in the House take the chair." He was instantly seized, brought to the bar, where he behaved with much effrontery, and was committed to Newgate. It appears he was in liquor, and he has written letters of contrition to-day to several Members, but I understand he is a man of violent principles and to a great degree disaffected.[1]

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 11, 1800.

Mr. Cooke, by desire of Lord Castlereagh, took advantage of the express which was on the point of sailing, and on the breaking up of the House of Commons wrote to Mr. King an account of what passed, for your Grace's information, last night.

It was expected that the Opposition would have made a great exertion, and that the debate would have lasted for many hours, which occasioned the absence of our supporters at 8 o'clock, who expected no division at that time and were at dinner.[2]

Your Grace will of course not suppose that the exertions of Opposition have ceased from the little resistance given to the article of Representation. Their object is to fix upon the most unpopular points of the measure, and to endeavour to inflame the people. The subject of giving compensation to boroughs is obviously the most exceptionable in the present arrangement, and they will of course endeavour to make an impression by debating this principle.

Mr. G. Ponsonby will therefore bring forward a distinct motion upon that subject on Thursday, which must be considered as a continuation of the debate upon Representation.

If Lord Castlereagh shall find it possible to go through the commercial article on Friday and Saturday, I shall hope the Report may be gone through on Tuesday and sent to the Lords.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Mr. Sinclair was a barrister, only remarkable for the violence of his democratic principles. He had been dining with a friend who entertained similar opinions, and, excited both by the violence of the language they had used and the quantity of wine they had drunk, he went to the House determined to make a speech, and the scene above described was the result. He was committed to Newgate, but discharged on the 13th of May following, in consequence of having in a petition expressed his regret for what had occurred.

[2] The numbers were—for Government, 81; against, 62.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 14, 1800.

Mr. George Ponsonby, who had given notice that he would bring on yesterday a motion to take the sense of the House upon granting compensation to boroughs, did not appear at the usual hour. It was intimated that he was not well. There is, however, good reason to believe that the Members who are proprietors of boroughs refused to support him. Lord Castlereagh soon noticed his absence, and he intended to move the order of the day unless the promised motion was brought forward. Upon this Sir John Parnell arose and made an apology for Mr. Ponsonby on account of indisposition; and then stated that as he had himself given notice of his intention to bring forward some measure for ascertaining the sense of the people, he should make use of the present opportunity. Lord Castlereagh conceiving this conduct to be an unfair Parliamentary manœuvre, rose to order, and put it to the Chair whether he was not in possession of the House and had the right of precedence. The Speaker, however, declared in favour of Sir John Parnell, upon which the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in order to mark the Speaker's conduct, moved that Lord Castlereagh should be heard. This was done as an animadversion on the Speaker, not with a view to insist upon the motion, which, after some conversation, was not persevered in.

Sir John Parnell then moved, after a speech of considerable length, "That an address be presented to His Majesty to request His Majesty would dissolve the present Parliament and call a new one before the present measure of Legislative Union should be concluded."

A debate commenced which lasted till 3 o'clock this morning, when the House divided: for it, 104; against, 150.

Mr. Saurin, Lord Downshire's member, rose about 8 o'clock, and renewed the subject he had repeatedly introduced of the competence of Parliament. He pushed the dangerous doctrines he had advanced on this head further than any preceding night. He laid it down in broad terms that if the measure of Union were carried against the sense of the people, it would be a nullity, and they would have a right to resist.

The doctrine was ably repelled by the Solicitor-General, Dr. Duigenan, Mr. Martin, Mr. M'Clelland, Mr. Ormsby, Sir John Blaquiere, and other gentlemen.

Mr. Saurin was considered to have pushed his doctrines so far, that Mr. Grattan felt himself obliged to soften them by alleging

that the whole argument went, not to the sense of the people at large, but of the electors, and to the mode of taking the sense of the people by a dissolution, which was strictly constitutional.

Lord Castlereagh, conceiving that Mr. Saurin's perseverance in attempting to establish the doctrine of resistance would have the worst effect, if not very severely reprobated, animadverted upon him with great ability and effect towards the close of the debate. He exposed the general principle which Mr. Saurin had laid down of appealing from the sense of the Parliament to the sense of the people, and allowing no act to be binding which was not established by the majority of the people. His Lordship stated this doctrine to be highly unconstitutional, and to be the true Jacobin principle. He said that the introduction of the principle could only tend to mislead the people and to goad them into fresh rebellion: that those who used it either intended rebellion or did not. If they did not, that nothing could be so cruel as to inculcate those doctrines which would lead the people to dangers they did not intend to share; and if they did, he called on them manfully to come forward to avow their intentions, and to place themselves at the head of the rebellion they were instigating. He concluded with an appeal to the country gentlemen to beware of those who were artfully attempting, night after night, to lead them gradually to the support of doctrines which they reprobated, and to harden them by degrees to the approbation of measures of which they had declared their abhorrence.

I am in hopes that the severe animadversion which Mr. Saurin received will have the effect of checking the violence which has been increasing recently among the lawyers in Opposition, and which has risen in proportion as the majority on the side of Government has appeared steady and decided.

The Martial-law Bill was read a third time and passed.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Whitehall, March 15, 1800.

I have the honour to acquaint your Excellency that, after having laid your letter (private) of the 10th before the King, I took immediate means to collect the sentiments of His Majesty's confidential servants upon it, who concur without exception in recommending it to you to use your utmost endeavours to preserve to the Crown the right of creating Peers of Ireland, however encumbered

it may be with restrictions or qualifications, unless you should be convinced that, by insisting upon it, the great question of the Union should be endangered or exposed to serious difficulty and hazard.

I can hardly hope from the temper which your Excellency represents to prevail among the Peers, as well as what I have already urged upon the subject, and from the means which I am persuaded have been taken by you to reconcile them to the measure, that any further arguments which I may be able to offer should be attended with any effect; but I cannot help observing that, after deducting such of the Peers who are ineligible to represent the Peerage of Ireland by being Peers of Great Britain, whose number will be found to amount, exclusive of the Princes of the Blood, to 41, and adding to them such other Peers as have neither property nor connexion in Ireland, of whom there are upwards of 40, the result will be that the number of those who can (I mean with any chance of success) offer themselves as candidates, will not exceed the proportions of the Scotch Peerage in its present reduced state, so that one out of very little more than 4 must be returned;[1] and the principle of representation once admitted, I cannot conceive upon what ground a more restricted choice can be contended for. In addition to this consideration, I will only observe that the limitations in the creations of Irish titles cannot render the period very distant, at which there will not only not be a sufficient number of Peers to leave a choice, but not even to supply the number who are to sit on the part of Ireland in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. I therefore cannot abandon the hope of your Excellency being able to retain this prerogative to the Crown, which, notwithstanding the apprehensions of the great and highly respectable authority of Lord Kilwarden, is in the judgment of His Majesty's servants as desirable to be maintained, as it is easy to be supported, upon the same solid basis as every other prerogative of the Crown is founded, namely, the general interest of the community.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 22, 1800.

Opposition conceiving that the division they had made on the question of reporting the Union Resolutions to the House had

[1] The Irish Peerage now (Jan. 1858) consists, besides the King of Hanover and one Peeress, of 193. Of these 73 are English Peers, and about 30 more have no connexion by property with Ireland. At the rate at which titles have become extinct since the Union, it will be considerably upwards of another century before the number can be reduced to 100.

been unfavourable to them, as their members admitted, thought it imprudent to risk another division, and they yesterday determined at a meeting at the Earl of Charlemont's, that there should be no division on carrying the Report to the Lords, that the chief members should not appear in the House, and that the inferior speakers should, if they chose, make whatever protest against the measure they pleased.

Sir Lawrence Parsons after a short speech made this intention known; upon which Lord Castlereagh, as there were but few members on the Opposition side, did not think it worth while to enter into debate. Sir John Macartney,[1] Mr. Tighe, Sir John Freke,[2] Mr. Burke,[3] and Mr. Egan,[4] made declamatory speeches, and about ten o'clock the Report was gone through. Mr. Ward[5] and Sir James Blackwood[6] pressed Lord Castlereagh in the course of the morning on the part of the Northern cotton manufacturers, that his Lordship would consent to the terms he had offered to them at Mr. Beresford's, in case they would declare their satisfaction. It appeared to Lord Castlereagh that the gentlemen who met at Mr. Beresford's were really content themselves with his proposal; there was private reason to believe that the subsequent rejection of it was by manœuvre of the anti-Unionists. The Northern manufacturers were dissatisfied at the manœuvre; they perceived in the debate that this course was abandoned by Opposition, and that their wish was that the manufacturers should be dissatisfied, in

[1] Sir John Macartney, Bart., so created Jan. 22, 1799, b. about 1750, d. 1812; m. 1st, about 1773, Anne, dau. of Edward Scriven, Esq.; and, 2nd, Oct. 1794, Catherine, dau. of Chief Baron Burgh, Deputy Chief Remembrancer to Lord Wellesley. M.P. for Fore from 1793 to 1797, Naas from Jan. 1798 till the Union.

[2] Sir John Evans Freke, 2nd Baronet, b. Nov. 11, 1765, d. May 12, 1845; m. Jan. 25, 1783, Catherine Charlotte, dau. of Arthur, 2nd Earl of Arran. M.P. for Baltimore from 1768 to the Union. He succeeded to the Barony of Carbery March 4, 1807.

[3] Michael Burke, of Ballydugan, b. 1760, d. Aug. 29, 1838; m. about 1783, Sarah, dau. and sole heir of John Morgan, Esq., of Monksfield. Director of Inland Navigation, and a Surveyor-General for Ireland. M.P. for Athenry from May, 1800, till the Union.

[4] John Egan, b. about 1750, d. May, 1810. Educated as a sizar at Trinity College. On Nov. 9, 1798, Lord Cornwallis appointed him Chairman of Kilmainham, which office he retained for many years. M.P. for Ballynakill 1789, and for Tullagh from 1790 till the Union. On Feb. 5, 1800, he made a most violent speech, and talked of the Lord Lieutenant's "revolutionary tour." He was a very tall, large man, and remarkable for his offensive manners and violent language, which acquired for him the sobriquet of "Bully Egan."

[5] Right Hon. Robert Ward, 3rd son of Bernard, 1st Baron and 1st Viscount Bangor, b. July 14, 1754, d. March, 1831; m. 1st, 1782, Sophia Frances, dau. of Richard Chapel Whaley, Esq., of Whaley Abbey; 2nd, May, 1797, Louisa, dau. of Rev. Dr. Abraham Symes. M.P. for Wicklow borough from 1777 to 1783, Killyleagh to 1790, and Bangor from 1797 till the Union.

[6] Sir James Blackwood, 3rd Baronet, succeeded to the Barony of Dufferin and Claneboye on the death of his mother, Feb. 8, 1807; b. July 8, 1755, d. Aug. 8, 1836; m. Nov. 15, 1801, Anne Dorothea, only dau. of the Speaker, the Right Hon. John Foster, 1st Lord Oriel. M.P. for Killyleagh from 1789 to the Union. Sir James's father was a strong anti-Unionist, and wrote a most offensive letter to Lord Cornwallis, who had requested him to attend the meeting of Parliament of 1799; he died Feb. 27, 1799.

order to create irritation. They therefore pressed the Northern members to induce Lord Castlereagh to concede the terms he held out to their full extent.

It being the sole object of Opposition to obtain means of influencing the country, and the subject of the cotton-trade being their best instrument to work with, it appeared sound policy, if possible, to cut the ground from under them, and upon this view it was determined to make the concession required. When the Schedule respecting the cotton-trade was read, Mr. Ward stated his reasons for wishing that the present duties should be continued on cottons for seven years instead of five, and urged the alteration as likely to produce the satisfaction of the manufacturer. Upon this Lord Castlereagh stated that he considered the extension unnecessary, but that if it would give satisfaction, and as it did not militate against the principle of gradual and entire reduction, he would consent. At the same time he warned the House of the dangers of furnishing arguments to the British manufacturers for insisting upon similar protection to their fabrics against Ireland.

As the alternative went to prolong the existence of a duty, the Speaker said the Schedule must be recommitted, which was done accordingly, and the Report was agreed to this day.

In the debate last night Sir John Macartney endeavoured to alarm the House on the subject of tithes. He stated that this kingdom was exempted from the tithe[1] of agistment solely by the vote of the House of Commons in 1735; that by the Union the operation and effect of that vote would expire; that the clergy would take advantage of it, and would sue for agistment tithe, which he valued at one million sterling a-year.

This subject was evidently introduced with a view of creating a general apprehension among the graziers through the kingdom, and was taken up with such avidity by Mr. Tighe and Mr. O'Donnell that Lord Castlereagh thought it prudent to stop further debate upon it. His Lordship said the subject was in no measure connected with the articles of the Union, and therefore purposely not mentioned in it, but that it was one of those subjects which required discussion before the Union passed, and that it had not escaped the consideration of Government.

I shall take a subsequent occasion of writing to your Grace upon this subject.

I have now the satisfaction to state that the Union Resolutions have passed the House of Commons without any embarrassing opposition to any one of the provisions, or any inconvenient amendment.

[1] See Despatch of Lord Cornwallis, March 26.

I trust that by the exertions of the Chancellor and our supporters in the House of Lords they may not be there detained for more than a week.

I hear it is the intention of Opposition to work on the people during the recess and at the assizes to the utmost of their power, and it is said that their chief object is to bring forward from all quarters of the kingdom petitions to the King.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The language of the Anti-Unionists aroused a strong feeling among the manufacturing and commercial interests. Lord Cornwallis and Lord Castlereagh were very anxious to conciliate these classes, whose influence lay principally in the north of Ireland, where the mass of the population was at this time perfectly loyal. Various modifications[1] of the Resolutions were suggested to the Ministers, who readily assented to many, which were not at variance with the principles already laid down. These concessions removed in a great degree the objections taken out of doors, but did not put an end to the Parliamentary opposition. Two divisions took place, March 4, at 6 A.M., in which, though accidental causes had thinned the ranks of Government, the Opposition, who had mustered all their strength, were defeated by 157 to 110, and 155 to 107. Mr. Saurin availed himself of this opportunity to modify in some degree the dangerous language he had previously held on the right of the people to resist.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, March 24, 1800.

Lord Clifden, to whom we stand indebted for seven Union votes, Lord Callan,[2] who has two friends in the House of Commons, and Mr. Preston,[3] Member for Navan, all nearly related to the

[1] The principal objection was to the proposed duties on calicos, which had been as high as 30 to 50 per cent. It was intended to reduce them 10 per cent., and the principal modification made was to delay the time when the reduction was to come into operation. Lord Castlereagh considered that this was the only article about which a fair case could be made.

[2] George, 1st and only Lord Callan, b. April 18, 1754, d. unm. Oct. 1815. M.P. for Callan from 1789 till he was created a Peer, May 31, 1790. He was the son of James Agar, whose elder brother Henry was father of the 1st Viscount Clifden, of the Right Hon. Welbore Ellis, and of Charles, Archbishop of Cashel, and then of Dublin, and afterwards 1st Earl of Normanton.

[3] John Preston, 1st and only Lord Tara, so created July 30, 1800; b. Nov. 4, 1764, d. July 18, 1821; m. Sept. 3, 1801, Harriet, dau. of Thomas Powys, Esq., of Berwick House. His great-grandmother was aunt to Lord Callan. M.P. for Navan from 1776 till he was made a Peer.

Archbishop of Cashel, came to me this day to request that I would again submit his name to His Majesty's consideration for the succession to the Primacy.

The earnest wishes of these persons, from whom we have received such powerful support in our arduous contest, added to the Archbishop's own merits in the cause, may perhaps induce His Majesty to think more favourably of his Grace's pretensions; and I must confess, after the kingdoms become united, I cannot see any objection to an Irish Primate.

If your Grace should see reasons which have not occurred to me against the appointment of the Archbishop of Cashel, I should wish that the matter might lie over until you see Lord Castlereagh, who proposes going to England during the recess of our Parliament.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, March 24, 1800.

. . . It is a most provoking thing that every General Officer who gets a command asks for ten times as much artillery and stores as he can possibly want, and that he and all the departments of Government expect that the whole should be packed and sent off as expeditiously as you could put a bundle of old clothes into a stage-waggon.

No settled plan is, I believe, settled for the Mediterranean operations—probably either the South of France, or a co-operation with the Austrian armies in Italy; in either case I consider those men, whom we have obtained with so much difficulty, as lost to all future service. The troops are none of them fit for actual service at present, although in a few months with proper care and training, they might become excellent—and the two senior Generals will most undoubtedly quarrel. Indeed, from a letter which I received a very few days ago from Charles Stuart,[1] he appeared disposed to give up the command from some disappointment or contradiction about the medical staff. There are, I believe, two more expeditions of considerable magnitude upon the anvil, which will afford us some quiet hereafter, by stripping us of all our disposable forces.

I shall observe what you say with regard to the reduction of

[1] Hon. Charles Stuart, Lieut.-General, Colonel 26th Regt., K.B., son of John, 3rd Earl of Bute; b. Jan. 1753, d. May 25, 1801; m. April 19, 1778, Louisa, dau. and co-heir of Lord Vere Bertie. He was brother of the Archbishop of Armagh, and father of the late Lord Stuart de Rothsay.

the Fencible Cavalry in this country; it is uncertain when it will take place here, and must be done gradually. Some addition must be made to the corps of Engineers, and two or three second lieutenants may be appointed as extra officers as soon as fit objects can be found; but that service requires much consideration, and in my opinion a great deal more encouragement. The officers have no objects of either ambition or emolument to which they can look forward, unless they seek the latter by improper peculation. After 40 years' service they may aspire to Colonel's pay, and nothing more. The situation of Chief Engineer should certainly be improved, and, perhaps you will add, more ably filled.

The Union Resolutions have all passed the Commons, and as soon as they have been agreed to by the Lords, which will probably be in the course of next week, they will be transmitted to England, and Lord Castlereagh will go over to attend their progress in London, and our Parliament will adjourn for six weeks.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 24, 1800.

The Union Resolutions having been carried up to the Lords on Saturday last by Lord Castlereagh, the House resolved itself into a Committee upon them, and went into a discussion of the article which relates to Representation.

I had signified to your Grace the extreme reluctance which a large proportion of the Peers, the most respectable and the most friendly to Government, had disclosed to agree in that part of the article which permits His Majesty to retain the power of creating Peers of Ireland after the Union. Their repugnance went to the principle generally, and there was no modification which they were really disposed to accept. At the same time they showed so anxious a desire to support His Majesty's Government, and to carry the great measure in debate into execution, that they listened to the principle of accommodation I was authorised by your Grace to hold out, with a more favourable inclination than from their real aversion to them I could have imagined. It was this conduct so honourable to them, joined to the danger of creating any division among our friends, which induced me to consent that the Crown should only retain the power of creating *one* Irish Peer for *three* that should become extinct, until the whole Peerage should be reduced to one hundred.

This regulation produced their acquiescence, and I am happy to acquaint your Grace that there was no division upon that part of the subject. The only question upon which the Committee divided was the number of temporal Peers, which was carried in favour of that proposed by 52 to 17.

Lord Yelverton took the opportunity of entering at large into the whole question and its details, and made a very masterly speech in favour of the measure.

The opposition was confined to Lord Farnham, Lord Bellamont, Lord Powerscourt, and Lord Dunsany.[1] The Chancellor, Lord Glandore, and Lord Tyrawley, supported the resolution.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 26, 1800.

The statements of Sir John Macartney, that the discontinuance of tythe agistment depended upon the mere resolution of the House of Commons of Ireland, which could have no longer any effect or operation after a Union, not only excited a very lively sensation in the House when it was first mentioned, but has since created a very general alarm. The Opposition took immediate hold of this statement as an engine to work upon the country, and I understand have sent forth inflammatory handbills to excite the feelings of the people. The country gentlemen in support of Government have also taken as much *real* alarm, as their opponents had affected a *false* one. They stated that the effect of Sir J. Macartney's statement, if not done away by some Parliamentary measure, would have such universal operation that they should no longer be enabled to resist the opposition which would be brought forward at the assizes, or to support the question of Union. I therefore thought it right to have the subject examined, and to call a meeting of the chief servants of Government upon it this morning.

It appeared that in the year 1735 the subject had been brought forward in the House of Commons upon several petitions, stating the claim of tythe of agistment to be a *new* claim. The Commons

[1] Randall, 13th Lord Dunsany, b. March, 1739; d. April 4, 1821; m. 1st, Aug. 12, 1771, Margaret, dau. of Edward Archdeckne, Esq., and widow of Edward Mandeville, Esq.; 2nd, Aug. 7, 1800, Emma, dau. of Joshua Smith, Esq., of Stoke Park, and brother of Sir Drummond Smith, Bart. This family, which claims the same descent as the Earls of Fingall, like them professed the Catholic religion, till Edward, 12th Baron, became a Protestant. Wolfe Tone, in his Memoirs, mentions dining with the Lord Dunsany here mentioned, whom he describes as a good Catholic, though nominally a Protestant.

examined closely into the question. It appeared that tythe agistment had never been demanded in Ireland before the year 1722, that the claims of it from that period to 1735 had been few and partial. The Commons therefore resolved that the claim was a *new* claim, and that all legal measures ought to be resorted to for opposing it, until a legislative measure should be taken.[1] This declaration of the Commons was never followed up by a law, but the claim of tythe agistment was from that time abandoned by the clergy, and has neither been since demanded nor paid, and the question on the subject supposed to be entirely at rest. It was therefore the unanimous opinion of His Majesty's chief servants, that however tythe agistment was still demandable in law, yet that after such a period, viz. sixty-five years, no clergyman could be hardy enough to demand it, that the recovery of it would be almost impossible, and that the attempt would be highly unjust and would create resistance.

They then agreed, in which the Archbishop of Cashel acquiesced, that it would be highly politic to check at once the ferment which was rising on the subject, by a Bill, but if nothing were done before the recess, the mischief which might happen during the assizes might render any further remedy of no avail. Accordingly the Lord Chancellor drew a short Bill to remove all doubts on the point, and to enact that tythe agistment should not be in future demandable, and Lord Castlereagh, after some observations upon Sir John Macartney's speech, and the use it was already turned to for inflaming the country, introduced the Bill this day, when it was read a first time in the House of Commons.

This measure has given the highest satisfaction to our friends, has completely disappointed Opposition, and I doubt not will receive the approbation of your Grace and His Majesty's servants.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE EARL OF FINGALL.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 26, 1800.

The letter which your Lordship has done me the honour to address to me in the name of yourself and of the Catholic Peers of

[1] The question was debated March 18, 1735, and, among others, the three following resolutions were carried:—1. That the demand of Tythe of Agistment for dry and barren cattle is new, grievous, and burdensome to landholders and tenants. 2. That commencing suits on these new demands must impair the Protestant interest, and encourage the Popish religion. On this question the House divided, Ayes 110, Noes 50. 3. That all legal means of resistance should be made use of.

this country, accords most perfectly with the liberal, loyal, and patriotic line of conduct, which your Lordship and the other Peers of your religious persuasion, have uniformly pursued during the course of the unfortunate troubles which have brought this kingdom to the brink of destruction. When I submit the contents of your Lordship's letter to His Majesty, I shall not fail to represent the advantages which his Government has derived from the meritorious services of the principal Catholic nobility and gentry of Ireland.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 28, 1800.

It is with the truest satisfaction that I am enabled to submit to your Grace this evening, the joint Address of both Houses of Parliament to His Majesty, accompanied by the resolutions they have passed in favour of a legislative Union with Great Britain.

By the exertions of the Chancellor all the Union resolutions passed through the Committee of the Lords on Monday last, with little opposition, except from Lord Farnham and Lord Bellamont. They were reported on Wednesday, and agreed to by a majority of 50, the contents present being 48, the proxies 24; the non-contents present 16, proxies 6.

Yesterday the amendments made by the Lords were brought down to the Commons, and were forthwith taken into consideration, and agreed to without a division. Lord Castlereagh then moved an Address to His Majesty in order to lay the resolutions before him, which, after some observations from Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Dawson, was agreed to. The Address was then sent to the Lords for their concurrence, who forthwith approved it, and it was resolved that the two Houses should attend me this day at four o'clock, which they have accordingly done.

The resolutions had been sent up from the Commons in an embarrassed order, which the Speaker had prevented from being rectified. The Chancellor, however, took care that this defect in the proceedings should be remedied, and by His Lordship's attention the resolutions were sent back to the Commons, in the form and order in which they are transmitted, and which I trust will prove to be correct and satisfactory.

I have received your Grace's despatch of the 25th instant marked private and confidential. I am highly gratified by the marked approbation which His Majesty's servants have expressed of my conduct.

Lord Castlereagh, to whom I have communicated their sentiments respecting his exertions and abilities, is truly sensible of so flattering a testimony in his favour. But when I make his Lordship's acknowledgments to His Majesty's Ministers for that testimony, I feel the sincerest pleasure in saying that it by no means exceeds his merits.

I am happy to find from your Grace, that His Majesty's servants see every probability that the Articles of Union may pass the two Houses of the British Parliament without difficulty or delay, so as to be returned to this kingdom by the 29th of April, to which day your Grace proposes our two Houses should adjourn. I am, however, afraid that the survey which is preparing of the boroughs of Ireland, will not be entirely completed by that period, and as it might be prejudicial if the two Houses should meet till every detail for completing the measure of Union be entirely ready, I have thought it right, upon consideration of the subject with Lord Castlereagh, to propose that the adjournment last till the 12th day of May. I trust this difference in point of time will be of no consequence to the question; and it is of great importance that Parliament should not again assemble, till every measure can be brought forward with despatch and accuracy, which may be necessary to complete the Union. I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, March 29, 1800.

I have received the honour of your Grace's letters of the 26th instant, and congratulate you very sincerely on the success of Lord Nelson and on the favourable fall of Genoa and of the future exertions of the Austrian arms.[1]

Your Grace will soon have been relieved from the apprehension of extraordinary delay in passing our resolutions which was occasioned by Lord Clare's letter. There certainly was at the time he wrote great appearance of ill-humour and dissatisfaction amongst our best friends in the House of Lords; but the alteration which I ventured to make of restricting the creations to one for three, instead of two, vacancies until the number shall be reduced to one hundred, had a wonderful effect. I propose to send Mr. Cooke to

[1] The rumours of the day were unfounded. Lord Nelson's success, the account of which reached London on the night of the 26th, was confined to the capture of the Généreux, and of a fleet of transports destined for the relief of Malta. Nor was Genoa taken, but intelligence arrived the same day of the rapid advance of the Austrians under Generals Ott and Klenau to invest that town, which it was believed would surrender to the first summons.

England, who next to Lord Castlereagh will be able to afford you the most useful assistance whilst the Bill is passing through the British Parliament. It gives me very sincere satisfaction to find that His Majesty's confidential servants are so sensible of the extraordinary talents and good services of Lord Castlereagh, to whom the success of this great and most difficult undertaking ought in justice to be principally attributed. I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin, April 2, 1800.

As the opposers of the Union in England will probably build much upon the alleged repugnance of this country to the measure, it may be useful that Mr. Pitt should be in possession of the declarations and petitions which have at different times appeared on either side. I have therefore the honour of enclosing a list of each. The petitions presented to Parliament have been more numerously signed than the addresses and declarations in favour of the measure, which were in general studiously confined to a superior description of persons; but the preponderance of property is undoubtedly on the side of the latter; in the House of Peers, composed of so large a proportion of the landed proprietors, and amounting in number (including bishops) to 230, not more than 27 are hostile; the balance of property in the Commons, though not in the same degree, is strongly in favour of Union, and throughout the kingdom at large, I think we are fully warranted in asserting that, however numbers may stand, the measure has been supported by a majority of the well-attached proprietors.

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

P.S. Underneath is an abstract of the best analysis we have been able to make of the annual landed income of the supporters and opposers of Union in the two Houses of Parliament; I believe the whole is under-estimated:—

	For.		Against.
Resident Peers	£606,800	..	£179,000
Bishops	80,000	..	6,000
Commoners	268,900	..	144,500
	955,700	..	329,500
Absentee Peers	102,500	..	29,000
	£1,058,200		£358,500

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, April 5, 1800.

. . . The adjournment of our Parliament has afforded me an opportunity of getting out of the constant worry to which I am subject at Dublin, and of looking over the papers respecting the corps of Engineers. . . .

A considerable flame will certainly be raised in the country by the anti-Unionists, but I am more afraid of the Yorkshire clothiers from some *private* hints which I have received. Our patriotic Speaker did not pay an idle visit to Harrowgate last autumn.[1]

The preparations at Brest must surely be intended against this country, although I am not clear that our Ministers are disposed to believe it. The French have certainly some hazards to run in getting to us, but so they must whatever may be their destination, and there can be no object so important as an attack on Ireland.

The convention with the French in Egypt never appeared to me in so bad a light as it did to some of the people in power at home, and I was afraid that if we attempted forcibly to oppose it, we should drive the Turks into the arms of France.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CASHEL.

MY LORD, Phœnix Park, April 9, 1800.

Should your Grace see no objection, I shall be much obliged to you if you will authorise Lord Donoughmore to put your name to a letter to the High Sheriff of Tipperary, purporting that, as the sense of the county was fully ascertained by the respectable meeting held at the last assizes, you see no occasion for again convening the freeholders to agitate the question of a legislative Union.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

(Answered instanter that I readily consented to do what he requires.—C. C.)

[1] This allusion will be best explained by an extract from a letter from Lord Auckland, then President of the Board of Trade, to Viscount Castlereagh, written in April, and dated Wednesday, ¼ past 5.

"MY DEAR LORD,

"In confidence—in the course of our discussion one of the ablest and most candid of the deputation told me this moment, that Mr. Foster had last year put them all on their guard, when he was in Yorkshire, by asking what would become of their woollen trade.

"Believe me, &c.,
"AUCKLAND."

The deputation had been sent up from Yorkshire to oppose several parts of the commercial resolutions.

EDWARD COOKE, ESQ., TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

[Secret.] Received April 10.

MY DEAR LORD, London, April 5, 1800.

I have seen the Duke of Portland and Mr. Pitt a second time. The Duke is anxious to send you the needful. Mr. Pitt was equally disposed, but fears it is impossible to the extent. He will continue to let you have from 8000*l.* to 10,000*l.* for five years. I hope to find out to-night what sum can be sent. . . .

Mr. Pitt approves of your taking advantage of the vacancies in the Civil List. Quere: Will the law allow you to increase the number of the Commissioners of Boards? He approves fully of what was done on the Agistment question.

There seems to be entire satisfaction in my Lord-Lieutenant's and your conduct, and you are in high feather here.

Believe me, &c.,

E. COOKE.[1]

DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Received April 11.]

MY LORD, Whitehall, April 7, 1800.

I am willing to believe that no doubt whatever can remain on your Excellency's mind, that the manner in which you have exercised the powers entrusted to you for effectuating the great measure of Union has been most acceptable to His Majesty; and that the means you have pursued have been considered by his confidential servants, as the best which could have been taken to secure the accomplishment of that important event. I therefore think it unnecessary to repeat the approbation which I have already expressed to you of the determination you formed to concede to the wishes of the House of Peers (whose exemplary conduct in the course of this great business entitles them to every possible mark of consideration, and must secure to them the gratitude of their latest posterity), a farther limitation of the prerogative of the Crown in the creation of members of that illustrious body; nor shall I recur to the alteration which Lord Castlereagh so properly consented to adopt respecting the duties on manufactured cotton, except to take notice of the observations with which he so judiciously accompanied that concession in his place in the House of Commons, as well as in his conferences with

[1] In a later letter to Lord Castlereagh, dated London, May 6, Mr. Cooke says, "I set out for Ireland to-morrow morning; I do not come quite empty-handed."

the deputation on the part of the manufacturers, in which he warned them against the possible effects of such requisitions; but as I have hitherto passed over in silence the measure you were forced to determine upon respecting the tithes of agistment, I feel it incumbent upon me to remove every degree of suspense which you may have experienced upon account of it, by assuring you of the entire concurrence of His Majesty's servants in the propriety of it, and that according to your statement of the circumstances of the case, had time admitted of it, you would have received full power to act exactly as you have done. The revival of a claim that had been originally brought forward and treated in its first appearance in the manner your Excellency has described, and that has now lain so long dormant, places the motives you assigned for it beyond a possibility of doubt; and although the candour and good disposition of the churchmen of this day, and the general sense of the laity, would have afforded ample security against any attempt to establish such a right, I cannot be sorry that means have been given you to quiet every apprehension of the sort, and at the same time to do justice to the real intentions of the clergy, as well as to demonstrate those of the Parliament and of Government. When I had the honour of laying before the King your Excellency's despatch of the 27th ult., containing Lord Fingal's letter to you of the 7th, and your answer to him of the 26th, His Majesty was pleased to express his approbation of the Earl's conduct, and that which the other Peers of the same persuasion have pursued during the course of the late troubles, and at the same time to authorise your Excellency to assure them that His Majesty would always hold their meritorious services in remembrance. His Majesty did not fail to observe the caution with which your answer was dictated, and the attention which it manifested to the sentiments which had been communicated to you in the despatch I had some time since the honour of writing to you upon this subject. I have had the pleasure of conversing very much at length with Mr. Cooke upon the subjects which you gave him in charge, and I trust we shall be enabled to give you every facility which you will find necessary for bringing the great work you have in hand to an happy and glorious issue; as we deemed it our duty to renounce the advantage of Lord Castlereagh's assistance here, we are sensible your Excellency could not have supplied his place with more ability than by means of Mr. Cooke; you certainly could not have chosen any person who could have executed such a commission with more zeal, fidelity, and talent, and his knowledge and experience are too well known not to insure us

every assistance that can be wished for, in enabling us to return this business to you in such a state as will not leave you in any doubt of its ultimate success.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, April 18, 1800.

. . . You are quite mistaken if you suppose that I enjoy more leisure from the present Parliamentary recess. On the contrary, I am more occupied than ever, as Lord Castlereagh is gone into the North to contend with Lord Downshire, and has taken Elliot with him, and Cooke is in England, so that I have all the Civil business on my hands, in addition to the Military details, and the judicial management of a considerable part of the country, which is principally governed by martial law. But if I was perfectly idle, I should be afraid to mention the idea of incorporating the two Ordnance establishments until the business of Union is finally concluded, as it would make an alarm amongst our expectant friends, who would apprehend that any alteration in our Board would abridge the means of making good our engagements. The nearer the great event approaches, the more are the needy and interested senators alarmed at the effects it may possibly have on their interests and the provision for their families, and I believe *that half of our majority* would be at least as much delighted as any of our opponents, if the measure could be defeated.

I trust therefore that Mr. Pitt will be able to return the Bill without any alterations.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE REV. BENJAMIN GRISDALE.

DEAR GRISDALE, Phœnix Park, April 21, 1800.

I received your letter with great pleasure, for although I have not much time to write to my friends, I have great satisfaction in hearing from them.

Our Union is, I trust, in a fair way; if the Bill in England is framed upon our resolutions without alteration, I can have no doubt of our success. How soon that measure will work my delivery, I cannot at present venture to guess. The word Union will not cure the evils of this wretched country; it is a necessary preliminary, but a great deal more must be done. My life here is wretched, and I long to pass the small remainder of it in quiet, and

am determined to retire as soon as I can reconcile it to the duty which I owe to my country. . . .

How miserably poor Lothian has misused talents which might have been useful to his family and to the public! I am sensible that he has a regard for me, for which I ought to be grateful.

Singleton is gone to England during the recess of our Parliament, but Mary remains with me, and desires her best compliments.

Dear Grisdale,

Sincerely yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, April 22, 1800.

. . . The establishment of the Engineers ought, in my opinion, to be the most favoured branch of the Military service, because it requires infinitely more science and application to dry study than any other, and it holds out fewer inducements to the tinsel and pageantry of soldiering, or of the society of a jolly mess, which are apt to operate powerfully on young minds; in short, the admission into the Engineers ought to be an object to a clever young man, who has been three or four years in the regiment of artillery. But as at my time of life, and with the sentiments which I feel towards some of my late colleagues,[1] it is not likely that I should establish any important reform, and as I see no prospect of any essential improvement in our military system (for I am afraid that a heavy hat and feather, a buttoned coat, and a cursed sash tied round our waist, will not lead the way to victory), I shall not choose to hazard any ill-humour on the part of the officers of artillery, who have certainly very considerable merit, and shall not for the present persevere in the proposed addition of a Lieut.-Colonel, although in my conscience I think it the best part of the plan, and, if Lord Howe pleases, the other part of the augmentation may go on.

The anti-Unionists have hitherto had very little cause to plume themselves on their success in the country; if any change has taken place in the public mind, it appears to have been in favour of the measure, and Dublin itself, although undoubtedly very averse to the Union, is in a state of more perfect tranquillity than it has ever before enjoyed. The Downshire assizes came on yesterday.

[1] Lord Cornwallis alludes to the Cabinet, of which of course he had ceased to form a part when he went to Ireland.

The grand jury, allowed by the enemy to have been most impartially chosen, and composed of the persons most respectable in point of character and property, were fifteen to eight against the Marquis. Lord Castlereagh writes from thence in great spirits. If you make no alteration about the wool,[1] there can be no doubt of success.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LIEUT.-COLONEL LITTLEHALES TO VISCOUNT DONOUGHMORE.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, April 28, 1800.

The suggestion contained in your communication of the 26th inst., relative to the freeholders, who are tenants of Lord Llandaff, has claimed that attention which it merits, and it is to be presumed, that from the steps that have been taken, the exertions and interference of Lord Matthew will be frustrated.

I am much concerned that your Lordship has put that construction upon Major-General Hutchinson's letter (which I sent for your private information), that neither Lord Cornwallis nor I placed upon it, and his Excellency requests that in the event of your Lordship having written to him, you will take the trouble of doing away any impression that may create in his mind the least anxiety or disquietude, as I can conscientiously assure you that Lord Cornwallis was much gratified that I had heard from him, and perfectly pleased with his communication.

I send you an extract of a letter from Lord Dorchester.

The article of the Union, in regard to Representation, was carried in the House of Commons on the 25th instant; Mr. Grey moved an instruction for securing the independence of Parliament. The object was to reduce the Irish members to 85, and to extinguish 20 English boroughs. The Committee divided 176 to 36 against his motion.

Sir Alan Gardner[2] sailed from Torbay to cruize off Brest on the 26th current, with 35 sail-of-the-line.

I have, &c.,

E. B. LITTLEHALES.

[1] Much jealousy existed between the Irish and English manufacturers of wool, the latter of whom thought the former had been too much favoured. The English manufacturers were heard before the House of Commons April 28 and 29, but the evidence did not induce the House to alter the scale laid down in the resolutions, which were carried, May 1, by 133 to 58.

[2] Rear-Admiral Sir Alan Gardner, Bart., afterwards Admiral of the Blue, created Lord Gardner in Ireland, Dec. 29, 1800, and in

EARL OF DORCHESTER TO LIEUT.-COLONEL LITTLEHALES.

Dorchester House, April 25, 1800.

. . . I had the honour the day before yesterday of receiving your letter of the 18th, and should have been extremely mortified had there been the smallest hesitation on your part, or in the opinion of my Lord Cornwallis, in suggesting what you did to Lord Donoughmore. I hope the measure will have the desired effect, and make all the Bagwells in the county as sensible of their own stupidity, as we are of their duplicity. . . .

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, May 2, 1800.

The grand Mediterranean expedition is, I find, given up, which affords me great satisfaction, as I saw no possible advantage that could be derived from it, that would compensate for a twentieth part of the certain loss and expense. I mentioned my doubts on the wisdom of the measure to one of the Ministers,[1] who I believe did not himself see it in a very favourable light.

We are most impatiently looking to the decision of the British Parliament on the woollen business, on the event of which I think the success of our great measure entirely depends. By our last express, dated Tuesday night, I understand Mr. Pitt had said that he thought the petitioners had made out no case.

It appeared evidently at the last assizes that the Unionists had rather gained ground in most places, and Lord Downshire was totally discomfited in the county of Down, and sneaked off to Donaghadee, on his return to England.

Nightingall is here on his way to ——[2]. I dare not commit any more to paper.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

England Nov. 15, 1806; b. April 12, 1742, d. Jan. 1, 1809; m. May 29, 1769, Susanna, dau. and sole heir of Francis Gale, Esq., of Liguania in Jamaica. M.P. for Plymouth Jan. 1790, to 1796, and for Westminster till created a peer. Lord of the Admiralty from Jan. 1790 to March, 1795.

[1] Probably Mr. Dundas, but the letter cannot be found among his papers.

[2] Colonel Nightingall had just received orders, which he was to keep most secret, to take the command of the corps to be embarked at Cork, and which was intended to make a false attack at Quiberon, to mask the real intention of besieging Bellisle.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin, May 9, 1800.

We met yesterday and have adjourned to Monday, by which day I hope we shall be fully prepared to proceed without intermission; the Opposition did not oppose the adjournment. Sir L. Parsons expressed his surprise that Government should think of reviving this odious measure, to the sincerity of which declaration the House bore general testimony by a loud laugh. Our friends were with few exceptions at their post and in high spirits; Mr. Pitt has given us every advantage by his firmness in resisting any alteration of the articles which can at all embarrass us.

I have written to Mr. Rose relative to the counteracting duties, which seem now to be our only remaining question.

Ever, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private and Secret.] Received May 10.

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, May 7, 1800.

. . . His Majesty has just informed me that Lord Downshire has been at Windsor on Sunday, to justify himself to His Majesty for the conduct he had pursued in opposing the question of Union. On which His Majesty observed to him, that if any person had told His Majesty that he (Lord D.) would have held such a conduct, H. M. would have insisted, considering what had passed between them (H. M. and Lord D.), that it was absolutely impossible. I have not time to enter into further particulars, and can only add that His Majesty farther observed to me, that by the doubts which Lord D. stated his having intimated to the Major of his regiment in a private letter he wrote to him of the propriety of his (the Major) signing the petition against the Union as an officer, Lord D. admitted that he was conscious of the impropriety of that proceeding. . . . I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 13, 1800.

In consequence of the assurances I had received that the Resolutions on the subject of Union would arrive previous to the

sitting of this Parliament on yesterday, I had directed the necessary measures to be prepared for commencing business as early as possible.

About two o'clock yesterday I had the satisfaction to receive your Grace's despatch of the 10th instant, inclosing the Resolutions as agreed to by the two Houses of the Parliament of Great Britain, together with their joint address to His Majesty, and desiring me to communicate them as speedily as possible to the two Houses of the Irish Parliament.

I accordingly sent a message to the two Houses, of which the inclosed is a copy.

In the Lords, the Chancellor, after presenting it, moved for its being considered on Wednesday.

In the Commons, Lord Castlereagh moved that the consideration should take place to-day, and also moved a Committee to consider the alterations which had been made in Great Britain.

This Committee will report at four o'clock, but it is not certain that the alterations can be agreed to this day, as, should Opposition object that they cannot be prepared to agree in the alterations till time is allowed to consider them, it may be necessary to concede a day or two for that purpose.

Lord Castlereagh also moved for leave to bring in a Bill to regulate the mode in which the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, to serve in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, are to be summoned and returned.

This produced a short debate. Mr. O'Donnell, Colonel Barry, Sir J. Parnell, and Mr. G. Ponsonby, argued that such a motion was informal, and ought not to be pressed till the House confirm the proceedings of the British Parliament. Lord Castlereagh and the Chancellor of the Exchequer supported the motion, on the ground that they wished as early as possible to put the House in possession of all the measures necessary to complete the Union.

The House divided between five and six in the evening. For giving the leave 135, against 80.

Lord Castlereagh then moved that the Bill should be printed and read a second time on Wednesday. His Lordship then moved for a return of hearth-money and window-tax paid by the several towns sending members to Parliament, in order to ascertain those which are hereafter to send representatives to the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

The city is perfectly tranquil, the tone of the House of Commons was by no means violent; but I am not yet assured as to the

line Opposition mean to adopt. They certainly do not seem to express any hope of being able to defeat the measure.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The selection of the boroughs to be retained was a matter of some difficulty. If open boroughs only were to be chosen, some of the most corrupt would remain. It was therefore determined to retain those which paid the largest sums in hearth-money and window-tax; and on examination it appeared, that whether the criterion to be adopted was only the payment made in the last year, or the average of two or three years, doubts could arise only in the case of very few boroughs, namely Mullingar, Monaghan, Enniskillen, Strabane, and Carrickfergus. Ultimately Carrickfergus and Enniskillen were selected.

Of the 34 boroughs, including Dublin University, which were to continue to return members, Lord Castlereagh considered that twelve were close, viz. Belfast, Clonmell, Armagh, Sligo, Carlow, Ennis, Coleraine, Tralee, Cashel, Dungannon, Portarlington, and Enniskillen. He might have added, Athlone, Bandon, Dundalk, Dungarvan, Kilkenny, Kinsale, Lisburn, New Ross, Wexford, and Youghal; as in each of these boroughs there was such a strong prevailing interest as to prevent all possibility of a successful opposition; in fact, a contest had scarcely ever occurred in any of them. It will thus be seen that 12 only were really open boroughs. That the selection was a judicious one may be safely inferred, as no opposition was offered to the list proposed.

COLONEL MAITLAND TO WILLIAM HUSKISSON,[1] ESQ.

DEAR HUSKISSON, Dublin Castle, May 14, 1800.

. . . This country is now more quiet than it has been for years; indeed, if it continues to be governed on the principles on which Lord Cornwallis acts, I think we may look for the speedy and solid re-establishment of permanent tranquillity throughout the whole of it. But it is his conduct, and not the disposition of the partys here which has led to the present calm; the same disposition to

[1] Mr., afterwards Right Hon. William Huskisson, b. March 11, 1770, killed Sept. 15, 1830, by an accident on opening the first railway completed in England, Liverpool and Manchester; m. April 6, 1799, Elizabeth, dau. of Admiral Milbanke. M.P. for Morpeth, Sept. 1796 to 1802; Liskeard, Feb. 1804 to 1807; Harwich to 1812; Chichester to 1823, and Liverpool till his death. Under-Secretary at War, 1796 to 1801; Secretary to the Treasury, 1804 to Feb. 1806; successively First Commissioner of Woods and Forests, Aug. 1814, Treasurer of the Navy and President of the Board of Trade, 1823, and Secretary of State, 1827, to May, 1828.

violence on all sides which originally existed, still prevails, and if the Orange Government had for a day the government of the country, there cannot be a doubt their violence would throw it back into a state of anarchy and confusion.

It has been most fortunate indeed for the interests of Great Britain, that the Government of Ireland was put into the hands of a person whose moderation led him to draw a middle line between the extremes of party violence—whose good sense has induced him to discriminate and to see through all the views of the men with whom he had to deal—and whose firmness has not only kept in check all their absurdity, but for a time has completely put down all their hopes of following and succeeding in their own plans, which must either have ended in the extirpation of the inhabitants, or the ruin of the country. If his plans be hereafter steadily followed, Ireland will be a jewel—if changed, a thorn—in the British Empire. It requires a person to be here only a day or two to be convinced of this, for though the Lord Lieutenant's measures may some of them not be popular in themselves, still from the general opinion entertained of the perfect rectitude of his intention, it is impossible any measure of his can be unpopular, because such has been the fairness of his conduct to everyone, that all are convinced whatever he proposes is meant for the public good. The success of the Union is greatly to be attributed to his conduct and not to management.

Yours, &c.,

T. MAITLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.[1]

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, May 18, 1800.

You will be glad to hear that we are going on extremely well; some of the most difficult points, especially the selection of the boroughs that are to send members, have been carried without opposition; the country is perfectly quiet, and cannot in general be said to be adverse to the Union. We are to have a Parliamentary battle on Wednesday next, on bringing in the Union Bill, and if we then make as good a division as we expect, there will be little further contest.

Lord Castlereagh has improved so much as a speaker as to become nearly master of the House of Commons; and the gratification of national pride, which the Irish feel at the prospect of his making a figure in the great political world, have much diminished the unpopularity which his cold and distant manners in private society had produced.

Maitland and Nightingall[1] have been here in their way to Cork; I can say nothing more about them. We are preparing troops for embarkation, and I am sorry to say that we find it very difficult to pick out four serviceable battalions from the corps that were completed from the English militia. Affairs look ill on the Continent; I wish we may not repent our last message to Buonaparte.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

From the correspondence preserved in the War Department it would appear that Lord Cornwallis was early made acquainted with the proposed expedition.

Colonel Maitland writes from Berkeley Square on March 28, 1800:—"I am extremely confirmed by the favourable opinion Lord Cornwallis seems to entertain of the probable success, provided we have decent troops. In a letter to me, his Lordship says, 'I was ordered to prepare three regiments for Sir Charles Stuart, and selected those for him which were reported to be in the best order, which renders it less likely that you will be able to get such men as would suit you. I should therefore recommend you to get two or three old regiments sent to Cork, and will take care to station them in the most convenient manner for embarkation.'"

In another letter he urges compliance with Lord Cornwallis's suggestion, and says the best moment for acting, is when Sir C. Stuart has drawn off the attention of the enemy.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, May 20, 1800.

I am sensible how much your Grace must have been occupied in consequence of the late horrid attempt on His Majesty's life, and am the more grateful to you for the communication which you have been so good as to make to me on the occasion. Notwithstanding the warmth of our late political differences, His Majesty's providential escape will afford the most heartfelt gratification to his Irish subjects in general, and I am convinced that Unionists and Anti-Unionists will zealously concur in the warmest expression of their congratulations.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] They were about to embark with the expedition alluded to May 2. Lord Cornwallis had selected the most efficient regiments then in Ireland to form part of that corps.

The King was reviewing a battalion of the Guards in Hyde Park on May 15, when, in one of the volleys, a ball-cartridge was fired, and a Mr. Ongley, who was standing about eight yards from the King, was severely wounded. Whether this was an accident, or whether it was intentional, was never ascertained, as the man who fired the shot could not be discovered. The same evening, as the King was entering his box at Drury Lane Theatre, he was shot at by Hatfield, who was tried for high treason, but acquitted on the ground of insanity, and confined in Bedlam, where he died Jan. 23, 1841.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, May 21, 1800.

. . . We have got through the two material points of the selection of the boroughs and the countervailing duties. There will be a debate this day on bringing in the Bill of Union, when we expect to make at least as good a division as we have hitherto done, and the Opposition say that perhaps they may give us another day; but they admit the thing to be over, and that they have no chance either in or out of Parliament.

I can hardly form an opinion respecting my own stay in the country. My private wishes most earnestly prompt me to endeavour to get away as soon as possible, whilst my public duty tells me that I ought to attend to circumstances, and not to press for my leave to return if there should be a likelihood of its being attended with serious mischief.

The Ministers know very little about this country, and they take an interested, violent, and prejudiced party, who call themselves friends to England and to the Protestant interest, for the people of Ireland. If a successor was to be appointed who should, as almost all former Lords-Lieutenant have done, throw himself into the hands of this party, no advantage would be derived from the Union. This party, however, must be treated with management and attention, and I have been so fortunate as to retain in a great degree their good will, and at the same time to have acquired the confidence of the Catholics. I am sensible that if the gentlemen whom I have described above were to look over me whilst I am writing, they would smile at my saying that I have the confidence of the Catholics, for the first principle of their faith is, that the Catholics never can be good subjects to our Government, and would cut all our throats if they could. I have, however, pretty clearly shown in the progress of the great measure in which we

have been engaged, to all those who have eyes, and temper to make use of them, that my influence on the Catholic body has not been inconsiderable. You will easily understand that I cannot, either in consideration of my own character or the public safety, leave them as I found them. I have raised no unauthorised expectations, and have acted throughout with the sanction of the Cabinet. The period of my return, therefore, however ardently I wish for it, must still remain in a degree of uncertainty.

I wish you may be right about continental matters, I confess that I am not so sanguine.[1] Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 22, 1800.

I have the satisfaction to acquaint your Grace that when Lord Castlereagh yesterday adverted to the late providential escape which His Majesty has experienced, the House unanimously burst forth into the most general manifestation of loyalty. Sir Lawrence Parsons, on the part of Opposition, took the occasion of declaring that however the House was unfortunately divided as to the great measure in question, that with regard to affection and attachment to their Sovereign, solicitude for his preservation, and admiration of his virtues, there was but one sentiment. The address to His Majesty being passed, Lord Castlereagh moved for leave to bring in a Bill for the Union of Great Britain and Ireland. His Lordship had some days since given notice that he would make this motion, and it had been given out that Opposition intended to muster all their strength, and to exert all their abilities to resist it. It appeared, however, that although they wished to bring together all the opposers of the question, the leaders of the party did not think it prudent to debate it. Mr. George Ponsonby, who has been considered as the chief conductor of Opposition, made only a very short speech, saying that he considered all arguments useless, that he could not hope to change the determination of the majority, but that he would still oppose the measure in every stage till its conclusion. Upon this declaration it appeared to Lord Castlereagh and the chief friends of Government, that it would be of no use to provoke a discussion which seemed to be declined by the leaders of Opposition, and the debate which took place was occupied by Mr. Ball[2]

[1] The surrender of Genoa was imminent; it took place June 4: but the success of Moreau in Germany led Lord Cornwallis to anticipate serious disasters. In fact, Bonaparte had crossed the St. Bernard six days before the date of this letter.

[2] John Ball, a barrister, b. 1755, d. 1813; m. Sept. 1791, Miss Osborn, of Dandiston, a

and Mr. Gould, two barristers, by Mr. O'Donnel, Mr. H. Osborne, and Sir L. Parsons, on the part of Opposition. Mr. Holmes,[1] Mr. Martin, Mr. Latouche, Sir Henry Cavendish, and Dr. Browne spoke on the side of Administration. The manner in which the debate was conducted showed that the House was tired with the discussion of the subject, and there was manifest indisposition to enter seriously into fresh debate.

The House divided about eleven o'clock; for giving leave 160, against 100. Four of our supporters were locked out, and one friend of Opposition.

Lord Castlereagh then presented the Union Bill, and an attempt was made to prevent its being read, but after a short resistance it was read the first time, ordered to be printed, and to be read a second time on Monday next. I understand there is to be a general meeting of Opposition to-day to consult as to their future conduct. From circumstances which have come to my knowledge there is much reason to believe they will not adhere together, as many gentlemen were most unwillingly detained in town even till yesterday. The city is perfectly quiet, and has shown no sensation on the subject of Union since the recommencement of business after the adjournment.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 27, 1800.

After the Union Bill had been read a second time yesterday in the Commons, Mr. Grattan rose to oppose its committal. He adverted to the arguments used by Mr. Pitt in the discussion of the subject; he went through the objections which had been stated by the Speaker in former debates, and concluded with an inflammatory address to the feelings of the country. He emphatically stated that by union this kingdom would be reduced to a state of slavery; but that the liberty of the people was immortal; it would rise again like the sun, and the nation would recover its rights.

Lord Castlereagh thought this language deserved animadversion. His Lordship said that he conceived this was not a period to argue the measure in detail. The subject had been so often and so fully

Roman Catholic. Made Second Serjeant in 1806. M.P. for Drogheda from 1795 till the Union.

[1] Peter Holmes, b. about 1737, d. Oct. 29, 1845; m. Feb. 22, 1765, Elizabeth, dau. of Henry Prittie, Esq. Comptroller of Stamps and then Secretary to the Board, from April, 1799, to Feb. 1824. M.P. for Banagher from 1768 to 1790; Killmallock, to 1797; Doneraile, to the Union.

discussed by all the abilities of the House and of the nation, that there was no man whose mind was not settled on the subject; he should therefore only observe on the close of Mr. Grattan's speech. He then congratulated the House that Opposition gave up every hope of immediate resistance, and had adjourned that measure *sine die;* and that, despairing of present convulsions, they were forced to deal in prophetic treason, and to predict distant rebellion. But he was as little alarmed with their prospects of future confusion, as he had been terrified by their menace of immediate resistance. He then censured Mr. Grattan for inviting future rebellion by cloaking it with the idea of liberty, and he asked whether it was the part of a good citizen to excite the people against a new system, which every man felt must immediately become the law of the land. All he wished was that the measure should have fair play, that it should be left to be judged by its own merits and effects, and that the public mind should not be poisoned against it, so as to prevent its true operation being felt and acknowledged. Sir J. Parnell followed, repeated his objections to the measure, and defended Mr. Grattan from the imputation of treason; and he limited Mr. Grattan's meaning to the idea that the Union would prove so fatal a measure, that the Sovereign would recommend it to the United Parliament to dissolve it.

Mr. O'Donnel and Mr. May, Mr. Burrowes, and Mr. Plunket spoke afterwards; the latter re-asserted the incompetence of Parliament, argued the nullity of the measure, and supported Mr. Grattan in the idea that the people would be justified in recovering their liberties. The House divided early on the question of committal—for, 118; against, 73.

Mr. Grattan then rose and moved that the Bill should be committed on the 1st of September. He took this opportunity of replying with much acrimony and invective to Lord Castlereagh's animadversions, and endeavoured as much as possible to invite personal altercation. He made general charges of puerility, arrogance, and presumption. He said that Lord Castlereagh's assertion, that the measure was agreeable to the sense of the people, was contrary to known fact; and that the assertion that he was exciting the people to future treason and rebellion was a direct and manifest untruth, if the expression of prophetic treason was in the slightest degree imputed to what he had delivered.

Lord Castlereagh rose with great coolness in reply; he said that he never should enter into personal altercation in that House; that he despised that parade of Parliamentary spirit which led to nothing, and which denied in offensive terms what had been never

uttered; that if any personal incivility were used to him, it was not in Parliament he should answer it, and that he should carefully avoid making himself an object for the interference of the House. His Lordship then appealed to the House with respect to Mr. Grattan's language, and the fairness of those inferences he had deduced from it; that he had stated an Union would produce a state of slavery; that the people would not long submit to the loss of their liberty, and would rise to recover it; and his Lordship then asked whether the result of this language was not a prophecy of future treason. He did not say that the honourable gentleman meant that the treason should follow, or that he would assist in it, but he argued that this language, however intended, might produce treason, which if it were not used would not happen.

He then adverted to the construction given to Mr. Grattan's language by Mr. Plunket and Sir J. Parnell: the one had considered it as justifying resistance, in which case he was warranted in the inferences he had used; the latter had explained it as meaning a dissolution of the Union by a measure of the United Parliament recommended by the Sovereign; and if this explanation was given, he allowed it to be innocent and satisfactory. His Lordship concluded a spirited and able reply, with congratulating the House on the progress of the Union to a state of permanent stability. It had been at first stated that the measure could not succeed, as it would be attended with immediate rebellion. That ground was given up, and the House was threatened with the consequence of future resistance and insurrection. But this menace no sooner was uttered than it was retracted, and the only danger which threatened the Union was stated to reside in the United Parliament, who hereafter would dissolve it and separate the two kingdoms again, upon the recommendation of the Sovereign. This was an event so highly improbable, that if the permanence of the Union were to rest upon such a contingency, he could wish it no greater security.

I understand Lord Castlereagh's reply gave very general satisfaction, and was considered as a signal proof of his ready judgment as well as of his abilities.

A second division at this period took place—for Mr. Grattan's motion, 87; against, 124. A debate then took place on Lord Castlereagh's motion for committing the Bill on Friday next, which lasted till near eleven o'clock without anything material occurring. About that time all the friends of Government, who had not expected an early division, were arrived, and Opposition declined to divide when the question was put.

I do not believe that Opposition mean to make it a point with

their members to remain in town any longer, but it is intended to make resistance by speaking upon the remaining stages of the measure.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

EDWARD COOKE, ESQ., TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, May 27, 1800.

The debate last night on the commitment of the Union Bill took at first a personal tone. Grattan led, and after a speech of some length, concluded by saying that Union was slavery, and that the people would rise to recover their liberties; that he would wait here, here, here—till the moment arrived. Lord Castlereagh reprobated this language, and called it prophetic treason and rebellion. Shortly the House divided—for committing, 118; against, 73. Grattan then conceiving, I suppose, that Lord Castlereagh still meant to pin treason upon him, made a gross invective against Lord Castlereagh. Puerility, insolence, arrogance, presumption, were dealt by him liberally, and he then stated that he had obliquely insinuated charges he dared not make directly, and that if in using prophetic treason Lord Castlereagh had in the slightest degree insinuated that he meant treason or rebellion, or professed so in his speech, he was guilty of the most foul, direct, and manifest untruth.

Lord Castlereagh replied with dignity, and pretty much in the manner stated in the Dublin Journal, except that he said that he despised the idle parade of Parliamentary spirit *which led to nothing*.

Lord Castlereagh's reply raised him much in the estimation of the House, and the general feeling was that he had completely shaken off the attack upon his adversary. He felt, however, that all was not quite settled and explained as he could wish, and rather wanted to send Grattan a message, and his friends have with great difficulty dissuaded him. The fact is that the whole House was completely satisfied; he rose in their opinion; there was no rumour that it was expected he should go further; we thought he would let himself down by doing so, and that it would be quitting the high ground on which he stood. I think therefore he has finally acquiesced in his friends' advice, which has been sincere and well considered.

Sir J. Crawfurd[1] was present, an impartial man; his observa-

[1] Sir James Crawfurd, Bart., b. Oct. 20, 1762, d. July 9, 1839; m. March 2, 1792, Maria Theresa, dau. of General the Hon. Thomas Gage, and sister of Henry, 3rd Viscount Gage. He was British Resident at Hamburgh from 1798 to 1803, during which time he effected the capture of Tandy and his companions. Afterwards Minister at Copenhagen.

tion was that Lord Castlereagh had fairly thrown Grattan on his back.

We are all perfectly contented with what has taken place. We do not expect any more divisions. The second division last night was 124 to 87; afterwards, when the House was full, the Opposition would not divide. The debate lasted till eleven. No new topics have been started. Be so good as to show this to Lord Camden.

Most truly yours,

E. COOKE.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 28, 1800.

. . . Under these circumstances I have not been enabled fully to comply with His Majesty's commands; but I inclose to your Grace two papers, which I trust may answer the object of the Address. The first is a return of those members of the Irish House of Commons who hold civil offices of any kind whatever, specifying the salaries annexed thereto, and stating the nature of their tenure. The second paper states those offices, the holders of which by particular Acts of Parliament are not permitted to sit in the House of Commons of Ireland—from which it will of course appear that every other office in Ireland not therein enumerated, is tenable with a seat in Parliament. . . . I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

It is unnecessary to print the names contained in this list. There were 56 members holding offices at pleasure, of whom four held also offices for life; six had offices for life only, and nine were King's Counsel, or had patents of precedence. Over these fifteen, Government had of course no influence. All offices created previous to 1793 were tenable by members of Parliament, except some inferior Revenue appointments, the Secretaryships of the Revenue Boards, the Assistant-Barristerships, and a very few others of little importance.

There was some difficulty in furnishing those lists which the Duke of Portland had called for, especially the second, as if any error had been committed in the enumeration of the excepted offices, it might have interfered with the right of some person to sit in Parliament. They were therefore transmitted as memoranda, not signed by any responsible person.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, June 3, 1800.

As the time is now drawing near when we shall have a difficult and heavy account to settle, it becomes necessary that I should lose no time in laying before you such part of the engagements into which I have been obliged to enter, as will require the assistance of your Grace and His Majesty's most confidential servants. I enclose to your Grace lists of the proposed creation of Peers, of the promotions in the Peerage, and of those to be recommended by Government for the Representation. The first should be made before the Union Act receives the Royal Assent, in order that we may have their votes in the election of the representatives: the second should be deferred until the election has taken place, and the particulars be kept perfectly secret, as it can hardly be expected that it will be so arranged as not to create some dissatisfaction.

The point on which I am most pressed, is the Representative Peerage, and without a small addition to the British Peerage, I do not see how I can extricate myself with credit from the most embarrassing difficulties. One promise only of a British Peerage has hitherto been made, viz., to Lord Ely; but after the eminent services of Lord Castlereagh, there can hardly be a doubt of His Majesty's conferring that favour upon Lord Londonderry, and I was under the necessity of assuring Lord Ormonde, who, though a zealous and warm supporter of the Union, was very pertinacious on that point, that on account of my near connexion[1] with his family I would solicit a Peerage for him from His Majesty, as a personal favour to myself.

The addition of two more, making the whole number five, would greatly relieve me; and it has occurred to me that Lords Drogheda[2] and Carysfort might be the most conveniently selected for that honour, the former being the only Marquis, and the first Irish Peer in rank who does not enjoy it, and the latter having a claim from English interest and connexion to strengthen that of his good services and disinterested support in this country. For the vacant Ribbon of St. Patrick, I must recommend Lord Altamont,[3]

[1] Lady Charlotte Butler, only child of Richard, 1st Earl of Arran (son of James, only Duke of Ormonde), m. June 1, 1699, Charles, 4th Lord Cornwallis.

[2] Charles, 6th Earl and 1st Marquis of Drogheda, so made June 27, 1791, K.P., Field-Marshal, Colonel 18th Dragoons; b. June 29, 1730, d. Dec. 22, 1822; m. Feb. 15, 1766, Anne, dau. of Francis, 1st Marquis of Hertford. Master-General of the Ordnance, 1770 to 1797; Joint Postmaster-General, 1797 to 1806. M.P. for Horsham from Sept. 1776 to July, 1780. Created Lord Moore in England Jan. 17, 1801.

[3] John Denis, 3rd Earl of Altamont, made Marquis of Sligo, Dec. 29, 1800, K.P.; b.

and as it will much increase its value, I wish to be empowered to invest him with it previous to the installation, which will take place about the period of the Parliament being prorogued.

I have on this occasion thought it expedient to resist all applications from such absentees as have not come over to give their personal assistance in forwarding the measure of Union, to be Representative Peers: none under that description, who are not already British Peers, have rendered any material service; and I conceive that by a general exception of that nature, I shall avoid giving personal offence to any of them, but I shall save His Majesty's Ministers in England from importunity, and prevent jealousies on this side of the water.

Lord Inchiquin[1] wrote to me early in the business to ask to be made a Marquis; but his Lordship has no Irish influence to support his request; if, however, your Grace should wish to add his name to the four mentioned in my paper, I shall have no objection.

In the proposed creation of Earls I have to observe that as the late Lord O'Neil and Lord Bandon[2] were on the point of being promoted in Lord Camden's administration when the rebellion broke out, and the former lost his life, I recommend that they should be created a few days before the others to give them the precedence: I have promised that Lord Donoughmore's Earldom should descend to his brothers in the same manner that his title of Viscount does at present; and although Lord Gosford's son, member for the county of Armagh, took a strong part against the Union, yet as his Lordship supported us both in the county and in the House of Lords, and is of an ancient and loyal family, I did not think it just to leave him out of this promotion. Lord Kenmare's conduct gives him very strong claims to the favour of Government, and as he now finds himself the youngest Peer of that rank, to which his family have thought themselves entitled above a century, I have ventured to give him reason to hope that His Majesty will not refuse to make him an Earl.

June 11, 1756, d. Jan. 2, 1809; m. May 21, 1787, Louisa Catherine, dau. and co-heir of Richard, 1st Earl Howe.

[1] Murrough O'Brien, 5th Earl of Inchiquin, and 1st Marquis of Thomond, so made Dec. 29, 1800; b. 1723, d. Feb. 10, 1808; m. 1st, May 3, 1753, his cousin, Mary, Countess of Orkney in her own right; 2nd, July 21, 1792, Mary, dau. of John Palmer, Esq., of Torrington, and niece of Sir Joshua Reynolds. The Scotch Earldom of Orkney was conferred Jan. 3, 1696, upon Lord George Hamilton (son of William, Earl of Selkirk, and Duke of Hamilton), for life only, with remainder to females. Since that time there has been no *Earl* of Orkney till the present Earl, the 6th in descent, succeeded his grandmother, Dec. 30, 1831. Lord Thomond was created Lord Thomond in England Oct. 2, 1801. M.P. for Liskeard from Oct. 1797, till he was created an English Peer. The family of O'Brien is one of the few which can prove lineal descent from the Kings of Ireland.

[2] Francis, 1st Lord Bandon, so created Nov. 20, 1793, raised to the rank of Earl, Aug. 6, 1800; b. Nov. 30, 1755, d. Nov. 26, 1830; m. Feb. 12, 1784, Catherine Henrietta, dau. of Richard, 2nd Earl of Shannon.

Your Grace may be surprised to see the name of Sir John Henniker,[1] who is not an Irishman, in my list for a Peerage; but as his son, General Henniker,[2] came into Parliament here at his own expense, and has been a steady supporter of the Union, and assiduous in his attendance, and as it will a little suit my provincial politics in England to do a kindness to Sir John, I trust that his promotion will not be disapproved.

I suspect from former correspondence that your Grace will think I am doing too much for Sir John Blaquiere; I hope, however, that the general tenor of my conduct will give me some claim to your confidence, and I can on this occasion appeal to Lord Castlereagh's testimony that my engagements with him have been of service. It is necessary that I should apprise your Grace that Lieutenant-Colonel Cuffe[3] is a natural son of Lord Tyrawley;[4] but his Lordship, who is a good politician, contrived to make himself so useful at a certain period of our business, that I was obliged to promise to recommend his son for a Peerage; I warned him, however, of the probability of His Majesty's objection to his attainment of this honour, so that His Majesty's servants here are by no means further committed on this point, than in stating the good services of Lord Tyrawley, and in expressing their wishes that he might be gratified in this favourite object of his life, if His Majesty should not consider the circumstance of his birth as an insurmountable obstacle. If his Lordship can be gratified in this instance, it will accommodate the administration here by his waving his claim to the Representative Peerage, and assisting us in other matters which it is unnecessary at present to detail.

Some small additions or alterations may still be necessary, but I have been desirous of giving your Grace a general outline as early as possible.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Sir John Henniker, 2nd Bart., created Lord Henniker, July 30, 1800; b. June 15, 1724, d. April 18, 1803; m. Feb. 24, 1747, Ann, dau. of Sir John Major, Bart. M.P. for Sudbury from 1762 to 1768, and for Dover from 1774 to 1784.

[2] Colonel, afterwards Lieut.-General, Brydges Trecothic Henniker, 3rd son of Sir John Henniker, 2nd Bart., b. Nov. 10, 1767, d. July 3, 1816; m. Sept. 25, 1791, Mary, dau. and co-heir of William Press, Esq. Created a Baronet Nov. 2, 1813. M.P. for Kildare borough from 1797 to the Union.

[3] Lieut.-Colonel James Cuffe, d. Sept. 1828; m. Miss Caulfield, dau. of a gentleman of property in Roscommon, and aunt to St. George Caulfield, Esq., of Dunamere Castle. Colonel Cuffe was M.P. for Tulsk from 1800 to the Union, and for Tralee from May 1819 till his death.

[4] James, 1st and only Lord Tyrawley, so created Nov. 7, 1797; b. 1747, d. June 15, 1821; m. April 28, 1770, Mary, dau. and sole heir of Richard Levinge, Esq., of Calverston. He was sent in 1762 as Military Ambassador to Portugal. Commissioner of Barracks from 1772 to 1776, when he was made Superintendent-General; Commissioner again, Jan. 1784 to 1803, when he was made Commissioner of the Board of Works. M.P. for Mayo co. from 1776 till he was made a Peer.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

DEAR JAMES, Dublin Castle, June 4, 1800.

I yesterday received your letter, dated the 31st, and about the same time an express arrived from the Duke of Portland, giving accounts from the Admiralty of the sailing of the Brest fleet; this event, you may suppose, diverted our attention for a time from internal politics, but all is now quiet; and a second express has just announced that the Brest fleet had not sailed, and that the report had been occasioned by one of our ships mistaking Lord St. Vincent's fleet for the enemy. We hope in the course of this week, or at latest on Monday next, to pass the Union Bill in the House of Commons; some of the most respectable opposers of this measure, but in all other matters staunch supporters of Government, have gone out of town; the party is breaking to pieces, and the Ponsonbys have occasioned great disgust by bringing Curran, a most disaffected though a very able lawyer, into Parliament. Notwithstanding all reports, you may be assured that the Union is not generally unpopular, and it is astonishing how little agitation it occasions even at Dublin, which is at present more quiet than it has been for many years.

How soon the successful issue of the Union will effect my deliverance, it is at present difficult to foresee; you will easily conceive how ardently I wish for that day, but I will not abandon my duty to my country.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, June 7, 1800.

Lord Corry yesterday, in pursuance of the notice he had given, moved an Address to His Majesty, praying that he would put an end to the measure of Union. The Address[1] I have the honour herewith to enclose, and your Grace will perceive it to be a statement of all the arguments and topics which have been brought forward at different times by the speakers in Opposition against the measure, and that it is intended to be a record of their objections.

As soon as the Address had been read from the Chair, Lord Castlereagh said that as it appeared to be the wish of gentlemen in

[1] This Address fills fifteen printed pages of the 'Votes.' It was in fact a pamphlet, and is said by Mr. Plowden to have been written by Mr. Grattan. Lord Cornwallis says (June 6), "It had been preparing for many days by a committee of the leaders of Opposition, and I am informed the groundwork was laid by the Speaker. It took fifty minutes to read."

opposition to record their reasons for not agreeing to the measure of Union, and to place them upon the Journals, he should not endeavour to defeat their intentions, and would therefore meet the Address by a direct negative.

Mr. Saurin then spoke for an hour in support of the Address with much energy, but with more caution and moderation on the subject of the competence of Parliament than he had hitherto used. He was ably replied to by the Attorney-General. Mr. Egan, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Gould followed. Before nine the House divided:—

For agreeing to the Address	77
Against	135
Majority . . .	58

The Report on the Union Bill was then received, and upon the Question that it should be read, the House again divided:—

For reading the Report	153
Against	88
Majority . . .	65

Upon the question being put that the Bill should be engrossed some fresh debate ensued, and Mr. O'Donnell moved that instead of being engrossed the Bill should be burnt. This produced warmth and indignation from several members on the side of Administration. Mr. O'Donnell was going to withdraw his motion, when Mr. Tighe seconded it, and several members of Opposition insisted that they would persevere in it. The Speaker submitted to the House, whether such a question could be put; this produced some discussion, and Mr. Beresford, after stating the motion to be an insult on the proceedings of the House, said that if any gentleman should indecently persist, after what had been stated by the Chair, to make a motion which was an affront to the majority of the House, he would move a vote of censure. This menace producing additional warmth, the galleries were cleared, when, after some explanation and discussion on both sides of the House, and a wish expressed by some respectable members of Opposition that the question should not be persevered in, the Speaker declared his opinion as to the order. He stated that he conceived the point was new; he recollected no precedent, that there were certain questions to which amendments could not be made, one of which was the question of adjournment, another that the order of the

day be read, and he considered the present question of a similar nature. He thought also that the motion might be made at a proper time, and was not censurable as an insult to the House, but he was of opinion it could not supersede the question which had been moved, and that he must therefore first put the question that the Bill be engrossed.[1]

After this declaration the question passed, and the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-day.

I understand that Opposition used every exertion to procure the fullest attendance possible, and they hoped to have divided 104; but several gentlemen who were in the country declined their summons.

Several of the friends of Government came in from dinner after the second division, as it had been given out that the debate would continue to a late hour.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, June 7, 1800.

The Report of the Committee on the Union Bill was received last night by a majority of 65, and this day it will be read a third time and passed, and be sent to the Lords on Monday. The greatest satisfaction is that it occasions no agitation either in town or country; and, indeed, one of the violent anti-Union members complained last night in the House that the people had deserted them.

This country could not be saved without the Union, but you must not take it for granted that it will be saved by it. Much care and management will be necessary, and if the British Government place their confidence in an Irish faction all will be ruined. The Chancellor and many of our most able friends are blinded by passion and prejudice, and would drive the country into rebellion

[1] The Speaker's parliamentary law would seem to be somewhat unintelligible. He appears to have been more anxious to get his friends out of their difficulty than to uphold the dignity of the House. The Journals of the English House of Commons furnish no precedent for any similar proceeding. In some few instances, but none later than the 19th James I., rejected Bills were ordered to be burnt. On the 3rd of June, 1772, two Bills, one regulating the Corn-laws, the other altering the Game-laws, were returned from the Lords with amendments, of a description which would now be considered quite unimportant. The House of Commons, however, considering any alteration in a Bill imposing penalties as a breach of privilege, fired up; and Governor Pownall and Mr. Whitworth proposed to *reject* the Corn-bill. The Speaker, Sir Fletcher Norton, said he would do his part of the business, and toss the Bill over the table. After two hours' debate, and several violent speeches, especially one from Mr. Burke, the House agreed to the motion *nem. con.* The Speaker kept his word, and the bill was literally kicked out of the House by the members who sat on the floor. The Game-bill was treated with the like indignity. See Hansard's Debates of that date.

in six months. Lord Castlereagh is by far the best, but I doubt whether he would yet have firmness to control the violent representations of his countrymen, and I trust when I retire that some Englishman may be sent over who will be at the trouble of acting for himself, and who will not submit to be governed.

I most sincerely condole with you and Mrs. Ross on the death of our poor friend Digby,[1] whose loss will be severely felt by his family and those who knew his worth. I am sorry too that a great personage will have one person less that had opportunity and honesty to speak truth to him.

Kindest compliments to Mrs. Ross; and

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

EDWARD COOKE, ESQ., TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin, June 7, 1800.

The Union Bill passed at ten to-night in the Commons. Some violent speeches from lawyers and a curious performance from Dobbs, who argued against Union from Daniel and the Revelations.

Lord Corry delivered the language of Opposition. Adherence to Saurin's doctrines—that the Union was carried by corruption—that it was against the wishes of the people—that he would assist the people to revive their constitution—that he would secede.

He then left the House. Soon after Plunket rose and talked of the villany of Government. Lord Ormonde's brother[2] called him to order. The House grew violent. The galleries were cleared. Plunket continued violent, and called on his friends to secede. About two-thirds of Opposition left the House in a body. Many very respectable characters remained, who explained their sentiments and reasons for not seceding.[3]

The Bill was then passed.

It is a great day over, and, all things considered, over well. Dublin is quiet.

[1] Mr. Digby had married the only sister of Mrs. Ross. His long connexion with the Court had placed him on a very intimate footing with the King, to whom he was in the habit of speaking in the most unreserved manner. The King always remembered with sentiments of sincere gratitude Mr. Digby's conduct during the Regency question, 1788-9.

[2] Hon. James Butler, b. July 15, 1777, d. May 18, 1838; m. Oct. 12, 1807, Grace Louisa, dau. of the Right Hon. John Staples. Became, on the death of his brother, Aug. 10, 1820, 19th Earl of Ormonde, made Marquis, Oct. 5, 1825, and created Lord Ormonde in England, July 17, 1821; K.P. M.P. for the county of Kilkenny from 1797 till he became a Peer.

[3] Lord Cornwallis, in a despatch to the Duke of Portland, dated June 7, gives a similar but much longer account of this debate, and states that the language of several of the seceders bore the appearance of real discontent, and seemed to threaten future opposition.

I am called over by family affairs, and I hope to see you next week.

Most truly yours,

E. COOKE.

The termination of the Union Debates in the House of Commons was marked by a very theatrical display which had been well organized previously. When the House adjourned, the Speaker walked out, followed by 41 members. The populace outside were expecting their appearance. Uncovered, and in deep silence, the mob accompanied them to the Speaker's residence in Molesworth Street. On reaching it, the Speaker turned round, bowed to the crowd, entered his house, and then the whole assemblage dispersed without uttering a word.[1]

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, June 9, 1800.

It is with pleasure I acquaint your Grace that when the House of Commons met to-day for business, Mr. Dawson, member for the county of Monaghan, who has hitherto been an active opposer of the measure of Union, rose in his place and declared in the fullest manner to the House, that, as it had now received the approbation of Parliament, and was to become the law of the land, he would not only think it his duty to pay obedience to it himself, but should exert himself to induce his constituents to reconcile themselves to its provisions. He was followed by Lord Maxwell, member for the county of Cavan, and some others, who severally expressed their determination to carry the Act of Union into execution to the utmost of their power.

Lord Castlereagh did not fail to use this opportunity of expressing his full sense of the patriotism of such conduct, and to give them the tribute of his marked approbation.

The House was highly pleased by the conciliatory disposition which has begun so early to display itself.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, June 9, 1800.

Having received repeated assurances in your Grace's despatches, that His Majesty would be graciously pleased to consider in the most favourable light the services of those who should

[1] This anecdote was furnished by a gentleman who received it from contemporary authority. It is not mentioned in Sir Jonah Barrington's Memoirs, but in the number of the 'Times' which gives an account of this debate, allusion is made to a scene apparently of a similar nature.

assist His Majesty's Government in forwarding and accomplishing by their influence and exertions the great measure of an Union of Great Britain and Ireland, I have thought it my duty to impress this sentiment in the manner I deem most effectual, and to take advantage of the zealous disposition it inspired.

This great work being now, I may say, completed by the passing of the Union Bill in the House of Commons, it now becomes my duty to state to your Grace that part of my engagements which it is of consequence should be carried into early execution.

It is probable that the Union Bill will pass the House of Lords in the course of this week, and will be then transmitted to Great Britain to be there passed under the Great Seal, and thence returned to me with a Commission to give it the Royal Assent.

It is provided by the Act of Representation, which that Bill incorporates, that the twenty-eight temporal peers who are to represent the peerage of Ireland for their lives in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, shall be elected the day after that in which the Union Bill shall receive the Royal Assent.

And it is therefore of essential consequence, both in point of propriety and of security to Administration, that those persons whom I shall recommend to His Majesty to be created Peers should be enabled to give their votes upon that day.

I therefore inclose herewith to your Grace a list of the persons to whom I have ventured to hold out a reasonable expectation that in consequence of their valuable services in the manner I have alluded to, His Majesty would, in his goodness, raise them to the rank of Peers of Ireland, and I am to request your Grace will lay my wishes upon this subject before His Majesty by an early opportunity, in order that time may be given for the proper letters to be signed and the patents to be passed, which will require the space of sixteen days in passing, as only one patent[1] can be sealed in a day, before it may be necessary to give the Royal Assent to the Union Bill.

The list which I submit may appear numerous, but I believe it hardly exceeds one or two former instances, and certainly no period ever before occurred, at which either the attachment of the friends to His Majesty's Government and the interests of the British Empire was of such essential importance, was more conspicuously displayed, or so highly deserving of favour and distinction.

This day Lord Castlereagh will proceed with the business which remains to be passed in Parliament, and to-morrow will intro-

[1] This singular system was abandoned when the Peers were created in this year. In England no such rule ever existed, the precedence of Peers created on the same day being determined by the order in which they appeared in the Gazette.

duce the Compensation Bill, which, I trust, from the secession which has taken place, will not be long obstructed. This Bill, and the other necessary measures, may probably take up near three weeks before they can pass the House of Lords, and the Houses must then adjourn for ten days. It is, therefore, my present intention, unless some objection should occur to His Majesty's Ministers, not to go down to the House of Lords to pass the Union Bill until all the Bills shall return from England, and then give the Royal Assent, and close the session with an appropriate speech.

The Union Bill being returned to me, it will ever be in my power to go down to the House of Lords and pass it, should I see any circumstance of danger or apprehension likely to arise.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

A LIST OF PERSONS RECOMMENDED TO HIS MAJESTY FOR THE DIGNITY OF THE PEERAGE OF IRELAND.

Charles Coote, Esq., is heir to Sir Eyre Coote, has a very considerable property, is member for the Queen's County, is proprietor of half the borough of Maryborough, and supported an expensive contest to return General Dunne instead of his brother, General Coote, who could not attend his duty in Parliament on account of military avocations. He is also heir-at-law to Lord Montrath, who has permitted him to request that a new barony should be granted to his Lordship, with remainder to Mr. Coote.

The Honourable Clotworthy Rowley,[1] is brother to the Earl of Bective, member for the county of Meath. His mother is eldest daughter to the late Mr. Rowley of Summerhill, whose wife was created Viscountess Langford; and he is married to the granddaughter of Mr. Rowley by his only son, who is deceased, and he also inherits great part of Mr. Rowley's extensive property. He trusts His Majesty will be graciously pleased to revive in him the title of Langford.

The Right Honourable Sir John Blaquiere, Bart., K.B., has exerted himself through the whole contest of the Union question both in and out of Parliament with great zeal, has exposed himself personally in the warmest moments of debate with great spirit, and been repeatedly an object of the fury of the populace, who twice attacked his house. He has also kept the friends of the measure together by his constant conviviality. Having filled offices of considerable trust under His Majesty, and faithfully served him for a

[1] Clotworthy, 1st Lord Langford, so created July 30, 1800, son of Thomas, 1st Earl of Bective; b. Oct. 31, 1763, d. Sept. 13, 1825; m. Jan. 11, 1794, his cousin, Frances, dau. of the Hon. Clotworthy Rowley. M.P. for Trim, 1790, and for the county of Meath from 1797 till he was made a Peer.

long series of years, and having married an heiress of considerable fortune in the county of Derry, he trusts His Majesty will raise him to the dignity of the peerage, and confer on him the title of De Blaquiere, which his ancestry enjoyed in France.

Right Honourable Lodge Morres, Lord of the Treasury. He is of the family of Lord Montmorris, and has estates amounting to 5000*l.* a-year in the counties of Kilkenny and Wexford, and has given a warm and useful support to the measure.

Sir James Blackwood, Bart., has a fortune of 10,000*l.* a-year, chiefly in the county of Down and the borough of Killyleagh, for which he is returned, together with his friend Mr. Thussenden, and Government is much indebted for his support in Parliament and in the county. He humbly wishes that the dignity of a Baroness may be conferred upon his mother, with remainder to himself and his heirs.

Sir John Henniker, Bart. His son, General Henniker, is upon the Staff of this kingdom, and having brought himself into Parliament gave the measure of Union a decided support. Sir John Henniker has a very considerable property in England, and, in addition to those reasons which have been more pointedly stated, the conferring a peerage on Sir John Henniker would be highly gratifying to his son.

Sir W. G. Newcomen, Bart., is a banker of eminence in Dublin, married the heiress of the Newcomen family, by whom he has 5000*l.* a-year, is member for the county of Longford, has been long friendly to Administration, and in the measure of Union has been particularly serviceable. It is known that for some time an attempt was made to injure his banking-house, and the corporation of the city publicly addressed him to give his vote against the Union at the most critical period of the session, when he withstood their solicitation with firmness. He has requested that His Majesty would confer upon his wife, Lady Newcomen, the dignity of a Baroness,[1] with remainder to his heirs male.

Sir Richard Quin,[2] *Bart.* He brought himself and his friend, Mr. Casey, into Parliament with the express determination to support the measure of Union, of which he is a zealous advocate. He is of a very respectable family in the county of Limerick, and has a fortune, unembarrassed, of above 6000*l.* a-year. His object is to be created a Baron.

[1] Charlotte, Lady Newcomen, b. 1755, d. May 16, 1817. Created Baroness Newcomen, July 30, 1800; and made Viscountess Dec. 4, 1804.

[2] Sir Richard Quin, Bart., b. July 30, 1752, d. Aug. 24, 1824; m. 1st, Aug. 22, 1777, Frances, dau. of the first Earl of Ilchester; 2nd, Feb. 26, 1816, Margaret Mary, dau. of James Coghlan, Esq., of Coghlan House, and widow, 1st, of George L'Estrange, Esq., and, 2nd, of Colonel Arthur Blennerhasset. Created Lord Adare July 30, 1800, and made Earl of Dunraven Jan. 22, 1822. Sir Richard and Mr. Casey were returned for Kilmallock Jan. 1800, and sat till the Union.

Sir Thomas Mullins[1] has a property of above 10,000*l.* a-year, chiefly in the county of Kerry. He is not himself in Parliament, but has given his support to the measure in the county, and by the voices of his son and of Mr. ——, who have voted according to his sentiments.

William Hare,[2] *Esq.* He and his son[3] have constantly supported the Union, and given a regular attendance. Mr. Hare's property is said to exceed 12,000*l.* a-year, in the counties of Cork and Kerry.

Joseph Blake,[4] *Esq.*, is member for the county of Galway, eldest son to Mr. Blake of Ardfry, also has a very considerable property in that county, and he is married to the daughter and heiress of the late Lord Lowth, by whom he has no male issue. He therefore humbly requests that the dignity of Baron may be granted to him and his heirs male, and in default thereof to the heirs male of his father.

Henry Sandford,[5] *Esq.*, has a very considerable property in Roscommon, and the borough of Roscommon, for which he served and returned a friend of Government. Having no children, he hopes His Majesty will grant him the peerage with remainder to the heirs male of his two brothers, one of whom is unmarried, and not likely to marry.

John Bingham,[6] *Esq.*, has the borough of Tuam, for the seats of

[1] Sir Thomas Mullins, Bart., b. Oct. 25, 1736, d. Feb. 29, 1822; m. Oct. 5, 1775, Elizabeth, dau. of Townshend Gunn, Esq., of Ratten. Created Lord Ventry July 30, 1800. His son William, 2nd Lord Ventry, sat for Dingle Icouch. Who the friend was has not been ascertained. The name is blank in the draft.

[2] William Hare, b. Sept. 1751, d. July 13, 1837; m. 1st, May 30, 1772, Mary, only dau. of Henry Wrixon, Esq., of Ballygiblin; 2nd, March 5, 1812, Anne, dau. of John Latham, Esq., of Meldrum. Created Lord Ennismore July 30, 1800; and made Earl of Listowel Jan. 12, 1822. M.P. for Cork county from Jan. 1796 to 1797, and then for Athy till he became a Peer.

[3] Richard Hare, afterwards Lord Ennismore, b. March 20, 1773, d. Sept. 24, 1827, v. p.; m. June 10, 1797, Catherine Bridget, dau. of Robert, 1st Lord Clonbrock. M.P. for Athy, 1797, to the Union, and for Cork county from 1812 till his death. Both father and son sat for Athy at the time of the Union. They bought their seats of the Duke of Leinster, and voted in opposition to his wishes. Their interest in the borough was estimated only at 1200*l.*, the Duke's at 13,800*l.*

[4] Joseph Henry Blake, b. Oct. 5, 1765, d. March 8, 1803; m. Aug. 18, 1784, Louisa Catherine Mary, dau. and co-heir of Thomas, 1st and only Earl of Louth, and 22nd Baron Athenry. M.P. for Galway county from 1790 till July 30, 1800, when he was created Lord Wallscourt. The Barony was (on account of his father being a Roman Catholic) conferred on him, with remainder to the heirs male of his father, but the contingency of his dying without issue, *vitâ parentis*, was overlooked. This event, however, did take place, and at Lord Wallscourt's death his father was still alive with an *heir apparent* only, in the person of a grandson. Doubts arose as to whether in law the peerage was not therefore extinct; and although the young man succeeded to his uncle's title, neither he nor any subsequent Lord Wallscourt has ever brought the question to issue, by claiming to vote for a Representative Peer.

[5] Henry Sandford, b. July 28, 1751, d. Dec. 29, 1824; m. June 13, 1780, Catherine, dau. of the Right Hon. Silver Oliver. Created Lord Mount Sandford July 30, 1800. M.P. for the borough of Roscommon, where he had both seats, from 1790 till the Union. His brother George, 3rd and last Lord Mount Sandford, sat for the same borough from 1783 to April, 1799.

[6] John Bingham, b. 1762, d. May, 1821; m. May 21, 1791, Anne Maria, dau. of Barry, 1st Viscount Avonmore. Created Lord Clanmorris July 30, 1800. M.P. for

which two friends of Government are returned. Mr. Bingham has a large fortune, and is married to a daughter of the Chief-Baron.

Henry Prittie,[1] *Esq., of Silver-Mines, in the County of Tipperary,* was formerly member for the county of Tipperary, where he has property of 8000*l.* a-year, and has supported the Union in the county, and with his two sons in Parliament.

John Preston, Esq., of Ballinter, in the County of Meath, is of the family of Lord Ludlow, has a property exceeding 5000*l.* a-year. He separated himself from his old political connexions in order to support the measure of Union, and was anxious, if opportunity had enabled him, to have procured an additional vote in favour of it.

Maurice Mahon,[2] *Esq., of Strokestown, in the County of Roscommon,* is not in Parliament himself, but his eldest son[3] is member for the county of Roscommon, who being embarrassed by the addresses of his constituents declined attendance, and his youngest son[4] supported the question. Mr. Mahon is of a very ancient family and of large property.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, June 9, 1800.

. . . At the close of this important struggle, it is but justice to our friends to represent to your Grace, that their zeal and fidelity has far exceeded what I could have formed any expectation of; some perhaps embarked not with the most cordial feelings to the measure, but all, since the defection of the Bagwells, &c., have acted with perfect honour, and many of them with a degree of energy which I trust will recommend them to His Majesty's favour. . . .

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

Tuam from 1797 to Feb. 1800. The two last members for Tuam were the Hon. Walter Yelverton and Mr. George Vesey. His family repeatedly contested Mayo county with the Brownes; and the duels arising out of these contests were celebrated among the Connaught fire-eaters.

[1] Henry Prittie, b. Oct. 3, 1743, d. Jan. 3, 1801; m. Jan. 6, 1766, Catherine, dau. and co-heir of Francis Sadleir, Esq., of Sopwell Hall, and widow of John Bury, Esq. (the father of Charles, 1st Earl of Charleville). Mr. Prittie was created Lord Dunalley July 30, 1800. Elected for Tipperary county in 1761, when not of age. He sat for it to 1768, and again from 1773 to 1790. His eldest son Henry was M.P. for the borough of Carlow from 1797 till the Union, and for Okehampton from 1818 to 1826. His 2nd son, Francis Aldborough, sat for Tipperary county from 1806 to 1818, and from March 1819 to 1831, but was not in Parliament before the Union.

[2] Maurice Mahon, b. June 21, 1738, d. Jan. 4, 1819; m. June 1, 1765, Catherine, dau. of Stephen, 1st Viscount Mountcashel. Created Lord Hartland July 30, 1800.

[3] Thomas, 2nd Lord Hartland, Major-General, and Colonel of the 9th Dragoons; b. Aug. 2, 1766, d. Dec. 1835; m. Oct. 16, 1811, Catherine, dau. of James Topping, Esq., of Whatcroft Hall; and leaving no issue, was succeeded in the Peerage by his brother Maurice, at whose death, Nov. 11, 1845, the title became extinct. M.P. for Roscommon county from Jan. 1800 to 1802.

[4] Stephen, Lieut.-Colonel of the 7th Dragoon Guards, b. Feb. 6, 1768, d. May, 1828, unm. M.P. for Knocktopher from May, 1800, to the Union, and for Roscommon county from 1806 to 1826.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Most Secret and Confidential.]

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, Friday, June 13, 1800.

In addition to the despatch I have had the honour of writing to your Excellency upon the subject of the Peerages which you have recommended to be created, it is necessary for me to open to you at length and without reserve, His Majesty's wishes and opinions as connected with that subject, together with those which he has been pleased to express respecting the proposed promotions in the Peerage of Ireland, the selection of the Peers who are to represent the Peerage of that kingdom, and the distribution of British honours.

With respect to the first of these subjects, as I am willing to hope from not finding his name in the paper of reasons for the proposed creations, that Lord Tyrawley is become so sensible of the impropriety of persisting in the wish he had urged to your Excellency in behalf of Colonel Cuffe as to withdraw it altogether, I have only to observe upon the time at which the creations should take place, which if it does not materially affect the issue of the election of the Representative Peers, so as that a considerable number of them would be likely to be chosen from among those who had opposed the Union, it is the decided opinion of His Majesty's confidential servants that the creation should be deferred until the Union Act has received the Royal Assent; and if the fate of the election should be exposed to a greater hazard, it even in that case is thought desirable that only such a number of creations should take place as to obviate that risk. But His Majesty's wishes in this respect cannot be so well illustrated as by my informing you that it is his opinion, in which his servants entirely concur, that it would be more creditable to the character of His Majesty's Government that five or six, or even more of the Representative Peers should be persons who had resisted the measure of Union, than that the exclusion of any one of them should be carried by the voice of a single Peer whose creation could be supposed to be ascribable to such a purpose. Such being His Majesty's sentiments, your Excellency will judge how averse His Majesty must be to raise any person to that dignity for the purpose of his becoming a candidate to represent the Peerage, and will abstain from pressing a measure so highly exceptionable to His Majesty, and which must either be opposed and resented by the Peerage in general, or, if submitted to, must prove it could not have been necessary to have

made any addition to the weight of Administration among the members of that body.

Gratifying as His Majesty's condescension in all other parts of this request must be to your Excellency, you will not be less sensible of his tenderness to the order to which we belong, by the intimation I am directed to make to you of His Majesty's further wishes, that if the creation of Peers can be suspended till after the election, the number to be raised to that dignity should be so divided, that they may be made out at two or more different times between the election and the day on which the Union is to take place, so as to give the least ground for jealousy or animadversion.

Among those whom in the proposed promotion in the Peerage your Excellency recommends to be raised to the dignity of Marquises, His Majesty has expressed a very strong wish that the honour could be confined to the Earl of Clanricarde,[1] to whom the Earl of Inchiquin is to be added, as assurances have been repeatedly given him, that His Majesty would confer that title upon him whenever any Peers of that rank should be created. His Majesty is the more anxious that this honour should be no further extended at present, because the titles of the persons proposed for it are of a date which would so little justify their being raised to such an eminence, as to give such umbrage to the British Earls in general as would bring forward a set of numerous and weighty claims, which would create serious embarrassments in the administration of the public concerns of this part of the United Kingdom. I am directed to observe to you that every one of the three Earls, except Lord Bective, is to have some mark of His Majesty's favour, and all of them are to be members of the Legislature; it is therefore to be hoped that you will be able to prevail upon them from their known attachment to His Majesty's Government, to waive their present pretensions, and that if it should be necessary to make an exception in favour of one of the three, that it may be confined to Lord Ely, whose influence is so extensive, and has been of late so usefully employed, as to make it less objectionable in his, than in either of the other cases.

The expectations of Lords Yelverton and Kilwarden appear so little suitable to the gravity of their professions and characters, that I cannot but feel a considerable degree of surprise that such ideas should have ever been seriously entertained by them; for their own sakes I am persuaded that every friend they have on

[1] John Thomas, 13th Earl of Clanricarde, b. Sept. 22, 1744, d. July 27, 1808; m. March 17, 1799, Eliza, dau. of Sir Thomas Burke, Bart., of Marble Hill. A General, and Colonel 66th Regiment.

this side of the water would be glad that they had remained satisfied with the place they at present hold in the Peerage; but at the same time if their wishes have been represented to your Excellency in such a way as to make it unadvisable to suggest the propriety of their being reconsidered, those noble persons hold too high a place in His Majesty's estimation to incline him to subject them to any disappointment.

The two other subjects which I have to bring under your Excellency's deliberation, though perfectly distinct in themselves, are from various circumstances and considerations so connected, and in many respects so dependent upon each other, that it would be inconvenient to treat them separately. The interference of His Majesty's servants here in the selection of those who are to represent the Peerage of Ireland, may at first sight certainly appear liable to objection, and to be a departure from that line of conduct which it has always been my wish to observe, and which the confidence which is due to your Excellency would naturally prescribe; but when the reasons assigned for wishing additions to be made to the Peerage of this kingdom, arise out of the difficulties which have been found in fixing from among the Peers of Ireland, upon those who are best entitled to the support of Government in the election of the representatives of that body, it would be inconsistent with what I feel due to your Excellency as well as to His Majesty's service, were I to withhold any observations or suggestions which could facilitate so important an arrangement, and which could prevent the necessity of having recourse to an expedient which it is so desirable to avoid. Supposing then Lord Londonderry to have been convinced by the arguments which have been stated to him, and to see the advantage of being himself a Representative rather than a British Peer, it might be necessary to alter four of the names which compose the list of Peers which I received in your despatch of the 3rd, because it is very much His Majesty's wish that at this moment Lord Ely should be the only person on whom the Peerage of this kingdom should be conferred, and His Majesty is disposed to hope, that if Lord Londonderry is not admitted to that honour, it may be in your power to satisfy the Earl of Ormonde with an assurance that His Majesty will include him in the first addition that is made to the Imperial Peerage. With a similar assurance I have reason to believe that Lord Carysfort and his friends will be perfectly satisfied, and considering the unfortunate state of Lord Drogheda's only heir, a place among the Representative Peers must be of the same value to Lord Drogheda as an English creation. With this view it has occurred to me that

it would not be difficult to make room for the four Peers who would be to be placed in the representative body. Sir J. Blaquiere I consider as out of the question, for although His Majesty does not object to comply with your Excellency's wishes in making him a Peer of Ireland, I am sure it would be highly imprudent to urge His Majesty to let that creation take place prior to the election. I look next to Lord Rossmore, whose age and infirmities naturally suggest his unfitness for undertaking a duty which it would be painful to him to fulfill, and to which certainly neither the place of his nativity, nor his hereditary fortune, give him any particular pretention. With all his amiable qualities (and I know him, and I know Ireland too well not to be sensible of them) I should imagine that he was better suited to an Irish residence, than to an attendance in the Imperial House of Lords. The next person who has occurred to me as fit to make an opening, is one whom it is impossible to respect more, and to feel a greater regard for than I do, and that is Lord Carleton; but the situation of a Representative Peer and of a Chief Judge seem to us so inconsistent and incompatible with each other, that I should be sincerely concerned that an attempt should be made to place him in a predicament which would subject him and his electors to the observations which would attach upon the choice of a person so circumstanced. Did not the reasons exist which have made it necessary for me to offer these suggestions to your Excellency, I should have thought the propriety of proposing a person in Lord Carleton's official situation as a representative of the Peerage so very questionable, as to have represented such a measure as one which should not pass without very mature consideration. My knowledge of the other Peers whose names I find on the list, is not sufficient to lead me to point out any one or more whom it would be not improper to remove for the sake of admitting the fourth of those Peers, for whom your Excellency has solicited a place among the British Peers. Should Lord Londonderry not be disposed to waive or suspend his wishes, room would be made by the means I have suggested for the other three, and if a place is to be found among the Representative Peers it may be possible, with the assurance which His Majesty may possibly be so gracious as to authorise to be given to Lord Carysfort as well as to Lord Ormonde, that in consideration of his necessary absence on account of his mission, Lord Carysfort may be induced to decline offering himself a candidate for the representation of the Peerage. But I am not sufficiently informed to speak upon this point in such a manner as to relieve your Excellency from the necessity of making such openings in the list you sent me, as may

make room for the eventual expectations of four of the Peers whom you have proposed for British Peerages. Sensible of the number and magnitude of the obstacles with which you have had to contend, in bringing the great measure of the Union to the state to which it is now happily advanced, and of the difficulties which you must have met with in this part of the arrangement, it is with great reluctance that I bring any matter forward that can open a new source of trouble and embarrassment; but entitled as I conceived myself to encourage the expectations of Lord Sheffield[1] to be recommended to a seat among the Representative Peers, and knowing that Mr. Pitt had held out similar encouragement to Lord Grandison,[2] I cannot but represent to you the very unpleasant situation in which we both find ourselves, by the omission of the names of both those Peers, and by the communication of the rule which has been laid down in regulating your choice, the expediency of which I by no means deny, though I in particular cannot but feel the hardship of it, as Lord Sheffield was certainly no less able than willing to have exempted himself from its effect, and would have done so most readily at any moment that it had been hinted to him, even without an idea of its being a necessary qualification for his being a candidate for the situation of a representative of the Peerage. In justice therefore to him I must say, that he cannot fairly be considered as coming within the exception, and I look to your Excellency's friendship to obviate the disappointment which I cannot but feel in common with Lord Sheffield, should he be excluded from the representatives of the Peerage, or to suggest some means by which Lord Sheffield may be relieved from its pressure. I am persuaded that Mr. Pelham, as well as myself, looked with confidence to Lord Sheffield's being one of the Peers who would be sure of being placed on the Government list, and I have reason to know that Mr. Pitt entertained that opinion as confidently as I did.

I believe I have now not omitted any of the subjects which it was my purpose to discuss in this despatch, and it will only be necessary for me to conclude, with recommending to your Excellency to endeavour to the best of your power to fulfill the wishes which I have had the honour of signifying to you on the part of

[1] John, 1st Lord Sheffield, so created Dec. 10, 1780, and promoted to an Earldom (Irish honours) Jan. 22, 1816. Created Lord Sheffield, in England, July 29, 1802; b. 1746, d. Jan. 18, 1832; m. 1st, 1767, Abigail, dau. of Lewis Way, Esq.; 2nd, Dec. 26, 1794, Lucy, dau. of Thomas, 1st Earl of Chichester; 3rd, Jan. 20, 1798, Anne, dau. of Frederick, 2nd Earl of Guilford. M.P. for Coventry, 1781 to 1784, and for Bristol from Nov. 1790 to June 1802.

[2] George, 2nd and last Earl of Grandison, of the 2nd creation, b. July 23, 1751, d. July, 1800; m. Feb. 10, 1774, Gertrude, dau. of Francis, 1st Marquis of Hertford.

His Majesty; but more particularly to employ your best exertions in resisting the creation of any Irish Peers previous to the election; in confining the grant of British Peerages to the Earl of Ely and the Earl of Londonderry at the farthest, and in convincing all the Earls who are recommended by you for Marquisates, with the exception of the Earl of Clanricarde, that they cannot render a more acceptable service to His Majesty, than by ceasing to entertain expectations which cannot be indulged without material injury to the order to which they have the honour to belong.

I am, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, June 17, 1800.

After having passed two painful years of difficulty and anxiety, my prospect had begun to brighten. The spirit of rebellion was almost universally subsiding, and the great and important measure of Union was not only carried by a majority in Parliament, but received throughout the nation, and even in the metropolis, with less ill-humour than could have been expected; and many of the most respectable, although not during the contest the least violent, of the anti-Unionists, had declared that they no longer wished to be ranked amongst the opposers of Government. But your Grace's despatches of the 12th and 13th, as far as my personal feelings are concerned, have placed me in a more distressing situation than I have yet experienced. In the most severe trials I have hitherto been able to conduct myself with a firmness becoming a man of honour and integrity, but now my condition is so much altered, that I must either say to those whom I am about to disappoint, that I will not keep my word with them, or acknowledge that I have pretended to have powers which I did not possess, and that I must declare my engagements to be void because His Majesty's ministers have refused to fulfil them.

Your Grace has by the stroke of a pen put Sir John Blaquiere out of the question with respect to the Representative Peerage, but you cannot by the same means put my breach of faith out of the question. That object was actually promised by me in the event of his hearty support; he has performed his part of the stipulation, and now that his service is over, it is proposed to me that I should tell him that it is out of the question that I should obtain for him the reward which I had engaged he should receive.

When the promise was given I thought that I had made a good bargain for the public, and in the progress of the business I have seen no cause to alter my opinion; but whether the agreement was advantageous or otherwise, I am bound in honour to stand by it, and I should feel myself a degraded man if I gave my consent to its being set aside.

Your Grace and His Majesty's confidential servants do not appear to be aware of the difficulties in which we should be involved by deferring the creation of the Peers until the Union Act has received the Royal Assent. For although I admit that it would be a matter of very little importance to the welfare of the Empire, whether five or six Unionist or anti-Unionist Peers should sit in the Imperial Parliament, yet I must contend that it would be of great consequence to the person in whom the administration of the affairs of this kingdom was imposed, if the former should, after the assurances they had received, have any colour for imputing their disappointment to what they might deem his treacherous delay; and it seems a degradation not altogether consistent with the nature of the distinction intended for the individuals in question, so to manage their creation as studiously to deprive them of all interference in the delegation from the body to which they are hereafter to belong, and to the interests of which they are to be associated.

The whole number of Peerages recommended are sixteen, one of which (Colonel Coote's) is only reversionary after the death of Lord Montrath, and two are to be given to females (viz., Ladies Newcomen and Blackwood), which cannot affect the election. In the month of June, 1796, at the period of the general election, one Viscount and fourteen Barons were created in England, which circumstance, in addition to these favours being indispensable to the success of the measure, led me to suppose that sixteen would not be thought an unreasonable number on so important an occasion as that of uniting the two kingdoms, by which act His Majesty's future power of creating Irish Peers is so much circumscribed.

I beg leave to assure your Grace, that I have not made Lord Tyrawley or any other person in this country sensible of the impropriety of their pretensions, nor have I the most distant hope of succeeding in an attempt of this nature in any one of the instances in which you have recommended that I should make the trial. In the case of Lord Tyrawley however, as your Grace will have seen by my despatch, dated the 3rd instant, I only promised to recommend his son, but did not hold out any sanguine hopes of success.

Every possible argument was used by Lord Castlereagh and

myself to persuade Colonel Blake and Mr. Sandford not to insist on having their Peerages granted with remainder to the children of their brothers, but they positively refused to accept their honours on any other condition.

I am so overcome by your Grace's letter that I know not how to proceed in the mortifying detail; there was no sacrifice that I should not have been happy to make for the service of my king and country, except that of my honour. The mischief, however, will not end with my disgrace, but the confidence in the English Government will be shaken, and the ill-humour of our disappointed supporters will greatly retard the benefits which might have been expected from the measure, and will not tend to strengthen the hands of my successor. I stated to your Grace in my former letter what I had said to Lord Ormonde; if I should now tell him that His Majesty has refused the boon which I asked as a personal favour to myself, he will not believe that I have pressed it in a manner that he had a right to expect, and it is then likely that there will be an end of all intercourse between us. I have had no communication with Lord Londonderry on the subject of a British Peerage, but I felt that it ought to be offered to him on account of the eminent services of his son. To Lord Carysfort I am under the strictest engagement that he shall have the interest of Government for the Representative Peerage, if he should not be made a Peer of Great Britain.

Lord Drogheda, who was mentioned amongst the candidates for a British Peerage, has a second son who is a very promising youth, but I stated his pretensions chiefly for the purpose of assisting my arrangements for the Representative Peerage.

Lord Ely, who never willingly relinquished anything, has a promise of being made a Marquis, which I understood from Lord Castlereagh was authorised from England in a letter written by Mr. Pitt, and transmitted by your Grace to him. Lord Altamont has likewise my promise of the same honour. Lord Bective, however, who, besides his strong support of three members in Parliament, has exerted with success the powerful influence which his great property gives him in the county of Meath, in counteracting the efforts of the anti-Unionists, will naturally be much dissatisfied if he receives no mark of favour, when he sees Lord Altamont invested with the order of St. Patrick, which I know Lord Bective wished to have, and Lord Inchiquin, who has not the smallest weight or consequence in this country, promoted to a Marquisate.

Neither Lords Yelverton or Kilwarden have asked for promo-

tion in the Peerage, though I understood it would be peculiarly grateful to the latter, but I thought it an attention due to their able and meritorious conduct on this occasion, to make the offer to them if it had met with His Majesty's approbation.

I gave my consent to the nomination of Lord Carleton for a Representative Peer on the supposition only of his retiring from the Bench, which he seems to think his ill-state of health will render necessary, but the propriety of his superannuation is a matter at present by no means decided.

I doubt very much whether any influence which this Government could exert in the House of Lords would procure the election of Lords Grandison and Sheffield, and especially of the latter, as great pains have been taken by the enemies of the Union to impress on the minds of the resident Peers, that their representatives would always be chosen from the Englishmen possessing Irish Peerages, or from the Irish Peers residing in England. With respect to Lord Rossmore,[1] I feel it my duty to observe that looking to the very high and confidential situation which he enjoyed in this country, to his long and uninterrupted residence in it, to the Parliamentary influence he has acquired by his connexion with Lord Clermont, who returns two members to the House of Commons, and to the very considerable property which he possesses, I deemed him qualified for a place in the Representative Peerage; and even if Lord Rossmore was set aside, I should feel it difficult to resist the claims of the connexion, and refuse my recommendation to Lord Clermont, who certainly at this moment has much stronger claims than any other non-resident Peer. I have now only to request that your Grace will assure His Majesty that I have on this occasion served him honestly and faithfully to the best of my abilities, that I have been biassed by no private motives or partialities, and that all my measures have been solely and uniformly directed to the attainment of that great object in which the honour of his crown and the security of his dominions were so deeply involved.

He will, I am persuaded, see the necessity of my having entered into embarrassing engagements according to the various circumstances which occurred during the long and arduous contest, and if

[1] Right Hon. Robert Cunninghame, created Lord Rossmore Oct. 19, 1796, with remainder to the sons of two of his wife's sisters. A General and Colonel 5th Dragoons, which regiment was disbanded in the early part of 1800. Born 1735, d. Aug. 6, 1801; m. 1754, Elizabeth, dau. and co-heir of John Murray, Esq. The two sisters in the entail were—Anne, wife of the Rt. Hon. Theophilus Jones; and Harriet, wife of Henry Westenra, Esq., from whom the present Lord Rossmore is descended. The third surviving sister was the Countess of Clermont. M.P. for East Grinstead from Oct. 1788 to Feb. 1789; and for Tulsk Oct. 1751 to 1761, Armagh borough to 1768, Monaghan borough till created a Peer.

any of them should appear so strongly to merit his disapprobation as to induce him to withhold his consent to their being carried into effect, he will be pleased to allow me to retire from a station which I could no longer hold with honour to myself, or with any prospect of advantage to his service. I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The indignation naturally felt by Lord Cornwallis at the despatch of June 12, was shared by Lord Castlereagh. In a long letter to Lord Camden, dated June 18,[1] he observes that the Duke of Portland writes in a very ungracious tone, and disapproves of almost every arrangement which had been made; he remarks that it would be treating Lord Cornwallis very harshly, if, after expressly directing him to carry the Union, the Government were now to repudiate engagements which he had had full authority to make. "If," he adds, "the Irish Government is not enabled to keep faith with the various individuals who have acted upon a principle of confidence in their honour, it is morally impossible that either Lord Cornwallis or myself can remain in our present situations; it will remain a breach of faith as injurious to the character of Government as to our own, having given an assurance which we were not enabled to fulfil.

"In so long a struggle, in a certain period of which, after the defection of seven Members,[2] the fate of the measure was in suspense, it is not wonderful that the scale of favours should have been somewhat deranged, if, in two or three instances, and I do not believe it will appear in more, certain individuals, availing themselves of circumstances, obtained assurances of favours to which in strictness they are not entitled."

In a letter, June 21,[3] to Mr. Cooke, who was then in London, Lord Castlereagh uses similar language. After warmly defending the conduct of Lord Cornwallis, he says that every despatch written during the last eighteen months fully apprised the English Ministers that the measure could only be carried by the force of influence, and that now to disavow promises would gain no popularity for themselves, while it would disappoint their supporters, and disgrace the Irish Government.

He thus closes this long and vehement letter. "I should hope, if Lord Cornwallis has been the person to buy out and secure for

[1] Castlereagh Correspondence, vol. iii. p. 326.

[2] The defection of Colonel Bagwell and others, Feb. 5, 1800.

[3] Castlereagh Correspondence, vol. iii. p. 330.

ever the fee simple of Irish corruption which has so long enfeebled the powers of Government and endangered the connexion, that he is not to be the first sacrifice to his own exertions, nor is the present [to be] the first occasion upon which the King's Ministers will, I trust, think it expedient to conciliate popular opinion by failing towards those who have served them to the best of their ability."

Mr. Cooke on the 23rd says he was much pleased with Lord Cornwallis's letter of the 17th, and "that he thought he would have acted so, as it was the only method of carrying the business." The Duke of Portland was evidently annoyed that each arrangement was not communicated to him before its completion; but as Mr. Cooke pertinently asks, "What then is a carte blanche?" how, when questions required an immediate decision, was it possible to refer them to London, whence an answer could not be obtained in less than seven or eight days? Lord Castlereagh, in his reply, asserts that Lord Cornwallis was always desirous to carry the Duke of Portland's judgment and concurrence with him on every point, but that the Union could not have been effected but by a person intrusted with unlimited authority, and that it would have been fatal to the measure, if the objections, or even the disinclination, of Ministers to any proposed arrangement had transpired. He admits that the Irish Government was liable to the charge of having in a few instances yielded too readily to unreasonable demands, but had the Union miscarried, and the failure been traceable to a reluctance on the part of Government to use the patronage in their power, he thinks they would have met with, and in fact would have deserved, less mercy.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO EARL CAMDEN.

[Secret.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin, June 18, 1800.

. . . On the subject of English Peerages, whatever embarrassment may incidentally arise from [non] compliance with the Lord Lieutenant's suggestions, *in strictness* he has no right to complain, as he certainly never was authorized to make any engagements of such a nature. Had Mr. Pitt explained himself on this point, in answer to a private letter[1] written by Lord Cornwallis some weeks since, expressly to ascertain how far he might hope for some accommodation in British Peerages, it certainly would have saved him from much of his present embarrassment, as I know he

[1] Neither the original nor the draft of the private letter of Lord Cornwallis to Mr. Pitt can be found.

inferred from Mr. Pitt's silence that his wishes would be assented to, and he was led, under that impression, to engage himself more explicitly relative to Representative Peerages than he otherwise would have done. . . . Ever my dear Lord, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, June 18, 1800.

Everything goes smoothly on this side of the water, but our correspondence with the Secretary of State is in a very different situation. The D. of P. has in fact positively told me that several of my engagements cannot be confirmed. It is needless now to enter into particulars, I shall therefore only say that they were thought at the time by Lord Castlereagh expedient and necessary, that I was guided by no partial or private view, and that my sole objects were to keep the country quiet and to carry the Union. These two great points are effected; I am on the best possible terms with the great Protestant ascendancy party, without losing the confidence of the Catholics, and the lower order of people; many of the most creditable, although perhaps the most violent of the anti-Unionists, declare themselves now the friends and supporters of Administration.

In this situation of things, I have received a letter of the most provoking nature from the D. of P., to the astonishment of Lord C. and Mr. Elliot, insisting that Lords Grandison and Sheffield should be Representative Peers, with a variety of matter of a similar nature. I have written a very temperate answer stating my difficulties, and have represented the necessity of my retiring if I am not permitted to keep faith with those to whom my honour is pledged. You will probably hear the statement on the other side when you go to town. Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, June 24, 1800.

My situation remains very doubtful. I have heard nothing that induces me to believe that the Cabinet have any intention to relax, since the harsh and ungracious letter which I received from the D. of P., who has never omitted any opportunity of putting me in the wrong, and reprobating my conduct. For my personal gratification, nothing could be so desirable as my quitting my

present station, but I am afraid that my abrupt departure, under the marked disapprobation of the English Government, would be attended with fatal consequences in this country.

You may be assured that I will act with temper, and bear everything but what would absolutely dishonour me, for the sake of the public.

You shall have a few lines as soon as I know anything worth communicating to you.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, June 25, 1800.

We have this morning received an express from Mr. Cooke, by which I understand that the Cabinet have agreed to confirm all my engagements; I shall now endeavour to get rid of that which was most obnoxious to them, by persuading Sir John Blaquiere that it will be for his interest and that of his family to relinquish the Representative Peerage.

There are too many in the Cabinet who meddle about the business of Ireland. Would to God I had done with them—Cabinet and all.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, July 3, 1800.

I have received a very proper letter from the D. of P., so that at present everything is going on in its usual train. He has in the King's name requested Lord Londonderry not at present to press for the British Peerage, but promises it on a future day, and indeed whenever the family may desire it; this throws back *one* Representative Peer upon me, and he has desired that I would not insist on a British Peerage for Lord Drogheda, and as I have made no engagement to him, and he is perfectly insignificant in respect to weight and interest in the country, and I only recommended him as being the oldest Marquis, in order to assist me in providing room for friends in the Representative Peerage (the point on which I am most pressed), I could not help giving way on this occasion, and thereby am loaded with a *second*.

To myself personally, and to Lord Castlereagh, the winding up of the engagements is more vexatious and tormenting than any of

the former part of the business. The quiet however of the country at large on the subject, and the almost good-humoured indifference with which it is viewed in the metropolis, where every species of outrageous opposition was to have been expected, console us for the painful audiences which we are obliged to give patiently to our discontented and insatiable supporters.

I am not however so engrossed by Irish politics, as to relieve me from the gloomy apprehensions which the late disasters in Italy[1] must create in every thinking mind. Austria must by this time have submitted to a peace dictated by Buonaparte, and what is now to become of us? After the haughty, and I have ever thought most unwise, answer given by Lord Grenville, can we humble ourselves to make overtures? What are we to expect by a continuance of the war? is there a hope that the British Navy can restore the French Monarchy?—I have long thought Lord Grenville a most dangerous Minister, and wished to withdraw from a Cabinet in which he had too much sway. . . .

If every man was to be rewarded according to the measure of his services in carrying the Union, Littlehales would have claim to a great share. In the private management of mankind he very much surpasses Lord Castlereagh, and the good-humoured and kind attention with which he has treated everybody who has had any business with him, has gained the universal esteem and regard of all parties.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Received July 6.]

MY LORD, Whitehall, June 26, 1800.

. . . Doubts having occurred to several of the King's confidential servants, respecting the construction of that part of the Union Bill which provides for the representation of the Spiritual Lords, a meeting took place this morning, the result of which it is incumbent upon me to communicate to your Excellency without delay, in the hope that, by being early acquainted with the unanimous opinion of His Majesty's Ministers, your influence and authority may be effectually interposed so as to keep down the expectations which some readings of that clause may raise; and by that means any question may be prevented from arising in the House of Lords

[1] Bonaparte crossed the Mont St. Bernard on May 15, and the battle of Marengo was fought June 16. The French had been uniformly successful during the intervening month.

of the United Kingdom upon the return of that part of the representative body.

It has been generally understood that the words under which a line is drawn in page 33 of the printed copy of the Bill which I have the honour to enclose, were introduced with a view of excluding the Earl of Bristol, or indeed any British peer who may happen to be possessed of an Irish bishoprick, from the representation of that part of the Irish House of Lords; but upon the most careful and attentive consideration that can be given them, it is the unanimous opinion of His Majesty's servants, that the united House of Lords will be under the necessity of construing those words in such a manner as to defeat this purpose of their insertion, and to admit, in the person of Lord Bristol, the right of the See of Derry in the order of rotation provided for it by the Bill.[1] . . .

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND[2] TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret and Confidential.] Received July 6.

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, June 27, 1800.

Nothing, certainly, could be farther from my intention than to propose any measure for your Excellency's adoption that could place you in a situation of any distress whatever, and impossible as I conceived the despatches which I had the honour of writing to you on the 13th to have hurt any of your personal feelings, I most sincerely lament the impression they made upon your Excellency, and I can assure you for my own part, that had it appeared to me possible that they could have produced such an effect I think myself incapable of sending them to you; and, what is still more, I am satisfied that had they been seen in that light either by His Majesty or by any of his servants to whom they were communicated, they would never have been suffered to have found their way to you. I hope I am not less sensible than any other person with whom I have the honour of acting in Administration, of the severe trials your Excellency has undergone, of the firmness and integrity with which you have conducted yourself, of your ability and success in conciliating the affections of the different descriptions of

[1] This unusual combination of honours now (1858) again exists. The Bishop of Tuam is an English Peer, Lord Plunket. There are many cases in which an English Peer has been an English prelate, or an Irish Peer an Irish prelate.

[2] Lord Castlereagh had written in very strong terms, similar to those used by Lord Cornwallis, stating that he could not remain in office if the Irish engagements were not kept. The Duke of Portland wrote him a separate answer.

His Majesty's Irish subjects, of the value of the important work which you have undertaken, and the services you have rendered and the honour you have acquired by bringing the Union, the greatest and most desirable measure which ever was in contemplation, to its happy and final accomplishment. Need I then, with such sentiments, disclaim any intention of hurting your peace of mind, much less of suggesting to you the breach of an engagement, or even the disappointment of a hope which you had thought it right to encourage or to give sanction to? I will not enter into the defence of either of those despatches farther than to say that several of the engagements I considered, and I still think I was not mistaken in considering, not to be absolute. But let me appeal to yourself whether, with the single exception of the peerage to Lord Tyrawley's natural son, there was, notwithstanding, one to which I intimated to you that I believed His Majesty would positively withhold his consent. I desire to remind your Excellency that they were not His Majesty's commands, but his opinions and wishes, that I signified to you. His Majesty acknowledged the difficulty of the task you had undertaken, and the merits of your labours. He was not forgetful of the powers you were necessarily entrusted with for that purpose, and his being desirous that they should be used as temperately as the nature of the case would permit, occasioned him to direct me to represent to you his wishes that the benefits to be derived from them in certain instances should be suspended or restrained. Having trusted the exercise of them to your Excellency, His Majesty was as little disposed as his servants to withdraw them from you, or to require you to break your engagements. It would be still, certainly, His Majesty's wish that no new peer should be created until the election of the twenty-eight had taken place; and even, as I before stated, that the numbers could be made at different rather than at the same time; but if you have entered into positive engagements upon that subject, His Majesty will not refuse to confirm them, and your Excellency will proceed to carry them into effect at the time and in the manner you shall judge most expedient for His Majesty's service.

As His Majesty had authorised assurances to be given to Lord Ely that he might depend upon being made a Peer of Great Britain, although the eminence of Lord Castlereagh's services have been such as, in His Majesty's gracious consideration as well as in the unanimous opinion of the public, to entitle Lord Londonderry to that distinction,—as the claims of the Marquis of Drogheda and of the Earls of Ormonde and Carysfort to be members of the Representative Peerage were irresistible,—it will not appear so unreason-

able that I should have imagined that some of your engagements in that respect must be conditional also, and I had nothing in particular to lead me to suppose that the displacing the persons whom I suggested as the most easily removable, was inconsistent with your engagements; but the assurances I now understand to have been given by your Excellency, make me desist from urging that matter further, and I shall confine myself solely to recommend it to you to find an opening for Lord Drogheda among the candidates for the Representative Peerage, and to reserve one for Lord Londonderry, should he be prevailed upon to see that His Majesty's interests will certainly be best promoted by his not having the British Peerage added to his Irish honours, and that his family will be no sufferers by it, as His Majesty is pleased to authorise your Excellency to assure Lord Londonderry and Lord Castlereagh, that at any time that it may be the wish of Lord Londonderry, or of any of his descendants when in possession of the title, to have a British peerage conferred on them, the sense His Majesty has of Lord Castlereagh's most distinguished and meritorious services will ever be remembered by His Majesty, and His Majesty will be ready to fulfil their wishes in such a manner, that, should it not take place in the lifetime of Lord Londonderry, his posterity by his present or any future Countess, would derive the same benefit from it as if the creation had taken place in the lifetime of the present Earl. I abstain from entering into any reasoning about the Marquisates, as well as about the other promotions proposed in the peerage, upon the ground of the engagements your Excellency has entered into with the parties interested, being absolute and irrevocable, but by resorting to those means which of all others are the least likely to be recommended to, or adopted by His Majesty. I have, therefore, only to say that it will be highly satisfactory to His Majesty, if your Excellency can avoid bringing forward the Marquis of Drogheda's pretensions to a British Peerage, and can find the means of placing him among the representative peers, and that you cannot perform a more acceptable service to His Majesty than by reconciling Lord Londonderry and his family to abstain from availing themselves of the honour of a British Peerage, which I have His Majesty's commands to say he cannot in justice withhold, unless Lord Londonderry and his family are convinced that their interests are best consulted by so doing. His Majesty will also be much gratified by as sparing and as tardy a distribution of Irish honours as the interests of his service will admit, and at the same time that His Majesty relies upon your Excellency's judgment and discretion in preventing any prodigality in the dispensation of the

patronage of the Crown, he looks to you with no less confidence for the preservation of the honour of Government, and the religious performance of all its engagements. I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private and Confidential.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, July 7, 1800.

The assurances which are given in your Grace's letter dated the 27th ultimo, that if you had thought it possible that your despatches of the 13th of June could have placed me in so distressing a situation as I had represented with respect to my feelings of personal honour and good faith, they would not have been transmitted, and the encouragement which you hold out to me to believe that His Majesty will not refuse his consent, even to those promotions which he feels himself the least disposed to confirm, provided that they are recommended by me in consequence of absolute and irrevocable engagements, have afforded me very sincere satisfaction.

I have used every means in my power to obviate the most inconvenient parts of the arrangements which I detailed in my letter dated the 3rd of June, and particularly those which I thought were likely to be most disagreeable to His Majesty, but I am sorry to say that I have hitherto met with very little success, and the enclosed copy of a letter which I have received from Lord Carleton, stating his claims to retire from his judicial situation under the provision of the Act of Parliament, deprives me of the only argument which I could have hoped to use with success in order to induce him to relinquish the Representative Peerage, which object has been generally sought after with an earnestness not to be described, and has involved me in my greatest difficulties.

Lord Londonderry and Lord Castlereagh, who never brought forward any pretensions of their own, are perfectly willing to wait for that mark of His Majesty's favour to which I thought it my duty to state their pretensions, until it shall suit His Majesty's convenience, but it will be impossible for me to throw back the Marquis of Drogheda on the list of representative peers, without not only disappointing a hope which I had sanctioned, but being guilty of a breach of a positive engagement.

I think it unnecessary at present to make any further reference to the letters which have lately passed between us, than to assure your Grace that I shall ever set the highest value upon your friend-

ship and esteem, and that I shall endeavour to conduct the public business in which I am engaged, in the manner that I think will be most agreeable to the views and wishes of His Majesty's Ministers.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LIEUT.-GENERAL HARRIS TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.[1]

[Received July 8.]

MY LORD, Manship Indiaman, Cove of Cork, June 30, 1800.

It having been resolved by the army which achieved the conquest of Mysore, to request your Lordship's acceptance of the sword[2] and war-turban of the deceased Tippoo Sultaun, and also the sword of the Maratta chief Mararirow (who after various contests became prisoner to Hyder Ally), I have now the honour, in the name and by the desire of that gallant army, to present your Lordship with the swords and turban.

In performing this pleasing duty, sensations arise in my mind which any language I possess can very inadequately convey.

When it is considered that your Lordship laid the basis of the system which the energy and decision of the Marquis Wellesley has so firmly secured, that my greatest merit in the part allotted to me in bringing this undertaking to so happy a conclusion, consisted in following the example which I had the satisfaction to witness, brought your operations to the point at which you thought it right to stop, dictated to the Sultaun terms so distinguished for their moderation towards him and justice towards the Allies, when, touching at this kingdom on my return from the scenes of your former glory, I find you effecting even greater services for your country, and when to these considerations is added warm personal gratitude for the protection with which your Lordship has long honoured me, your Lordship may conceive the satisfaction which I feel in having been chosen as the medium to present to you a mark of genuine respect from an army long separated from your Lordship, with little probability of ever again having the honour to be placed under your command.

I avail myself of the earliest opportunity of forwarding the swords and turban by Colonel Gent,[3] whom I beg leave to mention to your Lordship, as an officer whose conduct in the charge of the

[1] The original of this letter is lost, and it has been transcribed from a copy found among Lord Wellesley's MSS. in the British Museum, which was made by a native and is evidently full of errors.

[2] This sword, or rather dagger, is in the possession of the Editor. The handle is of jade, studded with small precious stones. The blade is of the highest-tempered steel.

[3] Colonel, afterwards Major-General, Gent, d. Jan. 29, 1811; m. Jan. 20, 1803, Miss Temple French.

engineer department during the siege of Seringapatam gave me the highest satisfaction, and I have to regret that urgent domestic concerns have compelled me to forego the honour of personally waiting upon your Lordship on so interesting an occasion.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

G. HARRIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL HARRIS.

SIR, Dublin Castle, July 9, 1800.

I have received the favour of your letter, which has been delivered to me by Colonel Gent, together with the sword and turban of Tippoo Sultaun, and the sword of the Maratta chief, Mararirow, of which the gallant army that achieved the conquest of Mysore have so obligingly desired my acceptance.

This distinguished mark of the esteem and regard of those brave officers and soldiers who have rendered such important services to their country, is most highly gratifying to my feelings, and I request that you will assure them that while I live, I shall most gratefully feel the high honour which they have conferred upon me by this most flattering token of their remembrance and approbation.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

ALEXANDER MARSDEN, ESQ., TO EDWARD COOKE, ESQ.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, July 10, 1800.

. . . Lord Castlereagh wishes me to remind you of the necessity of supplies—we are in great want.

Blaquiere's business has been very unpleasant. I succeeded yesterday in a final adjustment with him to the satisfaction of all parties. He played the true black in the business; but all things considered we have got well out of it. Some other of our Swiss guards are pressing us hard.

You know of the very handsome letters which we have got. I am extremely glad of it for the feelings of some of our friends.

Believe me, &c.,

A. MARSDEN.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

MY DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, July 11, 1800.

. . . It is astonishing that the Cabinet should have taken so little concern about the Irish affairs: Dundas certainly

knew nothing of the business, and Mr. Pitt never saw the D. of Portland's letter, the style of which was certainly that of a severe reprimand. This is the more inexcusable in Mr. Pitt towards me, for he well knows the sort of letters which the D. of P. is apt to write;[1] and I perfectly remember his being at much pains to prevent Lord Camden's feelings being hurt in consequence of a letter which his Grace had sent to Ireland when he (Mr. Pitt) was out of town.

When Lord Castlereagh was in England he went through the list of the Irish Peers with Mr. Pitt, with a view to the Representative Peerage, when the latter did not ask it for Lord Grandison, and rather scouted the idea of Lord Sheffield, when Lord C. stopped at his name; and he consented to *eighteen* new Peers, and did not absolutely limit us to that number, although our conduct has been reprobated for sending over a list of *sixteen*, one of which is a Barony to the present Lord Montrath, with the remainder to Mr. Coote; and two are female Peerages, which can give no weight in the election of the Representatives.

Whatever may be my private opinion and that of others about Sir J. Blaquiere, he governed this country for some years, and he has since held his rank in Dublin as a political character of no small consequence; and there were some critical periods during the contest, at which his leaving us would have exposed the success of the Union to great hazard. I have now, by a very difficult negotiation, prevailed upon him to relinquish the Representative Peerage; and I should feel much greater pleasure in having done it, if it had been recommended to me in a friendly and good-humoured manner.

Affairs on the Continent are as bad as possible, and I do not see how we can either expect or wish Austria to continue a war which in a few months must inevitably terminate in her destruction. The unprovoked insolence of Lord Grenville's letter has placed us in a state of such embarrassment, that I must confess I have hardly a hope that we can extricate ourselves. In the mean time we are as anxious to get rid of an army which we have raised by such extraordinary exertions, and which is by no means at present fit for service—as a child is to pull to pieces a new plaything; and we are squandering our money with the most wanton extravagance.

We are requested to send over a draft of 400 men from the Scotch Fencibles, to form a corps of riflemen under Colonel Manningham[2] for the amusement of the Court, His M. having been

[1] See the Duke of Portland's letter, and Mr. Pitt's memorandum of Nov. 4, 1798.

[2] Colonel Coote Manningham, afterwards a Major-General, and one of the Colonel Commandants of 95th Regt.; d. Aug. 23, 1809.

highly pleased with a specimen which he saw at the camp at Windsor. . . . Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO EDWARD COOKE, ESQ.

[Secret.]

MY DEAR COOKE, Park, July 12.

You have probably heard from Marsden, that Blaquiere[1] has waived his Representative Peerage for *more substantial* objects. I shall not trouble you with the detail. I am much relieved by the termination of this business, though it has cost us dear, and was not very smooth in the transaction. It certainly removes the most unpleasant feature in the arrangement. Carleton has absolutely resigned, claiming his resignation under the Bill. We declined coming to Parliament for a special provision, he will now be one of the Twenty-eight, which produces considerable awkwardness in the list, there being at present one too many.

I hope you will settle with King our further ways and means; from the best calculation I can make we shall *absolutely* require the remainder of what I asked for, namely fifteen, to wind up matters, exclusive of the annual arrangement—and an immediate supply is much wanted; if it cannot be sent speedily, I hope we may discount it here. Pray arrange this; and if they could give General Budé[2] his 300 in England, it would be very convenient at this moment of extreme pressure.

I have prevailed on Sack. Hamilton[3] to take charge of the Canal Board, as First Commissioner, and Gregory[4] to act as Secre-

[1] The "substantial objects" were a pension of 1000*l*. He had previously obtained compensation for his sinecures to the amount of more than 3200*l*. a-year. Lord Castlereagh wrote to Mr. King also, on this same day, "I am happy to tell you that Blaquiere has been prevailed on to see that the House of Lords will not afford the *best field* for his talents. The conviction has not been accomplished without considerable difficulty, but the Lord-Lieutenant left no means untried to accommodate to the King's feelings on this point."

[2] General Jacob Budé, b. 1737, d. Oct. 30, 1818, unm., in the Upper Lodge, Windsor, which the King had given him. Of an old French family, Bude de Vorace. Originally page to the Prince of Orange; then in the Sardinian, and afterwards in the Hanoverian service, ultimately with the rank of General. In 1777, sub-governor to Prince Frederick (Duke of York) and Prince William (Duke of Clarence). For many years in the household of the Duke of York. He was highly esteemed by the Royal Family. His pension was notwithstanding charged on the Irish Civil List.

[3] Right Hon. Sackville Hamilton, b. April 14, 1732, d. Jan. 1818; m. about 1771, Arabella, dau. of Rev. Dr. Berkeley. He filled various offices under the Board of Revenue from 1763 to 1780; was then made Under-Secretary, which office he held, except during Lord Fitzwilliam's administration, till 1796. First Commissioner of Barrack Board, and Director-General of Inland Navigation for many years. M.P. for St. Johnstown from 1780 to 1783; Clogher, 1783 to 1795; and Armagh borough, Oct. 1796 to 1797. He had pensions, either for himself, his wife, or his children, to the amount of 2300*l*. Commissioner of Compensation, 1800.

[4] Mr., afterwards Right Hon. William Gregory, b. 1762, d. 1840; m. 1789, Anne, dau. of William, 1st Earl of Clancarty. He held

tary. This will ensure us an honest Board, and give the measure every advantage. We have passed our Bill, and the arrangement gives general satisfaction.

We shall not finish in the Commons before Friday next, and the Session cannot close sooner than the beginning of the month. If we find that the election of the Peers is likely to go smooth, we may possibly be able to do without the new Peers.

Your 500*l.*[1] is voted; it is not more than your reversionary interest is worth. The average has been taken on the three last years, which gives Hill[2] 2200*l.* a-year. We have had no small trouble in settling the business.

Ever, my dear Cooke,

Most sincerely yours,

CASTLEREAGH.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, July 15, 1800.

As the Warrant of Precedence which accompanies the despatch which notifies to your Excellency the King's intention of conferring the dignity of the Peerage on the several persons who are named in it, is the first instance of the kind that has occurred in Ireland, I conceive it may be satisfactory to you to be informed of the reasons which induced His Majesty's servants to recommend that measure upon the present occasion. Upon its being represented that it had been the practice in Ireland, that in order to preserve the precedence of Peers of the same rank, only one patent had passed in a day, and that consequently it would require more than a fortnight to complete the addition recommended by your Excellency to be made to the Peerage, it was suggested that recourse might be had to the mode which was observed here upon similar occasions, and which always took place, not with regard to time, but for the purpose of ascertaining the precedence of those gentlemen who, not having rank either by birth or by office, would be

various offices for many years, and was Secretary to the Inland Navigation Board, 1800 to 1811; Commissioner of Excise to 1812, and Under-Secretary for the Civil Department from Oct. 5, 1812, to Jan. 31, 1831. M.P. for Portarlington from Feb. 1800 to the Union.

[1] Mr. Cooke had the reversion of the office of Clerk of the Parliaments, then held by Sir George Hill, who survived him many years.

[2] Right Hon. Sir George Fitzgerald Hill, 2nd Bart., b. June 1, 1763, d. March 8, 1839; m. Sept. 10, 1788, Jane, dau. of the Right Hon. John Beresford. Appointed Clerk of the House of Commons in Ireland, Feb. 1798, for which he received at the Union a compensation of 2265*l.* a-year. Lord of the Treasury in Ireland from 1807 to 1814. Vice-Treasurer Dec. 27, 1816, to Nov. 1830. Then Governor of St. Vincent to 1833; and lastly of Trinidad till his death. M.P. for Coleraine, March, 1791, to 1795; then for Derry to Feb. 1798; Londonderry County, Dec. 1800 to 1802; and Derry City to 1830.

placed no otherwise than by the mode used in Ireland, or by some direct signification of the King's pleasure; and it being the general opinion that no possible objection could occur to it, the warrant has been made out in the same form as has been observed here, with those variations only which the circumstances of the case required, and is now, therefore, sent to your Excellency, by which we conceive that it is now in your power to direct all those intended creations to take place on one and the same day. I hope your Excellency will be of opinion that I have fulfilled your commands respecting our old friend Conolly,[1] in the official letter which I shall send you by this post upon the subject of his resignation. But you will besides consider yourself fully authorised to add to it in any manner you think proper, that may appear to you to be necessary or desirable, to give him all the satisfaction he can wish for on this occasion; and, knowing his heart as well as I do, I have no hesitation in saying that I am certain that His Majesty has not any subject who is more zealously attached to his person and Government, or who would exert himself more strenuously than my friend Mr. Conolly always would have done, and always will do, to preserve the constitution of both countries, and to maintain inviolate the connexion—thank God! I may now say the Union—of the two kingdoms.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, July 21, 1800.

Notwithstanding the strong manner in which I stated, in my letter dated the 7th instant, the impossibility of my throwing back the Marquis of Drogheda on the list of Representative Peers, my desire was so earnest to render the arrangement as conformable as possible to His Majesty's wishes, that I made an attempt to induce the only Peer[2] with whom I had the least hopes of succeeding, to relinquish the expectation which I had given him reason to entertain of being named in the list recommended by Government; but, after a long and very unpleasant conversation, I had the mortification to find that I could not with honour withdraw myself from the engagement.

Should it be an object to prevail on Lord Drogheda to wait for his Peerage till a period a little more distant than the pro-

[1] When Mr. Conolly vacated his seat, and resigned his regiment of militia, Lord Cornwallis requested that a complimentary letter should be written to him, thanking him for his conduct during a long parliamentary life.

[2] There is no clue to the name of this Peer.

motion of Lords Ormonde, Ely, and Carysfort, I will endeavour to carry that point on receiving your Grace's intimation.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, July 25, 1800.

. . . By the letters I received yesterday from your Excellency, I am very glad to find that your Excellency will be able to defer the new creations till after the election of the Peers, and that though your endeavours to procure a place among the Representatives for Lord Drogheda[1] have failed, that you are able to defer the request you made in his behalf to H. M., to a future opportunity. From what has already passed upon that subject, you must be sensible of the King's disinclination to increase the peerage of either, and more particularly that of this kingdom; and I am therefore satisfied that it is unnecessary to recommend to you—and not less sure that no endeavours have been or will be wanting on your part—to save His Majesty from those sensations which he but too evidently suffers whenever there is occasion to move him to confer honours of this description for mere political purposes.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, July 28, 1800.

Having very little doubt that we could carry our list of Representative Peers without any additional force in the House of Lords, I had nearly determined not to publish the list of the new Peers before the prorogation of Parliament, and gave leave in consequence to several of them either to go to England or to distant parts of this kingdom.

Some difficulties have however occurred, which will, I believe, put me under the necessity of reverting to my original plan; for Colonel Blake has refused to vacate his seat for the county of Galway by the acceptance of an Escheatorship, by which circumstance the election of Mr. Martin, whom we are bound by the strictest promises to support, would be delayed for six months, and

[1] He was created Lord Moore in England, Jan. 17, 1801.

ultimately put to considerable hazard: and there are likewise doubts whether we could vacate the seat of Mr. Rowley, who is gone to England, on the failure of which the county of Meath, where there is a warm contest, would be kept in a state of riot and distraction until a writ can be issued from the Imperial Parliament. The first of these is the case of most importance, as the honour of Government is in a great degree committed. The Chancellor and the principal friends of Government consider the question as a matter of very little importance, and are confident that the immediate creation of the Peers will occasion no clamour or dissatisfaction, and that at all events very few of them will now be able to give their votes at the election of Representatives.[1]

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The most strenuous exertions of the military had failed to extirpate the banditti who infested some of the wild and mountainous parts of Ireland. Other plans were therefore adopted, and none were considered more likely to be efficacious, than opening roads through districts till then considered inaccessible. Large parties of military were employed in this task, and towards the end of June it was officially notified that new roads in the counties of Wexford, Wicklow, and Carlow were opened, and that detachments occupied twenty-two posts, to protect the peasants carrying provisions to market. Still considerable numbers remained in arms, and in a proclamation, dated Rathdrum, July 3rd, a reward of 210*l.* was offered for the capture of each of the first ten robbers named in a list of thirty-six, subsequently increased to forty-seven names.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, July 28, 1800.

The general tranquillity which for some weeks past has most happily prevailed throughout every part of Ireland, with a few trivial exceptions, has not produced of late any material occurrence, and in consequence it has entirely precluded the necessity of any despatch to your Grace on the internal situation of affairs in this country.

I have the satisfaction also to state, that the formidable banditti in the mountains of the county of Wicklow, under the noted chief

[1] Only five of the new Peers voted.

Dwyer, have been broken up and dispersed; many of them have been apprehended, and I entertain hopes that Dwyer himself will shortly be induced to surrender upon condition of transportation for life.[1]

The partial disturbances, rather of an alarming nature, that had some time since agitated parts of the counties of Tipperary and Limerick, seem at present entirely to have subsided, as well as in the county of Antrim; and in the frequent reports which I receive from the General Officers in the command of districts, there has not of recent date been any act of outrage reported to me.

In the northern part of the province of Connaught, as well as in the western counties of Leinster, the poor have suffered considerably, and the scarcity that was almost universal would have been still more severely felt in the metropolis, if Government had not taken effectual precautions, and if humane and benevolent private subscriptions had not been made for their relief. It is however with peculiar pleasure I have to mention, that although the distress is still very severe and painful in particular quarters, yet in the counties that have suffered the most, a great plenty of provisions is now stated to be brought into the markets, and it is even said that in Mayo and Galway they are at present overstocked, and the prices, particularly of potatoes, are most materially reduced.

I am also to observe to your Grace that there is a most promising appearance of an abundant harvest.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, July 28, 1800.

. . . In answer to your despatch private of the 25th inst., received this afternoon, I can assure your Excellency that His Majesty's Ministers have that perfect reliance on your judgment and discretion, that if it appears to you that the ground of much inconvenience and individual dissatisfaction will be removed by the creation of the Peers taking place previous to the election of

[1] Michael Dwyer, b. 1771, d. 1826; m. 1798, Mary Doyle, dau. of a small farmer. He joined Holt in the mountains of Wicklow in 1798, but separated from him the same year, and put himself at the head of a party of banditti. His regular followers did not exceed 20 or 30, but he could assemble a much larger number. In 1803 Emmett endeavoured to secure his assistance in the attack on Dublin, but failed; and in Dec. of that year he surrendered to Capt. Hume, and was transported to New South Wales, where he died, having been for 11 years High Constable of Sydney. He was uncle of Anne Delvin, in whose house Emmett was concealed, after the failure of his insurrection. Dwyer was a handsome, intelligent man, the type of a brigand of romance.

the representatives of that body, and that the character of Government will not suffer (as you seem to think it will not be likely to do) by such an addition to the Peerage prior to that event, you will consider yourself at liberty to direct the patents to be made out immediately on the receipt of this letter, or whenever you may judge it to be more expedient; and indeed, my Lord, when I recollect how long your Excellency has been entrusted by His Majesty with the power of carrying into effect the gracious intentions which I was commanded to signify to you on this behalf, I cannot but attribute the representation you have made to me upon this subject, to extreme delicacy on the part of your Excellency, and to your anxious desire to consult His Majesty's wishes.[1]

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Aug. 2, 1800.

. . . In regard to Mr. Blackwell,[2] I have to state, that as he was brought over with Tandy, Morres,[3] and Corbett,[4] and was, during the expedition, embarked with the former, his release at present might occasion too much hope in the other prisoners; for although I consider their cases as different, they scarcely warrant at once the making of so wide a distinction. I am there-

[1] These sixteen patents were all dated July 30.

[2] James Bartholomew Blackwell, b. 1765, d. about 1816. He was a student of medicine at Paris, and became a great personal friend of Danton. At the capture of the Bastille, he led the party of the Faubourg St. Antoine. He married, April, 1793, the daughter of a Somersetshire gentleman, a Colonel in the army, under very romantic circumstances. The father and daughter, whilst travelling in France during the Reign of Terror, were seized and brought before a Revolutionary Tribunal. Young Blackwell, then in the French service, came forward to save them from death, and immediately afterwards the young lady became his bride. He was confined in Kilmainham, but liberated Dec. 10, 1801, when he re-entered the French service. The Duke of Portland, in a letter of July 25, says he is "importuned by Mrs. Blackwell's friends;" he describes her brother as a person of considerable influence in Somersetshire; and imagines "that there is no intention of inflicting any punishment upon Mr. Blackwell."

[3] Harvey Morres (related to Lord Frankfort), b. March 8, 1767, d. May 9, 1839; m. 1st, 1794, Louisa, dau. of Baron de Helmstadt; 2nd, 1802, Ellen, dau. and co-heir of Bartholomew Callan, Esq., of Oberstown House, and widow of Dr. Esmonde already mentioned, who was hanged in 1798. He had been in the Austrian service, and on his return home became one of the rebel leaders in Tipperary. After his release he entered the French service, and rose to the rank of Colonel.

[4] William Corbett, b. (of respectable parents) Aug. 17, 1779, d. Aug. 12, 1842. He was one of the 19 undergraduates of Trinity College (among whom were Russell and Emmett) who were expelled for treasonable practices by Lord Clare at his visitation in Feb. 1798. He was taken at Hamburgh, and confined with others at Kilmainham, from whence he made his escape, the details of which are given in the adventures of Moriarty and Dunn in Miss Edgeworth's tale of 'Ormond.' He entered the French army, saw much service, and rose to the rank of General of Brigade.

fore to submit to your Grace the propriety and policy of sending a messenger from England for Blackwell, in order that he may be removed in safe custody, and it may be advisable not to take any step in respect of him which may prejudice the trial of the other prisoners.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Aug. 2, 1800.

You will think that I have totally forgot you, but although I have been going to write to you every day, something has always occurred to make me defer it to the next post.

I have received an application from Mr. Randle Jackson,[1] in the event of Percival's resignation of the Solicitorship of the Ordnance on his being appointed Solicitor-General. It would be very gratifying to me to do a kindness to Jackson, and I should be glad that the opportunity offered.

The outline of your arrangements for the Civil Department of the Ordnance, and the drawing-room[2] in the Tower, appear to me very proper; from the latter, the public has never derived the advantages which it has a right to expect from such an establishment. . . .

I yesterday gave the Royal Assent to the Act of Union, when there was not a murmur heard in the street, nor I believe an expression of ill-humour throughout the whole city of Dublin; had anybody prophesied this, when the measure was first proposed, he would not have met with more credit than my friend Mr. Dobbs did respecting the appearance of the Messiah at Armagh.

I have completed the 21st, 71st, and 72nd regiments to the establishment of 800, with very good volunteers from the Scotch Fencibles, all for unlimited service. . . .

Expeditions[3] I find are going forward, the objects of them are fair and proper, but I am not sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances to be able to judge of their probable success.

Nightingall is coming over for a short time, he is to be married to a daughter of Sir Lionel Darrell's.[4]

I sincerely hope that you and Mrs. Ross like Castlemilk, as it is a great comfort to know that you have a retreat where you can

[1] Randle Jackson, b. about 1768, d. March 15, 1837. Counsel to the East India Company.

[2] The drawing-room was the place where the Ordnance Maps were prepared. The Map-office is now removed to Southampton.

[3] See letter to General Ross, Oct. 8.

[4] Sir Lionel Darrell, Bart., so created May 12, 1795; b. Sept. 25, 1742; d. Oct. 30, 1803; m. July, 1766, Isabella, dau. of Timothy Tullie, Esq., Chairman of the E. I. Company.

be happy. How long have I possessed this knowledge to little purpose!

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Aug. 2, 1800.

It is with the utmost satisfaction that I have to report to your Grace, that I yesterday gave the royal assent to the Union Bill, and that it passed without a murmur in the city of Dublin, and without the smallest appearance of discontent or uneasiness.[1]

I have also this day delivered from the Throne, the Speech proroguing the Parliament, and which is to terminate the resident Legislature in Ireland, and it is with real pleasure that I have to congratulate your Grace and His Majesty's confidential servants on this auspicious event.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LIST OF THE LORDS TEMPORAL ELECTED TO REPRESENT THE PEERAGE OF IRELAND IN THE PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Aug. 2, 1800.

EARLS—	CLANRICARDE, A.	VISCOUNTS—	WICKLOW, B.
,,	WESTMEATH, B.	,,	NORTHLAND, A.
,,	BECTIVE, A.	,,	OXMANSTOWN, B.
,,	RODEN, A.	,,	O'NEIL, E.
,,	ALTAMONT, A.	,,	BANDON, B.
,,	GLANDORE, E.	,,	DONOUGHMORE, A.
,,	LONGFORD, A.	,,	CARLETON, E.
,,	ERNE, B.	BARONS—	CAHIR, B.
,,	DESART, B.	,,	GLENTWORTH, A.
,,	LEITRIM, A.	,,	CALLAN, E.
,,	LUCAN, B.	,,	SOMERTON.
,,	LONDONDERRY, A.	,,	LONGUEVILLE, E.
,,	CONYNGHAM, A.	,,	ROSSMORE, A.
,,	LLANDAFF, E.	,,	TYRAWLEY, E.

The above, with the exception that the name of Lord Londonderry is substituted for that of Sir John Blaquiere, is the very list originally proposed by Lord Cornwallis, and to which the Duke of Portland so strongly objected. The seven Peerages marked E. are now extinct; the present possessors of the Peerages marked

[1] There is a letter from Lord Castlereagh of the same date, in which he says that, notwithstanding the measure was in general approved of, it was thought advisable not to fire the guns, or make any public demonstration in Dublin itself. Nor were there any rejoicings in London. The Government thought that, as the state of affairs was in general so disastrous, they must reserve the Union with Ireland, their only successful measure, for the King's Speech on proroguing Parliament. The salutes, &c., were therefore postponed till Jan. 1, 1801, when the Union actually took effect.

A. and B. are respectively English and Representative Peers. Lord Somerton alone (now Earl of Normanton), does not sit in the House of Lords.

Two members of the Irish House of Commons alone now survive: the present Earl of Charlemont and Sir Thomas Staples. Lord Charlemont is also the only Peer remaining who had a seat in the Irish House of Lords, for though Lords Gormanston and Southwell were both more than of age at the time of the Union, they, being Roman Catholics, were incapable of voting.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Aug. 13, 1800.

In the list I transmitted to your Grace of intended promotions in the Peerage, I omitted to include Lord Somerton, the Archbishop of Cashel, for the rank of Viscount, who had my promise to that effect in the event of any Baron junior to him being promoted to that honour.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Aug. 16, 1800.

I am setting out on this auspicious day[1] on a tour, taking an interior circle, not going further north than Enniskillen, or further south than Limerick. I wish to examine carefully the Pass of Newtown Stewart in the county of Tyrone, about seven miles on this side of Strabane, by which any enemy landing at Lough Swilly or in the upper Bay of Donegal, must penetrate into the country; for I think if the French make a separate peace with Austria,[2] of which I have little doubt, they will turn their thoughts to this country. I have received a very kind invitation from Lord Enniskillen, to whom I shall certainly make a visit. The late reverses on the Continent have undoubtedly made the disaffected in this country a little more active, but hitherto according to my opinion in no degree to create serious alarm. The gentry of this country take up reports and opinions hastily, and are equally violent in their thoughts and actions. The Chancellor is full of apprehensions in the county of Limerick, and I think from a letter which I received from Lord Castlereagh in the North, that he is more sensible of dangers than there is at present occasion for.

[1] The anniversary of the battle of Camden.

[2] An armistice was (July 15) concluded between the French and Austrians, and this was followed by a treaty signed at Paris, July 28; but the Emperor of Austria, declaring that his plenipotentiary, Comte de St. Julian, had exceeded his powers, refused to ratify it.

I am as watchful as any of them, but I in general discourage the accounts of plots and traitorous conspiracies, as I know the principal object of the authors is to make them an excuse for the violences which at all times they wish to commit.

Nothing can be more quiet than Dublin. In our procession through a part of the Liberties, in going from the Castle to St. Patrick's Cathedral at the Installation, the concourse of people was immense, and they all had cheerful countenances, and when I passed they cried out, "There he is; that's he," and often added, "God bless him." These are not unpleasant circumstances to a man who has governed a country above two years by martial law.

I have not had an opportunity of seeing Mr. Upton[1] since I received your letter, he called on me for a few minutes with his brother.[2] He does not stand for the county of Monaghan, where he would not have the smallest chance of success. The candidates are Colonel Westenra[3] and Mr. Leslie,[4] son of the late member. Government takes no part, but it could on no account be hostile to Westenra, who is supported by Lord Clermont, and all those who married the heiresses of Lady Blayney.[5]

Lord Templetown, who had no support to give but his vote in the House of Lords, is angry that he is not made an Earl and a Representative Peer, but it is my lot to meet with unpleasant circumstances of that nature every day, and, what is still worse, to have promises claimed which I never gave, for there is no trick too impudent or too profligate for a thorough-paced Irish politician. I said that, from what I heard, I thought the object of the expeditions now going out were reasonable, but I by no means know that they are attainable, as I am totally ignorant of the information on which they were undertaken.

[1] Hon. Fulke Greville Upton, 2nd son of Clotworthy, 1st Baron Templetown, a Colonel in the army; b. April 3, 1773, d. March 4, 1846. He assumed the name and arms of Howard, in consequence of his marriage, July 7, 1807, with Mary, only child and heir of Richard Howard, Esq., of Elford and Castle Rising. He was for several years A.D.C. to General Ross. M.P. for Castle Rising from 1808 to 1832.

[2] John Henry, 2nd Baron Templetown, made a Viscount March 8, 1806; b. Nov. 8, 1771, d. Sept. 21, 1846; m. Oct. 7, 1796, Mary, dau. of John, 5th Earl of Sandwich. M.P. for Bury St. Edmonds from Aug. 1803 to 1812.

[3] Warner William Westenra (the successful candidate on this occasion), b. Oct. 14, 1765, d. Dec. 10, 1842; m. 1st, Oct. 3, 1791, Mary Anne, dau. of Charles Walsh, Esq., of Walsh Park; 2nd, June 3, 1819, Augusta, dau. of Francis Lord Elcho, and sister of Francis, 7th Earl of Wemyss. Mr. Westenra, Aug. 6, 1801, succeeded to the title and estates of the 1st Lord Rossmore, so created 1796, with remainder to the issue male of his wife's sisters, of whom Mrs. Westenra was one.

[4] Charles Powell Leslie, b. about 1766, d. Nov. 15, 1831; m. 1st, Anne, dau. of Rev. Charles Ryder, son of John, Archbishop of Tuam; and, 2nd, May 24, 1819, Christiana, dau. of George Fosbery, Esq., of Clorane. M.P. for Monaghan from Nov. 1801 to 1826, and for New Ross from Aug. 1830 to June, 1831.

[5] Mary, widow of Cadwallader, 7th Baron Blayney, and dau. and sole heir of Sir Alexander Cairns, Bart., of Monaghan; d. Aug. 28, 1790; m. 1st, Aug. 3, 1724, Lord Blayney; and 2nd, Colonel John Murray, by whom she had five daughters,—Lady Rossmore, Lady Clermont, Mrs. Jones (wife of the Right Hon. Theophilus Jones), Mrs. Westenra, and Mary, who died young.

Mr. Dundas sent me Lord Wellesley's letter and his answer, and the papers respecting the Nabob of Arcot; [1] I told him that I wished the latter to be so managed, as either to frighten him so much as to induce him to give up the management of the country, or to furnish a pretext for taking it from him.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Slane Castle, Aug. 17, 1800.

I have hitherto omitted to mention to your Grace that I promised Lord Longueville, to move His Majesty to confer upon Lord Bantry the dignity of a Viscount.

Your Grace is too well acquainted with the strong parliamentary interest which Lord Longueville possesses, and of his support of the measure of the Union, to render anything further on my part necessary in urging a compliance with his request.

I likewise believe that I omitted to mention to your Grace, that I had engaged to recommend Lady Viscountess Castlestewart for the dignity of a Countess, since which Lord Castlestewart [2] has applied that he himself may be made an Earl, to which exchange I conceive that there can be no objection.

Lord Castlereagh will explain the particular pretensions of Lord Castlestewart.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CASHEL TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY LORD, Cashel, Aug. 26, 1800.

Since I came from Dublin to this country I have had so much reason to apprehend that this year's crop of potatoes will fall far short of a sufficiency to feed those who depend upon them for their support, that it seems to be indispensably necessary to renew

[1] Lord Cornwallis, when in India, had with difficulty prevailed on the then Nabob of the Carnatic to observe the existing treaties. His son, Omdad ul Omrah, who succeeded Oct. 16, 1795, was still more impracticable. On the capture of Seringapatam, papers were found proving him to have been in constant communication with Tippoo. After much consideration, Lord Wellesley determined to take possession of the Carnatic, unless certain terms were agreed to by the Nabob, whose death, July 15, 1801, put an end to the discussion. His son was however equally obstinate, and the result was the annexation of the Carnatic before the close of the month.

[2] Andrew Thomas, 6th Lord and 1st Earl of Castle Stuart, so made Dec. 29, 1800; b. Aug. 29, 1725, d. Aug. 26, 1809; m. Aug. 2, 1782, Sarah, dau. and co-heir of Mr. Justice Lill.

the proclamation against distilling of corn. I also doubt whether it may not become necessary to prohibit the exportation of it. That the crop of potatoes will be extremely defective is the opinion of every skilful person with whom I have conversed on this subject. Should this opinion be well founded, which I believe it to be, I submit to your Excellency whether some means ought not to be forthwith adopted, to avail yourself of the present plentiful crop of corn as a substitute for the potatoes.

Your Excellency will, I hope, excuse the liberty I have taken in suggesting this idea to your better judgment; who will, I am sure, do what upon due consideration shall be more advisable on this occasion.

I have, &c.,

C. CASHEL.

LIEUT.-COLONEL LITTLEHALES TO MAJOR-GENERAL SIR JAMES DUFF.

SIR, Dublin Castle, Sept. 11, 1800.

In consequence of the representation of the alarming state of part of the district under your command, which was this day made by the magistrates and gentlemen of the county and city of Limerick to my Lord-Lieutenant, at the meeting convened by his Excellency for that especial purpose, I am directed by his Excellency to acquaint you that a professional gentleman of legal experience, ability, and integrity, will be selected, with a view of assisting you in conducting the proceedings of courts-martial, the necessity of which is at present too apparent, and of arranging the evidences and preparing the witnesses for prosecution. This gentleman will be desired to confer on all occasions with you, and you will cause all informations and depositions of every description to be transmitted to him; he will point out the persons, who being apprehended ought to be bailed; he will compare the evidence with the charges alleged against them respectively, and give his judgment on those cases in which it may be proper to proceed.

The gentleman to be appointed to execute these arduous duties, will arrange the nature of the charges, and point out those who are proper objects for trial by court-martial, by the Insurrection Act, or by the ordinary tribunal of justice; he will attend the trials, regulate the evidence and frame the sentences.

You will in every instance consult as far as may be necessary, the wishes of the magistrates and gentlemen of your district, and co-operate with them, at the same time that you will claim their assistance and support, and recommend unanimity and concert to

them, without which it will not be reasonable to expect a speedy restoration of tranquillity and peace.

In order more fully to enable you to suppress the present dangerous spirit of outrage to the laws, and to check the system of horrid whippings and depredation which are continually perpetrated, I am enjoined by his Excellency to invest you with powers to confirm the sentences of courts-martial, in all cases where death is not pronounced, and to inflict corporal punishment, where the sentences are of that nature, provided you are thoroughly satisfied of the guilt and criminality so sentenced.

In delegating these extraordinary powers to you, his Excellency is persuaded that you will use them with firmness and discretion, and that you must be sensible that his Excellency can only bring himself to grant them to you, to relieve the loyal inhabitants from the cruel sufferings to which they are at present exposed.

It will be indispensably necessary for you to establish your headquarters at Limerick, and not to quit the immediate vicinity of that station but in cases of emergencies.

His Excellency recommends through you to the magistrates and gentlemen of the county of Limerick, to establish parochial offices, and to obtain a particular description of the individuals in each parish, and make such further regulations as may appear to you to be necessary.

In short, by a temperate, firm, and judicious line of conduct, aided and supported by the magistrates and gentlemen of the district, there cannot be the smallest doubt but that you will with your own exertions, and the assistance of the Military whenever the Civil power may demand it, speedily and effectually bring to justice all delinquents, and restore peace to this disturbed part of Ireland.

I have, &c.,

E. B. LITTLEHALES.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Sept. 17, 1800.

I returned to this place on the 13th, after a scene of crowded tables and constant hurry of twenty-eight days, to which my spirits are very unequal. I found however no trace of ill-humour with respect to the Union, and with the exception only of the county of Limerick, the whole country through which I passed was as perfectly tranquil as any part of Britain. The disturbances and outrages in the county of Limerick, according to the unanimous opinion of the magistrates, whom I convened to meet me in the

county-hall in Limerick, do not proceed from any remains of the old leaven of treason and rebellion, but from local causes of discontent, such as tythes, and the letting lands over the heads of the ancient occupiers. But from whatever species of grievances they arise, it is absolutely necessary that the present horrors should be checked, or the country will be depopulated, and I flatter myself that I have, with the concurrence of the meeting I mentioned, arranged a plan that will answer the purpose.

We succeed miserably in our expeditions, which will I am afraid never force Buonaparte to submit to our terms: would to God that we had peace almost on any terms, for it is evident we cannot make war.

Lord ——'s situation is much to be lamented, but I confess that I see no prospect of its being improved by the plan proposed by Mr. ——. Without service or money, and with very little interest, never intending to join any regiment, how is he to get his name pushed forward from being youngest Lieutenant in some corps to the rank of Field-Officer? it would perhaps be easier if he was a more obscure man. It appears to me on the whole that the attempt would engage those who embarked in it, in endeavouring to carry one of the most outrageous and mischievous jobs that ever was proposed, without a prospect of any adequate advantage to the person for whom it was undertaken; and after the line of conduct which I have myself observed, and the language which I have uniformly held on the abuses of the army, I should perhaps be more blameable than any other person, if I gave it any support. After all I suspect that Lord ——'s military inclinations are, like his father's, principally confined to the plumage and tinsel of war. I annex an extract of what I wrote to a certain personage on the subject of expeditions.

Give my kindest compliments to Mrs. Ross, and

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[Extract.]

Sept. 7, 1800.

"I admit that whilst we are at war, and have the means of acting, we should not remain entirely on the defensive; but at the same time I would not go lightly in quest of adventures, with regiments raised with extreme difficulty, without means of recruiting, and which are at present in an unformed state, and commanded principally by officers without experience and knowledge of their profession. The expense likewise of expeditions is enormous, and the disgrace attending upon ill success is not likely to promote

that most desirable object, a good Peace; I therefore think that the probability of attaining solid advantages should clearly appear.

"You will not in our present circumstances suspect me of looking forward to a Continental war, or of thinking that any benefits can arise from a numerous encampment at Windsor; but I wish to improve our present disposable force, of which it stands in the greatest need, and would not hazard the destruction of it, unless the objects to be obtained were of real importance.

"If there is a reasonable prospect of success at either of the places you mention, I think them of sufficient consequence to justify the attempt."

EARL CAMDEN TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

DEAR CASTLEREAGH, Wildernesse, Sept. 26, 1800.

. . . I apprised Mr. Pitt of the necessity of writing such a letter to Lord Cornwallis as should persuade him of the real wish of the English Government that he should remain in Ireland, and he told me he would speak to the Duke of Portland, who, he doubted not, would write to him in such a manner as would be most likely to induce him to stay there with comfort to himself.

Most affectionately yours,

CAMDEN.

The rest of the letter contains a proposition to Lord Castlereagh to relinquish the office of Keeper of the Signet in Ireland in favour of Mr. Pelham, on the understanding that the office of Chief Secretary would not be in the gift of the Lord-Lieutenant, but of the Prime Minister, and thus be more permanent in its character.

Lord Castlereagh answered the following day by placing his office of Keeper of the Signet at Mr. Pitt's disposal, but suggesting that when Mr. Pelham resigned the office of Secretary of State, it should be permanently affixed to that of Chief Secretary.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Received Sept. 29.]

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, Sept. 25, 1800.

. . . Our time has been so much occupied of late *by the most important of all possible subjects*,[1] as you will probably have

[1] M. Otto, the French agent in England for the exchange of prisoners, had towards the middle of August made some overtures for an armistice between France and England. Projets and contre-projets were exchanged, but without effect; and, on Oct. 5, M. Otto

been informed by Lord Castlereagh, that I trust you will forgive us for detaining him till next week, before which it will be impossible for us to take into consideration the different propositions respecting the provisions for Roman Catholic and Dissenting Clergy, and the other very important questions, relative to the Roman Catholics in general and tythes, but in the course of which I trust and believe that he will be enabled to lay before you the opinion of the King's servants upon all those subjects, but certainly on the two first.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Oct. 8, 1800.

The letter of which I sent you an extract was addressed to D. (Dundas) who has always treated me with more attention and confidence than any other of my late colleagues. The ultimate object[1] of the expedition which was to have been carried into execution after the junction of Sir R. A. (Abercromby) is laid aside. Being totally ignorant of the information, if any existed, on which it was to be undertaken, I am not authorised to give an opinion on its probable success, but I am inclined to think it was the wisest thing to let it alone. I understand that of the force which has been collected at Gibraltar for the purpose of expeditioning, supposed 20,000, 5000 are to go to Minorca, 10,000 to Lisbon, and 5000 are to come to Ireland. I am afraid that any defalcation of the number will fall on Ireland.

I cannot help entertaining considerable apprehensions that our Cabinet will not have the firmness to adopt such measures as will render the Union an efficient advantage to the empire. Those things which, if now liberally granted, might make the Irish a loyal people, will be of little avail when they are extorted on a future day. I do not, however, despair.

His Majesty first sent me a private communication through the Duke of Portland, and afterwards ordered a public letter to be written by his Grace, desiring that I would immediately arrange the consolidation of the Ordnance establishments of Great Britain

announced that the negociations were at an end. Malta, then besieged by the English, was one great cause of dispute. That difficulty had however been already removed, though neither party knew it. The island surrendered Sept. 15.

[1] This army was assembled at Minorca under Sir Charles Stuart; and was afterwards sent to Gibraltar, and placed under Sir R. Abercromby. The plan alluded to was to land the troops between Genoa and Nice, take possession of the passes of the Maritime Alps, and cut the French in Italy off from all communication by those routes with France. The rapid success of Bonaparte, after Marengo, rendered this scheme hopeless.

and Ireland, and offering to put as many of the officers of the Irish artillery into the line as were not qualified for the artillery service. To the private letter I replied that I thought the consolidation very advisable, and that it would be very proper to arrange a plan for effecting it; but that I hoped it would not be brought forward immediately, whilst the wax was still warm on the patents of the new Master-General and Lieut.-General—that it would not be a popular measure on this side of the Channel, and that I should therefore recommend that, instead of standing alone as the first feature of the Union, it might be brought forward some months hence, accompanied by other arrangements of a more pleasing and palatable nature. I shall answer the public letter which I received yesterday, with a similar proposal of delay.

To have run the hazard of agitating this island to a degree of madness, to have taken a step which everybody for the last century would have thought likely to produce a civil war—for what? to consolidate the two Ordnance establishments, which might have been done eight or nine years ago with the greatest ease, if the D. of Richmond had been in the smallest degree accommodating, and which in fact, except as a little scramble for patronage is concerned, has nothing to do with the Union.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Oct. 24, 1800.

This letter will, I conclude, find you settled in town, and I hope that none of the family are the worse for the excursion.

Everything here is going on much as usual; our scarcity is not likely to be so severely felt as yours in England; our potatoe crop, however, is certainly not good, which will probably occasion pretty serious distress in the spring. I am, besides, under some apprehensions that the madness and folly of our Lord Mayor,[1] in the violence of his warfare[2] against forestallers, &c., &c., will

[1] Alderman John Exshaw, b. 1751, d. Jan. 6, 1827.

[2] The doctrines about what was then called forestalling and regrating would in modern times be considered very extraordinary. In the newspapers of the day it is stated that upwards of 400 convictions for these offences took place. Among others Mr. S. F. Waddington was convicted at Worcester, and afterwards at Maidstone, and fined on each occasion 500*l.*, with one month's imprisonment for the first, and three months for the second offence. Lord Kenyon presided at one trial, and when the verdict was delivered, assured the jury that no greater benefit had ever before been conferred upon the country by any jury. He could find no statute bearing on this question, but was obliged to fall back on the common law, based on "Lex Julia de Annonis."

totally destroy the Dublin market. It is a delicate matter for the interference of Government, especially when we have to deal with a fool, who is playing the popular game; but something must be done.

My promised reinforcements, which amounted to two brigades, besides the 4th regiment, are all in the air. God knows what is to become of the Mediterranean army, from which I was to have received the two brigades; and I am told that the 4th cannot be spared from England. We have given, within these six last months, 8000 very fine men from the Irish militia to the line, and between 3000 and 4000 from the fencibles to the line, and Colonel Manningham's rifle corps—which last is a very amusing plaything. Lord Cawdor's fine regiment is likewise leaving us, so that, on the whole, we shall, I am afraid, make but a bad battle if the French should find their way hither. I do not like the regiments that I have seen which have been filled up from the English militia. I have earnestly requested the Duke of Portland to endeavour to prevail on H. M. to postpone for a time the consolidation of the departments of Ordnance and the corps of Artillery.

Lord Castlereagh will return soon to England to try to persuade the Ministers to adopt manfully the only measure which can ever make the mass of the people in Ireland good subjects; but I suspect that there is too much apprehension of giving offence in a certain quarter.[1] I have said that I will stay till next summer, and I think that is as much as can in reason be asked; but I have cause to believe that reason will be put out of the question, and that I shall be further pressed.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Nov. 1, 1800.

The impossibility of insuring a protection to Ireland by means of our fleets at all seasons of the year, and the difficulty of assembling an army in time to oppose a formidable invasion in an island which is open to be attacked at such distant points, and which affords no positions where a small body of troops could materially retard the progress of a superior enemy, have struck me

[1] The King.

very forcibly; and it has often occurred to me that the erection of two or three fortresses, in situations judiciously chosen, might greatly tend to the future security of this part of His Majesty's dominions.

The consideration, however, that a plan of this kind could not be carried into effect within a period that would afford a prospect of its being of any service during the present war, and the apprehension of alarming both countries by a proposition of so expensive a nature, have hitherto discouraged me from submitting my thoughts on this head to your Grace; but having understood lately that similar ideas have been entertained in England by persons in high official situations, and that it is probable that my sentiments may not be unfavourably received, I have been induced to venture to call the attention of your Grace and His Majesty's other confidential servants, to the subject, and to submit to you the expediency of my sending for two or three officers of engineers from England, in whose judgment I could best confide, to examine the country, and fix on the spots where such fortresses could be most advantageously constructed.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The suggestions of Lord Cornwallis coincide singularly with those submitted to Government in a more detailed plan by the Duke of Wellington, when Chief Secretary in Ireland. The latter considered that the nature of the country, and the excellence of the roads made it almost impossible to select any position for an army which was not liable to be turned; and he therefore proposed to construct three fortresses at Cashel, Monaghan, and Galway, able to hold 6000 men each, but for which 4000 would be a sufficient garrison. The King's troops would thus be enabled to hold their ground against superior forces, and the loyal inhabitants would have a safe place of refuge.

Dublin, the Duke thought, could not be defended by lines, or by a system of detached forts; but the Pigeon House, and connected with it, Ringsend, should be fortified, which would require about as strong a garrison as either of the other places. The city would thus be rendered untenable by an enemy, who could receive no supplies by sea. Lord Cornwallis, in 1802, while commenting upon Colonel Hope's plans, suggests a course very similar to that subsequently proposed by the Duke. But to garrison such fortresses, and yet retain a corps available for field operations, required

a large force. Lord Cornwallis had repeatedly complained to the Government of the insufficiency of the army, both as to numbers and quality. In July, 1799, out of nearly 60,000 men, he had only five regiments of regular cavalry, and nine battalions of the line. In September, 1800, when he had a little above 40,000 men, he renewed his application for more troops, grounding it on the political state of the country, and on the danger which would arise from the landing of 10,000 or 20,000 men.

"The country," he said, "is quiet, but on an invasion, with prospects of success, the ill disposition of the Irish would show itself in hostility and outrage. The yeomanry not calculated to serve in the field against a regular army; the militia and fencibles incomplete, and very deficient in officers capable of conducting them against veterans; the regulars good in officers, but their ranks filled with recruits from militia and fencibles."

At this time, as Colonel Littlehales informed Lord Castlereagh, there were not, out of the large number on paper, 20,000 men fit for duty, who could be reckoned upon to defend a country peculiarly open to invasion from its numerous bays; nor, in the opinion of Lord Cornwallis, was there any defensive position in which it would have been wise to await an attack. The French, he thought, could easily force him to fight, or compel him to give up the open country, which would inevitably lead to a general insurrection. Unless, therefore, the blockade of Brest could be maintained with certainty, Lord Cornwallis earnestly pressed for a large reinforcement—at least 7000 infantry and two regiments of light cavalry.

The English Government on this occasion endeavoured to meet the difficulty, by offering, as they had previously done, foreign troops. At one time they had proposed Russians; in November of this year they proposed 6000 Dutch, to which Lord Cornwallis reluctantly assented; but even these were never sent, and with a force not much more than sufficient to preserve domestic tranquillity, he was left to meet the risk of a foreign invasion, which happily was prevented by the activity of the fleet.

These were not the only military difficulties against which Lord Cornwallis had to contend. Notwithstanding all his exertions many regiments were in a lamentable state of discipline. Some instances of this have already been given, and the conduct of the troops, especially of the militia, does not appear to have improved this year. The most stringent general orders were issued, but were so ill obeyed, that it was necessary to repeat them week after week, till the close of the summer. Provisions, especially potatoes, were forcibly seized on their way to market, and subordinate officers were

in the habit of pressing cars, nominally for the use of the army, but really for their own. Occasionally officers were guilty of crimes of a deeper dye. A female, who was a crown witness in a case of murder, was brought into a garrison town for the protection of her life. Lieutenant —— of the — regiment, and Lieutenant —— of the — militia, under whose charge she was placed, availed themselves of their position to commit the most criminal outrages upon her. A large reward was offered in the Gazette for their apprehension, but by an immediate flight they escaped the punishment which their conduct had deserved.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Nov. 1, 1800.

I have the honour to transmit to your Grace a distribution of His Majesty's forces in Ireland, a return of the stationary and disposable troops, and copies of the secret instructions which have been sent to the general officers commanding districts.

With respect to the quality of our troops, it is proper that I should explain to your Grace that the Irish militia and fencible corps serving in this country have, within a few months, given about 12,000 of their best men to the regular service, and that, consequently, a great portion of this part of our force is composed of raw and undisciplined recruits.

On the subject of the militia and fencibles I must likewise observe, that the same sense of subordination, and an equal zeal and energy, cannot be expected from the officers in general of troops of this description, as may be naturally looked for amongst those who have chosen the army as their profession, and whose great objects in life depend entirely on the military character which they may be able to establish.

The regiments of the line serving in this country, having been lately filled up from a very reduced state by volunteers from the English militia, must likewise be considered as young regiments, and the admission of a proportion of militia officers into those corps, with temporary rank only in the army, in which they are to expect no further promotion, exposes them, in some degree, to the inconveniences I have stated in the fencible and militia service.

Comparing our present force with the number of troops in this country in May, 1799, the infantry has suffered since that period a reduction of 6000 men, and will, in a few days, be still further reduced by the departure of the Carmarthen regiment.

In estimating the force with which the enemy is likely to attack, we can only limit the amount by the extent of their means of maritime conveyance, for there is at present little reason to believe that the French will not have it in their power to employ as many veteran troops in the invasion of Ireland as their naval resources will enable them to transport.

In 1796 they embarked 16,000 men on board of ships-of-war, a considerable part of which reached the Irish coast in 48 hours from Brest, and the extraordinary circumstances of the weather alone rendered the attempt abortive. With the addition of the Spanish ships it is not unreasonable to suppose that they have now the means of transporting a much larger number.

The risk of being intercepted can hardly be said to be greater than it was at that time, and their success in evading our fleet was such, as to encourage them to repeat the experiment.

They have since tried to move the country by small expeditions, but they find that the system will not answer, and tends only to dishearten and destroy those who are well-affected to their cause. If, then, after she is freed from all her other enemies, we are to carry on a maritime war with France, stripped of her colonial possessions, and precluded altogether in her present situation from commerce, is it not highly probable that the enterprising spirit of Buonaparte will attempt to strike a formidable blow at the vitals of the British empire, even at the hazard of sacrificing a remnant of navy which in its present condition, is rather a burthen than a protection to his country, and which would not be of material assistance in facilitating a plan of founding a respectable marine in France after a peace?

Having given my reasons to your Grace for thinking that the enemy is more capable than on a former occasion to make a powerful attack on this island, and having stated that our infantry, on which the defence of this country depends, has been considerably decreased in numbers and by no means improved in quality, I feel it to be my duty to represent the expediency of sending a reinforcement of 5000 men to Ireland.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Nov. 6, 1800.

. . . The prospect of public affairs is indeed most gloomy. What a disgraceful and what an expensive campaign

have we made! Twenty-two thousand men, a large proportion not soldiers, floating round the greater part of Europe, the scorn and laughing-stock of friends and foes. The infatuation of Ministers is so great that I have no hopes of amendment, and if the means of forming another army should fall as unexpectedly again into their hands, they would in a few months in like manner bring it to disgrace and ruin. In the mean time I am very uneasy about our situation at home, and have made a strong requisition for reinforcements.

The country is attackable on so long an extent of coast that it will be very difficult to assemble a sufficient force to make any opposition to the progress of a capable and active enemy before he will have overrun à great part of the island, that I have long thought of constructing two or three tolerably good fortresses to cover the assembling of the army, and to enable our troops to adopt some measures of vigour without being exposed to the hazard of a total overthrow.

Considerations of expense, and the former ill-success of the D. of R.,[1] prevented me from making any communication of my sentiments to Ministers, but understanding from Lord Castlereagh that Mr. Pitt entertained similar opinions, I have made the proposition to the D. of P., and have desired Macleod to sound Twiss about coming over to assist in the choice of the proper stations in the event of the Cabinet's adopting any part of my ideas.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

This island is as quiet as it has been for many years, and will remain so if it is tolerably governed, and the French do not come over.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Nov. 9, 1800.

General Massey[2] has most strongly urged me to recommend that his wife should be created a peeress in her own right, as a reward for his long and faithful services as a soldier and his zealous loyalty as a subject.

[1] The Duke of Richmond. His plan for fortifying Portsmouth and Plymouth was negatived by the Speaker's casting vote, Feb. 26, 1786. The numbers were 169 on each side.

[2] General Eyre Massey (brother of Hugh, 1st Lord Massey) was himself created Lord Clarina Dec. 27, 1800; b. May 24, 1719, d. May 17, 1804; m. May 3, 1767, Catherine, sister of Robert, 1st Earl of Leitrim. A General, Colonel of the 27th Regt. He was wounded at the battle of Culloden, led the storm at the Havana, and served with Wolfe in America. M.P. for Swords from 1790 to 1797.

I informed him that I could not venture to ask your Grace to lay before His Majesty any further request from me on the subject of peerages without danger of incurring his displeasure; and that I had, on this ground, lately resisted many solicitations of that nature.

General Massey, however, was so confident of His Majesty's disposition to confer such a mark of favour upon him, and of your Grace's inclination to promote his wishes, that I could not refuse to transmit his application, that His Majesty may judge how far it will be proper to grant to Mrs. Massey the honour which he solicits.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE EARL OF CLARE TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Ely Place, Nov. 14, 1800.

I have seen Sir Michael Smith,[1] and communicated to him the offer which you authorised me to make to him, of the Lord-Lieutenant's recommendation to His Majesty to appoint him Master of the Rolls. He is ready to accept the situation on terms which appear to me to be perfectly reasonable. The tenure of his office of a Baron of the Exchequer is during good behaviour, and the annual profits of it, salary and fees included, are little short of three thousand pounds. By an Act passed in Ireland in the reign of Hen. 7th, the tenure of the office of Master of the Rolls can be during the King's pleasure only, and from every inquiry which I have been enabled to make, the profits of it do not exceed on an average eighteen hundred pounds yearly. There has, however, been a shabby perquisite of the office arising from an open sale of the situation of Six Clerks and Examiners of the Court of Chancery, which certainly ought to be abolished. Under these circumstances I feel that if the office of Master of the Rolls is to be placed on a respectable foundation in this country, it ought to be assimilated as nearly as may be to that of the Master of the Rolls in England; and if the tenure in that country is permanent, it ought to be made permanent here; so the profits of the office here ought to be made up to the possessor of it (fees included) three thousand pounds

[1] Right Hon. Sir Michael Smith, Bart. So created Aug. 28, 1799; b. Sept. 7, 1749, d. Dec. 17, 1808; m. 1st, Mary Anne, dau. of James Cusac, Esq., of Coolmines; and 2nd, Eleanor, dau. of Michael Smith, Esq. This office had always been considered a political sinecure, and was at this time held jointly by Lords Glandore and Carysfort, with an income, including fees, of 2614*l.* a-year, which sum was granted to them as compensation. It was proposed to appoint Sir Michael, Master of the Rolls during good behaviour, with a net salary of 3000*l.*, and that arrangement was carried into effect.

annually; and if the tenure is not to be permanent, the King should be empowered to make a concurrent grant to the Master of the Rolls of an annuity equal to that provided by the Act of the last Session for him in case of removal, to take effect only if he should be removed from his office; and if Sir Michael Smith has an assurance that such a regulation will be made when the Imperial Parliament shall meet, I make no doubt he will immediately accept the office on the faith of it.

If the Chancellor of Ireland is likely to be called over occasionally to attend Parliament at Westminster, it will be absolutely necessary to the administration of justice here, that there should be an efficient Master of the Rolls, which on the present establishment of the office, no man who is capable of discharging the duties of it will be found to accept it. On the same principle it will be found necessary to have a standing Commission for the custody of the Great Seal in the absence of the Chancellor (with the King's license), directed to the twelve Judges, or by one of them; and I shall take the liberty to send you the sketch of such a Commission, which you will have the goodness to transmit to England. But if there should arise any difficulty there in directing such a Commission, I shall thank you to request in my name of his Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant, that he will have the goodness to recommend to His Majesty to grant me leave of absence to go to England, which is essential to my health, to drink the waters of Bath, previous to the meeting of Parliament; and in the event of any objection to a standing Commission for the custody of the Seals, that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to order a temporary Commission for the custody of it, directed in the usual form to Lord Kilwarden, Lord Yelverton, and Sir Michael Smith.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CLARE.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Nov. 15, 1800.

I have recommended Mr. Toler, who is to succeed Lord Carleton as Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and Lord Charles Fitzgerald,[1] whose situation Lord Castlereagh explained to your

[1] Lord Charles Fitzgerald, second son of James, 1st Duke of Leinster. Created Lord Lecale Dec. 27, 1800, b. June 30, 1756, d. Feb. 18, 1810; m. Oct. 1808, Julia, widow of Thomas Carton, Esq., of Maidstown near Dublin, said in Cox's Magazine to have been a dairyman. A Vice-Admiral. M.P. for Arundel from Jan. to May, 1807; for Kildare county 1776 to 1790; Cavan borough to 1797; Ardfert 1798 to the Union. Commissioner of Revenue 1789 to 1792, and then Muster-Master-General to 1806.

Grace, for Peerages of this kingdom; and with great diffidence I must request that your Grace will endeavour to obtain His Majesty's permission that I may add one more recommendation for this honour, which will positively be the last that I shall presume to make.

The person in whose favour I venture to solicit, is the mother of Mr. Frederick Trench[1] of Woodlawn in the county of Galway. That gentleman exerted himself with zeal and weight in our successful attempt to obtain Resolutions in favour of the Union in the county of Galway, and he made one or two very able and impressive speeches in support of that measure in the last Session of Parliament.

If your Grace can obtain this favour for me from His Majesty, you will greatly oblige me, and relieve me from the disagreeable sensation of parting on ungracious terms with an honourable and disinterested friend, who, if he had, like many others, made his bargain, would not now have had occasion to stand in the light of a solicitor.

I shall wait for your leave before I shall feel myself at liberty to transmit the recommendation. I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Nov. 15, 1800.

Although I must acknowledge that I have only received your Grace's permission to recommend at this period Lords Ormonde, Ely, and Carysfort for British Peerages, yet as Lord Drogheda is the only person who has received assurances that His Majesty intends to confer that favour upon him, but whose promotion is to be postponed until a future creation shall take place, I have ventured to add his name to the enclosed list, trusting that your Grace will be desirous, if possible, to relieve a man of his advanced age from a state of expectancy, and conceiving that an engagement of that kind which is known to lie over, will produce other claims that may be embarrassing to Government, and that every man

[1] Frederick Trench, of the same family as the Earls of Clancarty, created Lord Ashtown Dec. 27, 1800; b. Sept. 3, 1755, d. May 1, 1840; m. May 25, 1785, Elizabeth, dau. and sole heir of Robert Robinson, Esq. M.P. for Maryborough from 1784 to 1790, and for Portarlington from Feb. 1798 till the Union. On the 22nd of Jan. 1799, he spoke early in the evening in favour of Sir John Parnell's amendment; but a few hours later he said that he had misunderstood the effect of that amendment, and should vote with Government, who thus obtained a majority of one. Sir Jonah Barrington asserts that this change of intention was preceded by a conversation in the lobby with Mr. Cooke.

who may think himself of sufficient consequence in this country to bring forward his pretensions to a British Peerage, will desire to be created when that honour shall be conferred on Lord Drogheda.

I consider the situation of Lord Londonderry's family as standing on ground totally different, and that it cannot be connected with that of Lord Drogheda or any other candidate.

Having stated my sentiments and my wishes to gratify an old man and a most loyal subject, I leave the matter in your Grace's hands, and have only to request your forgiveness for what I have presumed to offer on the occasion.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private and Confidential.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Nov. 18, 1800.

I have just received your Grace's letter dated the 13th instant, and although I certainly have a predilection for British troops, yet I am perfectly satisfied that under the present circumstances, it is more expedient that the Dutch troops[1] should be sent to this country.

As that corps is at present stationed in the Isle of Wight, it will, I conclude, be most convenient that they should be sent to Cork, and I shall therefore make my arrangements accordingly.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Nov. 18, 1800.

I this morning received your letter, accompanied by one from the Duke of Portland, and am perfectly sensible that whatever my private opinions may be, I should not be justifiable in hesitating a moment about the acceptance of the Dutch troops, and I shall prepare for their reception accordingly.

It gives me great pleasure to learn that you are to send no more troops to Portugal, being thoroughly convinced that any force that we could possibly have spared, would have been incapable of defending that country, if it had been seriously attacked.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Ultimately these troops were not sent to Ireland.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 1, 1800.

The time is now approaching when the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is to assemble, and the people of Ireland, who have long suffered all the horrors that treason, rebellion, and sectarian rancour could produce, look forward at present to that meeting with composure and confidence.

I am too well acquainted with the spirit of benevolence and liberality which actuates His Majesty's Councils, to doubt the earnest desire of the Cabinet to apply the most efficient remedies to the evils which have brought this island to the brink of ruin, and to which (notwithstanding a degree of temporary remission that has been obtained by the exertions and the moderation of Government) no permanent or radical cure has hitherto been applied; and I feel it to be my duty in the station which I hold, to lay before your Grace such opinions as an anxious and attentive observation during the eventful period of my Lieutenancy have enabled me to form.

Although other causes of much less importance have occasionally contributed to increase the dissensions which have agitated this country, no man who is acquainted with Ireland can deny that the violence of religious animosities has been, and still continues to be, the principal source of all its miseries.

The tract[1] which Lord Castlereagh submitted to your Grace on the great Catholic question is so clear and able, and so entirely comprises every material argument that can in my opinion be urged on that important measure, that I shall not trouble your Grace with any further reasoning on a subject of which you are so fully in possession.

It will, I am persuaded, be equally unnecessary for me to express my apprehensions that the question, if unnoticed by Administration, will in all likelihood be taken up by Opposition in England soon after the meeting of the Imperial Parliament; the probability of such an event, and the mischievous consequences that will attend it, must so forcibly occur to your Grace and His Majesty's other confidential servants, as to induce you to take every means in your power to prefer your claim in time, and to secure to Government the management and the ultimate credit of the measure, whenever Parliament shall think fit to take that business into its serious consideration.

I am aware that the sentiments of a man who came lately

[1] A pamphlet of several hundred pages, written with much ability.

almost a stranger to this country will be received with diffidence, and that it may be proposed to consult the more experienced Irish politicians before it is absolutely determined that any decisive measure shall be adopted.

That there are men of great talents who have long held high stations in Ireland I will readily admit; but on certain points I am afraid that the strength of ancient, and I may almost say hereditary, prejudices will warp their judgment, and get the better of their understanding.

They assert, and I speak from high authority amongst them, that the Catholics of Ireland (seven-tenths of the population of the country) never can be good subjects to a Protestant Government. What then have we done, if this position be true? We have united ourselves to a people whom we ought in policy to have destroyed.

This assertion, however, is not warranted by the conduct of the Catholics in the late political contest on the measure of Union, when they certainly had it in their power to have frustrated the views of Government, and throw the country into the utmost confusion; and I have no doubt, even if the Protestants have hitherto with justice accused them of obstinate and irreclaimable disaffection, that the grounds of those charges will be completely done away when the former feel themselves no longer the objects of suspicion, and are relieved from their present mortifying and degrading exclusions.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 2, 1800.

The inclosed copy of a letter, which I have received from Lord Clanricarde,[1] will prove to your Grace that, although I may have been considered as an importunate solicitor for the friends of Union, I have not succeeded in affording universal satisfaction.

Putting, however, my merits or demerits with respect to Lord Clanricarde out of the question, it is doing him but justice to state that he is an honourable man, and that he has considerable weight and influence in the county of Galway, which he has zealously exerted in the support of Government.

After what I have said in the letter which I wrote in favour of Mr. Trench of Woodlawn, I feel myself precluded from making any

[1] Lord Clanricarde requested that, as in failure of heirs male his property was entailed on females, the titles might descend in the same manner. A fresh patent to effect this was granted, Dec. 29, 1800.

request that would tend to increase the Irish Peerage; I can, therefore, only submit for His Majesty's consideration how far the antiquity of Lord Clanricarde's title and family may give him a claim to such a mark of the royal favour, and I may likewise add the probability of its having no effect, as Lady Clanricarde is a very young woman, and is now about to lie in of her second child.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

EDWARD COOKE, ESQ., TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin, Dec. 9, 1800.

. . . There are several matters which have recently been officially recommended by the Lord Lieutenant, and as the time of the Union approaches, it is extremely wished that every matter depending should be concluded before that time. The Irish Peerages must pass before that day if at all. . . .

Believe me, &c.,

E. COOKE.

MEMORANDUM (in pencil) BY MR. KING.

I know of none except the arrangements of the Secretary's office and the Catholic question, to which no answer has been given, and even with respect to those they have been told that they could not be determined till Lord C. (Castlereagh) should arrive.

ALEXANDER MARSDEN, ESQ., TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Most Private.]

DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Dec. 9, 1800.

I am induced to write to you from the great degree of inconvenience which I am subjected to, by the delay in sending over the King's letter for putting into our hands the money saved in the Civil List in this country, to be applied to Secret Service here.

It has fallen to my lot to make a considerable number of the engagements which this money was to discharge, and I am pressed, in some instances in the most inconvenient degree, to make good my promises. There has besides been borrowed from a person here, a considerable sum, which he is extremely anxious to have repaid. The King's letter for this purpose is, I know, in the Treasury department;[1] but as you have a superintending concern for our distresses here, I beg leave to entreat that you will have enquiry made at the Treasury about it.

Lord Castlereagh has been out of town some time, but will

[1] After a most careful search, neither this document, nor any warrant for the transmission of money to Ireland, for such services as are above alluded to, can be found.

return in a few days; he wrote before he left town to Mr. Rose[1] or Mr. Long[2] about it.

There are some other King's letters which some of our friends here are looking for rather anxiously, but money is the grand desideratum.

I am, &c.,

ALEX. MARSDEN.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, Dec. 10, 1800.

I have spoken to you more than once about my friend Lord Sandwich, and expressed my opinion that it was rather unfair and very unpolitic to counteract his interest in Huntingdonshire. Mr. Brown[3] was the man who represented the county till Lord Hinchingbrook came of age, and when he resigned it, Lord S. promised to endeavour to get him a Crown living. Mr. Brown will not believe that he has exerted himself to obtain one, and is violently enraged on that account, and Lord S. suspects that the Bishop of Lincoln[4] and Lord Carysfort prevent his succeeding in order to destroy his interest, and promote that of Lord Carysfort.

I feel that I have no business to trouble you with this story, but as you have expressed goodwill towards Lord S., and as he has great confidence in you, I trust you will excuse my forwarding his letter—and you will either mention the business to Mr. Pitt, or take no notice of it, as you may think more advisable.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Mr., afterwards the Right Hon. George Rose, b. June 11, 1744, d. Jan. 13, 1818; m. 1769, Theodora, dau. of John Duer, Esq. Originally in the Navy. Secretary of the Treasury July, 1782, to April, 1783, and again from Dec. 1783 to March, 1801. Paymaster-General, July, 1804, to Feb. 1806, and Treasurer of the Navy and Vice-President of the Board of Trade from April, 1807, till his death. M.P. for Launceston, May, 1784, to June, 1788; Lymington to June, 1790; and Christ Church till his death. He was well-known for his readiness in finding plausible excuses for his friends. On one occasion a most intimate acquaintance of Mr. Pitt's applied for some petty office for a constituent. On being asked if he was anxious about it, he said a civil answer would suffice. Mr. Rose sat down, and forthwith handed him a letter, in nearly the following terms:—

"MY DEAR SIR,—Immediately upon receiving your most pressing application I went to the Premier, and I vow I never saw a man so distressed as he was at having just previously promised the place for which you had made such urgent application. Believe me, &c., GEORGE ROSE."

[2] Right Hon. Charles Long, created Lord Farnborough, June 13, 1826, G.C.B., b. 1761, d. Jan. 17, 1838; m. May 28, 1793, Amelia, dau. of Sir Abraham Hume, Bart. Secretary of the Treasury from 1791 to March, 1801. Lord of the Treasury Aug. 1804 to Feb. 1806. Secretary for Ireland Sept. 1805 to March, 1806. Paymaster-General, April, 1807, to July, 1826. M.P. for Rye, Jan. 1789 to 1796; Midhurst to 1802; Wendover to 1806; Haslemere till created a Peer.

[3] Lancelot Brown, son of Capability Brown, b. 1748, d. Feb. 28, 1802, m. Nov. 18, 1788, Frances, dau. of the Rev. Henry Fuller, of Rose Hill. M.P. for Huntingdon Borough from May, 1784, to May, 1787, and for Huntingdonshire from April, 1792, to May, 1794.

[4] George Pretyman, consecrated Bishop of Lincoln, 1787, Bishop of Winchester, 1820; b. Oct. 9, 1753, d. Nov. 14, 1827; m. 1784, Elizabeth, dau. and coheir of Thomas Maltby, Esq., of Germans. He afterwards took the name of Tomline.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 12, 1800.

Macleod may perhaps have informed you that poor Parish is much deranged in mind, and has at his own request left this country, in which he thinks that all persons have conspired to ridicule and abuse him. This melancholy affair is not only shocking to his family and friends, but exceedingly distressing to me at this particular juncture.

I have desired Macleod to send over Colonel Whitworth,[1] or in the event of there being any bar to his coming, some sensible officer of the corps who would be likely to prove useful to me, and to mention it to Lord Howe.

We have nothing new here. Lord Castlereagh, who is still in the north, has been desired to go immediately to England. My situation is unpleasant enough, as I must for many months carry on the business with Cooke, who, although a very clever fellow, is not a man of an accommodating temper, and is much more partial to the old system of Government than to the measures which I have introduced, and I believe has no good disposition towards me.[2] Elliot is going over to reside in England to my great concern.

I have had a correspondence of a very delicate nature with the Duke of Kent,[3] who, if he writes his own letters, must be a young man of talents. I hope I have succeeded in giving opinions contrary to his wishes without offending him; I dare not, however, feel too certain on that point. With the most flattering expressions to myself personally, he expressed an earnest desire to serve under me in this country.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Lieut.-Colonel, afterwards Colonel Sir Francis, Whitworth, R.A., brother to Charles, only Earl Whitworth; b. 1756, d. Jan. 26, 1805. He was knighted as proxy for his brother at the Installation of the Bath, May 23, 1803.

[2] What were Mr. Cooke's feelings towards Lord Cornwallis may be collected from an extract of a letter of his to Lord Castlereagh, marked *most secret*, and dated Dublin, Nov. 9, 1798:—"I am happy your official notification" (of Chief Secretary) "arrived last night. Under all circumstances, I think your Lordship a bold man, and I hope you will be a successful one. What you have already experienced, and what I wrote to your Lordship of Lord Cornwallis' sentiments in expressing himself to the Speaker, prove that you have no pliant twig to manage. How can he hope to manage a nation without advisers, friends, or supporters?" (Mr. Cooke meant, without taking *my* advice, and throwing himself into the hands of the old Ascendancy party.) "I think he is gradually letting the public mind slip away from him, and the hearts of the loyal to cool. I think he suffers a false impression to be made, and to be given of his conduct, contrary to his real sentiments."

[3] There are several letters among Lord Cornwallis' papers from and to the Duke of Kent, in some of which he expresses a similar wish to serve under Lord Cornwallis. But all those relating to this particular epoch must have been destroyed, as no trace of them can be found. It is therefore impossible to explain the allusion in the text.

The Duke of Kent was born Nov. 2, 1767, d. Jan. 23, 1820; m. May 29, 1818, Princess Victoria Mary Louisa, dau. of Francis Frederic Antony, Duke of Saxe Coburg Saalfield, and widow of Emich Charles, Prince of Leiningen.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 13, 1800.

I could not conveniently refuse the earnest request of Colonel Robert King, that I should transmit to your Grace the enclosed letter from his father-in-law, Lord Oxmantown; I informed him, however, that I was precluded from assisting him in obtaining the object for which his Lordship solicits by adding any recommendation from myself, from my having assured your Grace on a former occasion that I would give you no further trouble on the subject of Peerages.[1]

I should do injustice to Colonel King if I did not represent to your Grace that he is a popular young man, and much esteemed and respected in the part of the country in which he resides.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 14, 1800.

Before this letter reaches you, and indeed probably while I am writing, you will receive the fatal account of the death of poor Parish. He left a paper full of expressions which show the goodness of his heart, but recapitulating all the wild ideas and suspicions which had occupied his distracted brain.

I have requested that the Duke of York would not send us the battalion of Dutch artillery, and indeed I wish the whole corps of Hollanders had gone to any other part of the world, but I could not refuse to take them without showing an unaccommodating disposition which would have been ill suited to the difficulties of the times.

You ask me what I am to get, and hint at some newspaper[2] paragraphs about promotion in the Peerage. I assure you that it never entered into my head, nor into that, I believe, of any person on your side of the water; with the exception of Dundas I have met with nothing like kindness or civility from any one. But be that as it may, I would not wish promotion, to which my fortune is not equal.

I shall continue to press the adoption of the measure which can alone in my opinion give quiet or security to this country. When

[1] The request was granted. Colonel King was created Lord Erris, Dec. 29, 1800, and was afterwards, May 30, 1806, made Viscount Lorton.

[2] The rumour of his promotion to a Dukedom. See Jan. 7, 1801.

that point is either carried or rejected, I shall have no other object but that of dozing away the remainder of my days quietly at Culford.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Received Dec. 15.]

MY DEAR LORD, London, Dec. 11, 1800.

. . . Considering how fast the period approaches which limits the creation of Irish Peerages, I shall transmit to your Excellency by this night's mail His Majesty's letters for all on whom that honour is intended to be conferred, except General Massey and Mr. Trench of Woodlawn, the first named because I am unacquainted with the title he wishes to assume, and the latter on account of the precedence to which the General's rank will entitle him, and which will consequently delay the completion of Mr. Trench's patent; but your Excellency may depend upon receiving the King's letters for the creation of those gentlemen, by the return of the post by which you inform me of the title by which General Massey's wish is to be accomplished.

I have also the satisfaction to acquaint your Excellency that His Majesty has been graciously pleased to consent to gratify the wishes of Lord Clanricarde, on condition that there is no male heir of the earldom of Clanricarde in existence, and that the landed estate of the family, which is now in Lord Clanricarde's possession, shall be settled on his eldest daughter and her sisters, and to the heirs male of their bodies in succession respectively; and although His Majesty has the fullest reliance on Lord Clanricarde's correctness in all respects, he has directed me to consult his law officers on the possibility of having the patent drawn in such a manner as to secure the performance of the conditions above mentioned, an object which the disappointment His Majesty has experienced in the case of the Countess of Antrim,[1] makes him more particularly anxious to secure. The King imagined the family estate had been settled upon the eldest daughter, and now finds that there is no difference between the share which she possesses of it, and that enjoyed by her younger sister, except that the eldest has the incumbrance of the family seat. Your Excellency will therefore take particular care when you signify to Lord Clanricarde these

[1] Anne Catherine, Countess of Antrim in her own right, succeeded her father, Randal William, 6th Earl and 1st Marquis of Antrim, July 28, 1791, b. Feb. 11, 1778, d. June 30, 1834; m. 1st, April 25, 1799, Sir Henry Vane Tempest, Bart.; and 2nd, May 24, 1817, Edmund Phelps, Esq. She was mother of Frances, Marchioness of Londonderry.

gracious intentions on the part of His Majesty, to let him clearly understand that they can only be fulfilled upon his acceding without reserve to the conditions which His Majesty thinks proper to prescribe.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 18, 1800.

. . . Lord Castlereagh sailed last night for England, and Elliot follows in a few days, so I shall be left to transact all public business with Cooke, with whom I have not been in the most pleasant habits, and whose sentiments have in general differed much from mine on the subject of managing this country. He was for many years entirely connected with the Chancellor and the old set of Irish politicians.

My situation is altogether as unhappy as you can conceive, and I see no hope of relief, and yet I cannot in conscience and in duty to my country abandon the Catholic question, without which all we have done will be of no avail.

It was said, when I determined to free myself at the first outset from the trammels of the ruling party here, that I should not be able to carry on the Government; a general discontent throughout the island was foretold in consequence of the Union. No predictions ever proved more false, and you may be assured that all the powerful opposers of the measure in favour of the Catholics would join in giving their approbation as soon as it is effected. My only apprehensions are from the K——, from the cabal of late Lords-Lieutenant, and from the inferior cabinet on Irish affairs, consisting of Lords Hobart, Auckland, &c., and the timidity of ministers.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, London, Friday evening, Dec. 19, 1800.

His Majesty having been much solicited to grant a Peerage to the Marquis of Buckingham's *second* son, has at length acceded to that wish, and I, therefore, take the *earliest* opportunity of apprising your Excellency that a letter will probably be sent to you by to-morrow's post, for directing a patent to be made out for

granting to the *Marchioness* of Buckingham[1] the dignity of a baroness by the title of Nugent, with limitations to her second son Lord George Grenville,[2] and his heirs male of the dignity of a Baron.

I think it possible that His Majesty may be induced to make one more addition to the Irish Peerage,[3] but it will not increase the *present* amount of the Peerage, as it will only be a new title for the purpose of continuing the honour to the daughter of a Peer who has no issue male, and whose fortune will descend entire to his daughter.

I am, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

DEAR JAMES, Phœnix Park, Dec. 22, 1800.

I yesterday received your letter, dated the 17th, and most perfectly approve of James's moving the address. The first meeting of the United Parliament affords a most propitious occasion, and I most sincerely hope that he will acquit himself to his own satisfaction, so as to induce him to persevere in taking some share in the business of Parliament.

Our primate is rather reserved, but he seems to like his situation better than he did at first, and appears to be disposed to be as civil and accommodating to Government as could reasonably be expected after the manner of his appointment. I have lost my poor Bishop Young, of whom I was so proud, and the effects of our late political contest will prevent my getting as much credit by his successor.[4] I have carried the Union, and have for the present tranquillised this country, but much remains to be done, in order to render it an useful appendage to the British Empire.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Mary Elizabeth, dau. and heir of Robert, 1st Earl Nugent, b. Dec. 18, 1758, d. March 16, 1813; m. April 16, 1775. Created Baroness Nugent Dec. 27, 1800.

[2] Lord George Grenville, 2nd and last Lord Nugent, b. Dec. 31, 1789, d. Nov. 27, 1850; m. Sept. 6, 1813, Anne Lucy, dau. of General the Hon. Vere Poulett. Lord Nugent was Lord of the Treasury from Nov. 22, 1830, till Sept. 8, 1832, when he was appointed Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, which post he resigned March 13, 1835. M.P. for Buckingham from 1810 to 1812; Aylesbury, to Sept. 1832; and again from 1847 till his death. He was the author of several light articles in prose and verse.

[3] The only patent to which this observation can apply was that of the Earldom of Clanricarde.

[4] George de la Poer Beresford, son of the Right Hon. John Beresford, b. July 19, 1765, d. Oct. 16, 1841; m. 1794, Frances, dau. of Gervais Parker Bushe, Esq., of Kelfane. Bishop of Clonfert Dec. 1800, and then of Kilmore March, 1802, till his death.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 25, 1800.

As the wind is pretty fair this morning, I expect that Whitworth will arrive in the course of the day, when I will get him to prepare statements and explanations respecting the incorporation business. The basis is to consider the officers of the old battalion only, previous to the addition of the second battalion in 1794, as entitled to retire on full-pay, or be placed second on the Line, which includes the field officers (the eldest captain having got his first commission in 1794). Then to reduce eight companies, taking the youngest officers from each rank, who will be placed on half-pay, and some of the second lieutenants, if good for anything, may be placed at the bottom of our corps. We shall then by degrees manage the remaining twelve companies, and find means for providing here for two or three of the captains who have merit.[1]

You will see Elliot, who is now on his road to London; he has been much in my confidence, and can give you the best account of our affairs.

I have been very attentive to Cooke, and have endeavoured to put him as much at his ease as possible with me, so that I hope we shall go on tolerably well together. He has a narrow-minded jealousy, which is inexcusable in so clever a fellow, and being no man of details himself, he will not suffer those who are under him, and are very capable, to manage it for him. The consequence is that the ordinary business is always behindhand, and in great confusion, and everybody who has anything to do at the Castle is discontented. Although connected with the old system and set of men, I do not think he is adverse to the Catholic question, or disinclined to the line of conduct which I pursue in governing the country. On a point on which the Chancellor and myself differed lately (though without quarrelling), when I refused to sign a pardon which he had written himself and sent to me, for some magistrates who were summoned before the Court of King's Bench, for a contempt of Court, Cooke, when he heard of it, was entirely on my side, and I believe gave his opinion very freely to the Chancellor.

I am troubled more frequently than I used to be with those swellings in my feet and ancles, which, although not gout, at least

[1] Similar details respecting the amalgamation of the English and Irish Ordnance establishments occur in many other letters to General Ross, who, as Surveyor-General of the Ordnance, was the ordinary channel of communication between Lord Cornwallis and the Board. Such observations being of no peculiar interest, are in most instances omitted.

not ordinary gout, are not very dissimilar from it; my spirits in general are not good, and I feel that I am growing old and good for nothing.

My returning in the course of next summer will perhaps depend on the fate of the Catholic question. *If it should be rejected* I shall certainly leave Ireland in June or July, unless there should be reason to apprehend immediate invasion; but if the good genius of the British isles should prevail, and that measure so essential to the preservation of the British empire should be adopted, I could not refuse to lend my services to endeavour to turn it to the best account. Dundas and Lord Grenville are, I believe, heartily with us.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Dec. 29, 1800.

. . . There will be full time to have all the patents passed before the 1st of January. I am now to request your Grace will take an opportunity of laying before His Majesty my humble acknowledgments for His Majesty's gracious condescension to all the recommendations I have submitted, either for promotions in the Peerage, or for the creation of new Peers upon the present great and important occasion.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

[Secret.]

MY DEAR LORD, Phœnix Park, Dec. 29, 1800.

Your letter of the 24th, which was brought yesterday, has not much contributed to raise my spirits, which the late public events have much depressed. Holding Ireland on our present tenure, how are we to make head against all Europe leagued for our destruction? Lord Kilwarden again spoke to Littlehales on the subject, and told him that the Catholics placed their trust in me, and rather insinuated that they conceived that the object of my remaining in the Government after the completion of the Union was to carry the point for them. Whatever Lord Loughborough's opinion may be of the practicability of concession, he will in a short time, or I am much mistaken, find it still more impracticable to resist.

Everything has been given of late with a most profuse hand,

and the points which I neither asked nor recommended have been acceded to more readily than those for which the honour of my Government was engaged, and on which the success of the Union depended.

Our new Primate was with me for an hour the day before he set out for Armagh, and from what I have seen and heard of him, I have every reason to believe he will do exceedingly well. . .

From some conversation which I have had with Marsden, I trust that he and Cooke will go on better.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Dec. 30, 1800.

It would not be convenient to me to urge, or even to propose, an augmentation at the Woolwich Academy, as it would have the appearance of desiring to increase my own patronage. But I am by no means on that account called upon to object to a measure which is recommended by persons who can have no private view in promoting it, and who are most capable of judging on its expediency. I wish therefore that you would speak to Lord Howe to obtain the King's sanction, and I will then notify the additional number to Apsley.

I have no personal wish in this world but to leave this country in a state of security, and to have contributed to make the inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland one people, with a common interest, and a mutual desire to support and assist each other. Believing, as I do, that this great work may now be effected, and apprehending that if the opportunity is lost it can never again be regained, you, who know the feelings of my heart, will not wonder at the anxiety that I suffer. Lord Loughborough, I find, is our most active and formidable opponent. With almost all Europe leagued against us, we cannot long exist as a divided nation. When Bonaparte has settled matters with the Austrians,[1] which must soon be the case, he will naturally turn his thoughts towards Ireland, and will endeavour to avert those blessings which a powerful influence in our own country is so desirous to reject.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] The battle of Hohenlinden was fought Dec. 3, and an armistice was concluded at Steyer on the 25th.

The following is a correct list of the Peerages, Irish or English, conferred during Lord Cornwallis's administration. The promotions are also enumerated. Those marked with * were unconnected with the question of Union.

Creations—

*Lord KILWARDEN, July, 1799. Had been promised by Lord CAMDEN.
*Lord HENLEY, Nov. 9, 1799.
*Lord WHITWORTH, afterwards Earl WHITWORTH, March 21, 1800. Extinct.
Earl of MONTRATH to be Lord CASTLE COOTE, with remainder to Mr. Coote, July 30, 1800. Extinct.
Lord LANGFORD, July 30, 1800.
Lord DE BLAQUIERE, July 30, 1800.
Lord FRANKFORT, now Viscount, July 30, 1800.
Baroness DUFFERIN, July 30, 1800.
Lord HENNIKER, July 30, 1800.
Baroness NEWCOMEN, afterwards Viscountess, July 30, 1800. Extinct.
Lord ADARE, now Earl of DUNRAVEN, July 30, 1800.
Lord VENTRY, July 30, 1800.
Lord ENNISMORE, now Earl of LISTOWELL, July 30, 1800.
Lord WALLSCOURT, July 30, 1800.
Lord MOUNT SANDFORT, July 30, 1800. Extinct.
Lord DUNALLEY, July 30, 1800.
Lord TARA, July 30, 1800. Extinct.
Lord HARTLAND, July 30, 1800. Extinct.
Lord CLANMORRIS, July 30, 1800.
Lord LECALE, Dec. 27, 1800. Extinct.
*Lord RADSTOCK, Dec. 27, 1800.
*Lord GLENBERVIE, Dec. 27, 1800. Extinct.
Lord NORBURY, afterwards Earl of NORBURY, Dec. 27, 1800.
*Lord GARDNER, Dec. 27, 1800.
*Marchioness of BUCKINGHAM to be Baroness NUGENT, Dec. 27, 1800. Extinct.
Lord ASHTOWN, Dec. 27, 1800.
Lord CLARINA, Dec. 27, 1800.
Lord ERRIS, afterwards Viscount LORTON, Dec. 27, 1800.
Earl of CLANRICARDE to be Earl of CLANRICARDE, with remainder to his daughters, Dec. 29, 1800.

English Peerages, granted on account of Irish services—

*Earl of CLARE to be Lord FITZGIBBON, Sept. 24, 1799.
Marquis of DROGHEDA to be Lord MOORE, Jan. 13, 1801.
Marquis of ELY to be Lord LOFTUS, Jan. 13, 1801.
Earl of ORMONDE to be Lord BUTLER, Jan. 13, 1801. Extinct.
Earl of CARYSFORT to be Lord CARYSFORT, Jan. 13, 1801.
Marquis of THOMOND to be Lord THOMOND, Sept. 15, 1801. Extinct.

Promotions in the Irish Peerage—

*Earl of MORNINGTON to be Marquis WELLESLEY, Dec. 2, 1799. Extinct.
Viscount O'NEIL to be Earl O'NEIL, Aug. 7, 1800. Both extinct.
Viscount BANDON to be Earl of BANDON, Aug. 7, 1800.
Earl of INCHIQUIN to be Marquis of THOMOND, Dec. 19, 1800. Both extinct.
Earl of BECTIVE to be Marquis of HEADFORT, Dec. 19, 1800.
Earl of ALTAMONT to be Marquis of SLIGO, Dec. 29, 1800.
Earl of ELY to be Marquis of ELY, Dec. 29, 1800.
Viscount CASTLESTUART to be Earl of CASTLESTUART, Dec. 29, 1800.
Viscount DONOUGHMORE to be Earl of DONOUGHMORE, Dec. 29, 1800.
Viscount CALEDON to be Earl of CALEDON, Dec. 29, 1800.
Viscount KENMARE to be Earl of KENMARE, Dec. 29, 1800.
Lord GLENTWORTH to be Viscount LIMERICK, Dec. 29, 1800. Since Earl.
Lord SOMERTON to be Viscount SOMERTON, Dec. 29, 1800. Since Earl of NORMANTON.
Lord YELVERTON to be Viscount AVONMORE, Dec. 29, 1800.
Lord LONGUEVILLE to be Viscount LONGUEVILLE, Dec. 29, 1800. Extinct.
Lord BANTRY to be Viscount BANTRY, Dec. 29, 1800. Now Earl.
Lord MONCK to be Viscount MONCK, Dec. 29, 1800.
Lord KILCONNELL to be Viscount DUNLO, Dec. 29, 1800. Now Earl of CLANCARTY.
Lord TULLAMORE to be Viscount CHARLEVILLE, Dec. 29, 1800. Now Earl.
Lord KILWARDEN to be Viscount KILWARDEN, Dec. 29, 1800. Extinct.

The creations and promotions recommended by Lord Cornwallis were with one exception carried into effect. Colonel Cuffe did not obtain a Peerage.

Lord Clanricarde was not created a Marquis, but obtained a patent in favour of his daughters.

Lord Ormonde's Marquisate was not conferred till January 22, 1816, and Lord Templetown was not created a Viscount till March 8, 1806.

But Lord Cornwallis did not consider these two latter as promises. An Earldom was offered to Lord Gosford, who declined it then, and again in 1803, as he would not accept the honour if in any way connected with the Union, which, nevertheless, he had warmly supported. However, on the 10th of February, 1806, he, with Lords Oxmantown and Somerton, were created Earls.

A sum of 1500*l.* per annum was placed at the disposal of the Lord-Lieutenant, by an Act passed in 1799, to be distributed as secret service. Towards the close of 1800, Mr. Cooke drew up, for the use of Lord Castlereagh, the following confidential memorandum, which still remains in the Castle of Dublin :—

PENSIONS TO LOYALISTS.

I submit to your Lordship on this head the following:—

First, that Mac——[1] should have a pension of . .	£300
He was not much trusted in the Rebellion, and I believe has been faithful.	
Francis Higgins, proprietor of the 'Freeman's Journal,' was the person who procured for me all the intelligence respecting Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and got ——[2] to set him, and has given me much information	300
M'Guichen, who is now in Belfast, ought to have .	150
I wish a man of the name of Nicholson, whom I employ regularly, should have	50
Darragh[3] ought to have for himself and his wife, at least	200
(At first written 300*l.*)	
He might be mentioned in the Loyalist Bill.	——
	£1000

Swan ——
Sirr ——

I think it might be right to get rid of many of our little pensioners, and Major Sirr's gang, by sums of money instead of pensions. Marsden will be kind enough to confer with Sirr upon the several cases, and see which can be got rid of by a sum of money, which require stipends.

Mr. Wilson and others recommend that Coleman should get office or pension. He lost his property, his house, &c., being burnt down by the Rebels.

Pollock's services ought to be thought of. He managed Mac—— and M'Guichen, and did much. He received the place of Clerk of the Crown and Peace, and he has the fairest right to indemnification.

[1] Leonard M'Nally, Esq., a barrister of some reputation, son of a Dublin merchant. He was regularly employed by the Rebels, and was entirely in their confidence. He was author of various plays and other works, which had no great merit; b. 1752, d. Feb. 14, 1820. Sir J. Barrington says that in order to set up his (M'Nally's) character he agreed to fight him.

[2] It is singular that Mr. Cooke, writing confidentially for the information of Lord Cornwallis and Lord Castlereagh, should omit the *name* of the person alluded to. Hughes was suspected of having betrayed Lord Edward, but it is evident he could not have been the individual here meant, for, if he had been employed, the communication would have been direct with the Castle.

[3] Mr. Darragh, of Eagle Hill, near Athy, was an active magistrate. In March, 1798, a man of the name of Condon rode up to him while he was standing at his own door, fired at him, and wounded him severely in the groin. He never recovered from the effects of the wound, and died not long after the grant of this pension.

[1] Samuel Turner	£300
Francis Grenville Tracy	300
Leonard M'Anally	300
John Guichen	150
Mr. and Mrs. Daragh	200
Edward Nicholson	50
(James) Gray	50
Mrs. (Mary) Eldon	30
(Richard) Harpur	50
(Richard) Callaghan and (Ann) wife	40
	1470
(Rev.) — Gilmer	30

These sums were given by a warrant dated December 20, 1800, but the names were kept secret—the payments being confidentially made by the Under-Secretary. None of the recipients are now living.

List of Boroughs Disfranchised.

After the Bill authorising compensation to be made for the disfranchised boroughs, and for the places abolished by the Union, had passed, the Right Hon. Richard Annesley, the Right Hon. Sackville Hamilton, and Dr. Duigenan were appointed Commissioners to assess the sums to be given to the different individuals affected. Many months elapsed before the various claims could even be investigated. Fifteen thousand pounds, the sum allotted for each borough, was apportioned among the various patrons, according to the interest possessed by each in the borough. The following is a list of the names of the several patrons, and their share of the compensation:—

Antrim	Earl of Massareene, and his three brothers, 3,750*l.* each.
Ardee	Two branches of the family of Ruxton:—one Mr. Ruxton, 7,500*l.*; and two of the same name, 3,750*l.* each.
Ardfert	Earl of Glandore.
Askeaton	Earl of Carrick, 6,850*l.*
„	Hon. E. Massey, 6,850*l.*
„	Sir Vere Hunt, Bart., 1,100*l.*
„	Sir J. Hoare, Bart., 200*l.*
Athboy	Earl of Darnley.
Athenry	Theophilus Blakeney, Esq.
Athy	Duke of Leinster, 13,800*l.*
„	Lord Ennismore, 1,200*l.*
Augher	Marquis of Abercorn.

[1] It has been found impossible to obtain any information about most of these individuals, or to ascertain what services they had rendered to the Government. Of some few notice has already been taken, but the history of the majority of them is very obscure. Richard Harpur, who d. Feb. 1811, James Gray, and Mary Eldon, seem to have been very illiterate persons, as their receipts are signed with a cross. The joint pensions to Richard and Ann Callaghan expired April, 1811, on the death of the survivor.

BALLANAKILL .. .. Marquis of Drogheda.
BALLYSHANNON .. .. Earl of Belmore.
BALTIMORE .. .. Sir John Freke, Bart.
BALTINGLASS .. .. Earl of Aldborough and his brothers, 3,750*l.* each.
BANAGHER .. .. Right Hon. G. Ponsonby.
BANGOR .. .. Earl of Carrick, 7,500*l.*
„ .. .. Hon. Edward and Hon. Robert Ward, 7,500*l.*
BANNOW .. .. Marquis of Ely.
BELTURBET .. .. Earl of Belmore.
BLESSINGTON .. .. Marquis of Downshire.
BOYLE .. .. Earl of Kingston.
CALLAN .. .. Lord Callan.
CARLINGFORD .. .. Marquis of Downshire, 7,500*l.*
„ .. .. Ross Balfour Moore, Esq., 7,500*l.*
CARRICK .. .. Earl of Leitrim.
CARYSFORT .. .. Earl of Carysfort.
CASTLEBAR .. .. Earl of Lucan.
CASTLEMARTYR .. .. Earl of Shannon.
CAVAN .. .. Theophilus Clements, Esq., 7,500*l.*
„ .. .. Thomas Nesbitt, Esq., 7,500*l.*
CHARLEMONT .. .. Earl of Charlemont.
CHARLEVILLE .. .. Earl of Shannon, 7,500*l.*
„ .. .. Earl of Cork, 7,500*l.*
CLOGHNAKILTY .. .. Earl of Shannon.
CLONMINES .. .. Marquis of Ely.
DINGLE ICOUCH .. .. Richard Boyle Townshend, Esq.
DONEGAL .. .. Earl of Arran.
DONERAILE .. .. Viscount Doneraile.
DULEEK .. .. Henry Bruen, Esq.
DUNLEER .. .. Right Hon. John Foster, 7,500*l.*
„ .. .. Henry Coddington, Esq., 7,500*l.*
ENNISCORTHY .. .. Lord Lismore, 12,300*l.*
„ .. .. Robert Cornwall, Esq., 2,700*l.*
FETHARD, (Tipperary) .. Lord Lismore, 7,500*l.*
„ „ Thomas Barton, Esq., 7,500*l.*
FETHARD, (Wexford) .. .. Marquis of Ely.
FORE .. .. Marquis of Downshire.
GOURAN .. .. Viscount Clifden.
GRANARD .. .. Lord Lyttleton, 7,500*l.*
„ .. .. W. F. Greville, Esq., 7,500*l.*
HARRISTOWN .. .. John Latouche, Esq.
HILLSBOROUGH .. .. Marquis of Downshire.
JAMESTOWN .. .. Gilbert King, Esq., 7,500*l.*
„ .. .. John King, Esq., 7,500*l.*
INISTIOGUE .. .. William Tighe, Esq.
KELLS .. .. Marquis of Headford.
KILBEGGAN .. .. Gustavus Lambart, Esq.
KILDARE .. .. Duke of Leinster.
KILLYBEGS .. .. Earl of Conyngham.
KILLYLEAGH .. .. Sir James Blackwood, Bart.
KILLMALLOCK .. .. Richard Oliver, Esq.
KNOCKTOPHER .. .. Sir Hercules Langrishe, 13,862*l.* 10*s.*

KNOCKTOPHER .. .. Sir George Shee, Bart., 1,137*l.* 10*s.*
LANESBOROUGH .. .. Lord Clonbrock.
LIFFORD .. .. Earl of Erne.
LISMORE .. .. Duke of Devonshire.
LONGFORD .. .. Earl of Longford.
MARYBOROUGH .. .. Right Hon. Charles Coote, 7,500*l.*
„ .. .. Sir John Parnell, 7,500*l.*
MIDDLETON .. .. Viscount Middleton.
MONAGHAN .. .. Earl of Clermont, 3,750*l.*
„ .. .. Lord Rossmore, 3,750*l.*
„ .. .. Right Hon. Theophilus Jones, 3,750*l.*
„ .. .. Henry Westenra, Esq., 3,750*l.*
MULLINGAR .. .. Earl of Granard.
NAAS .. .. Earl of Mayo.
NAVAN .. .. Lord Tara, 7,500*l.*
„ .. .. Earl of Ludlow, 7,500*l.*
NEWCASTLE .. .. Right Hon. David Latouche.
NEWTOWN ARDS .. .. Earl of Caledon.
NEWTOWN LIMAVADY .. Earl of Londonderry.
NEWBOROUGH, or GOREY .. Stephen Ram, Esq.
PHILIPSTOWN .. .. Earl of Belvedere, 3,750*l.*
„ .. .. Earl of Lanesborough, 3,750*l.*
„ .. .. Countess of Lanesborough, 3,750*l.*
„ .. .. John King, Esq., 3,750*l.*
RANDALSTOWN .. .. Viscount O'Neil.
RATHCORMACK .. .. Lord Riversdale.
RATOATH .. .. Gorges Lowther, Esq.
ROSCOMMON .. .. Lord Mount Sandford.
ST. JOHNSTOWN (Longford) Earl of Granard.
ST. JOHNSTOWN (Donegal) Countess of Wicklow.
STRABANE .. .. Marquis of Abercorn.
TAGHMON .. .. Henry Bruen, Esq.
TALLAGH .. .. Duke of Devonshire.
THOMASTOWN .. .. Viscount Clifden.
TRIM .. .. Marquess Wellesley.
TUAM .. .. Lord Clanmorris, 14,000*l.*
„ .. .. Hon. W. Yelverton, 1,000*l.*
TULSK .. .. St. George Caulfield, Esq.
WICKLOW .. .. William Tighe, Esq.

There were four other boroughs—St. Canice, where the Bishop of Ossory always returned the two members; Clogher, equally under the influence of the Bishop of Clogher; Old Leighlin, where the Bishop of Ferns had great power; and Swords, which owned no patron. The 15,000*l.* for each of the first three boroughs, was paid to the Commissioners of First Fruits, to be appropriated as they thought fit, and the compensation for Swords was placed in the hands of trustees, to be laid out in building schools, and in other works for the general benefit of the borough. The whole sum was 1,260,000*l.*

It will be seen by the above list that none of the borough-proprietors had more than two seats, except—

Lord Downshire	who had	7 seats.
Lord Ely	„	6 „
Lord Shannon	„	4 „
Lord Granard	„	4 „
Lord Belmore	„	4 „
Lord Clifden	„	4 „
Duke of Devonshire	„	4 „
Lord Abercorn	„	4 „
Mr. Tighe	„	4 „
Mr. Bruen	„	4 „

This does not, however, give a complete idea of the Parliamentary weight of the great borough-proprietors. Besides the seats for which they received compensation, many of them had influence in places which were still to return one member; and as one seat in the Imperial Parliament was considered quite equal to two in the Irish, no compensation was allowed. Thus Lord Ely had one seat at Wexford, Lord Shannon one at Youghal, the Duke of Devonshire one at Bandon and one at Dungarvon, and Lord Abercorn one, if not both, at Dungannon. Many of the counties also were almost entirely in the hands of certain great families, whose nominations were scarcely ever disputed. A few boroughs, nominally open, were practically close, and some three or four families had, by intermarriages, acquired a power which rendered them most formidable to any Government. The Ponsonbys, for example, exercised influence, direct or indirect, over twenty-two seats; Lord Downshire and the Beresfords respectively, over nearly as many. Nor was this all: the great boroughmongers constantly bought from other persons seats, for which they returned their own adherents. Lord Longueville, in one of his querulous letters, claims Cork and Mallow, and six other seats, as his own. Lords Shannon and Ely were in a similar position. The largest sums paid for compensation were 52,500*l.* to Lord Downshire, and 45,000*l.* to Lord Ely.

Of the thirty-four boroughs which were retained, the cities of Dublin, Cork, Waterford, Limerick, and Londonderry, the boroughs of Carrickfergus, Drogheda, and Newry, and the University of Dublin, nine in all, were quite open. Downpatrick and Galway soon shook off the influence of any patron. The other twenty-three remained close till the Reform Bill in 1831, though in several instances they were not in the hands of the same persons who had the nomination at the time of the Union. There are now but five at most where the old influence can be said to prevail.

CHAPTER XXII.

The Catholic question — Intentions of the English Cabinet — Insuperable objection of the King — Rumour of a dukedom for Lord Cornwallis — Resignation of the Ministry — Lord Cornwallis prepares to leave Ireland — Memoranda circulated amongst the Catholics — The King's illness — Lord Hardwicke Lord-Lieutenant — Trial of Napper Tandy — Sir William Medows Commander-in-Chief — The Roman Catholic College at Maynooth.

THE completion of the Union compelled the English Cabinet to come to some decision on the Catholic question. The views of Lord Cornwallis and Lord Castlereagh may be collected from their letters, and they were fully adopted by Mr. Pitt, Mr. Dundas, and several of their colleagues. From all the information that can be derived, either from documents which have been published, or from private sources, the subject would seem to have been discussed in Cabinet, and it may be reasonably inferred that, at one time, the whole Cabinet were disposed to consider how far the Roman Catholics could be relieved from their remaining disabilities. The question, most certainly, had never been laid before the King, and his insuperable objection was not made known to the Irish Government, nor probably were any of the English Ministers aware of his fixed determination. It is not quite clear when, or by whom, the intimation that such a scheme was in agitation was first conveyed to His Majesty, but probably Lord Loughborough the Chancellor, Lord Auckland, and the Primate of Ireland communicated with the King, and were the persons by whose advice he was guided, and when Mr. Pitt broached the subject, he found the King's decision irrevocable, and accordingly tendered his resignation early in February.

Various reasons have been assigned for the course adopted by Mr. Pitt, but the whole proceeding is involved in some obscurity. It appears certain, that when he found that there was no prospect of his obtaining permission to propose, as Minister, any measure for the relief of the Roman Catholics, he and some of his colleagues determined to resign, thinking that as independent members they could more effectually advance the object they had at heart.

There can be no doubt that neither Mr. Pitt, Lord Cornwallis, nor Lord Castlereagh, though all considering the removal of the Catholic disabilities very necessary, ever pledged themselves to any particular line of conduct should such a measure not be carried.

The King was deeply affected by these transactions. He complained that no communication had been made to him, and that, till the end of December, he was not aware that Mr. Pitt and some of his colleagues were so deeply committed. While the arrangements for a new Ministry were making, but before any office had been vacated, his mind became disordered; and, from the expressions which dropped from him, he evidently attributed his illness to the conduct of Mr. Pitt. This state of affairs continued till the end of February, and Mr. Pitt having then become convinced that during the King's life no material alteration could be made in the laws affecting the Roman Catholics, gave it to be understood that he would not object to resume office without pressing the Catholic question. Such at least is the inference which, it is thought, may be fairly drawn from the papers before the public. On March 14, Mr. Pitt formally resigned, having up to that time discharged the duties of Chancellor of the Exchequer and having even brought forward the budget.

This whole question is discussed at length in the 'Edinburgh Review' of January, 1858. There may be a difference of opinion as to the justice of the views adopted by the author of the article, but he gives not an incorrect statement of facts, and argues the points in dispute in a fair and reasonable manner. The papers in this volume throw additional light upon the subject.

Four papers are introduced at the end of this chapter dated at the close of 1801 and the beginning of 1802. They relate to Maynooth—a subject to which the attention of Lord Cornwallis had been often drawn—and give an authentic statement of the views entertained by the Ministers by whom that college was first established.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE RIGHT HON. WILLIAM PITT.

[Most Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Thursday, Jan. 1, 1801.

Since I had an opportunity of explaining to you Lord Cornwallis's sentiments in respect to his further stay in Ireland, the Duke of Portland has been so obliging as to communicate to me a

paper which has been in circulation, referring to one of mine on the Catholic question. As that paper rests its objections to the measure principally on the merits of the question, I feel it necessary to represent to you the disappointment Lord Cornwallis may feel should the sentiments stated in that paper be adopted and acted upon by the Cabinet. When I left Lord Cornwallis he certainly was prepared for some difference of opinion in the Cabinet on the principle of the measure itself, and for much caution on the part of His Majesty's Ministers in general, with respect to the period when they might think themselves justified in prudence in proposing to Parliament so important an alteration of the Test Laws; but he did not apprehend, from anything that had hitherto passed on the subject, that their sentiments were adverse to the principle of the measure connected with the Union, much less that they were prepared to oppose the question on its merits, and to declare their determination to resist hereafter any further concessions to the Catholics. As this impression on his Excellency's mind was in a great measure the result of what passed with reference to this subject when I was in England in the autumn of 1799, I think it necessary to recall to your recollection, that after the details of the Union had been completed, I was directed by the Lord-Lieutenant to represent to you the state of parties as they stood at that time in Ireland, and particularly to request that you would ascertain what was likely to be the ultimate decision of His Majesty's Ministers with respect to the Catholics, as his Excellency felt it to be of equal importance to the future quiet of Ireland, to his own feelings, and to the credit of Administration in both countries, that he should so conduct himself towards that body as to preclude hereafter any well-founded imputation, or even any strong impression on the minds of the Catholics, that they had been deceived. The statement I then made to you was, as I recollect, nearly to the following effect: that we had a majority in Parliament composed of very doubtful materials; that the Protestant body was divided on the question, with the disadvantage of Dublin and the Orange Societies against us; and that the Catholics were holding back, under a doubt whether the Union would facilitate or impede their object. I stated it as the opinion of the Irish Government that, circumstanced as the Parliamentary interests and the Protestant feelings then were, the measure could not be carried, if the Catholics were embarked in an active opposition to it, and that their resistance would be unanimous and zealous if they had reason to suppose that the sentiments of Ministers would remain unchanged with respect to their exclusion, while the measure of Union

in itself must give them additional means of disappointing their hopes. I stated that several attempts had been made by leading Catholics to bring Government to an explanation, which had of course been evaded, and that the body, thus left to their own speculations in respect to the future influence of the Union upon their cause, were, with some exceptions, either neutralists or active opponents; the former entertaining hopes, but not inclining to support decidedly, without some encouragement from Government; the latter entirely hostile, from a persuasion that it would so strengthen the Protestant interest as to perpetuate their exclusion. I represented that the friends of Government, by flattering the hopes of the Catholics, had produced a favourable impression in Cork, Tipperary, and Galway; but that in proportion as his Excellency felt the advantage of this popular support, he was anxious it should be ascertained, in availing himself of this assistance, which he knew was alone given in contemplation of its being auxiliary to their own views, that he was not involving the Government in future difficulties with that body, by exposing them to a charge of duplicity, and he was peculiarly desirous of being secure against such a risk, before he *personally* encouraged the Catholics to come forward and to afford him that assistance which he felt to be so important to the success of the measure. In consequence of this representation the Cabinet took the measure into their consideration, and having been directed to attend the meeting, I was charged to convey to Lord Cornwallis the result, and his Excellency was referred by the Duke of Portland to me for a statement of the opinions of His Majesty's Ministers on this important subject. I accordingly communicated to Lord Cornwallis that the opinion of the Cabinet was favourable to the principle of the measure; that some doubts were entertained as to the possibility of admitting Catholics into some of the higher offices; and that Ministers apprehended considerable repugnance to the measure in many quarters, and particularly in the *highest;* but that, as far as the sentiments of the Cabinet were concerned, his Excellency need not hesitate in calling forth the Catholic support, in whatever degree he found it practicable to obtain it. I trust you will be of opinion that I did not misconceive or misstate what passed in that Cabinet. I certainly did not then hear any direct objection stated against the principle of the measure by any one of the Ministers then present. You will, I have no doubt, recollect that, so far from any serious hesitation being entertained in respect to the principle, it was even discussed whether an immediate declaration on the subject to the Catholics would not be advisable, and whether

an assurance should not be distinctly given them, in the event of the Union being accomplished, of their objects being submitted, with the countenance of Government, to the United Parliament upon a Peace. This idea was laid aside, principally upon a consideration that such a declaration might alienate the Protestants in both countries from the Union, in a greater degree than it was calculated to assist the measure through the Catholics; and accordingly the instructions I was directed to convey to Lord Cornwallis were to the following effect: that his Excellency was fully warranted in *soliciting* every support the Catholics could afford; that he need not apprehend, as far as the sentiments of the Cabinet were concerned, being involved hereafter in the difficulty with that body which he seemed to apprehend; that it was not thought expedient at that time to give any direct assurance to the Catholics, but that, should circumstances so far alter as to induce his Excellency to consider such an explanation necessary, he was at liberty to state the grounds on which his opinion was formed for the consideration of the Cabinet. In consequence of this communication the Irish Government omitted no exertion to call forth the Catholics in favour of the Union. Their efforts were very generally successful, and the advantage derived from them was highly useful, particularly in depriving the Opposition of the means they otherwise would have had in the southern and western counties, of making an impression on the county members. His Excellency was enabled to accomplish his purpose without giving the Catholics any direct assurance of being gratified, and throughout the contest earnestly avoided being driven to such an expedient, as he considered a gratuitous concession after the measure as infinitely more consistent with the character of Government. The Union having been carried, I was directed by the Lord-Lieutenant, when last in England, to recall the attention of His Majesty's Ministers to the Catholic question, and to impress on their minds the anxiety his Excellency felt that they should not suffer themselves to be anticipated in the proposed act of grace by the Opposition. On my return to Ireland I communicated to the Lord-Lieutenant what had passed in the Cabinet with reference to this subject. I apprized his Excellency that sentiments unfavourable to the concession had been expressed by the highest law authority, and that the Cabinet at large did not feel themselves enabled, in His Majesty's absence, and without sounding opinions in other quarters, to take a final decision on so momentous a question. But I did not feel myself warranted, from anything that had passed, to disappoint the hopes his Excellency had been led so distinctly to form, and which he

still continues to entertain. Should the ultimate decision of His Majesty's Ministers accord with the statement of the question to which I have alluded, you will easily conceive, in addition to the public regret his Excellency will experience at the abandonment of a measure which he considers to be essential to the future interests of the empire, that he will feel a peculiar degree of pain in finding himself placed in those awkward circumstances with respect to the Catholics, to which he foresaw the transaction in itself was so likely to lead, and which he took every *possible precaution* to avoid. You know that Lord Cornwallis is the last person in the world that would wish to consider what has passed on the part of the Cabinet as a pledge given to him, though not to the Catholics. You know his feelings are, with respect to the disposal of this question, altogether public. I have merely presumed, and I trust you will be of opinion that I have not gone beyond my duty in doing so, to recall those communications which passed through me to your recollection, anxiously trusting that no additional difficulty has been introduced into the transaction from any inaccuracy on my part, and feeling assured that you will give what I have stated, together with all the other considerations which bear on this important question, their due weight in your decision.

I have, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

MY DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Jan. 8, 1801.

You will easily believe with what sincere affliction I heard last night from Mr. Elliot that your boy was very ill. God send that the mail which we hourly expect may bring better accounts.

This is not a time to trouble you with letters, but it cannot be painful to you to know how truly your friend participates in your apprehensions or sorrows.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS, &c., &c., CASTLE, DUBLIN.

[Endorsed by Lord Cornwallis—*Anon.* From an old and sincere[1] friend. Post-mark, Jan. 8, 1801.]

MY DEAR LORD, January 7.

You will not see the signature, nor recognize the usual handwriting of a very sincere and very old friend who has lately

[1] General Grenville was supposed to have been the author of this letter, prompted possibly by his Royal Master. His friendship for Lord Cornwallis, and the intimate footing he was on with the Royal Family, render the supposition very probable; and the handwriting of the original, though disguised, bears much resemblance to that of the General.

been *à portée* to much conversation that has passed on the subject of your Dukedom.

From the fullest sense of what is due to you for your military and civil services, I am desirous that you should know that the K. has said in express words to more than one authority, which I know to be correct:—"If Lord Cornwallis asks me for a Dukedom, I most certainly shall give it to him."

You are sufficiently well acquainted with our interior to be satisfied that those who wish you well, must see the finer threads of this business more accurately than you can, at so great a distance from the master-hand that guides them. Whether this mark of approbation be really an object to you or not I cannot undertake to judge, and it is more than probable that you will not give to this anonymous letter all the credit that is due to it, though you may see reasons that ought to prevent me from discovering myself to you.

And yet it is probable, that if you had been in England, my friendship to you, and the sincerest respect for your public services, might have induced me to have trusted my name to your honour and discretion.

However, whether you act upon this letter, or throw it in the fire, I shall at least have discharged my mind from the difficulties I have felt since I have been in possession of this secret. But no time is to be lost.

I am, my dear Lord, most truly and unalterably yours.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

MY DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, Jan. 12, 1801.

I will say nothing of business or politics, except that we are making progress in the plan of incorporation,[1] and that I had last night a very satisfactory letter from Lord Castlereagh on the great point which is now in agitation, and on the success of which, in my opinion, greatly depends the stability of the British empire.

Believe me ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

MY DEAR LORD, Phœnix Park, Jan. 14, 1801.

. . . Your letter, dated the 7th, afforded me very sincere satisfaction. If Mr. Pitt is firm he will meet with no difficulty, and

[1] Of the Irish and English Artillery.

the misfortunes of the present times are much in his favour towards carrying this point, on the same grounds that the rebellion assisted the Union. Timid men will not venture on any change of system, however wise and just, unless their fears are alarmed by pressing dangers.

I never had the smallest doubt of your having been perfectly correct in regard to what passed in Cabinet, as your memory is good, and you wrote to me immediately after it had taken place. I had, however, some apprehension that Mr. Pitt's recollection was not so clear, as I thought that he would have felt that they had gone too far to retreat, without some extraordinary change of circumstances; it is now most satisfactorily settled.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MRS. YOUNG.[1]

MADAM, Phœnix Park, Jan. 16, 1801.

I have most sincerely participated in your anxieties and in your affliction, and I feel it to be as much my duty as it is my inclination to assist the family of that excellent man your late husband.

Mr. Marsden will wait on you at my request to talk on this subject, which can be better explained in a conversation than by correspondence.

I am, Madam, with the most earnest good wishes for yourself and family, your most obedient and faithful servant,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Jan. 19, 1801.

I have not made up my mind exactly with regard to what I should say to the D. of York respecting the fencible regiments; but as it strikes me at present, it would be hazardous to attempt any change that would for a time put so large a portion of our force into an unserviceable state. And after all, the fencibles, especially those from Scotland, with all their radical defects, are nearly as good as the English militia, and as some of the regiments of the line which have been completed from the English militia.

[1] The widow of the Bishop of Clonfert, who was left with eleven children, ill provided for. A pension of 500*l.* was conferred upon her in the course of a few months, but in the mean time Lord Cornwallis himself assisted her materially.

I shall give the Honourable Arthur Cole,[1] Lord Enniskillen's youngest son, to whom Mr. Dundas, at my request, has given a Madras writership, a letter of introduction to you; and if General Stuart is not gone, I wish you would recommend him strongly to his patronage, and, if possible, contrive that he should go out in the ship with him. He is a very fine lad, and modest, and well behaved. In the greatest haste,

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

I have this moment received your letter, dated the 15th, and have received the greatest satisfaction from your conversation with Lord S.[2] *Our* Chancellor will bully and talk big, but he is too unpopular here to venture to quarrel with Administration.

THE KING TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY DUNDAS.

Windsor, Feb. 7, 1801.

I cannot but regret that on the late unhappy occasion I had not been treated with more confidence previous to forming an opinion, which, to my greatest surprise, I learnt on Thursday from Earl Spencer has been in agitation ever since Lord Castlereagh came over in August, yet of which I never had the smallest suspicion till within these very few weeks; but so desirous was I to avoid the present conclusion, that, except what passed with Earl Spencer and Lord Grenville about three weeks past, and a hint I gave to Mr. Secretary Dundas on Wednesday sevenight, I have been silent on the subject, and, indeed, hoping that Mr. Pitt had not pledged himself on what I cannot with my sentiments of religious and political duty think myself at liberty to concur. Mr. Secretary Dundas has known my opinions when he corresponded with the Earl of Westmorland, then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and at least will do me the justice to recollect that both then, and when afterwards brought forward by the Earl Fitzwilliam, my language perfectly coincided with my present conduct.

GEORGE R.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

DEAR JAMES, Dublin Castle, Feb. 7, 1801.

I had the pleasure of receiving yesterday a note from my friend Mr. Alexander (member for Derry), dated from the House

[1] Hon. Arthur Cole, 4th son of William, 1st Earl of Enniskillen, b. June 28, 1780, d. unm. June 16, 1844. He was a very distinguished Civil servant of the East India Company, and showed singular firmness and decision during the Madras mutiny. M.P. for Enniskillen from Feb. 1828 till within a few weeks of his death.

[2] Lord Spencer, who was an intimate friend of General Ross, had informed him that he expected the King would give way on the Catholic question.

of Commons, giving a most favourable account of James's performance;[1] and I am happy to find, by your letter which I have just received, that everything has succeeded so completely to your satisfaction. God send that you may long enjoy the comfort which you have so much reason to expect from so promising a son. The mistake about the Admiral was curious enough; he must have been much surprised at being requested to second the Address. The political horizon is gloomy indeed, and I am afraid that all is not right at home; should an awkward, though a very serious question,[2] come to issue, which I sincerely deprecate, I would on no account put you under any difficulties either with respect to yourself, or to James. I trust, however, that my apprehensions on that score are groundless. You will probably know more by the time this letter reaches you. Pray tell James how sincerely I rejoice in his success.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Feb. 11, 1801.

I have received your letter, dated the 6th, but, although the mail of the 7th arrived this morning, have heard no further accounts of political changes[3] than you mentioned when you wrote on the 4th, except that Mr. Addington[4] is to be the ostensible minister.

I rather guess that Lord Hobart[5] will be my successor here, partly from probability and my knowledge of his sentiments on the Catholic question, with which I connect the sudden departure for England, of his friend Mr. Borough[6] who went with him to India.

This is a melancholy ending of all my labours, but if the good ship Britannia can weather the storm, I shall be satisfied.

A copy of my first despatch to the Duke of Portland on the

[1] Mr. Cornwallis was M.P. for Eye, and seconded the address, Feb. 2, 1801.

[2] The Catholic question.

[3] Mr. Pitt tendered his resignation, which was accepted, on the 5th, but it was not generally known for two or three days.

[4] Right Hon. Henry Addington, 1st Viscount Sidmouth, so created Jan. 12, 1805, b. May 30, 1757, d. Feb. 15, 1844; m. 1st, 1781, Ursula Mary, dau. and coheir of Leonard Hammond, Esq., of Cheam; 2nd, July 29, 1823, Marianne, widow of Thomas Townshend, Esq., dau. and ultimately sole heir of William, 1st and only Lord Stowell. Speaker of the House of Commons from Nov. 25, 1790, till Feb. 10, 1801, then First Lord of the Treasury to May, 1804. He was afterwards, with intervals, Lord President, Lord Privy Seal, and Secretary of State for the Home Department from Jan. 1805 to 1822. M.P. for Devizes from May, 1784, till he was made a Peer.

[5] It does not appear that it ever was in contemplation to send Lord Hobart to Ireland. The Lord-Lieutenancy was declined by several persons. The Duke of Portland, on March 26, intimated his readiness to accept it.

[6] Mr., afterwards Sir Richard Borough, Bart., so created Nov. 12, 1813, b. April 18, 1756, d. Jan. 22, 1837; m. Aug. 21, 1799, Anna Maria, dau. of Gerard, 1st Viscount Lake.

incorporation was transmitted to Macleod, to be shown to you and to Lord Howe, and I conclude you have seen it by this time.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret.] Received Feb. 13.

MY DEAR LORD, London, Feb. 9, 1801.

Having nothing to add to the general facts stated in my former letters, I have hitherto postponed writing in order that I might the better be enabled to explain to your Excellency the shape which this transaction was ultimately likely to assume. Mr. Pitt, from a conviction, I conclude, that the King's mind could not give way, and seeing the danger of the State falling into the hands of Opposition, has used his utmost influence with his friends to lend themselves to the new arrangements, from which I suppose, but this is merely supposition, the conduct of the new Government will rather be to evade, than to negative the question on the principle. Mr. Pitt will take the first opportunity of the question being regularly before the House to state his opinion at length upon it, but he does not think that it will be expedient either with reference to the success of the question itself, or the predicament in which the King stands, for him to press the measure under the present circumstances. The inclination of his mind, after having argued the question, is, not to vote at all. He is of opinion that to try the question now, would only pledge people against it; that we should have no chance of success in the Lords, and that if we carried it through both Houses, the King would at all risks refuse his assent; but a still stronger reason operates in his mind for not so pressing it, which he particularly desires that I may represent to your Excellency, namely, the conviction that were the question so carried it would be deprived of all its benefits. Under these considerations it is his wish that your Excellency, without bringing forward the King's name, should make the Catholics feel that an obstacle which the King's Ministers could not surmount, precluded them from bringing forward the measure whilst in office; that their attachment to the question was such that they felt it impossible to continue in Administration under the impossibility of proposing it with the necessary concurrence, and that they retired from the King's service, considering this line of conduct as most likely to contribute to the ultimate success of the measure; to represent to them how much their future hopes must depend upon strengthen-

ing their cause by good conduct; in the mean time that they ought to weigh their prospects as arising from the persons who now espouse their interests, and compare them with those which they could look to from any other quarter; that they may naturally rely on the zealous support of all those who now retire, and of many who remain, when it can be given with any prospect of success; in the mean time that Mr. Pitt would do his utmost to establish their cause in the public favour, and thus prepare the way for its ultimate success, but that they must distinctly understand that he could not concur in a hopeless attempt at this moment to force it, and that he must at all times repress with the same decision as if he held an adverse opinion, any unconstitutional conduct in the Catholic body. This will give your Excellency the outline of that communication, which he thinks himself alone authorized to make to them. To look to any specific time, to which they might attach their hopes, is so indefinite and so delicate a consideration as your Excellency will feel is scarcely to be touched upon. From what has already passed, the prospect of a change of sentiment on the part of the King, seems too hopeless to be held out in fairness to the Catholics as any solid ground of hope, and his death is that solution of the difficulty, which all parties must equally deprecate. The prospect is therefore not very encouraging in itself; but unpromising as it is we must endeavour to make them feel, that *their* particular interests as well as their duty will be best consulted rather by a temperate and loyal conduct than by giving way to the feelings connected with disappointment and despair. Such are the principles we must preach; I wish it were reasonable to expect that they would be implicitly acted upon. With respect to yourself, Mr. Pitt is fully alive to the painful task imposed upon your Excellency during the remainder of your abode in Ireland, particularly should it of necessity continue beyond the period of the change on this side, but this he trusts will not be of long duration, and little doubting what your Excellency's feelings must be on the whole of this case, I have impressed on his mind that in justice to you the Irish part of their arrangements should not be protracted. In urging this, I have not less consulted my own feelings, as I shall not incline to remain a single individual on the Treasury bench, after those with whom we have acted retire from it.

Ever my dear Lord, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

P.S. Mr. Pitt has seen the first part of this letter. As I found

that circumstances might delay his writing, I was anxious that your Excellency should not remain longer in ignorance of his sentiments, as it may enable you the better to break this business to the persons most interested.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Feb. 15, 1801.

No consideration could induce me to take a responsible part with any Administration who can be so blind to the interest, and indeed to the immediate security of their country, as to persevere in the old system of proscription and exclusion in Ireland. My sentiments on this head are sufficiently known, and I have heard from pretty good authority that my successor is fixed, and I have some reason to guess that Lord Hobart is the person. I feel it, however, to be my duty to my country, not to quit my station angrily, and to employ such reasonable space of time as it may suit Government to take in sending over a successor, in endeavouring to tranquillize the minds of the Catholics, to persuade them to wait with patience for the accomplishment of their wishes, which, although it is not so near as we had reason to expect, may nevertheless, from the eminent characters of all parties who are pledged in their favour, still be considered as ultimately secure, and by every means in my power to prevent such immediate effects of their disappointment, as would, under our present difficulties, tend to the utter destruction of the empire.

I trust that you will believe that there is no house that could be more agreeable to me than yours, but I shall be so troublesome a guest, from the number of people that will be coming to me, that I shall only avail myself of your kind invitation, in the event of my not being able to find some convenient lodging. You will naturally be aware that I must resign the Ordnance, which I unwillingly accepted as a Cabinet office, but I can see no reason for your resigning, and I am sure that the public service would suffer very much by your quitting your station. At all events I request that you will form no resolution till I see you.

It appears to me impossible that the new, or rather the dregs of the old Administration can go on; they find as much difficulty in obtaining recruits as any of the new levies, and they have reduced their standard full as low.

Lord Spencer has been very kind to me by promising to make Broke a Post-Captain before he leaves the office.

Hoping to find you and Mrs. Ross and the boy in perfect health on my return, I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

Dublin Castle, Feb. 15, 1801.

MY LORD,

Mr. Napper Tandy is to go down to the county of Donegal in order to take his trial at the assizes that are to be held there in the ensuing month.

This unfortunate wretch is now become an object of universal contempt, mingled I believe pretty generally with some grains of compassion. There is scarcely a doubt that he would be condemned, but I have been informed by the Crown lawyers that it is not a matter of absolute certainty. He wishes to plead guilty and confess his crimes in the fullest manner, if he had reason to hope that he might be pardoned on condition of his being banished from His Majesty's dominions for life.

Considering the incapacity of this old man to do further mischief, the mode by which he came into our hands, his long subsequent confinement, and lastly, the streams of blood which have flowed in this island for these last three years, I am induced to request that your Grace will submit the above proposition to His Majesty's favourable consideration. I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

Dublin Castle, Feb. 17, 1801.

DEAR JAMES,

After having, as I thought, nearly accomplished the settlement of this devoted country in peace and tranquillity, and rendered Ireland a powerful bulwark for the security of Britain, an unexpected blast from St. James's has overset me, and has added grievously to the perils which have of late surrounded us, and threatened to overwhelm us.

Most ardently praying for blessings on my country, to which neither as a politician or a soldier I see any prospect of my being able to render any service, I shall now retire altogether from public life, but without resentment or any evil disposition on my mind, detesting faction, and wishing the Government success.

I have sent over my resignation of the Lieutenancy of Ireland with assurances that I will patiently wait for the arrival of a successor; I shall then repair to London, and after paying my duty to

the King, resign the Ordnance, and after that proceed to spend the remainder of my days, Bonaparte bene placito, quietly at Culford. I state my feelings to you that you may be convinced that I have not the most distant wish to interfere with James's politics. It gives me the most sincere pleasure to find that he has obtained such universal applause, and, as far as I am concerned, I request that he will consider himself most perfectly independent.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 19, 1801.

As my continuance in the situation I have the honour to hold, may not be long enough to enable me to fulfil all the engagements which I have thought it my duty to contract on the part of His Majesty's Government, and by the direction of his Ministers repeatedly conveyed to me by your Grace, I feel myself peculiarly bound by every tie and obligation at the present moment to draw your Grace's attention to this subject.

The general nature and extent of these engagements has been communicated and explained to your Grace, by Chief Secretary my Lord Viscount Castlereagh, and he will lay before you an accurate detail of them.

Much anxiety is daily manifested by those gentlemen whose expectations I have not yet been enabled to fulfil, and though I endeavour to impress on their minds an assurance that their just hopes will not be disappointed by any change in His Majesty's councils, they intimate a wish to receive that assurance from the authority of those, with whom the future administration of Ireland may be connected.

I am therefore to request your Grace will take the earliest opportunity of conferring with His Majesty's Ministers upon this subject, and that you will furnish me with an official authority to assure all those gentlemen who have any promise of favour in consequence of the Union, that they will be fully provided for according to the extent of the engagements made with them, and that no new pretensions will be allowed to interfere with their prior and superior claims.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The promises alluded to in the foregoing letter, were recorded in a list enclosed, which it is not considered advisable to publish

in extenso. Of these engagements, seven were for pensions, one of which, to Mrs. Young, widow of the Bishop of Clonfert, had no connexion with politics. Thirteen were legal appointments, five of which were completed before Lord Cornwallis left Ireland. Four were for promotions in the Peerage. Thirty were promises of places, varying from 400*l.* to 800*l.* per annum; or of pensions from 300*l.* to 500*l.* Thirty-five of the persons mentioned in this list were M.P.'s, and had voted for the Union, and three of the pensions, though granted nominally to persons not in Parliament, were actually to be received by Members. Some of these pensions and places, on account of the change of Government in 1806, never were conferred, but the M.P. for whose benefit one in particular was intended, came to Sir Robert Peel, when Secretary in Ireland, and claimed the arrears of the pension, amounting to several thousand pounds. It is unnecessary to add that such an application was not successful. Lord Hardwicke,[1] when he assumed the Government, recognized the engagements made by Lord Cornwallis, and as far as he was able fulfilled them; but he also resigned before all the claimants had been satisfied, and the Duke of Bedford,[2] who succeeded him, did not consider himself bound by the antecedent promises.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, Feb. 26, 1801.

The Duke of Portland has signified His Majesty's approbation of the plan which I transmitted for the incorporation, and I shall immediately proceed to carry it into effect. On the whole, with the honest and earnest assistance of T. Pakenham, we shall get through the business of the incorporation with less difficulty than we had reason to expect.

My brother is highly pleased at being again called into service, and it certainly is very flattering to him to be recommended by Lord St. Vincent to succeed to the command of the fleet which he himself resigns.[3]

All other matters look as gloomy as ever. They have not yet been able to find a Lord-Lieutenant, and the station at present

[1] Philip, 3rd Earl of Hardwicke, K.G., b. May 31, 1757, d. Nov. 18, 1834; m. July 24, 1782, Elizabeth, dau. of James, 5th Earl of Balcarres. Lord-Lieut. of Ireland from May, 1801, till Nov. 1805, when he was replaced by Lord Powis, who, however, was never sworn in.

[2] John, 6th Duke of Bedford, K.G., b. July 6, 1766, d. Oct. 20, 1839; m. 1st, March 21, 1786, Georgiana Elizabeth, dau. of George, 4th Viscount Torrington; 2nd, June 23, 1803, Georgiana, dau. of Alexander, 4th Duke of Gordon. Lord-Lieut. of Ireland.

[3] Lord St. Vincent had been Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet, but he resigned when he was made First Lord of the Admiralty, Feb. 21, 1801.

requires a man of very superior qualities. Unless he will take the Government upon himself, and make himself independent of the influences which I resisted, and which ruined the administration of my predecessor, the country will be completely undone.

It is too mortifying a reflexion—when all difficulties were surmounted, when Protestants and Catholics, Unionists and Anti-Unionists, all joined in esteem and confidence towards the Government, and were softened into an acquiescence of surrendering their animosities and prejudices, as a sacrifice to the public safety, that the fatal blow should be struck from the quarter most interested to avert it, and that Ireland is again to become a millstone about the neck of Britain, and to be plunged into all its former horrors and miseries.

The time of my release must be subject to much uncertainty; if Brome should find any place that would suit me, I think from the number and variety of people by whom I shall be assailed, that it will be better to lodge by myself, but if that should not happen, I shall accept of your kind invitation.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Most Secret and Confidential.] Received Feb. 27.

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, Feb. 23, 1801.

I am under the painful necessity of acquainting your Excellency, that after an indisposition which has been of about 10 days' continuance; but which though it has confined the K. to the Queen's House, has not prevented him from seeing his confidential servants and several other persons, or passing his evenings in company, the state of H. M. mind appeared so much disordered in the course of Saturday night and yesterday morning, as to make the Queen and the Royal Family deem it expedient to call for the advice of the younger Dr. Willis[1] in addition to that of Drs. Gisborne[2] and Reynolds,[3] who have for some days attended H. M., and I understand that two persons appointed by Dr. Willis, were to sit up last night in H. M. chambers. Mr. Addington, who passed the best part of an hour yesterday with H. M. by his own desire, told me that though there were evident symptoms of derangement, or rather of considerable mental oppression and

[1] John Willis, M.D., b. Sept. 28, 1751, d. Oct. 2, 1836, unm. He had a pension of 717*l.*

[2] Thomas Gisborne, M.D., b. about 1725, d. April 24, 1806, unmarried. President of the College of Physicians from 1791 to 1794, and from 1796 to 1803.

[3] Henry Revel Reynolds, M.D., b. Sept. 26, 1745, d. Oct. 22, 1811. Physician to the King.

uneasiness, H. M. conversation was perfectly temperate and reasonable, and that he appeared to be much relieved at different times by an abundant shedding of tears, and Mr. Addington left H. M. in such a state as led him to entertain a good hope that in the interval of a few days H. M. may be restored to the full enjoyment of his mental faculties.

I have not seen any one to-day who is capable of giving me any particulars of the actual state of H. M. health. It appears by the bulletin signed by the physician that he had some hours' sleep, but that he still continued to have fever.

Impossible as it may be to conceal entirely from the nation the calamitous event which is hanging over us, your Excellency without doubt will be of opinion that the supposition of its having taken, or being likely to take place, should be discountenanced as much as possible; and that our language respecting H. M.'s illness should be formed and regulated by the terms employed by his physicians in the daily bulletins, of which a copy shall be regularly transmitted to your Excellency. This alarming and dreadful event will account for my taking no other notice of the letter (private) which I had the mortification to receive from you on Saturday, than to acknowledge its having reached me, or of the much to be lamented events which have occasioned it. At the present moment I am persuaded that no thought can be entertained but of guarding against the dangers which threaten us, and I look with the most unqualified confidence for your Excellency's assistance in that respect.

I have the honour to enclose you the copy of intelligence received to-day from France, upon the authority of which I have reason to think your Excellency may entirely depend.

I am, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, Feb. 27, 1801.

I have just received your Grace's letter dated the 23rd instant, the contents of which have afflicted me most severely. Your Grace may be assured that at this most disastrous period I can have no thought but for the preservation of my country, and you may in every respect with perfect confidence rely on my zealous and unwearied exertions to afford every assistance in my power.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, March 3, 1801.

I last night received your letter, dated the 27th, and a few minutes ago that of the 28th; the latter contains comfortable encouragement respecting the King's situation.

As it is my audience day, I desired Cooke to write fully to you on the subject of the papers,[1] and I enclose a few lines, which may be more easily communicated, and which in fact contain every essential explanation. These papers have produced no ill consequences here; but on the contrary, have done a great deal of good. I trust when their merits are candidly considered, they will at least appear harmless, and they certainly commit no man of either party further than he has already committed himself.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Lord Donoughmore[2] has often offered to go over; but I told him I saw no occasion. He desires me to tell you that he is ready to set out whenever you desire it.

In order to prevent the mischief which the disappointment of the expectations of the Catholics might have occasioned at this dangerous crisis, I delivered to Lord Fingall and Dr. Troy, two papers, to be by them circulated among the principal Catholics in different parts of Ireland. The first, I was assured, stated correctly the spirit of Mr. Pitt's declaration, and the other conveys my private sentiments founded on the speeches and conduct of many of the most eminent characters in the kingdom of all parties and descriptions.

A verbal communication would have been liable to much error and misrepresentation, and could not have been diffused to any efficient purpose. The papers were given as private memoranda, and have been attended with the best consequences for the preservation of the tranquillity of the country.

MEMORANDUM. (From MR. PITT'S Papers.)

When it was notified to the Lord Lieutenant that Mr. Pitt, Lord Grenville, Lord Spencer, Lord Camden, Mr. Dundas, and Mr. Windham, had requested permission to retire from His Majesty's councils, upon their not being sanctioned in bringing

[1] The memoranda circulated with Lord Cornwallis's approbation among the Catholics.

[2] Lord Donoughmore was a Representative Peer.

forward such measures as they thought essential to secure to the empire the full benefit of the Union, the most important of which measures was a concession of further privileges to His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, his Excellency conceived that it was expedient that the Catholic body should have an authentic communication upon a subject so deeply affecting their situation and interests, and so calculated to influence their future conduct.

His Excellency had long held it as his private opinion, that the measure intended by those of H. M. Ministers who were retiring from office, was necessary for securing the connexion of Ireland with Great Britain. He had however been cautious in his language on the subject, and had studiously avoided any declaration to the Catholics, on which they could raise an expectation that their wishes were to be conceded. Through the whole measure of the Union, which was in discussion two years, and during which period every effort was made to procure a resistance to the measure on the part of the whole body of the Catholics, no favourable assurance or promise was made to them.

Their judicious conduct during that trying period confirmed his Excellency in the opinion that every measure tending to secure their attachment to the empire in future, which in this instance they had so essentially served, ought in true policy to be attempted.

His Excellency did therefore recommend it to his Chief Secretary, who was engaged with His Majesty's Ministers in the course of the summer in England, to second every disposition for effecting the objects of the Catholics. At the same time he retained a prudential reserve to the Catholics during the progress of the discussions of the Cabinet.

His Majesty having approved of the solicitation of the majority of His Majesty's Ministers to retire from His Majesty's councils, and his Excellency having requested that His Majesty would extend to him the same indulgence, it became a matter of public duty for his Excellency to explain to the Catholic body, the sentiments which had been held with respect to them, and to inculcate the line of conduct, which in this arduous crisis it became them to pursue.

His Excellency therefore, being apprized of the sentiments held by Mr. Pitt, did on the 13th Feb. send for Lord Fingall and Dr. Troy, and gave them two papers to be by them circulated among the principal Catholics in different parts of Ireland.

The first his Excellency felt assured corresponded with Mr. Pitt's sentiments, and the other conveyed his own private sentiments, founded on the speeches and conduct of many of the most eminent characters of all parties and distinctions.

It being of great importance that any communication made by his Excellency should not be misunderstood or misinterpreted, and that it should make a due impression and produce a general good effect, his Excellency preferred a written to a mere verbal communication, which might have been ill-reported and subject to perversion according to the inclination or the capacity of those who should circulate and receive it.

His Excellency has seen a happy result from this mode of proceeding. Rumours from England having been transmitted that the wishes of the Catholics were likely to be acceded to, every ill-consequence from their disappointment has been obviated, and there is now every reason to believe that they will take that line of conduct which the well wishers to His Majesty's service and the cause of the empire would desire.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Whitehall, March 3, 1801.

. . . I must not conclude this letter without informing your Excellency that it is the intention of Government, as soon as circumstances will permit, to apply to Parliament for an Act for the further suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, which it is proposed should contain all the powers given to His Majesty by the Act which is now on the eve of expiring, and by the happy prospect which this day's symptoms afford of His Majesty's recovery—upon which I most sincerely congratulate your Excellency—I have the most confident hope that this necessary measure will soon be carried into effect.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

P.S. I have the happiness of acquainting you that His Majesty had last night between nine and ten hours' sleep, and that he is so much refreshed by it, and all other symptoms are become so favourable, that the Queen is gone out to take the air for the first time since His Majesty's illness. P.

MEMORANDUM found among the Papers of LORD MELVILLE, enclosed in the following EXTRACT of a LETTER from LORD CORNWALLIS to LORD CASTLEREAGH, dated March 7, 1801.

"It gave me very sincere satisfaction to find by your letter of the 2nd, which I received yesterday, that Mr. Pitt understands the papers that were delivered to the Catholics precisely in the

sense in which I explained them in my letter, and the paper transmitted by Cooke on the 3rd instant.

"I conceive that, without the communication of any papers, every man must have felt that neither Mr. Pitt, nor any of the Ministers who resigned with him, nor Mr. Fox, Mr. Grey, &c., &c., could take a share in an Administration (formed under no peculiar exigency of the State) without bringing forward the Catholic question. The greater and more immediate danger will naturally claim the first attention, and many circumstances may, and I am sorry to say are too likely to occur, in which it would be highly criminal in those gentlemen to refuse their services.

"I perfectly agree with you that, either in the case of a regency or of the King's recovery, the question must sleep."

Mr. Pitt thinks the fair statement to be made, in case the papers are alluded to in Parliament is, that you had felt it your duty, for the sake of the public tranquillity, to impress the Catholics with a strong sense of how much both their duty and interest enjoined a loyal and dutiful demeanour—that the precise terms in which it was done not having been a matter of previous concert with all the persons to whom the sentiments might be referable, that the papers in question could not be considered as affecting them further than they adopted them by their language in Parliament; that the sentiments *generally* expressed in those papers met his approbation; in respect to the pledge which might be attributed to the second paper, he should decline upon principle making any other pledge than his past conduct. What his future conduct might be would depend upon what he felt to be due to the question itself, as well as to the public interest.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, March 9, 1801.

The melancholy situation of public affairs, and the little prospect that I see of our country's getting through its present difficulties, has so overcome my spirits, that for some days I have not been able to write.

We have received the mail of the 4th, by which it appears that the King is recovering—so far it is favourable; but the immediate consequence will be the establishment of a weak Administration, who neither will make peace, nor can make war, and who very soon will drive Ireland into the desperate state from which it has, much against the will of the old Irish rulers,

and, I may add, of the majority of the British Cabinet, been lately with so much difficulty rescued.

The papers which you saw were memoranda given to some of the principal Catholics for the language which they were to hold to the people of their persuasion: the reasoning of the former was taken from a letter which Mr. Pitt nearly dictated to Lord Castlereagh, and the second was taken from a letter which I received from Dundas. Nobody can maintain that the papers give any further pledge than the conduct of the persons alluded to has already afforded. A verbal communication made to two or three persons in Dublin, could not have been diffused through the country to any useful purpose, but the circulation of the papers has had a powerful effect, and perfectly tranquillized the minds of the Catholics.

I shall write to Macleod about the two companies and the men of the Irish artillery that are to be sent from hence. The sooner the reduction of the Irish corps can be accomplished the better it will be for the services, as some of the discontented officers are attempting to do mischief.

It would, in my opinion, be a dangerous plan to put a Prince of the Blood at the head of the Ordnance, and would by no means tend to lower the estimates. You would have horse artillery and galloping howitzers and mortars in abundance. Cavalry and artillery were to subdue the world, but they have hitherto made a wretched progress.

I will write again soon. Whitworth's absence is inconvenient, and I am not sanguine in my expectations that much will be done in Denmark.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MEMORANDA.

I.

[A copy of this paper is among the Hardwicke Papers, endorsed Mr. P. to Lord C.]

The leading part of His Majesty's Ministers finding unsurmountable obstacles to the bringing forward measures of concession to the Catholic body whilst in office, have felt it impossible to continue in administration under the inability to propose it with the circumstances necessary to carrying the measure with all its advantages, and they have retired from His Majesty's service, considering this line of conduct as most likely to contribute to its ultimate success. The Catholic body will therefore see how much their future hopes must depend upon strengthening their cause by

good conduct. In the mean time they will prudently consider their prospects as arising from the persons who now espouse their interests, and compare them with those which they could look to from any other quarter. They may with confidence rely on the zealous support of all those who retire, and of many who remain in office, when it can be given with a prospect of success. They may be assured that Mr. Pitt will do his utmost to establish their cause in the public favour, and prepare the way for their finally attaining their objects. And the Catholics will feel that as Mr. Pitt could not concur in a hopeless attempt to force it now, that he must at all times repress, with the same decision as if he held an adverse opinion, any unconstitutional conduct in the Catholic body.

Under these circumstances it cannot be doubted that the Catholics will take the most loyal, dutiful, and patient line of conduct; that they will not suffer themselves to be led into measures which can by any construction give a handle to the opposers of their wishes, either to misinterpret their principles, or to raise an argument for resisting their claims; but by their prudent and exemplary demeanour they will afford additional grounds to the growing number of their advocates to enforce their claims on proper occasions, until their objects can be finally and advantageously attained.

II.

The Sentiments of a sincere Friend to the Catholic Claims.

If the Catholics should now proceed to violence, or entertain any ideas of gaining their objects by convulsive measures, or forming associations with men of Jacobinical principles, they must of course lose the support and aid of those who have sacrificed their own situations in their cause, but who would at the same time feel it to be their indispensable duty to oppose everything tending to confusion.

On the other hand, should the Catholics be sensible of the benefit they possess by having so many characters of eminence pledged not to embark in the service of Government, except on the terms of the Catholic privileges being obtained, it is to be hoped that, on balancing the advantages and disadvantages of their situation, they would prefer a quiet and peaceable demeanour to any line of conduct of an opposite description.

In 1805, Mr. Plowden, the author of the History of Ireland, wrote to Lord Cornwallis, enclosing these two papers, and requesting to know whether they were correct copies of those given by

him to Dr. Troy, referring especially to the latter clause of the second paper.

Lord Cornwallis replied, that he had "neither a copy, nor a distinct recollection of the words of the papers" given to Dr. Troy, which were hastily drawn up "to be circulated amongst his friends, with the view of preventing any immediate disturbances, or other bad effects that might be apprehended from the accounts that had just arrived from England;" and that if he had made use of the word *pledged*, he could only mean that in his own opinion "the Ministers by resigning their offices gave a pledge of their being friends to the measure of Catholic emancipation;" for that he never "received authority, directly or indirectly, from any Member of Administration who resigned his office, to give a pledge that he would not embark again in the service of Government, except on the terms of the Catholic privileges being obtained." The preceding letter refers to these papers.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, March 11, 1801.

I last night received your letter dated the 7th, and conclude that all ministerial arrangements will now go on as it was originally intended. The remainder of my time here will not be pleasant, as I am dunned without mercy by all those who have any claims on Government for services in the late struggle; I trust, therefore, that Lord Hardwicke will not be very unreasonable in the time that he asks for preparation.

There are, I understand, many stories fabricated and circulated in London respecting the conduct of this Government, and our encouragement of petitions.[1] You will, I trust, be assured that the whole are absolutely false—that I have discouraged everything that could possibly irritate the public mind—and that I have used all the means in my power to maintain the most perfect tranquillity.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

DEAR JAMES, Dublin Castle, March 12, 1801.

Our late accounts of the King's health have been so favourable that I conclude the projected arrangements will soon take

[1] See the letter of Lord Fingall to Mr. M'Kenna, of April 10.

place, and that I may expect my successor to arrive early in the next month. The important question which has overthrown the long administration of Mr. Pitt must now sleep, as any person who should attempt to bring it forward would be accused of wishing either to kill or distract the King. When I come to London I shall resign the Ordnance, and it is then my determination to retire absolutely from all public and political life, and to pass the remainder of my days in Suffolk.

I have taken such measures as will, I trust, for some time insure the tranquillity of Ireland, unless my successor should be weak enough to suffer some of its old and violent rulers to resume the power which they have hitherto so much abused, and which they would again employ to plunge this wretched country into all the miseries and horrors from which it has, with so much difficulty, been rescued.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Dublin Castle, March 19, 1801.

. . . The officers of the Irish Board of Ordnance with their Secretary will all receive complete compensation for the loss of their offices, from the Commissioners[1] appointed by Act of Parliament. . . .

The papers which were circulated amongst the Catholics[2] have done much good. It would, perhaps, have been better not to have inserted the word *pledge;* it was, however, used in a letter which I received from Mr. Dundas at the same time with the communication[3] from Mr. Pitt through Lord Castlereagh, and it could not, by any fair construction, be supposed to convey any other meaning than that persons who had gone out of office because the measure could not be brought forward, would not take a part in any administration that was unfriendly to it.

I am afraid Lord Hardwicke will be slow in his movements, and you will conceive that my long continuance under my present circumstances cannot be very agreeable.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] The Commissioners who settled the claims for boroughs also fixed the compensation to be given for offices abolished.

[2] The papers mentioned March 9.

[3] If this communication was made in writing it must have been destroyed, as it cannot be found either among the papers of Lord Cornwallis or of Mr. Pitt.

I wish you would not take any hasty steps respecting your own situation.[1]

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Whitehall, March 19, 1801.

I beg your Lordship a thousand pardons for my inadvertence in not acquainting you with my own hand of Lord Hardwicke's appointment to the Lieutenancy of Ireland on the day in which it took place. Unwilling that the communication of that event should be made to you without being accompanied by the expression of those sentiments which it could not but occasion in my mind, I forbade its being conveyed to you officially, and am thereby, unintentionally and very unexpectedly, the cause of its having reached you by no other means than those of the Gazette, which I am very sincerely and seriously sorry for. I trust, however, to your candour, and to the length of our acquaintance, to acquit me of any intended neglect or indifference, and to do justice to the regard and respect which I have for so many years borne, and must inevitably bear you. Lord Hardwicke told me that you had corresponded upon the subject of his appointment, and that you had indulged him with the time he wished for to take possession of it. I therefore have nothing to add respecting it but my acknowledgments of this part of your conduct being actuated by the same principles of liberality and public spirit which induced you to accept, and have directed you throughout the course of your administration, and which you will allow me to assure you cannot but confirm and strengthen those sentiments of regard and esteem with which

I am, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE EARL OF HARDWICKE.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Dublin Castle, March 27, 1801.

As I am returning to a private life the difference of a few days to me cannot be material. I request, therefore, that your Lordship will not hurry yourself inconveniently on my account. In the mean time I shall remove to the Lodge in the park, and put the Castle in order for your reception.

About the time that General Lake was named for his appoint-

[1] General Ross wished to resign with Lord Cornwallis, but at the request of the latter remained in office.

ment in India, Lord Clanricarde, who had exerted his influence, which is considerable in the county of Galway, in favour of the Union, expressed a desire to be removed from the Scotch to the Irish Staff, and likewise intimated that he thought he had some claim to be considered in the line of office in this country. Seeing no prospect of my being able to gratify his wishes with respect to office in the civil line, I wrote privately to the Duke of York to say that I wished to have an opportunity of obliging his Lordship, but that as I did not know Lord Clanricarde as a soldier, I therefore could not venture to recommend him for the succession to the Mastership of Kilmainham on the resignation of General Lake, which would be considered as a leading step to the eventual succession to the command of the troops on my departure, and left the matter to the decision of H. R. H., under whom Lord Clanricarde had served, and who would consequently be the properest person to determine on the question of his being qualified for that arduous situation. The Duke signified his approbation of Lord Clanricarde, who was in consequence appointed Master of Kilmainham, and looked upon as the future Commander of the Forces.

There is nothing, however, in this transaction that is in any degree binding upon Government, and I can on no account recommend any officer with whose military qualifications I am unacquainted. Without, therefore, entering into the merits of any individual, I shall only declare that I perfectly agree with your Lordship in thinking that it is of the utmost importance that an officer should be appointed who stands high in public opinion, and under whose command the country would feel a degree of security.

The sole power and authority, both civil and military, must be vested in the Lord Lieutenant, but he would not act prudently if he interfered with the Commander-in-Chief in the details of the army. . . . I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY LORD, Whitehall, April 1, 1801.

The circumstances under which I received your Excellency's despatch of the 15th February might apologise for its having remained for some time unanswered, but I shall not attempt to excuse the neglect I have committed, and shall only express my hope that this may reach you in time to remove any doubt that my silence may have occasioned, respecting the senti-

ments of the King's Government with regard to the measure which you recommended relative to Napper Tandy, the considerations on which it was founded, and the conditions you proposed to annex to it, in all which I am to assure your Excellency of the entire concurrence of His Majesty's confidential servants.

I am willing to flatter myself that the deference so justly paid to your Excellency's opinion and judgment, and the confidence which it has been the intention of the King's Ministers unreservedly to repose in you, will have left you no doubt of giving effect to the measure you suggested with regard to Napper Tandy, and that you will have indulged that humanity towards him which the consideration of his age and infirmities have appeared to you to admit, and which so distinguishes your own character.

I have, &c.,

PORTLAND.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, April 4, 1801.

. . . Mr. Burgh, the Speaker's (Foster's) brother-in-law, has been long agent, under the denomination of Treasurer of the Ordnance, and although he is not just the man whom I should have selected before all others for a particular mark of favour, yet I do not see how I can well avoid appointing him to the office of Treasurer. He voted with us on the Union, though much, I believe, against the grain. He has a large family, and is rather popular in the principal society of this place.

Lord Hardwicke says that he will set out for Ireland on the 17th, provided a Commander-in-Chief can be found before that time. If they are nice in their choice, I am afraid his Lordship's journey will be deferred.

The D. of Y., I believe, favours the appointment of Lord Clanricarde, but I am afraid that as a Commander in the field, he would make a sad figure. I think our friend Gardiner would do much better than any that have been named—he is both more of a soldier and of a man of business. To be sure he takes, for a constancy, rather too much wine.

I am quite out of heart about public business, and hardly see a prospect of salvation. I wish Lord Liverpool had again reason to complain, as he did last year, of Bonaparte's teasing us with offers of peace.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, April 6, 1801.

I am exceedingly glad to find that Brome is desirous of going to France. I agree, however, most perfectly with you in thinking that the French will not at present enter into any negotiation. I shall be obliged to you if you will tell Lord Whitworth[1] that I am very sensible of his kindness in agreeing to take Brome if the Ministers consent. . . .

My last accounts from Lord Hardwicke say that he will set out on the 20th if a Commander-in-Chief should be then appointed, but in the present state of things there can be no certainty, and I shall not think myself fairly out of the scrape till I land at Park-gate.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

EARL OF FINGALL TO THEOBALD M'KENNA,[2] ESQ.

DEAR SIR, Killeen Castle, April 10, 1801.

I this morning received the letter you were so good as to write to me relative to the address. Besides the obligations already owing to you by the Catholics and those in which I feel myself indebted for your particular attention to me, this fresh instance of your never-ceasing exertions demands our general thanks. Should Lord Cornwallis be addressed on his departure, which I have strong reason to think he now does not wish, you have furnished us with the best things that can possibly be said on the occasion. If, unfortunately, to accommodate all parties, we are under the necessity of sacrificing a little (as I really conceive the Catholic question to have made now such strong grounds as to want merely a *favourable opportunity* for its entire accomplishment, and very little more comment, either on itself or those it regards) it will perhaps be as well to give up some points which relate to the Union, though strongly I approve it, so many of my friends think otherwise that it must, I fear, be relinquished. I know we cannot please all, but perhaps it is not a bad maxim to please all we can

[1] Charles Lord Whitworth in Ireland, so created March 21, 1800, and an Earl in England, Nov. 25, 1816, K.B., b. 1754, d. May 12, 1825, when the titles became extinct; m. April 7, 1801, Arabella Diana, dau. of Sir Charles Cope, and widow of John Frederick, 3rd Duke of Dorset. From 1784 to June, 1803, Lord Whitworth was, with short intervals, employed in the diplomatic service in Poland, Russia, Denmark, and France, which he quitted on the rupture of the Peace of Amiens. He was a Lord of the Bedchamber from March 2, 1813, till the following August, when he became Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland till 1817.

[2] Theobald M'Kenna, a Catholic barrister, much in the confidence of the Catholics, and a writer in favour of Government. He got a pension.

through life. I propose being in Dublin on Monday to see the Lord-Lieutenant, Tuesday. If he persists in thinking we had better not address him, it becomes, I think, a matter of consideration whether we shall come before the public in any other shape. I should have gone to Dublin this day but was informed Lord C. was not to be seen at the Castle till Tuesday, and from what appears on the general face of things, I am strongly inclined to think his leaving us is not likely to take place so soon. There seems, from the Secret Committee appointed in the Imperial Parliament, to be some well-grounded apprehensions, and who so fit to govern this country at such a moment as the present man? I might add, who will undertake the task? I write this in haste, but hope you will be able to make it out. I shall have much pleasure in finding your recovery rapidly increasing, and am

Dear Sir, with very sincere esteem and regard,

Your faithful and obedient servant,

FINGALL.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, April 11, 1801.

I had the honour to receive your Grace's letter dated the 1st instant, signifying the concurrence of His Majesty's confidential servants in what I had recommended respecting Mr. Napper Tandy.

He was arraigned on the 7th, when, after attempting to get his trial postponed, he pleaded guilty without having received any previous encouragement to hope that his life might be spared, and sentence of death[1] was accordingly passed upon him.

I have directed that means should be taken to obtain from him any information that he may be capable of giving respecting the designs of the disaffected or the plans of the enemy, before he receives any intimation of the lenient disposition of Government.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

MY DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, April 16, 1801.

I shall reply in a day or two to the different matters mentioned in your letter dated the 13th, which I have just received; but I cannot delay a moment to assure you of the

[1] He was, after no great interval of time, allowed to quit the country.

sincere satisfaction that I feel on your being established as Colonel of an old regiment.[1]

I have received the most satisfactory accounts of our Indian affairs from Lord Wellesley, and we are all now in the greatest joy at the news of the death of the Emperor Paul,[2] which has just arrived by the Tuesday's Lottery express. In short, I have not felt so comfortably for a long time.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, April 18, 1801.

The death of Paul has been a stroke of good fortune that we had no right to expect, and that *alone*, in my opinion, renders our success at Copenhagen of any solid advantage, for our loss[3] has been so severe that we could not follow up the blow, if the four Northern Powers remained inveterately united against us. God send we may have a fair opportunity of treating, and that we may use it with prudent firmness, and not with arrogance!

By a letter which I received a few days ago from Lord Hardwicke, I concluded that Harris's appointment, however extraordinary it appeared to me, was entirely arranged, but by the letters of the 14th nothing appeared to be settled. Lord H. seems determined not to stir until he has got a Commander-in-Chief. After what passed about Lord Clanricarde,[4] I cannot with honour interfere, but I really believe they will not easily get a better than Gardiner.

Brome tells me that he has secured apartments for me at Dorant's York Hotel, which is, I believe, in Albemarle Street, and will be very near you. I shall remain here a day or two after Lord Hardwicke's arrival.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] General Ross had been a few days before removed from the Colonelcy of the 89th to that of the 59th regiment, which he held for upwards of 26 years.

[2] The murder of the Emperor Paul, of which the details are well known, took place on the 25th March. How far the Empress his wife, or his son Alexander, were cognizant of his proposed deposition, is a question that has never been satisfactorily answered. But after the perpetration of the crime, the conspirators, as they were retiring, were met in the gallery by the Empress, then perfectly aware of what had occurred. She probably imagined that, like the Empress Catherine, she would be called upon to assume the reins of Government, and accordingly held out her hand for them to kiss. They, however, declined such a recognition of her claims, bowed, and passed on, as they always intended that Alexander should succeed his father. This fact is given upon undoubted authority.

[3] The Gazette returns stated the loss at 255 killed, and 688 wounded; but when the complete details were collected, the numbers were: killed 350, wounded 850. The ships engaged had been seriously damaged, several had grounded, and, had the Danes declined the armistice, it is highly probable that some of the English vessels would have been lost.

[4] The appointment of Lord Clanricarde as Commander-in-Chief had been pressed by the Duke of York, and Lord Cornwallis was unwilling to oppose the Duke's wishes.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, April 22, 1801.

I remain still in the same uncertainty respecting my departure, and I feel a little at the discredit which attaches upon the army from the difficulty of finding a General proper for the command. I have no doubt of Gardiner's doing better than any one of the candidates who have been named; but after what has passed with Lord Clanricarde, with the knowledge and approbation of the D. of Y., I dare not communicate my sentiments to any one. For, although I am not committed to support Lord C.'s pretensions, I have, under H. R. H.'s directions, gone too far to take any part against him. Upon further acquaintance with him, however, I am every day more and more convinced of his incapacity.

I desired Lord Hardwicke not to hurry himself inconveniently for the difference of a few days; but I hope that the difficulty will not last too long, lest I should be suspected of acting a more shabby part than those members of the former Government who have resigned on a point which regarded me more particularly. I have been for some days under great anxiety about Lord Castlereagh.

I am very impatient for some further accounts from the North and from Egypt, and trust soon that we shall see some prospect of peace.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, May 1, 1801.

Your letter dated the 25th arrived only last night. I lost, however, no time in my inquiries about the confectioner, and find that he is engaged to Lord Hardwicke. I have, therefore, not thought it right to say anything to him respecting the proposition of Lord St. Helens.[1] He is a most capital fellow in his way. It gives me great satisfaction to find that Lord St. Helens is going to Russia. God send that we may at least get rid of some of our enemies.[2] I feel the utmost anxiety, mixed with a good deal of apprehension, about Egypt.

Your account of a certain personage is indeed lamentable, and in the present critical state of the country I shall think Ministers very culpable if they do not establish some Government.

[1] Alleyne Fitzherbert, created Baron St. Helens, in Ireland, April 23, 1791, and in England July 31, 1801, b. March, 1753, d. unm. Feb. 19, 1839. He was in the diplomatic service upwards of 25 years, being employed during that time in Brussels, Paris, Russia, and Holland. Chief Secretary in Ireland from 1787 to 1789. M.P. in Ireland for Carysfort from 1787 to 1790.

[2] Lord St. Helens succeeded in concluding a Convention with Russia, which he signed at St. Petersburg on the 17th of June.

My own situation is most painful. On account of my military command I should not refuse to remain for the greater part of the summer if it was pressed upon me, but I should wish to employ that time in looking at the part of the country which is most exposed to attack, and which I have hitherto been too much taken up with politics to have had time to examine, and generally to revise and improve my military arrangements; but I am now kept from day to day in the most anxious and awkward suspense.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 4, 1801.

It is with much concern that I transmit to your Grace the enclosed letter[1] from Sir James Duff, by which you will see that the horrid outrages which prevailed in the county of Limerick during the last autumn have been again renewed.

I have empowered Sir James to take the same measures that were adopted at that time to suppress these enormities, and which were then attended with success; and have desired him to consult with the magistrates, and to suggest any other steps that may be likely to prove efficacious. But I confess, that as long as the wages of the labouring poor continue to be so inadequate to their means of subsistence, I entertain little hope that this rich and fertile county can enjoy any permanent tranquillity.

There has been of late some stir among the disaffected in this country, and some seditious papers have, I believe, been transmitted from England, to all which matters the Government of Ireland will pay due and vigilant attention; but I have at present no reason to suspect any concerted system of active treason or insurrection.

I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

ALEXANDER MARSDEN, ESQ., TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

[Private.]

MY DEAR SIR, Dublin Castle, May 6, 1801.

. . . I am again under the necessity of entreating your aid to have our money matters settled. I have already informed you how distressingly I am, more than any one, embarked in this business, and since I wrote to you nothing has been received.

[1] The letter only gives the details which Lord Cornwallis briefly sums up, and possesses no general interest.

I wonder to see Mr. A.'s secret service money so limited this year.[1]

Cooke can fully explain to you our necessities, and furnish you with our debts.

Very faithfully yours,

A. MARSDEN.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, May 7, 1801.

Lord Hardwicke assures me that he is perfectly ready to set out, but that he cannot leave England until a Commander-in-Chief is appointed, and of that event I see no more prospect than I did six weeks ago. Nothing in the mean time can be more unpleasant than my situation. . . .

The great change that has taken place in our situation, both with respect to the Northern Powers and to Egypt, affords some prospect that we may at last get over our difficulties; and I confess, as a sincere friend to peace, that I am not sorry that the negotiations will not be conducted by Lord Grenville.

I have been, and indeed am still, very uneasy about Lord Castlereagh, who has had a return of his fever. They tell me there is no danger, but I have no idea of a fever of so long continuance without danger.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, May 9, 1801.

After reading yesterday your letter of the 4th, which gave me great satisfaction on the subject of the appointment of a Commander-in-Chief in every respect, except the report that had been propagated of my having recommended Gardiner, judge what was my surprise at hearing from what I conceive to be exceedingly good authority, that our friend —— was to be my successor.[2] Surely some of the King's confidential servants want the assistance of Willis.

I am afraid my friend Elliot, to whom I had said,—If they are at a loss for a Commander-in-Chief, why do they not appoint Gardiner, who would, in my opinion, do very well?—mentioned it indiscreetly to Pelham, who certainly was rather anxious some Commander-in-Chief should be named, as he was, by the delay, kept out of the

[1] The sum voted in 1800 for secret service money was 175,000*l.*; in 1801, 75,000*l.*—in each case including 25,000*l.* from the Civil List.

[2] Sir William Medows was ultimately appointed.

office of Secretary of State.[1] Do not mention my having heard of ——, lest my authority might be suspected, which might be prejudicial to him.

I am beyond measure anxious and uneasy about Egypt, and have for some time much lamented that the Royals and 64th Regiments formed from the Irish Militia, which have been hurried away to destruction in the West Indies, were not sent thither. I tremble for poor Hutchinson; he is a sensible man, but he is no General—at least he was not one in 1798.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE DUKE OF PORTLAND.

MY LORD, Dublin Castle, May 9, 1801.

I received yesterday at a late hour your Grace's letter, dated the 4th instant, acquainting me that Lord Longueville had been informed of a conspiracy for a general massacre in the Barony of Muskerry, and that six of the principal leaders were apprehended.

Had the plot, which is said to be discovered, been of so very serious a nature, it is impossible that I should not have heard of it from the various channels by which information is constantly transmitted to Government, particularly from that vigilant and attentive officer, Major General Myers, who has long commanded His Majesty's Forces in the district where this transaction is stated to have occurred.

It appears, however, by a report from that General, which I received a few hours only before your Grace's despatch reached me, that a circumstance has taken place which, by great exaggeration, has given rise to that story, and for this purpose I enclose to your Grace his letter, and the information against one M'Donald apprehended in Cork, and the papers found upon him. I likewise send to your Grace a letter from an intelligent gentleman of Cork, and one of the late Sheriffs of that city, who it appears had, previously to General Myers' communication, traced this man and sifted his story, and though Mr. Harding is well disposed to view it in the most serious light, it will be found to fall greatly short of the representation of Captain Rowland.

It may not be improper, whilst I am writing on this subject,

[1] It was intended that Lord Hobart should be Secretary of State for the Home Department, but the Duke of Portland was not to relinquish that office for that of President of the Council till the Irish arrangements were completed. The changes did take place on July 30.

that I should transmit to your Grace a letter received from a gentleman in the county of Wexford, containing information of a design to revive rebellion in that county. Your Grace will see from the reports I transmit, how greatly these dangerous plots are heightened by the warmth of imagination.

Before I conclude my letter I cannot avoid requesting that your Grace will receive with a degree of qualification the stories which are told in England of the state of some parts of the country, as you may be assured from the attention of the General Officers in their respective districts, and the loyalty and zeal of most of the magistrates, besides our private channels of intelligence, that facts of so strong a nature could not long remain a secret from me, and, I trust, that the general tenor of my conduct, since I had the charge of the administration of His Majesty's Government in Ireland, has sufficiently proved that I have not been inattentive to any traitorous designs that could endanger the safety of the State, and that I have not been remiss in any important information.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, May 12, 1801.

From the tenor of your letter and Mr. Elliot's, I conclude that we may look for Lord Hardwicke's arrival in two or three days at farthest, and that I shall see you in London soon after the time you mention.

The joy that I should feel at being released from a situation which, with regard to every idea of enjoyment of life, has been most irksome to me, will be greatly alloyed by my apprehension that I am leaving a people who love me, and whose happiness I had so nearly secured, in a state of progressive misery.

The military business is completely arranged for our friend Medows. The General Officers have their instructions; every corps has its orders in the event of the enemy's landing in the north, the south, or the west. In five, or at utmost six, days from the first notice upwards of 20,000 of the best species of his troops will be assembled at Fermoy, Tullamore, or Belturbet. Three thousand light infantry are stationed at Athlone and in the environs of that place, in body of men superior, and in every respect, except experience of actual service, equal to the corps that Abercrombie commanded in America. Brigades of artillery, pioneers, every branch, is in a state of perfect preparation.

Two officers have passed through this country carrying the news of our having taken the Danish settlements[1] in the West Indies. I am afraid that troops have been destined for these conquests which would have been more usefully employed in Egypt.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE REV. B. GRISDALE.

DEAR GRISDALE, Phœnix Park, May 15, 1801.

Your letter of the 7th has found me still in Ireland, and not absolutely certain of the precise time of my being released. It is, however, not true that I made any engagement, or ever pressed Government in any respect about my removal. To say the truth I believe they were very glad to take me at the first word. In consequence of the triumph in England of that party which I had kept in order here, and of the adoption of a system which will soon renew the horrid scene of bloodshed from which we had nearly emerged, I requested to retire from my situation as soon as it might suit His Majesty's convenience.

Lord Hardwicke, my successor, informed me that he proposed to set out about this time, but as the new Commander-in-Chief, Sir William Medows, cannot conveniently leave England before the 1st of June, I doubt whether the Lord-Lieutenant will come over much before him.

You know me too well to doubt of my being happy at the thoughts of retirement, and you will likewise believe that the ungracious circumstances that attend it do not give me much concern, but the reflection of the misery to which a people are doomed who have shown me every mark of gratitude and affection, and the ultimate danger to which the convulsions in Ireland will expose the British empire, are a severe alloy to my prospects of future enjoyment.

Our prospects with respect to foreign affairs have brightened very much within these few weeks, and our troops in Egypt have shown that British soldiers, when properly led, are not inferior to our seamen.

It will afford me great pleasure to see you at Culford; the place is so altered that you will not have the smallest recollection of it. Brome now begins to take a great interest in it, which gives me no small satisfaction.

Most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] The Danish settlements in the West Indies, Ste. Croix and several other islands, were taken between March 20 and March 31. The fleet was commanded by Rear-Admiral Duckworth, and the army by Lieut.-General Trigge.

SIR BOYLE ROCHE[1] TO LIEUT.-COLONEL LITTLEHALES.

[Received May 16.]

London, Thayer Street, near Manchester Square,
May y^e^ 12th, 1801.

DEAR SIR,

I was exceedingly surprised to be informed that Mr. Gerald Aylmer[2] was put into the patent with me as Inspector of the River Kenmare, which has been a great disappointment to me, as Mr. W. A. Crosbie[3] and I had come to an agreement about the exchange of our places, and he was certain that he had interest enough with Lord Hardwicke to effect it, which would have been very convenient for both, as he who desires to live in England would have been accommodated with a sinecure place, and I, who intend to be a resident in Dublin, should be very happy in his situation of a Commissioner of Stamps.

I have now been an officer in the Revenue for upwards of twenty-five years, and am entitled by the Revenue Laws to retire upon my emoluments. My salary was three hundreds a-year, which I received quarterly.

I had a deputy given me at sixty pounds a-year, which entirely excused me from any attendance. My deputy was obliged to share all captures with me, the value of which were at times considerable, all which I am willing to compromise for four hundreds a-year upon the incidents of the Revenue; and in doing this I shall be rather a loser than a gainer.

If the Lord-Lieutenant can do this before his departure he would add to the obligations he has already conferred upon me.

I request you, with your usual goodness to me, to lay this letter before his Excellency.

I am, Dear Sir,

Ever affectionately yours,

B. ROCHE.

[1] Sir Boyle Roche, Bart., so created Nov. 30, 1782; b. about 1735, d. June 5, 1807; m. Mary, dau. of Admiral Sir Thomas Frankland, Bart., Gentleman Usher at the Castle. M.P. from Oct. 1775 to the Union, for Tralee, Gowran, Portarlington, and Old Leighlin. He was celebrated for his bulls, of which one or two authentic specimens may be given. "It would be better, Mr. Speaker, to give up not only a part, but if necessary even the whole of our constitution, to preserve the remainder." "Here, perhaps, Sir, the murderous Marshall Law men (Marseillois) would break in, cut us to mince-meat, and throw our bleeding heads on that table to stare us in the face." A pension of 300*l.* was conferred, May 22, 1801, jointly on Sir Boyle and Lady Roche, who had also a separate pension of 200*l.* He had previously applied more than once for a Peerage. In Jan. 1795 he wrote to the Lord-Lieutenant (Lord Fitzwilliam) reiterating his claim, and desiring to know if Lord Westmoreland had recommended him.

[2] Gerald Aylmer was made Inspector of the Shannon jointly with Sir B. Roche, d. Jan. 9, 1837; m. April, 1811, Catherine, dau. of Patrick Lambert, Esq., of Carnagh. His paternal estate of Lyons was sold to Lord Cloncurry.

[3] W. A. Crosbie had been Commissioner of Barrack Board, which he resigned in 1798 on receiving a pension of 250*l.*

NOTE (in pencil).

DEAR MARSDEN,

I have informed Sir Boyle I could not interfere in this matter.

Yours,

E. B. L.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Phœnix Park, May 22, 1801.

I have just received your letter of the 19th, and am informed by a letter from Elliot of the same date, that Lord Hardwicke actually left London on that morning. Elliot says his Lordship will travel slowly, but as he does not speak with certainty we must be on the look out.

It is reported that the French fleet, with a large body of land-forces, has orders to sail from Brest. It is an awkward time to leave the country without a Commander-in-Chief, but I cannot stay after Lord Hardwicke's arrival.

I have written to the D. of York to state my readiness to obey H. M.'s commands if my services should be required.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

ALEXANDER MARSDEN, ESQ., TO JOHN KING, ESQ.

SIR, Dublin Castle, May 25, 1801.

I have the honour of acquainting you, for the information of the Duke of Portland, that the Earl of Hardwicke sailed from Holyhead yesterday evening, and arrived early this morning in this port.

His Lordship on his arrival at the Castle was sworn Lord-Lieutenant, a more particular account of which is contained in the enclosed paper which I send you that it may be inserted in the London Gazette.

I have, &c.,

ALEX. MARSDEN.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Holyhead, Thursday night, May 28, 1801.

I am just landed here, the easterly wind having prevented my proceeding to Parkgate. I cannot exactly ascertain the day that I shall be in town, as I promised to stay a night at Sir C. Oakeley's, but it will probably be either late at night on the 1st or in the forenoon of the 2nd.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Shrewsbury, May 30, 1801.

The roads and weather are so bad that I do not mean to attempt making the journey in two days, and consequently shall not arrive in town till the morning of the 2nd. Will you be kind enough to communicate this to Mary.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Many documents are preserved in the Castle at Dublin on the same subject as the four annexed papers, and of about the same date. Among them are various written communications between Mr. Marsden and Dr. Troy, letters from Lords Clare and Kilwarden, &c., &c.; but as the substance of them is contained in the following pages, it has not been thought necessary to print them.

EARL OF HARDWICKE TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY ADDINGTON.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY DEAR SIR, Phœnix Park, Dec. 21, 1801.

I am at all times as unwilling to give you the trouble of an unnecessary letter, as I am to omit communicating to you whatever facts or circumstances may be material for your information.

A point has lately occurred, connected with a question which we are all very anxious to keep out of sight, but which, from the manner in which it is now brought forward, may possibly require the consideration and decision of the Cabinet.

In the course of last summer Lord Kilwarden, with Lord Avonmore and Lord Norbury, held their annual visitation of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth. No particular or formal report was made of their visitation at the time, but in the month of October Lord Kilwarden stated to Mr. Abbot[1] that a circumstance had fallen under his observation, which he had frequently considered since the visitation, and which he thought it necessary to submit to Government, because it appeared to him to be a departure from the original intention of the College at Maynooth. The circumstance to which Lord Kilwarden alluded, and which he shortly after stated to me, was a building near the College, and erected upon the ground belonging to it, and fitted up and furnished for the reception of lay boarders. They were of opinion that it deserved

[1] Right Hon. Charles Abbot, created Lord Colchester June 3, 1817, b. Oct. 14, 1757, d. May 8, 1829; m. Dec. 29, 1796, Elizabeth, dau. of Sir Philip Gibbes, Bart. Chief Secretary in Ireland from May, 1801, to Feb. 1802; then Speaker of the House of Commons till he was made a peer. M.P. for Helston from June, 1795, to 1802; Woodstock to 1806; University of Oxford to June, 1817.

the serious consideration of Government, how far it would be wise to permit such an institution as a lay boarding-school to be engrafted on the College at Maynooth, which was intended for the education of persons to exercise the office of priests. Lord Kilwarden observed that such was the general understanding at the time the Act passed, though there is no such restriction or limitation in the Act itself. It was also stated about the same time by the Duke of Leinster to me, and to Mr. Abbot, that an application upon the subject of this school was intended to be made, the object of which was to obtain the sanction of Government to the lay institution. In consequence of these representations, an intimation was given to Mr. Knox, agent to the College, the object of which was to prevent such a question from being brought forward. He was desired to mention to the heads of the College, that it was the wish of Government that no further measures should be taken towards establishing a lay boarding-school as a part of the College. Soon after this intimation, Lord Fingall called upon me for the purpose of ascertaining the intention of Government upon this subject, and of enquiring whether it would be advisable for the trustees to conclude an agreement for an house in the town of Maynooth, for which they were in treaty, in order to apply it to the purpose of a school to be annexed to the College. I told Lord F. that as the laws now stood, the Government would not interfere with the establishment of a school at Maynooth, or anywhere else, but that it might be a question how far it was eligible to suffer a lay school to be added to the institution, and that without insisting upon any sudden or immediate dissolution of the school, it seemed to me better that it should subside, and that at any rate it would not have been just or right after the statement made to me by Lord Kilwarden, to suffer the College to lay out a sum of money under the idea that the establishment would afterwards be approved of by Government. Not long after this, Lord Fingall mentioned the subject to Lord Clare, who came to the Castle in order to speak to me about it. In that conversation I explained to him the precise meaning and extent of the intimation, which he said he had understood to have been a peremptory order for the immediate suppression of the school. He also entered into the discussion of the expediency of a system of mixed education rather than an exclusive education for priests, and upon asking whether he meant a system upon the plan of Eton or Westminster, where the Collegers and Oppidans are educated together in the same classes without distinction of orders, he assented to the comparison, and observed in the conversation that all parties seemed very desirous to keep back as much as possible whatever related to Catholic questions. Here

the conversation ended. Lord Kilwarden, at subsequent interviews with me, repeated his objections to the school, and I afterwards understood from Mr. Marsden, with whom Lord Fingall occasionally conversed upon the subject, that he proposed to remove his son next year to a school in England, and that probably the plan of a lay school at Maynooth would gradually subside. Notwithstanding matters were thus, as I supposed, at an end, it appears that Lord Clare saw Dr. Troy a few days ago, and told him that the school was to go on without any change until the question was determined. For the substance of that conversation I beg to enclose a paper which Dr. Troy certifies to contain a correct report of it. Upon hearing of this order, communicated by the Chancellor to Dr. Troy in direct contradiction to the intimation given by Mr. Knox to the College, and without any consultation whatever, I thought it necessary to communicate to him Dr. Troy's account of the conversation, a minute of which had been furnished to me by Mr. Marsden. Lord Clare disclaimed any intention of countermanding my order, and assured me that he had merely explained to Dr. Troy the nature of the order conveyed by Mr. Knox, the extent of which he had understood to be from our former conversation, not that the school should be instantly dissolved, but that no new expense should be incurred upon that account till they heard further from Government upon the subject.

I have endeavoured to state as correctly as I can the substance of our conversation of yesterday, of which I enclose a fuller account, and recommend this, as well as the other papers enclosed, to your perusal, because I think it very material that you should be fully possessed of all that has passed upon this point, which upon many accounts is of no inconsiderable importance.

When Lord Clare furnishes me with the statement he has promised to make, not only of the origin and intention of the College at Maynooth, but of his opinion upon that and other points connected with the Roman Catholic schools, and controlling the priests by the revival of penal laws, it may, perhaps, be necessary that I should transmit it for the consideration of the Cabinet. On this point I shall be much gratified by receiving your opinion. In the mean time this statement and the enclosed documents will distinctly prove that I have used my best endeavours to prevent the question being brought forward for discussion. Whether Lord Clare has taken the part he has, from spleen or dislike to the Government, or from a conviction that it was right to do so, I cannot pretend to determine; but so far I must observe, that his bringing it forward to public notice at this time, and in this particular manner, is very inconsistent with the concurrence he

expressed in our first conversation, with the general opinion of the inexpediency of agitating at the present moment any points connected with the Catholic Question. It would be very curious if after all that has passed, Lord Clare should be attempting to acquire popularity with the Catholics at the expense of the Government. He seems to me, with a great share of cleverness and vivacity, to be very deficient in consistency and precision in his ideas; for at the very moment that he is contending for the policy of a mixed education of lay boys with those intended for the priesthood, he asserts that it is the fixed system of the priests not to suffer such mixed education, and moreover cannot deny the greater probability of the lay scholars under priestly discipline and with priestly associates, becoming monastic, than of the clerical pupils acquiring from their lay schoolfellows the more liberal habits of those who are not secluded from the world. In considering the policy of this measure it may be worthy of observation, that any such establishment necessarily tends to perpetuate the distinction, which so far as education is concerned was intended to be done away, by giving an equal admission to Catholic and Protestant pupils at Trinity College, Dublin. I am, &c.,

HARDWICKE.

MINUTES OF CONVERSATION between the RIGHT HON. CHARLES ABBOT and LORD KILWARDEN at CORK ABBEY, Dec. 25, 1801.

In the course of this conversation, which lasted above an hour, the following points were distinctly stated and re-stated by Lord Kilwarden.

I. *The original purpose* of the College of Maynooth was to educate only priests. The proofs of it are:—1. that it originated in the circumstances of the times which had revolutionized the Continent, and rendered the former places of educating the Irish priests (viz. St. Omer, Paris, &c.) unfit and unsafe, and rendered it desirable to educate them at home.

2. The speech of the Minister (Mr. Pelham), in opening the measure to Parliament, pointed only at that object.

3. Lord K., who was then Attorney-General, and commissioned by Mr. Pelham to confer with the Catholics, had no conference but with Dr. Troy (titular Archbishop of Dublin) and another priest, and when under his general instructions to talk with them, he wished them to make the College a joint school for the laity and clergy, they would not hear of it, and stated it to be prohibited by their own rules.

Lord K. in illustration of this, incidentally stated the case of the present Bishop of Meath, who was educated for the priesthood at the Sorbonne, and having come over for his health to Ireland, was refused to be re-admitted at the Sorbonne, on account of his having proceeded with his education here promiscuously with the laity, (I believe in Trin. Coll. Dublin).

4. A further proof that such was the original plan was this, that the College had not from its foundation ever taken any other shape than for priests, though certainly the Act was expressed in general terms.

II. As to any *subsequent compact*, such as I told him Lord Clare says was made after he threw out the Bill in 1799, Lord K. said he knew of none; it might have been some expectation held out to Lord Fingall; he did not believe any passed with Lord Cornwallis, but if it did, Colonel Littlehales would know it most probably.

III. As to his *Report of his Visitation* at Maynooth to Lord Hardwicke, Lord Avonmore had authorized him to report to Government the appearance of this lay school, the novelty of which had surprised them both.

The boarding-house for the boys is a dormitory, at the distance of a field or two, but upon the College ground, and within the same fence; it contained no school-rooms, and therefore he supposed the boys must go to the priest's college for their lessons.

That as visitor he had only to report the fact, but personally he had also expressed his individual opinions upon the novelty and impolicy of the measure.

IV. I then related to Lord K. what had passed subsequent to the Report. Upon stating the intimation I had given to Knox by his Excellency's direction, he desired (with excuses) to know whether I was sure of my recollection, as to the substance and mode of the intimation.

I repeated to him the whole as nearly as possible in the manner which I noted from Lord Hardwicke, and which he sent to England to Mr. Addington, and added that I believed it was so communicated in ipsissimis verbis.

He said he wished to be accurately possessed of it, because it had been quite otherwise represented, though he was not at liberty to say how or by whom.

I told him, I knew Lord Clare had otherwise represented it; but I wished to know if he had it from Mr. Knox himself, or whether

Mr. Knox did represent it differently. That I was in some degree anxious about that, although I was very sure of my own precise recollection of a matter which naturally appeared to me of moment both before and since it had occurred.

Lord K. said, he did not hear it from Knox, nor had he indeed seen him.

He seemed much surprised that Knox had not been to me, and that I had not received any communication from him upon the subject.

I said whatever difference of opinion might fairly be entertained by the most honourable men upon the general question of policy, and although no man was for high office, character, learning, and knowledge of the country, more entitled to be heard respectfully, and with greater deference, than Lord Clare, yet it was quite impossible that any orders given by the Lord-Lieutenant should be superseded by any other person however high: and when his Excellency had given an intimation that the lay school was *not to go on*, it could not be permitted that any other person should direct it to *proceed*.

That this had been explained to Lord Clare, who disclaimed the intention, though he certainly had done the thing, as appeared by Dr. Troy's narrative, taken down by Marsden and admitted by Dr. Troy to be true.

I then told him that Lord Hardwicke had thought it necessary to send a written direction to Mr. Marsden, to assure Dr. Troy of the kind disposition of Government to all descriptions of the King's subjects; but that they must come to the Lord-Lieutenant for explanations of the Lord-Lieutenant's orders, and not go elsewhere; or to that effect.

Lord Kilwarden said, Certainly there could be no Lord-Lieutenant, if any other man was to do away his orders. He lamented that this led to such a dispute, because the intimation could only point at Lord Clare; but that it was certainly necessary to preserve the Lord-Lieutenant's authority, &c., &c.

V. Upon the POLICY of such a mixed school. 1. To my question whether he had told Lord Clare that he was of opinion for going on with this school, and for educating such boys with such priests, in such an institution, he said most decidedly not.

I said Dr. Troy represented the Chancellor to have said so of Lord Kilwarden.

Lord K. said on the contrary he had told the Chancellor there could not be a worse education.

And when he told the Chancellor of the nature of their examination of an hour at the Visitation, about St. Augustin and Origen, and their coarse vulgar jokes and manners at the dinner, Lord Clare seemed much surprised at it, and seemed not to know they were of such a description.

2. As to the abstract policy, Lord K. would advise the Crown and Parliament, with a view only to the present race, to govern by a strong military force, and keep down the Catholics by the bayonet, but with a view to posterity he should wish to educate the Protestants and Catholics together: and such was the object of opening Trin. Coll. to the Catholics.

3. I told him that now at Trin. Coll. the Provost informed me there were many sons of opulent Catholics, and that their numbers of this class increased. Lord K. said he knew it to be so; but the Chancellor did not admit it, and ought to be put in full and unquestionable possession of the fact, &c., &c.

MEMORANDUM OF THE EARL OF CLARE UPON THE ORIGINAL INSTITUTION OF MAYNOOTH.

Dec. 28, 1801.

In the year 1795, at the opening of the Session of Parliament in Ireland, Lord Fitzwilliam in his Speech from the Throne, recommended to both Houses to take into serious consideration the imperfect system of education in Ireland, more particularly with respect to persons of the Roman Catholic religion. And Doctor Hussey very soon after came into this country, under the patronage of the Irish Government, to be put at the head of a college to be founded exclusively for the education of persons of that persuasion, of all descriptions. Nothing further passed during Lord Fitzwilliam's stay in Ireland, but soon after Lord Camden's arrival here, an Act passed appointing trustees consisting of the Chancellor and the Chief Judges, who were placed at the front of this Institution, very reluctantly on their part, of ten Popish Titular Bishops, and somewhat a greater number of Lay Catholics, who were empowered to take lands by purchase, not exceeding the annual value of one thousand pounds, and private pecuniary donations without limitation, to enable them to found a College in Ireland, for the education indiscriminately of persons of the Popish religion. By this Act the trustees, thirty in number, are invested with visitorial powers, and with a power to make bye-laws for regulating the interior economy of the College, with the approbation of the Lord-Lieutenant for the time being, and an immediate grant was made by Parliament of eight thousand pounds to the trustees, to enable

them to purchase a house and other necessary buildings for the accommodation of students. In the following summer a house and some land, now occupied by this seminary, was purchased by the trustees, and in the month of November, 1795, at the first general meeting of the trustees, the Chancellor, by desire of the Chief Judges stated to them, that whenever the attendance of the Chancellor and Chief Judges should be specially desired, they would be ready to lend their assistance in forwarding the Institution; but that a regular attendance at the meetings of the trustees would be utterly incompatible with their judicial duties.

In the Session of 1796, a further grant of 7000*l.* was made by Parliament to the trustees to enable them to enlarge the accommodations for students, and in the Sessions of 1797 and 1798 two further grants, of 10,000*l.* each, were made for the same purpose, making in the whole a sum of 35,000*l.* But in the progress of these several profuse grants, no step was taken to regulate the expenditure, or guard the Institution from abuse. Much less was it intimated that a resolution had been taken to deviate from the original object of it, which was clearly and distinctly understood, as the Act of 1795 imports, to be the foundation of a College for the education of persons of the Popish religion indiscriminately, who, it was understood, were to contribute, at least partially, to the expense of their maintenance and education at it. In the Session of 1799, however, it came out that a private arrangement had been made with Dr. Troy, and some other Popish titular Bishops, by whom, or by what authority, I never yet have been enabled to learn, for the total perversion of the Institution, an arrangement by which it seems to have been stipulated that this country should be encumbered with a permanent annual establishment of eight thousand pounds, for maintaining a mere monastick institution for the education exclusively of Popish priests; and accordingly a grant was sent up to the House of Lords in the Session of 1799, of eight thousand pounds to complete the establishment of the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth for one year ended on the 25th March, 1800. This establishment was called for by the late Lord Farnham, and on its being returned to the House of Lords, it appearing clearly to be a gross perversion of the original Institution, that the whole foundation was eleemosynary from the master of the College down to the lowest scout attendant upon it, that no precaution whatever had been taken to put the Institution under the control of the State in any manner, and that it was in effect a system of patronage at the public expense in the hands of a few Popish titular Bishops, the House of

Lords did nearly unanimously reject the grant. In the next year I was desired by Lord Cornwallis, after consultation with Dr. Troy and some other Popish bishops, to frame an Act which might be palatable to them, and might subject this Institution to some effectual control connected with the State. The first principle which occurred naturally was to establish an effectual general visitorial power over it, connected with the State. To this, however, two peremptory exceptions were made:—first, that the discipline and study of the ecclesiastical branches of education must remain exclusively under the management and direction of Popish ecclesiastics, without the interference or enquiry of Protestant visitors; and next, that in all other points of visitorial authority, visitors of the Popish religion should be joined in commission with any State officers who might be named as visitors. Both points were necessarily yielded, and, as the law now stands, the Chancellor and Chief Judges are permanent visitors, to whom are associated the titular Primate and Archbishop of Dublin by name, and Lord Fingall. On the death of any of these the Popish trustees are empowered to elect a visitor to succeed him, subject to the approbation of the Lord-Lieutenant. After a pretty long negotiation with Dr. Troy, to which I submitted very reluctantly by Lord Cornwallis's desire, he consented to receive lay pupils for education according to the original intention of the Institution, and he consented also to oblige the ecclesiastical pupils to contribute in part to the expense of their maintenance and education whilst at College. Both points I consider to be essential to palliate the mischiefs of this institution. For I fear that the utmost we can do will be to palliate its mischiefs, after the strange precipitance and want of forethought which has hitherto marked every stage of its progress. If the Irish priesthood is to be educated at a monastery at Maynooth, secluded from all intercourse with laymen, I cannot see what will be gained by reclaiming them from the foreign Popish universities. And if none but the lowest ranks in the community, who are unable to contribute to the expense of their maintenance and education, are received into the Irish College, I cannot see any one advantage to the State which can result from it. And I can see that it will give a weight of patronage to some few Popish ecclesiastics, which they may use as a powerful engine to annoy the State.

The great difficulty in correcting all this mischief is, that we have most giddily made this establishment, and have never looked to the necessity of making regulations to guard it from abuse. If regulations are now adopted which may be effectual, I make no doubt they will occasion a very serious outcry by the whole body of

Irish Catholics. There is, however, one point of folly to which we have gone upon the subject of Popish education, which it will be impossible long to blink. As the law stands in Ireland, any man who chooses to call himself a Papist may open a school without licence. And it is a fact within my knowledge, that a Popish servitor of Trinity College, whom I expelled as being secretary to a treasonable committee of United Irishmen at the last visitation held there, did immediately after his expulsion open a school at Cork. The Bishop of the diocese attempted to silence him, and the schoolmaster treated the Bishop to a suit in prohibition in the Court of King's Bench, where the schoolmaster succeeded in silencing the Bishop.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO ALEXANDER MARSDEN, ESQ.

MY DEAR MARSDEN, Priory, Jan. 1, 1802.

Many thanks for your attention in quitting me of my Concordatum luggage. They are so poor, and so unfortunate, that I shall have no other alternative but plaguing the State whenever they are forgot, so recommend them to your future protection, if you and your colleagues dislike being deemed, as much as I do, the channel of persecution.

When the grant to the Catholic College was made for the year 1799 in the Irish Parliament, 'twas much more intent on the question of the Union than on the internal economy of that seminary. The grant was, as well as I recollect, introduced precisely as it had been made in former years, and passed through the Commons. When it got to the Lords, reflections were thrown out on the accounts of the College, and the grant was thrown out by the Chancellor,[1] one of whose objections to the institution was to its monastic constitution, there being then no lay-students. An attempt was made to revive the grant in the same session, but it could not be done consistently with the rules of Parliament, and the expenses of that year were defrayed by the authority of the Lord-Lieutenant, merely upon the faith and authority of the vote of the Commons. In the last session of our Parliament the Chancellor brought in a bill for the better government of that seminary, the detail of which I forget, but which was the result of a conference which he had, by my desire, with the leading Catholics, and which went, as well as I remember, principally to establish a visitatorial authority distinct from the Trustees, and to give the Lord-Lieutenant a negative in the appointment of the superiors of

[1] See Lord Cornwallis to Lord Clare, April 18, 1799.

the College. With this Bill the grant went forward. The Chancellor's opinion, I recollect, was always for intermixing lay with ecclesiastical students, though not to be educated on the foundation; but I do not recollect that the policy of this was at the time disputed, so as to become matter of express disputation between him and any of the other visitors. The objection against the College that no lay-students were admitted came from him, and he was satisfied as soon as he understood that it was the intention of the Trustees to receive a certain number of lay-students so soon as the necessary accommodations were prepared for their reception. I was very little alive to the point one way or other, being very sufficiently employed on other subjects, and fully satisfied when the preliminaries of peace between the Protestant and Catholic opinions were concluded so far as to suffer the annual grant to pass without opposition.

I am, dear Marsden, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

The date of the following letter is uncertain, but it was probably written about June, 1801.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR ——.

SIR,

I have received your very extraordinary letter dated the 6th instant, for the whole tenor of which I am utterly unable to account, except by an entire misapprehension on your part of my expressions.

I stated no base or unworthy motives for your refusing to enter into the British corps of Engineers, which was a matter entirely optional, and to be decided by your own inclinations and future views in life, but at the same time that I lamented your having at so early an age given up a line which appeared to me to hold out so fair a prospect to you, and in which from what I had heard of your character, you were likely to have obtained reputation and to have rendered beneficial service to your country, I could not help suspecting that the pleasures of a luxurious capital, to which your situation had for seven years confined you, might have given you habits that made you less anxious to pursue a laborious profession.

I do not conceive that if I had expressed these sentiments to a third person, they could have come under the description of calumny, but when conveyed to you in a private letter, and accompanied by an opinion of your talents and general character, which to say the least could not possibly be offensive to any one, I am at a loss to find out any injury of which you have to complain.

I have dwelt on this point, and entered into a more temperate discussion than the general style of your letter would have claimed, because you appeared to me to have written on this subject under a misconception, and under the immediate influence of passion for a supposed injury which did not exist.

I shall now shortly take notice of two or three points in your very uncivil and, in my opinion, improper epistle, and then, as far as I am concerned, our correspondence will cease for ever.

With regard to your statement of a message delivered by Colonel Whitworth, I can only say that either he must have very much misapprehended me, or you must have misunderstood him. I never did cast any general reflexion upon the character of Irishmen, such a sentiment would have been very foreign from my feelings and from my heart; but I trust that no person who knows me would believe me capable of so extreme a weakness as to have put so illiberal a censure upon the whole country, over which I had then the honour to preside, into the mouth of Colonel Whitworth to be delivered by him to you.

With regard to your Father, he has frequently acknowledged obligations to me, but I should too much imitate your style of writing if I was to recapitulate them.

I shall now conclude by observing that there is a vein of menace that runs through the whole tenor of your letter, to which I am not much accustomed. I hope that I have neither injured or insulted any man, and I am certain that it never was my intention to do so; but I have not in the course of a pretty long life been used to suffer considerations of personal danger to influence my conduct, and I do not feel disposed to adopt a different system at a period when that life has become an object of much less consequence to me.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Expected French invasion — Lord Cornwallis appointed to the command of the Eastern District — Proceeds to France to negociate a Peace — His instructions — Interview with Bonaparte — Private conference with the First Consul on taking leave — The Conferences at Amiens — Discussions with respect to Malta — The Fisheries — On the compensation for the Prince of Orange — Society and mode of living at Amiens — Conclusion of the Definitive Treaty.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, July 2, 1801.

I have just received your letter dated yesterday, with the extract of the 'Morning Post,' which is a very curious paper, and, I believe, contains a great deal of truth.[1]

General Debbeig has written to me to notify that he has represented to Lord Chatham the most extraordinary treatment which he has suffered during my administration, and to require that I would state what he is accused of. I have desired Apsley to endeavour to collect the papers relating to his being invalided, as I have now a very imperfect recollection of the particulars, but I am perfectly satisfied that I was well warranted in what I did.

I am beyond measure persecuted by letters from Ireland claiming promises, and recommendations to Lord Hardwicke, &c., &c.

Yours most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, July 19, 1801.

Brome and Lady Louisa, with the two children, are gone to Cheltenham, and our society has since been reduced to Mary, Grisdale, and myself. Singleton stays in town for the Duchess of Gordon's extraordinary ball.[2]

[1] Morning Post, July 1. There are two leading articles to the effect that the Duke of Portland would not resign the Home Office, but would wait to be dismissed; that Lord Rosslyn was to be President of the Council; so that Mr. Pitt, having got rid of all the old Whigs, could return with a pure Government. It was added that the Duke of Portland had feathered his nest with Marylebone.

[2] The ball was given, July 20, at Buckingham House, in Piccadilly, and was attended by about 300 persons. The newspapers of

I have written to David Scott about the papers, and thought it best to defer for some time my application to Charles Grant, as it might be an awkward circumstance if they immediately compared notes. Scott will probably tell me what papers he intends to send, and I can then submit to Grant whether he could recommend any addition. It is a matter on which I must receive much satisfactory information before I could venture to give an opinion.

The subject of taxation was loosely mentioned in several of the minutes and papers that were written when the question of the permanent settlement of the revenue was agitated, but it must be exercised with great prudence and discretion, and must not be left to the capricious will of the Governor. It has the disadvantage of novelty, which is a very serious one in a country so bigoted to old habits.

The last accounts from Egypt, although a little vague, are, on the whole, of a favourable nature, and I am not without hopes that this year may put an end to our long and bloody war.

Lord Hardwicke gives his principal confidence to Marsden and Littlehales, and has hitherto done exceedingly well. My accounts say that he is a gentleman, that his intentions are very good, but that he is inexpert at business, which makes the work rather heavy. He will, I believe, make a very serious point of Marsden's succeeding if Cooke should resign his office, and I have likewise heard that Abbott is much prepossessed in Marsden's favour. My friend Alex. Hope,[1] I understand, gives universal satisfaction.

Yours ever most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, July 23, 1801.

I yesterday received a letter from the Duke of York, informing me that, as there were grounds to believe from every report that the French meant to invade this country, he had recommended to His Majesty to give me the command of the Eastern District.

the day say, "At half-past two a new Scotch dance, called the Barme, was danced, which afforded considerable amusement from the spirited way in which it was kept up: instead of forming the circle by holding hands, it was done by laying hold of coats and tails; many scenes highly comic took place, which threw the Company into such good humour that they kept it up till six. Lady Heathcote wore a loose white gauze, quite ætherial."

[1] Colonel, afterwards General, the Hon. Sir Alexander Hope, G.C.B., Colonel 14th Regt., and Lieutenant-Governor of Chelsea Hospital, b. Dec. 9, 1769, d. May 19, 1837; m. Oct. 23, 1805, Georgiana, dau. of George Brown, Esq. M.P. Dumfries Boroughs Sept. 1796 to 1800, and then for Linlithgow County to 1835.

You will easily conceive how this deranges all my plans. Without horses, house, or aide-de-camp, I must probably be obliged to set out for Colchester in two or three days, as H. R. H. informed me that he expected to receive His Majesty's approbation within that time. Fortune could not have persecuted me more severely; it would have afforded me much more satisfaction to have received an order to go to Egypt.

Yours very sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Colchester, July 31, 1801.

You will easily imagine my life here cannot be very agreeable. The *ennui*, however, of Colchester might very well be borne by a man who has not been spoiled by the constant enjoyment of the pleasurable gratifications of this world, but the difficulties of my situation, and the certain disgrace that I must suffer if the enemy should effect a landing of a very moderate force, sit heavy on me. What could I hope for with eight weak regiments of militia, making about 2800 firelocks, and two regiments of dragoons?

Yours most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Colchester, Aug. 2, 1801.

I was yesterday on Clackton beach and at Walton tower, from whence I saw two line-of-battle ships and a 74 razée very properly stationed for the protection of the coast; and Sir Edward Berry,[1] who commands, told the officer whom I sent to him that he expected three or four more in the course of two or three days. With the means of naval defence in our power, and the vigorous exertions that are now making to employ those means to the best advantage, every day's delay renders an attack less probable, and I have doubts whether after having desired to be employed, it is worth your while to make a strong point of it.

The Duke of York has given me Nightingall as Assistant Quarter-Master General.

Lord Buckingham, through Charles Lennox, has expressed a wish that all that had passed might be forgotten, to which you may

[1] Captain, afterwards Rear-Admiral, Sir Edward Berry, Bart., so created Dec. 12, 1806, K.C.B., b. April 17, 1768, d. July 13, 1831; m. Dec. 12, 1797, Louisa, dau. of the Rev. S. Foster, D.D. of Norwich.

easily conceive that I did not think it worth while to object, or to inquire the cause of his indignation, of which I am at this moment ignorant.

Yours most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Colchester, Aug. 4, 1801.

I have just received your letter, and have read the account of Sir J. Saumarez's[1] exploit, which has afforded me the most sincere satisfaction. In our wooden walls alone must we place our trust; we should make a sad business of it on shore. This county (Essex) is in the greatest want of hands to get in a most abundant crop of every sort of grain, a considerable part of which must be spoiled, even without any further demand for men, if the weather should not prove uncommonly favourable.

I am perfectly aware of the ill consequences of the present madness about artillery; but be assured that nothing that I could say would cure it, and that my sentiments are not held in great estimation by the present military advisers. It was owing to the popular estimation which I am supposed to possess, and not to any respect for my military talents, that I was called upon at this time.

If it is really intended that —— should defend Kent and Sussex, it is of very little consequence what army you place under his command.

I return you Lady Spencer's excellent letter, and I subscribe entirely to everything she says of her Lord. Mr. Pitt is, I am persuaded, influenced by the purest and most public-spirited motives, but I think he has undertaken a very critical and difficult line of conduct, and one that will expose his character to much misrepresentation.[2]

Yours very sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Rear-Admiral, afterwards Admiral, Sir James Saumarez, K.B., created Lord de Saumarez, Sept. 12, 1831, b. March 11, 1757, d. Oct. 9, 1836; m. Oct. 27, 1788, Martha, dau. of Thomas Le Marchant, Esq. The battle alluded to was fought July 12, 1801, when with five sail-of-the-line and two frigates he defeated a fleet of six Spanish and four French sail-of-the-line, besides four frigates. Two of 112 guns each blew up, and one 74 was taken. Lord de Saumarez was an officer on board the ship which took Lord Cornwallis to India in 1786, and so attracted his attention that he offered him a commission in the army, promising to take him under his protection, but, after some consideration, Lord de Saumarez declined the offer.

[2] Mr. Pitt, though out of office, promised to support Mr. Addington. See 'Memoirs of Lord Sidmouth,' 'Malmesbury Correspondence,' and other publications for details relating to his subsequent conduct.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Colchester, Aug. 10, 1801.

I was very glad to find by your letter which I received yesterday, with a copy of one which you addressed to Mr. Percival, that the difficulties in the incorporation are in a fair way of being overcome; and, indeed, I have for some time suspected that the lawyers had misapprehended the business.

The ideas of invasion begin to subside, and indeed, I think, with some reason, as our naval preparation for defence, and the increase of our force in small craft, must every day render such an attempt on the part of the enemy more improbable. I am sorry to say that our strength by land is not likely to increase in proportion, as the eight regiments of militia in this garrison do not, in the aggregate, expect more than an acquisition of 500 men, in consequence of the order for calling out the supplementary aid. God send that we may have no occasion to decide the matter on shore, where I have too much reason to apprehend that the contest must terminate in the disgrace of the General, and the destruction of the country.

I am sorry that Pelham is obliged to adhere to his engagement with Sir G. Shee, who is, in my opinion, very unfit for the situation of Under-Secretary.

Lord Hardwicke would not give up Marsden's succession in the event of Cooke's being removed; in which his Lordship showed his good sense.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Colchester, Sept. 2, 1801.

As I parted on good terms with Cooke, who is a man of much quickness and very considerable talent, I should wish that you should conduct yourself towards him in such a manner as to make him conceive that I had spoken favourably of him; and that if you should have any discussions on ordnance business with his department (Under Civil Secretary) you should be on your guard not to make him jealous by communicating in preference with Marsden, with whom he is at present on bad terms.

Admiral Pakenham is capable of giving you the best information upon the whole of the Ordnance business, and has conducted himself in a manner to deserve every attention that can be shown to him. I must likewise recommend your brother Surveyor-Gene-

ral, Bob Uniacke, who is a particular friend of mine, and a very honest and well-intentioned fellow, and latterly tant bien que mal did all the business of the department. My friend Wynne,[1] who was Clerk of Deliveries, may perhaps give you some information, and will be happy to assist you in any personal matters.

Wishing you both a pleasant and useful tour and happy return to your family, I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Brome, Sept. 17, 1801.

I confess that I see no prospect of peace, or of anything good. We must, I am afraid, still lose many more good men in Egypt. We shall prepare for the land defence of England by much wild and capricious expenditure of money, and if the enemy should ever elude the vigilance of our wooden walls, we shall after all, make a bad figure.

By the late orders I see that detachments of our regiments of dragoons are to be instructed to act as horse-artillery, a species of force with which we are at present, in my opinion, amply provided, and there is a fine troop in Ireland, where, since the establishment of British artillery in that country, it is totally useless.

I do not think that the present Ministers will find so much difficulty in Parliament as you seem to expect. Mr. Pitt has already gone too far to withdraw his support, and the country gentlemen will go with them, partly from the opinion that they are more disposed to peace than the last Administration, and partly from their dread of the democratic principles of the Opposition.

I am myself out of sorts, low-spirited, and tired of everything, but whilst I live shall ever remain,

Most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Brome, Sept. 22, 1801.

As it is probable that I may be called to town in a few days on a business of considerable importance, which at present it will not be prudent to trust to the post, I wish you would tell me fairly whether it will be of any inconvenience to you that I should take up my quarters at your house.

[1] Robert Wynne, b. May 4, 1761, d. May 31, 1838; m. May 4, 1791, Elizabeth, dau. of Sydenham Singleton, Esq., M.P.

Littlehales, who is with me, says that he believes this letter will find you still at Horton.[1]

Yours ever most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Colchester, Sept. 30, 1801.

You will perhaps have guessed that the business on which I expected to be employed was not that of *making war*.

How that matter may turn out God only knows, but I think that you will not disapprove of my line of conduct.

The Duke of York left us this morning, and on Saturday next I shall go for the greater part of the next month to Culford, provided things remain quiet.

Yours most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Oct. 9, 1801.

I shall go to town to-morrow or Sunday, and in a very short time, I conclude, proceed to Amiens. Brome goes with me.

Mr. Pitt approves warmly of the Peace, but that is not the case with Lord Grenville or Windham, and, I am afraid, with Lord Spencer, although I have not heard of him.

Yours very sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, No. 16, Grafton Street, Oct. 16, 1801.

I have just received your letter dated the 12th, and take my chance that this will meet you at Horton to acquaint you that I do not expect to leave this country before the 1st or 2nd of next month, so as to arrive at Paris (to which place I am first destined for three or four days, at the particular invitation of Bonaparte) by the 6th. He wishes me to see the festival on account of the Peace, which is to take place on the 9th, after which I am to go to Amiens.

Brome, Littlehales, and Nightingall go with me, and Mr. Moore,[2] General Moore's brother, who is in the Secretary of

[1] The seat of Sir Robert Gunning.

[2] Francis Moore, b. 1767, d. in Ischia, Aug. 11, 1854; m. Frances, dau. of Sir William Twysden, Bart., and widow of Archibald,

State's office, and has had a considerable share in the negotiation. Mr. Merry,[1] who has been some months at Paris, and has likewise been a negotiator, is to be the principal person in the diplomatic line.

Yours most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO SIR JOHN KENNAWAY.

DEAR KENNAWAY, Grafton Street, Oct. 19, 1801.

I have been so much hurried that I have not had time to answer your kind offers of service. My family on this occasion is circumscribed, and—exclusively of Mr. Merry, who has been negotiating at Paris, and Mr. Moore, of the Secretary of State's office, who is to act under him—consists only of Lieut.-Colonel Littlehales, who is to be my private secretary, a station which he held in Ireland, and of Lord Brome and Lieut.-Colonel Nightingall.

I have experienced and profited by your skill in the diplomatic line, but as the winding up of the present business is to be left principally in the hands of those who have hitherto conducted it, I could not avail myself of your talents on the present occasion.

As soon as the objects of my present mission are fulfilled, I look with confidence to quiet and retirement, and shall be happy to see you at Culford, and to show you as good partridge-shooting as Suffolk can afford.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE KING TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

Kew, Nov. 1, 1801.

When the King conversed with the Marquess Cornwallis on Friday, he slightly mentioned the unpleasant situation in which his Electoral Dominions have been placed by the unjustifiable possession of them by the King of Prussia at the time of the dispute of this kingdom with the Northern Powers, and which that Monarch has not as yet relinquished. He certainly has intentions to obtain the Bishopricks of Osnaburg and Hildesheim, and also that of Munster, in lieu of the Dutchy of Cleves, which the French have taken from him.

The Bishoprick of Munster alone is worth more than the

11th Earl of Eglinton. He was in the Foreign Office from July, 1784, to Jan. 1803, and then Deputy-Secretary-at-War to Dec. 1809.

[1] Antony Merry, d. June 14, 1835; m. Jan. 21, 1803, the widow of John Leather, Esq., of Herringford Hall. Minister in France, the United States, Denmark, and Sweden, from April, 1802, to April, 1809.

King of Prussia's loss; but, setting that consideration aside, any idea of his obtaining either or both of the other Bishopricks is a palpable injustice to the House of Hanover, who have by treaty alternately one of the family as Bishop of Osnaburg; and Hildesheim was formerly for an hundred years in the possession of that House, and now have constantly a garrison there. It lies within the Dutchies of Colenberg and Gottingen, which would occasion continual disputes if in the possession of the King of Prussia.

This short state the King has drawn up, that the Marquess Cornwallis may be fully apprized of the principal facts, and may be enabled, in a proper manner, to have it insinuated to the rulers in France, that if His Majesty's good inclination or that of any of his family is desired, great care must be taken in any settlement of the affairs of Germany, that neither His property nor the quiet possession of His Electoral Dominions be affected.

GEORGE R.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE KING.

Grafton Street, Nov. 1, 1801, 6 o'clock, P.M.

Lord Cornwallis has this moment had the honour to receive Your Majesty's commands of this day's date, to which he will not fail to pay the most unremitting attention, according to the wishes which Your Majesty has been graciously pleased to signify to him; and he earnestly hopes that he shall acquit himself upon this and every other occasion in such a manner as to merit Your Majesty's approbation.

CORNWALLIS.

Although Lord Malmesbury had twice failed to bring his negociations to a favourable conclusion, the English Government were still desirous of restoring peace, and hints were conveyed through diplomatic agents abroad, that if France entertained similar views, they would be responded to in London. Communications were made to Lord Grenville as early as January, 1800, which seemed to afford a reasonable hope of a satisfactory result. In the beginning of March, 1801, M. Otto,[1] who was the French Commissioner for prisoners in England, was formally authorised to advert to this question; and after much debate a preliminary treaty was signed, October 1, by him and Lord Hawkesbury. As most of the discussions were verbal, few or no records of them

[1] Louis Guilliaume Otto, a native of Baden, but employed in early life by M. de la Luzerne in the diplomatic line, b. 1754, d. Nov. 9, 1817; m. 1st, Miss Livingstone, an American lady; 2nd, 1782, a dau. of M. de St. Jean Crevecour, French Consul at New York. Made Comte de Moslay by Bonaparte in 1805, and a Peer of France by Louis XVIII.

exist, and the grounds for the consent of England to the terms agreed upon are therefore not distinctly known, but it may be doubted whether the concessions were not too large.

The principal articles of the preliminary treaty were:—1st. The restoration of all the Colonial acquisitions of Great Britain, except Ceylon and Trinidad. 2nd. The evacuation of Egypt and the Neapolitan and Roman States by the French, and of Malta by the English, the latter island to be given back to the Knights. 3rd. The restoration of all sequestered property on either side. 4th. The release of all prisoners of war, but the expenses incurred for their maintenance to be paid by the country to which they respectively belonged. This last article was so loosely worded, that it was impossible to enforce it in the manner really intended: nor was this the most important error. The claims of the Prince of Orange, about which the King was very anxious, were passed over *sub silentio*, on a verbal assurance from M. Otto that due provision should be made to satisfy them.

In one instance, from want of timely information, Lord Hawkesbury agreed to an unfortunate arrangement. The English Government had strenuously insisted on the evacuation of Egypt, which the French as strongly opposed. But they at length gave way with great apparent reluctance, and then showed more eagerness to hurry on the signing of the preliminaries than they had previously displayed anxiety for delay. M. Otto had, in fact, learnt that the surrender of Alexandria was inevitable, and he was aware that if such information reached the British Government they would insist on important concessions on other points. Alexandria surrendered to General Hutchinson September 3, but the official despatch did not reach London till November 21.[1] At Paris the news must have been known long before.

That Bonaparte at that moment desired peace is evident. He conceived that it would, for a time, be advantageous to his own interests. He was desirous of an interval of repose to enable him to establish order at home, and to make preparations for future conquests. But it is equally clear that he wished to dictate the terms of peace, and that, while he was holding the most pacific language, he was contemplating a renewal of hostilities at no remote period. His conduct throughout the negociations was marked with unfairness and duplicity, and while the delay in the proceedings was occasioned solely by him, he endeavoured to throw the whole blame on England. He tried to bring forward

[1] Lord Elgin, Sept. 6, transmitted a letter from Sir John Hutchinson, dated Aug. 27, announcing that Menou had offered to capitulate. This despatch was received in London Oct. 2, and the preliminaries had been signed in the evening of Oct. 1.

various questions, not alluded to in the preliminary articles. He constantly evaded fulfilling engagements verbally made, so that it became necessary to reduce every statement into writing. Even after it had been admitted that the presence of the Spanish and Batavian plenipotentiaries ought not to be dispensed with, he repeatedly but vainly endeavoured to convince Lord Cornwallis that he ought to proceed without them; and the haughty style in which he endeavoured to dictate the forms and manner of negociating was very offensive. But he failed in all his endeavours to vary the substance of the preliminary articles, except as to the repayment of the expenses incurred in the maintenance of the prisoners. On the other hand, he was compelled to provide some indemnity for the Prince of Orange.[1]

Amiens was selected as the seat of the conferences, and Lord Cornwallis was nominated the British plenipotentiary. He sailed from Dover November 3rd, 1801, and after a stormy passage of fifteen hours, reached Calais about ten at night. All the authorities of the place were waiting for him on the pier, and he was received with every possible mark of honour. He proceeded immediately to Paris, where, as will be seen, he could only obtain one interview with the First Consul; and as he thought he could carry on the negociations better with Joseph Bonaparte[2] than with so crafty and unscrupulous a man as Talleyrand,[3] he went to Amiens November 30th, hoping that a comparatively short time would complete the business; but the definitive treaty was not signed till March 27th, 1802.

A portion only of the despatches to and from Lord Hawkesbury are here given, and scarcely any of the notes or protocols drawn up at Amiens, nor has it been thought necessary to print all the various projects about Malta: sufficient has been published, it is hoped, to give a connected view of the negociations, and to show the difficulties under which Lord Cornwallis laboured.[4]

[1] William Frederick, Prince of Orange, afterwards, Dec. 6, 1813, King of Holland; b. Aug. 24, 1772, d. Dec. 12, 1843; m. Oct. 1, 1791, Frederica Wilhelmina Louisa, dau. of Frederick William, King of Prussia. In 1840 he contracted a morganatic marriage with the Comtesse D'Oultremont, and abdicated, Oct. 7 of that year, in favour of his son, William Frederick, the late King of Holland.

[2] Joseph Bonaparte was the eldest brother. The date of his birth is not certain, as his brother Napoleon, for some reason which is not easy to explain, assigned at various times different dates for the birth of himself and his brothers. Probably b. Jan. 7, 1766, d. July 28, 1844; m. Aug. 1, 1794, Marie Julie, dau. of M. Nicholas Clary, a merchant at Marseilles.

[3] Charles Maurice, Prince de Talleyrand Perigord. Though an eldest son he was, because he had a club foot, put into the Church, and became Bishop of Autun: b. Feb. 2, 1754, d. May 17, 1838; m. (having been relieved from his vows a month before) Aug. 20, 1802, the divorced wife of M. Grand, previously mentioned. She had lived some years with him as his mistress.

[4] Besides the public and private documents relating to the Peace of Amiens existing in this country, there is an almost equal mass at Paris. Through the kindness of the

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Downing Street, Nov. 1, 1801.

. . . The conduct of the King of Prussia respecting Hanover, has excited a degree of suspicion and uneasiness with regard to his ultimate views on that Electorate, which the evasive answers and general character of the Prussian Cabinet are by no means calculated to remove. I am not wholly without hopes that the next mail may bring some explicit and satisfactory declaration on the part of His Prussian Majesty, in which case I shall immediately despatch a messenger to your Lordship with the intelligence. But, if I should be disappointed in this expectation, you will, in that case, take an early opportunity of having a confidential communication with the French Government on this subject. You cannot find it difficult to make them sensible how contrary it would be to the interests of France, that the King of Prussia should be permitted to possess himself of so large an extension of territory, and you will assure the French Government that any exertion on their part to effect the restoration of Hanover to its lawful sovereign, would be felt in this country as the first fruits of that good understanding which is about to be so happily established between the two Governments.

The situation of the Prince of Orange is the next point to which I would call your Lordship's attention. In all your private and public communications on this subject, you will take care to state expressly that His Majesty never had it in contemplation for a moment to abandon the interests of that illustrious House; and that when he consented to withdraw the article respecting them from the preliminary treaty, it was only on the ground that those interests were actually arranging in another quarter. If, therefore, no effectual and suitable provision shall have been made for that Prince previous to the signature of the definitive treaty, His Majesty will feel himself called upon to insert it in an article for that purpose, and you will endeavour strongly to impress on the mind of the First Consul the manifest justice of such an expectation.

The re-establishment of the King of Sardinia[1] is the only remaining topic to which I shall for the present have occasion to

French Government the Editor was allowed to inspect them. A large portion of them have been published by M. du Casse in his Life of Joseph Bonaparte.

[1] Charles Emanuel IV., b. May 24, 1751, d. Oct. 6, 1819, having abdicated June 4, 1802; m. Aug. 27, 1773, Marie Adelaide Clotilde Zaviere, dau. of Louis, Dauphin of France, and granddaughter of Louis XV.

advert. But before your Lordship has any direct communication with the French Government on the affairs of His Sardinian Majesty, it would be desirable that you should have a confidential interview with the Russian Minister at Paris. He is a man in whom Count Woronzow[1] seems to place confidence, and by whom, he assures me, your Lordship will be treated without reserve. You will, I trust, be able to learn from him not only what His Imperial Majesty may have been able to effect in favour of that unfortunate monarch, but all that has passed between the French and Russian Governments respecting him. Your Lordship would by this means be enabled to judge what are the real views of the First Consul with regard to Piedmont, and what chance there is of succeeding in what remains to be attempted for the King of Sardinia through the influence of Great Britain. Important, however, as it is that your Lordship should cultivate the confidence and intimacy of Count Marcoff,[2] I am not of opinion that anything would be gained by a joint interference on the part of England and Russia in this business. I am, on the contrary, inclined to think that, desirable as it is that both should agree to press the restoration of Piedmont to His Sardinian Majesty, the First Consul would be more likely to listen to their separate than to their joint representations on this subject. . . .

The two first—the evacuation of Hanover by the troops of His Prussian Majesty, and a suitable provision for the House of Orange—are objects so interesting to this country, that your Lordship will not fail to press them with all the earnestness which they so justly demanded. The third and last point, namely the restitution of Piedmont to the King of Sardinia, must be urged, in some measure in proportion to the prospect of accomplishing it. Much as His Majesty interests himself in the re-establishment of that Prince, and sincerely anxious as he feels for the independence of the North of Italy, he thinks it right to consider these as objects which must be made subordinate to higher interests, and not be suffered to risk or to retard the general peace of Europe.

I have, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

[1] Comte Simon Woronzow, b. June 26, 1744, d. June 21, 1832, and was buried in St. Marylebone church; m. 1781, Catherine, dau. of Admiral Simiavin. Ambassador in England from 1784 to 1800. He spent many years in England, and his daughter m. George, 11th Earl of Pembroke.

[2] Comte Arcadi Ivanovitch Marcoff. His family were in poor circumstances, but he was protected by Zubow. He died about 1819, a very old man.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Paris, Nov. 8, 1801.

I have only to tell you that, after some impediments from the weather both by land and sea, we arrived yesterday at this great capital, which, however it may appear to others, furnishes me only with the most melancholy reflections.

This morning I waited on Talleyrand, who was personally civil, and said that Bonaparte was "empressé de me voir;" but he doubted whether he could do so to-morrow, as after 11 o'clock no carriages would be allowed to go into the streets, on account of the fête. This fête does not, like ours, consist of eating and drinking, or levees and balls, but is solely confined to illuminations and fireworks, of which I believe I shall not be a spectator, as it is impossible to see them without wading through a great deal of mud.

It is yet uncertain whether Bonaparte intends to allow me a private interview, on which circumstance depends the possibility that my journey to Paris may be attended with any public benefit. Although I have had nothing to tell you, yet as His Majesty's Ministers, as well as yourself, may be impatient to hear even that nothing, I have thought it advisable to send away a messenger.

And believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Paris, Nov. 10, 1801.

. . . I have had this morning my first audience, at which Talleyrand, of course, was present. Bonaparte was gracious to the highest degree; he inquired particularly after His Majesty and the state of his health, and spoke of the British nation in terms of great respect, intimating that as long as we remained friends there would be no interruption of the peace of Europe.

I told him that the horrors which succeeded the Revolution had created a general alarm; that all the neighbouring nations dreaded the contagion; that when for the happiness of mankind, and of France in particular, he was called to fill his present station, we knew him only as a hero and a conqueror; but the good order and tranquillity which the country now enjoyed made us respect him as a statesman and a legislator, and had removed our apprehensions of having connexion and intercourse with France.

Lauriston[1] informed me that the First Consul would see me without the presence of a third person before my departure for Amiens, but this information became less interesting to me since the good news which you have imparted to me respecting Hanover.[2]

The concourse of people at the fireworks last night was very great, no carriages were allowed to pass but those of the Foreign Ministers,[3] and as I drove through them I was astonished to find such a multitude so perfectly quiet, and I heard nothing near my coach but expressions of civility.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MEMORANDUM.

[Received Nov. 11.]

Saturday, Nov. 7, 1801.

His Majesty's confidential servants having taken into their consideration the memorandum presented yesterday by M. Otto, are led to observe that the armament intended for St. Domingo[4] by the French Government, cannot fail to excite great uneasiness in this country, particularly as ships of the line, equipped and armed as such, can neither be necessary nor useful for the purpose of conveying troops nor for the professed object of the expedition; and that the nature and extent of the naval part of the armament must occasion such measures of precaution on our part as would be productive of an enormous expense, and, as we are disposed to believe, an useless one, from the opinion which we entertain of the real views of the French Government.

It is therefore thought advisable that Lord Cornwallis be instructed to protest against the sending out a force so constituted as that described in M. Otto's communication, and to declare that the British Government cannot consent to it.

With respect to the wish that has been expressed of obtaining a supply of provisions at Jamaica, there will be every disposition to give effect to it as far as the means of the island may extend, but that no means applicable to that purpose would be found to exist, if we should be compelled to send a large British force to that quarter.

[1] Jacques Alexandre Bernard Law, Marquis de Lauriston, Maréchal de France, great-nephew of the celebrated Law, descended from an old Scotch family long settled in France; b. Feb. 1, 1768, at Pondicherry, where his father was Governor; d. June 11, 1828; m. Dec. 5, 1789, Antoinette Julie, dau. of General Le Duc. Inspector-General of Artillery.

[2] Lord Hawkesbury, in a despatch dated Nov. 6, stated that Lord Carysfort, then Minister at Berlin, had announced the immediate evacuation of Hanover by the Prussians.

[3] The exception was made in favour of Lord Cornwallis alone, of which probably at the moment he was not aware.

[4] The fleet consisted of 22 sail-of-the-line (including 5 Spanish), 17 frigates, and some smaller vessels, carrying 25,000 land troops. They sailed Dec. 14, Admiral Villaret Joyeuse commanding the fleet, and General Le Clerc the army. They were afterwards reinforced with 7 sail-of-the-line and 4 frigates, under Admirals Gantheaume and Lenoir.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.] Received Nov. 17.

MY DEAR LORD, Downing Street, Nov. 14, 1801.

I have received the favour of three private letters from you, for which I return you many thanks. Your letter of the 10th. which arrived this morning, was particularly interesting, and leads me to hope that before you leave Paris you will have an opportunity of settling in substance with Bonaparte personally, the principal points that remain to be determined by the definitive treaty. There certainly cannot be the least objection to your listening to anything Talleyrand may have to say, and to your entering into any explanations with him which may appear to you to be likely to facilitate the speedy termination of the business. At the same time you are probably apprised that he is a person who is likely to take every unfair advantage in conducting business with others, and should therefore be treated with more than usual caution and circumspection. I send your Lordship a copy of the despatch I received yesterday from Lord St. Helens, with the answer of the Russian Government to our proposition respecting Malta. You will perceive by it that even if the French Government were disposed to agree to a Russian garrison being introduced into the island, the sentiments of the Russian Government render an arrangement of this kind absolutely impracticable. I understand, however, from Count Woronzow that the Emperor of Russia[1] would undertake the guarantee of the island, and he appears anxious that the garrison should be under the command of the King of Naples[2] as suzerain of the island. I hope to be able to send you in a few days more precise instructions on this subject.

If the French Government shall adopt the idea of sending a part of their forces to the West Indies in ships of the line, disarmed and dismantled, it will be proper that some means should be adopted (of as little suspicious and offensive a nature as possible) of ascertaining that this is really the case.

The debates in both houses of Parliament on the Peace and on the Russian Convention have gone off as well as possible.[3] Lord Grenville has met with very little support, and has produced no

[1] Alexander I., Emperor of Russia, b. Dec. 23, 1777, d. Dec. 1, 1825; m. Oct. 9, 1793, Louise Marie, dau. of Frederick, Grand Duke of Baden.

[2] Ferdinand IV., King of Naples, b. Jan. 12, 1751, d. Jan. 4, 1825; m. 1st, April 7, 1768, Maria Caroline, dau of Maria Theresa; 2nd, 1815, Duchess de Floridia.

[3] There were several debates on this question in both Houses: one in the House of Lords Nov. 3, when Government had a majority of 114 to 10. Another in the same House on the 13th, and three in the House of Commons, Nov. 3 and 4, and 13, none of which were followed by divisions.

effect. I should be obliged to your Lordship if you would desire Mr. Merry to inform us from time to time of any observation he may make on the internal state of France, and of the views of the different parties. Amidst your more important concerns I should be unwilling to give you any additional trouble.

I am, with great truth and esteem,

HAWKESBURY.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.] Received Nov. 18.

MY LORD, Downing Street, Nov. 16, 1801.

In my despatch, No. 5, I informed your Lordship, that His Majesty's Government had no objection to your entering into discussions at Paris with the French Ministers on the topics which were likely to become the subjects of negotiation at Amiens.

The point of the greatest importance, reserved by the preliminary articles for arrangement in the definitive treaty, is that which relates to the island of Malta. In addition to the instructions with which your Lordship is already furnished upon this subject, I have received His Majesty's commands to communicate to you the following plan, as being most likely, under the present circumstances, to form an arrangement conformable to the preliminary articles, and satisfactory to all the parties interested :—

1st. The Order of St. John of Jerusalem to be restored upon the principles, and in the form, specified in His Majesty's instructions to your Lordship.

2nd. The Maltese natives to be admissible to the Order.

3rd. The Civil Government of the island to be under the direction of the Order.

4th. The rights of the King of Naples as suzerain of the island to be maintained, and the different forts in the island to be under his Sicilian Majesty's command, and to be garrisoned by such troops as he may think proper to appropriate to that object.

5th. In order to defray the expenses of the garrison, the French Republic, having abolished the commanderies in France attached to the Order, shall, in concert with His Britannic Majesty, settle the amount of the sum which may be annually requisite for this purpose, in addition to that portion of the revenues of the island, which, conformably to His Majesty's instructions to your Lordship,

was proposed to be applied to this object, and the payment of the sum so settled shall be divided in equal proportions between the two Powers.

6th. The whole of this arrangement to be under the guaranty of the Emperor of Russia.

I have thought it right to state this arrangement thus briefly to your Lordship, but the mode of bringing it forward is left with confidence to your Lordship's discretion. I have, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret and Confidential.] Received Nov. 18.

MY LORD, Downing Street, Nov. 16, 1801.

In addition to what I have stated in my other despatch of this date on the subject of Malta, I think it right to inform your Lordship that I have reason to believe that the French Government was particularly hostile to the admission of a Russian garrison in that island. If, therefore, in the discussions, which you may have with the French Government on this point, you should perceive or understand that they are ignorant of the proposal made by the King's Government to the Emperor of Russia, in order to obtain a Russian garrison for Malta, and His Imperial Majesty's rejection of it, you will avail yourself of this circumstance to represent the plan now proposed, as a concession on the part of His Majesty, and as being the least likely to meet with any solid objection on the part of France. I have, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Most Secret and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Paris, Nov. 20, 1801.

When I mentioned to your Lordship in my letter No. 1, that this Government was desirous of agitating some of the points of negotiation here previous to the meeting at Amiens, and submitted to you how far such a proceeding would be approved by His Majesty's Ministers, I was led to believe that I might have had interviews with the First Consul, and that the business would have been conducted in a more liberal, as well as a more expeditious manner than at a formal diplomatic assembly.

I have, however, since had reason to believe that I am not likely to be favoured with any confidential interviews with the First Consul, and that the only difference between my transacting the business at Paris or at Amiens, would be that I should have to deal with Talleyrand on the spot, instead of negotiating with him through the medium of Joseph Bonaparte, who has the character of being a well-meaning, although not a very able, man, and whose near connexion with the First Consul might perhaps be in some degree a check on the spirit of chicanery and intrigue which the Minister of the Exterior so eminently possesses.

Notwithstanding the encouragement held out by Lauriston, of which I informed your Lordship in my letter, dated the 10th instant, Bonaparte has shown no disposition to see me, either publicly or privately, since the first interview, and he has put off the parade, which was fixed for Monday last, the 16th instant, which offered the only opportunity of presenting the gentlemen who accompanied me, until the 6th of December (15th Frimaire), although, according to usage, there should have been a parade on the 1st Frimaire.

Under these circumstances, therefore, I can hardly believe that I could obtain any advantage by formally demanding an audience, without the support of the Minister, for which, since the happy deliverance of Hanover, the situation of the Stadholder and of the King of Sardinia would afford but a flimsy pretext, as they may be mentioned at my audience of leave, which will be a matter of course.

It is besides necessary to bring to an explicit declaration the cession of Ceylon and Trinidad, which cannot be so easily evaded or protracted at a formal meeting at Amiens, as at desultory and unofficial conversations in the apartments of the Minister, who, from what I learn, will have much difficulty, and must be driven to use strong measures with his allies, especially with Spain, before he can obtain their acquiescence.

Besides the formal cession of Ceylon and Trinidad, by the respective Governments of Spain and Holland, there remain no points of much consideration to be adjusted, except Malta, and the proposition of receiving Tobago in lieu of a part of the money due for the maintenance of prisoners.

The first is a matter of such infinite difficulty that I think it hardly possible to devise arrangements that will not be liable to many objections; but, on the whole, I am inclined to think that the plan, which is proposed in your Lordship's despatch No. 7,

is the best that can be adopted under the present circumstances, and it is perfectly conformable to the spirit of the 4th article of the preliminaries. Your Lordship may be assured that I shall give the most serious consideration with regard to the time and mode of bringing it forward. . . .

Our claim for the maintenance of prisoners must be clearly made out, and, as it must be a long matter of account, it will be some time before the question of Tobago can be brought to issue.

Having maturely weighed all these circumstances, it appeared to me that a great advantage would be given to the French Government, if I should engage so far in the negotiation here as to render it difficult for me to transfer the seat of it to Amiens, and on that account I sent the note (a copy of which and of his answer I herewith enclose) to the Minister. On finding, however, yesterday, when I saw him after receiving your Lordship's despatch of the 17th instant, that M. Otto had communicated to him the acquiescence of His Majesty's Ministers in my commencing the negotiation here, I told him that the treaty must be agitated and concluded at Amiens, for which place I proposed to set out about the 6th or 7th Frimaire (26th or 27th of November), and, that in the mean time, I should be ready to converse with him on any points which might be forwarded by a private discussion.

From the enclosed note of Talleyrand's, as well as from other information, it appears that Joseph Bonaparte and myself are the only Plenipotentiaries that are to repair to Amiens, at least in the first instance; I should therefore wish to receive His Majesty's commands whether, if I should see no probability of the arrival of a Minister from Spain or Holland, I should require the concurrence of Plenipotentiaries on the part of those Powers, if it should be only for the purpose of rendering valid the acquisitions which are to be surrendered to us by the treaty.

When I made the usual visit to the Foreign Ministers here immediately after my audience of the First Consul, I omitted to send cards to the Ministers of the Helvetic, Cisalpine, and Ligurian Republics, because I considered that such a visit in form from me, would at once be taken as an acknowledgment of those Governments on the part of His Majesty, and I do not know whether His Majesty's Ministers may think proper that it should take place at the present moment.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

COLONEL LITTLEHALES TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

MY DEAR SIR, Paris, Nov. 21, 1801.

A variety of circumstances, as well as an anxious desire to see as much of Paris as possible, have prevented me from writing to you at an earlier period; I have now the satisfaction to mention that Lord Cornwallis continues in perfect health, and proposes to proceed to Amiens in six or seven days.

Lord Cornwallis has received very marked attention from all descriptions of persons here, but he has seldom seen the First Consul, nor has any of his suite been presented to him; his Lordship has, however, dined with most of the French Ministers, and at the Opera, a few nights since, he was greeted with loud and general acclamations.

I accompanied Lord Cornwallis yesterday to see the ceremony of the opening of the session of the Corps Législatif; the Members were all in costume, but the procession had more the appearance of an exhibition on the stage, or even of a puppet-show, than a solemn proceeding of a legislative body; and in many parts of the House, or at least at the doors of it, centinels, with fixed bayonets, were planted, and in all the avenues leading to it detachments of troops were posted.

France may perhaps, in the opinion of some people, possess the semblance of liberty, but as for the reality, it is totally out of the question at present, as no government is so despotic. There does not appear to be any society, comparatively speaking, in Paris, as the theatres, which are numerous, are constantly crowded, and they are the only places of general resort. The Revolution seems to have made a serious and melancholy alteration in the manners of the people of this country.

As Singleton is going to England to-morrow, and as you will see him on his arrival in London, I shall not add further than that I am with great regard, &c.,

E. B. LITTLEHALES.

HEADS OF CONVERSATION BETWEEN LORD CORNWALLIS AND M. JOSEPH BONAPARTE.

Paris, Nov. 24, 1801.

M. Joseph Bonaparte, on his arrival this morning at my hotel, before we proceeded to business, declared that his intention was to deal fairly and openly, that he was a stranger to the diplomatic arts, and should not attempt to gain any point by cunning or chicanery, and that he made no doubt, from my character and the line of life in which I had been engaged, that I should approve

of those sentiments, and readily concur with him in the determination to act on the principles which he had avowed, during the whole progress of our intercourse.

On going through the preliminary articles, M. Bonaparte stopped at the 4th, and began by stating the right of suzeraineté of the King of Naples, and seemed, as Lord Cornwallis thought, to point him out as the proper power for the guarantee; on which the latter observed, that, although there certainly was a right of suzeraineté in the King of Naples, yet the condition of that Prince could hardly be considered of sufficient weight in Europe to render him a proper guarantee between two nations circumstanced as Great Britain and France, and that any guarantee must be looked upon as nugatory unless it was vested in one of the superior Powers. Bonaparte coincided in this opinion, and mentioned the Emperor of Russia as the proper guarantee, but deprecated his putting a Russian garrison into Malta, which measure would give him a claim to a passage through the Dardanelles, and in many respects would tend to the speedy dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, and probably to the interruption of the peace of Europe; and then he proposed nearly word for word the plan suggested by Lord Hawkesbury, which circumstance made Lord Cornwallis suspect that the person who assisted him in forming a project so similar to that of our Government, might likewise have communicated the refusal of the Emperor of Russia to give a garrison. The latter, therefore, only observed that he was glad to find that on the whole the sentiments of M. Bonaparte were consistent with the spirit and meaning of the preliminary article, that he was not prepared to speak decidedly on the subject, but should apply for His Majesty's instructions, which he should probably receive about the time of their meeting at Amiens.

On reading the 6th article, Bonaparte admitted that the treaty of Madrid was entirely done away, and that the treaty of Badajoz[1] alone remained in force.[2] Lord Cornwallis mentioned how earnestly we desired that the small territory of Olivenza should remain in

[1] The war between Spain and Portugal having been brought on only through the anxiety of Bonaparte to acquire some means, by conquests of Spain in Portugal, to offer compensation to England in lieu of demands she might make, both Spain and Portugal were desirous at the earliest opportunity to restore peace, and accordingly, June 6, 1801, a treaty between them was signed at Badajoz, by which Portugal surrendered Olivenza and a few villages on the Guadiana, to Spain. Bonaparte was indignant at this arrangement, and refused to be a party to it, but made a treaty himself with Portugal at Madrid, Sept. 29, 1801, by which a considerable portion of Portuguese Guiana was ceded to France. It was understood that there was also a secret article by which Portugal bound herself to pay France 30,000,000 francs.

[2] Joseph Bonaparte had been kept in profound ignorance of the secret articles added to the treaties of Badajoz and Madrid, and to the preliminary articles signed in London.

the hands of the Portuguese, but as he knew how much difficulty the French experienced at present in forcing the Spaniards to give up Trinidad, he did not think proper to press this matter seriously.

Bonaparte seemed surprised when Lord Cornwallis told him, after reading the 10th article, that the charge against France for the maintenance of prisoners was very considerable, and said that no charge of that kind had been made by either party in the war on the Continent. Lord Cornwallis said that he believed in the present instance that the case was very different, and that England had for a considerable time maintained the French prisoners in England, and at the same period paid for the subsistence of the English prisoners in France; that he would apply for a detailed account, and if it should be admitted to be a just charge, and that the sum should be large, there might be a means of liquidating the greater part of it and at the same time doing an act of great accommodation to the British Government, by giving an island that was intrinsically of no great value to either country, but was an object of our earnest wishes, because the planters were all subjects of Great Britain; and that although Lord Cornwallis knew that the First Consul had, during the negotiation, objected that any part of those dominions of France which it possessed at the beginning of the war should be exacted from him, yet he might possibly see a proposition of this nature in a different light.

In the 13th article Bonaparte observed that they wished for some adjustment about the fisheries, when Lord Cornwallis answered, that he was not sufficiently conversant in that business to enter into particulars, and could only at present say that it was a matter in which the British Government must act with the utmost caution, as any improper cession in that article would create a most violent clamour, and be attended with much mischief; and that he recollected about the time of the Peace of 1762 the late Lord Chatham had threatened to call the Ministers of that day to a severe account if they gave up any points that might be prejudicial to the British fisheries at Newfoundland.

No objections or observations were made by either party on any of the other articles.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Secret.]

MY LORD, Amiens, Dec. 3, 1801.

I acquainted your Lordship in my despatch No. 9, with my intention to leave Paris on the 29th ult., in order to proceed to

this place; my desire however to have some conversation with the Minister of the Exterior, after my interview with the First Consul, induced me to defer my journey until the 30th, on the evening of which day I met at Clermont the messenger charged with your Lordship's despatches.

The 28th ult. was fixed for my taking leave of the First Consul, when he admitted me to a conference of about half an hour, without the presence of a third person.

He began the conversation by assurances of his earnest desire for peace, and avowed that it was much wanted for his country, which had entirely lost its commerce, and in a great degree exhausted its pecuniary resources, adding, you see that I conceal nothing, "et que je parle franchement;" he desired only to adhere, in the arrangement of the definitive treaty, to the full intent and meaning of the preliminary articles, and as I should find M. Joseph Bonaparte a just and fair man, he made no doubt that everything would be speedily adjusted.

I then represented the King's sincere desire for a lasting peace, and stated, that His Majesty had no wish to concern himself about the mode of Government which France might think proper to adopt, provided it was compatible with the happiness and safety of the neighbouring nations, and that He was sensible of the merit of the First Consul in having rescued his country from the confusion and anarchy by which it had been so long oppressed. I urged the consent which the British Government had given to the departure of the fleet destined for St. Domingo (which measure, exclusively of the expense with which it would be attended by our being obliged to send so many ships to the West Indies, might occasion great clamour and bring much censure upon them), as a proof that there remained no ill-disposition on their part towards this country, but that on the contrary they were willing to make considerable sacrifices in order to cultivate a good understanding. The Consul replied, that he had been much chagrined by my remonstrance against the sailing of the fleet; that if we had persisted he should have abandoned the expedition, and have endeavoured to make some agreement with Toussaint,[1] however disadvantageous it might have been; that he was ready to give up everything for our satisfaction "hormis l'honneur;" but no consideration should have induced him to have taken the guns from his ships, when they were armed and ready for sea. He afterwards observed, that we were materially interested in the reduction of Toussaint's power,

[1] Toussaint l'Ouverture, b. 1743, d. April 27, 1803. He had governed a large part of St. Domingo for some time, when he was captured by the French, by stratagem, in 1802, and conveyed to France, where he died, not without suspicion of foul play.

who would otherwise establish in the West Indies, a piratical state, like those of Barbary, to the material injury of all nations which had colonial possessions in that quarter of the globe.

After this digression I drew his attention to the subject which first induced me to make use of the King's name, by expressing in strong terms the concern which His Majesty took in the interests of the Stadtholder and the House of Orange, and the hopes which He entertained that a suitable provision would be made for that Prince and his family; the First Consul expressed warmly the gratification that he should feel at being able to do any act that would be personally acceptable to the King, of which he desired me to convey the strongest assurances. He said, that it had been his intention that the Prince of Orange should be properly considered in the arrangement of the indemnities, but that since His Majesty had interfered in his favour, he would take care that he should have a larger portion than had been originally intended.

I was not so fortunate in my intercession in favour of the King of Sardinia, for whom the Consul said, that it was out of his power, after the conduct which he had held, to make any provision, except by establishing him in Sardinia with a pension from France; that his Sardinian Majesty had rejected the offer which he made to him, of restoring his Piedmontese territories, after the battle of Marengo, and had, at that time, thrown himself into the hands of another power (Russia); and that he (the Consul) could not now do it, without disgusting all the partizans of France in Piedmont, and even exposing himself to much discontent at home, and gave me to understand that no hopes could be entertained on that subject.

He then adverted to the preliminaries, and entered more at large into the objections to the admission of a Russian garrison into Malta than Joseph Bonaparte had done at our interview, and set forth the mischievous consequences with which it might be attended as well to England as to France; that it would bring the Russian trade through the southern communication of the Dardanelles instead of the Baltic, which would not be for our interest, and that the Emperors of Russia had of late shown themselves to be such unsteady politicians, that it would hardly be safe for either party to trust implicitly to their faithful discharge of so important a trust; and indeed he pressed this point so far as nearly to convince me that he did not know of the Emperor's refusal. After combating the idea of a Russian garrison, he proceeded to state, that even if Malta was held in trust by a weaker power such as the King of Naples, it would be a constant object of jealousy between England

and France, and, as the interest of either country might preponderate in Europe, it would probably be able, by promises or by intimidation, to induce the feeble power to depart from its engagements.

The only effectual plan, in his opinion, to remove all cause of future contention, was to blow up the fortifications, which would render the possession of the island an object of no material consequence to either party, but if there appeared to be any advantage, it certainly lay on the side of the Power which was the strongest at sea, which circumstance must acquit him of being actuated by any partial motives in making the proposal.

I represented that the Knights would not probably choose to take possession of the island in so defenceless a state, where they might become the prey of a Barbary corsair; to which he answered that "it was not necessary to have works like the present, which had cost between three and four millions, to secure them against the attack of pirates, and that they might easily erect such defences as would, with a small garrison, protect them against dangers of that nature, without in any degree rendering Malta a place of arms that would be an object of importance or jealousy to the powers of Europe." I said, "that having received no instructions with respect to a proposition of this kind, and being totally unacquainted with the sentiments of my Government thereupon, I could give no answer." I did not however understand that he meant to make a serious objection to the plan proposed by Joseph Bonaparte, as mentioned in my despatch, No. 9. I was confirmed in this opinion by a conversation which I had on the following day with Talleyrand, who repeated the assurances which the First Consul had given, that they should be satisfied to conclude the definitive treaty according to the tenor and spirit of the preliminary articles.

The First Consul then proceeded to the 10th article, and after expressing some doubts whether any material charge could with justice be made against him for the maintenance of prisoners, he told me, that he could be induced by no pecuniary consideration to give up the island of Tobago,[1] which he looked upon as a dishonourable act; that if we wished for it because it was an English island, he would exchange it for a French island, several of which were in our possession, or for any establishment or territory in India, and dwelt a considerable time on the latter proposition, and

[1] In Talleyrand's first instructions to Joseph Bonaparte, dated in October, he admitted that M. Otto had been authorized to state, verbally, that Tobago might be given up to England upon certain terms, not confined to an exchange of islands.

pressed that we should give him, or allow him to negotiate with the Nabob for a few leagues round Pondicherry, to help to pay the expenses of that establishment. I told him that I did not think it probable, that His Majesty would give any island in the West Indies for Tobago, but I would represent what he had proposed; with respect however to India, I could venture to assure him, that no territory, of the description which he mentioned, could be of any service to him; that there was no Nabob with whom he could treat; and that I was persuaded that His Majesty's Government would never consent to a measure that could only tend to embroil the two nations; upon which he said smiling, "Vous êtes bien dur," and observed that, if there should be a considerable balance of money due for the maintenance of prisoners, he hoped to be allowed time for the payment.

He then proceeded to the business of the fisheries, in which he said that the ignorance of the French Ministers had, in the former treaty, given us great advantages; on this subject I informed him, that any proposition which might be made by the French Plenipotentiary would be taken by me ad referendum; but that I could not encourage him to hope for any material alteration.

At the conclusion of the conference, the First Consul expressed a wish that we could agree to remove disaffected or dangerous persons from either country, at the request of the nation to which they might respectively belong, and declared his willingness to send away United Irishmen. And he then stated, that the attempt on his life by the infernal machine, was contrived by the Count d'Artois [1] and the Archbishop of Arras.[2] Considering this rather as desultory conversation, I thought it most prudent to make no answer or observation.

When I saw M. Talleyrand on the 29th, the day before I left Paris, I urged him, in the strongest terms, to hasten the arrival of the Spanish and Dutch plenipotentiaries at Amiens, and particularly asked when the former might be expected; to which he replied that he could not ascertain that fact, as the Prince of Peace[3] appeared to him to be deranged in his mind, having published as an exposé (after the manner of the French) that he had made peace with Portugal, after having gained five great victories and taken

[1] Comte d'Artois, afterwards, Sept. 16, 1824, Charles X., b. Oct. 9, 1757, d. Nov. 6, 1836; m. Nov. 16, 1773, Marie Therese, dau. of Victor Emanuel III., King of Sardinia. Abdicated Aug. 2, 1830.

[2] Bishop, not Archbishop of Arras, Louis Marc François Hilaire de Conzier, b. March 13, 1732, d. Dec. 16, 1804. He had previously been in the army.

[3] Don Manuel Godoy, Duc d'Alcudia, Prince of Peace, b. May 12, 1767, d. 1839; m. 1st, Sept. 11, 1797, Maria Teresa, dau. of the Infant Don Louis, brother of Charles III.; 2nd, Jan. 7, 1829 (his first wife having only died Nov. 24, 1828), Dona Josepha Tudo, Comtesse de Castillo Fiel, by whom he is said to have previously had several children.

nine fortresses at the point of his sword. On a repetition however of my serious remonstrances on the necessity that the island of Trinidad and the Dutch possessions in Ceylon should be formally ceded to us, he assured me that the French Government would take care that these points should be settled to our complete satisfaction.

M. Joseph Bonaparte is expected here this evening, and I shall not fail, in obedience to His Majesty's commands, to state to him the necessity of his obtaining, with as little delay as possible, from the Spanish and Batavian Governments, a notification of their distinct and unqualified accession to the preliminary articles of peace concluded between His Majesty and the French Republic.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Secret.]

MY LORD, Amiens, Dec. 6, 1801.

Agreeably to what I had the honour to announce to your Lordship in my last despatch, M. Joseph Bonaparte arrived here in the evening of the 3rd instant.

We communicated yesterday to each other our full powers, and I transmit enclosed a copy of those of the French Minister, which may be sufficient unless a Minister shall arrive from Portugal, in which case, should it occur, which is not very probable, M. Bonaparte said he would immediately procure powers to treat with the Plenipotentiary who should be sent from that country.

As soon as the formality of examining the full powers had been gone through, I entered with the French Minister on the subject of your Lordship's despatch No. 8, relative to the necessity there appeared to be of obtaining from the Spanish and Batavian Governments a notification of their accession to the Preliminary Articles, and of the presence at the Congress of Ministers from those Powers, in order that the formal cession of the island of Trinidad, and of the Dutch possessions in Ceylon, might take place, for the accomplishment of which we of course considered the French Government to be responsible. M. Bonaparte admitted this in the fullest extent, and answered, on the subject of the arrival of Plenipotentiaries from Spain and Holland, that Monsieur de Schimmelpenninck[1] might be daily expected here from Paris (there seems indeed to be no reason to apprehend any delay from that quarter);

[1] Rutger Jan Schimmelpenninck, b. Oct. 31, 1761, at Deventer, d. March 26, 1825; m. 1788, Catherine, dau. of M. P. C. Mahuis, then holding high office in Amsterdam.

but that, although the Spanish Government had proved their acquiescence in the Preliminary Articles by the nomination of Count Campo d' Alange [1] to be the Plenipotentiary, and had sent him orders to repair to this place, he was sorry to find that that Minister, who was actually at Padua, had been under the necessity of excusing himself from undertaking the commission on account of ill health, which gave room to fear that a considerable time might elapse, especially at this unfavourable season of the year, before the person who might be appointed in his room could make his preparations and perform so long a journey. This account of the state of things with respect to Spain not appearing to me to afford that satisfaction which I had been instructed to obtain, I have delivered to M. Bonaparte a note on the subject, a copy of which I transmit enclosed.

As, however, the delay with respect to Spain could form no objection to our proceeding in the mean time to arrange the Treaty between His Majesty and the French Republic, M. Bonaparte proposed, either that we should begin the business by reducing the Preliminary Articles into the form of a definitive Treaty, or that one of the parties should bring forward a projet of a Treaty founded upon them, which might be discussed, and to which the other party might offer any objections or alterations; and he left it to the option of His Majesty's Government whether they would present a projet, or whether it should come from him. Upon which it was settled that I should produce the projet; and I have little doubt, as soon as I shall receive it from your Lordship, together with His Majesty's final commands in regard to Malta, that the business will be arranged with expedition.

M. Bonaparte apprehended there might be some difficulty in the article respecting the prisoners. But as the First Consul has put an end to all hopes of the cession of the island of Tobago, and as by the preliminary article the matter is to be adjusted according to the law of nations, and in conformity to established usage, I cannot conceive that it will require a great deal of time to settle the question, however difficult it may hereafter prove to obtain the payment.

It is perhaps necessary that I should acquaint your Lordship, that having mentioned as a matter of course that the Treaty was

[1] Don Manuel de Negrete y de la Torre, b. Jan. 15, 1736, d. March 13, 1818; m. Nov. 10, 1758, Dona Maria Agustina de Adorno y Sotomayor. Made Captain-General Sept., and Ambassador to Vienna, Dec. 1795. Named Minister for the Conferences at Amiens Oct. 1801. He never repaired to his post, but was sent to Lisbon instead. Created July 27, 1808, Duc de Campo Alange, and made Minister of Foreign Affairs. Afterwards Ambassador at Paris, where he remained till the entry of the Allies, 1814.

to be made in the two languages, French and English, as the Preliminary Articles had been, M. Bonaparte appeared rather to have expected that the French language alone should be made use of. I trust, however, that no serious difficulty will occur on this head.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Amiens, Dec. 7, 1801.

You will easily believe that the life which I have led since we parted has been most uncomfortable and tiresome. I am too much a *John* to delight in foreign society, and the French of the present day have all the disagreeable qualities of the old French, without the accomplishments. I had two interviews with Bonaparte, the latter for about half an hour tête-à-tête. He is quick, animated, et il parle en Roi. In talking of public affairs, where France is concerned, the language is, "I would rather give up; it is hard upon me; I will take care of the Stadtholder," &c. &c. The Government is that of a military despotism, in most respects wisely, but not mildly administered. People of all ranks seem to look on quiet as the summum bonum—ce grand homme nous a tranquillisé. God knows how all will end, but I think Bonaparte's power will not easily be shaken.

I am apprehensive that I shall pass a great part of the winter here, for the Spaniards, who are enraged at being obliged to give up Trinidad, have appointed a man who either is, or pretends to be, very ill at Padua, to attend our negotiations here. The French would pass over this difficulty, but it seems that we must have a formal renunciation from Spain.

I heartily wish it was all over, and that I could get back again to Culford, from whence it would not be easy to move me.

I had great difficulty here to prevent everybody with me from believing the nonsensical paragraph about Lord Chatham's going to India. I suppose that he was forced to contradict it, in order to stop the torrent of applications from the credulous.

Believe me ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

In reply to the despatch of Lord Cornwallis, Nov. 26, which covered the "Heads of Conversation" between him and Joseph Bonaparte, Lord Hawkesbury, Dec. 5, conveyed the opinion of Ministers on the several points adverted to.

1st, Malta.—The Government considered it indispensable that the island should be effectually independent of both England and France, and that either no French Langue should subsist, or that an English Langue should be established—the latter course appearing to them most advantageous to Great Britain. As to the garrison, it would be necessary, before consenting to leave it in the hands of the King of Naples for three, four, or five years only, to ascertain how France proposed to provide for the ultimate defence of the island.

2nd, Portugal.—Joseph Bonaparte having admitted that the Treaty of Madrid was annulled, and that of Badajoz[1] was alone in force, it appeared but just, not only that the boundaries of the Guianas should be fixed as they were settled by that latter treaty, but that Portugal should be relieved from the pecuniary sacrifices which she was bound by the secret article to make to France, or, if that was not acceded to, that Olivenza should be given back by Spain.

3rd, The Prisoners of War.—Lord Cornwallis was referred to the previous discussions about their maintenance, and was furnished with a statement of the sums claimed from France, and on the payment of which he was to insist.

4th, Newfoundland.—The demands of France for more extended powers of fishing were totally inadmissible.

5th, The Prince of Orange and the King of Sardinia.—Every endeavour should be made to obtain an indemnity for those two princes, especially for the former, and it might be possible to consent to recognize the Cisalpine and Ligurian Republics, and the King of Etruria,[2] if the question of compensation could be satisfactorily arranged.

6th.—That it appeared more expedient that one Treaty containing the whole of the stipulations should be signed by all the parties concerned, than that there should be separate Treaties with each Power.[3]

[1] The instructions to Joseph were to consider the Treaty of Madrid as in force as regarded France, and that of Badajos as regarded Spain—thus setting aside the secret article of the Preliminaries.

[2] Louis, Infant of Spain and Duke of Parma, made King of Etruria March 21, 1801, b. July 5, 1775, d. May 27, 1803; m. Aug. 25, 1795, Marie Louise Josephine, dau. of Charles IV., King of Spain.

[3] The French, as appears from the instructions to Joseph, preferred the latter course, but felt the necessity of the appearance of the Spanish and Batavian Plenipotentiaries at Amiens.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY ADDINGTON.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Amiens, Dec. 12, 1801.

I am sensible that the duties of my situation as His Majesty's Plenipotentiary for arranging and concluding the Definitive Treaty of Peace, consist only in giving every information in my power to His Majesty's confidential servants respecting the state and sentiments of the French Government, and in endeavouring by my representations to carry into effect the objects of my instructions, but that I have no right to obtrude my opinion upon them on the expediency of measures for which they alone are responsible.

The kind confidence, however, with which you have honoured me, and the very sincere regard and respect which I entertain for your personal and political character, induce me to hazard privately some opinions of my own on the subject of Malta, which is now the most prominent feature of our negotiation.

The alarming preponderance which France has attained in the affairs of Europe must give us reason to apprehend that, whenever we are under the necessity of placing confidence in the engagements of a feeble power, that power will be induced either by its interests or its fears to deceive us and to betray its trust.

You will understand from this opinion that I do not feel perfectly satisfied with the prospect of a Neapolitan garrison; but I confess that I have great doubts whether the proposition which accompanied Lord Hawkesbury's despatch, dated Dec. 6, for our engaging, and becoming ourselves a party, in an attempt to revive the ancient splendour and the spirit of chivalry in the degraded Order of Malta, which has so lately sold the very seat of its government and of its importance, will afford us any better security. It appears likewise to me that the statement of the Conseil Provisoire of the Order in Russia which was transmitted by Lord St. Helens, is much too sanguine in regard to its probable financial powers, and that it holds out ideas that in the execution would in many instances be found totally impracticable.

On the supposition, however, that it was actually carried into effect, and that the whole body of the Order, including the French and English knights, were, in defiance of the most sacred laws of the ancient institution, assembled: could we in the present state of things hope that France would not possess an absolute sway in all their councils, when the Pope, the whole of Italy, Spain, and a great part of Germany, are either submissive, or entirely devoted, to the will of the gigantic Republic?

I am perfectly aware that all proposals that are made by an able and subtle enemy should be received with caution and most attentively examined, but when we have no adequate plan of our own to bring forward, I scarcely think that the maxim of "Timeo Danaos" alone, should induce us to reject precipitately the idea of destroying the fortifications.

I cannot pretend to know what reasons may be urged against it with respect to the general state of the politics of Europe, and particularly what effect it might have on Russia; but as an abstract question between us and France, it seems to me to merit serious consideration.

The means which the French might use to induce the King of Naples or the Knights to put them in possession of Malta at the beginning of a war are obvious, and if they obtain it in its present state and have time to lay in a moderate stock of provisions, with a small garrison it becomes impregnable.

On the contrary, if there were no works left but such as would be sufficient to keep off a Barbary pirate, and if the casemates and magazines were demolished, the French, if they apprehended our probable superiority in the Mediterranean, must keep a large body of troops for its precarious defence, for the maintenance of which it would be difficult to provide; and in that condition it would certainly be considered by their Government as a feeble, as well as an expensive and dangerous, step towards the accomplishment of any great designs which they might form against our Asiatic empire.

From my conversation with Joseph Bonaparte, I have reason to believe that the French will engage, if ever they should re-establish their Langues, that they will not oppose the revival of those which England formerly possessed; and they have pointed out the very plan proposed by Lord Hawkesbury, although they recommend in preference the demolition of the fortifications.

The choice therefore of every project which has hitherto presented itself to either party on this difficult question, still remains with our Cabinet; and it has rather been my wish to lay before you such military remarks as have occurred to me in favour of the demolition, than to lead your opinion on a point on which it is no easy task to come to a satisfactory decision.

This letter will be delivered to you by my friend Littlehales, who has not been idle here, and who has found opportunities of obtaining some information that may be interesting to you, as well with respect to the state of affairs, as to the persons who are at present of consideration in this country. I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

VISCOUNT BROME TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

MY DEAR GENERAL, Amiens, Dec. 12, 1801.

The whole time I was at Paris, I was much in the same situation as a country booby who comes to London for the first time, running about the town gazing and staring at everything. I say this for fear you should impute my not having written to you from thence to idleness (which, I know not why, you sometimes seem to suspect me of). My time, however, was really occupied almost totally by sights in the morning and society in the evening; by society I mean great dinners of 40 or 50 people with the dress of mountebanks and manners of assassins. We had occasionally a mixture of *ladies* at these dinners, among whom the most conspicuous is Talleyrand's mistress, who is an old East Indian acquaintance of yours; her name is Grand, she is very like him, and he is like everything that is detestable. I had only one opportunity of seeing Bonaparte, which probably you have heard from Singleton. There is nothing in my opinion very striking *in his* appearance except the state of fear and alarm he appears to be in, and which certainly is very unbecoming a hero, but is very *natural* in his situation, which is undoubtedly very precarious. We went to see the opening of the Session of the Corps Législatif, and really no puppet-show could be more ridiculous; my Father was received with military honours by the guard (for there is a guard everywhere to defend the liberties of the people), and after being introduced to some of the principal members, was ushered into the hall, where, after we had waited some time, the doors flew open and the members entered, marching two and two to military music. After they had taken their places, and the sentinels were stationed at the doors (inside of the hall), there came in a man dressed in a sort of mountebank dress, who it was natural to imagine was going to exhibit on the tight-rope, but who turned out to be our friend Citizen Chaptal,[1] Minister of the Interior, who made them a speech requesting them to choose their President and to proceed to business, which, when he had retired, they accordingly did; it consisted in the President reading two or three letters, one of which was from an artist, making them a present of an engraving of one of

[1] Jean Antoine Chaptal, Comte de Chanteloup, b. June 5, 1756, d. July 20, 1832. He was son of a small apothecary, and was more distinguished as an eminent chemist than as a politician. Minister of the Interior from 1801 to 1804. Later in life he resided principally at Chanteloup, the celebrated seat of the Duc de Choiseul, which he had bought, and where he carried on very large beetroot sugar manufactories, almost the first established in France.

Bonaparte's victories, and another from some patriotic bookseller, begging their acceptance of an almanack. After this we retired, and, though the President was still reading, the guard was turned out, and the band struck up without the least regard to his dignity. I hope this specimen will allay any apprehensions you may have entertained of the contagion of French liberty; indeed I believe Windham would find it difficult to discover any Jacobin principle in the constitution, which is certainly the most despotic that ever existed in any country. My only fear is that it will not last till the definitive treaty is signed.

I intend being in England the latter end of this month, or the beginning of next.

Pray remember me kindly to Mrs. Ross, and

Believe me, yours sincerely,

BROME.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Amiens, Dec. 13, 1801.

I had the honour to receive your Lordship's despatch, No. 9, early in the morning of the 9th instant. On the 11th I waited by appointment on M. Joseph Bonaparte; and, agreeably to the instructions contained in that despatch, stated to him distinctly, that it was indispensably requisite, in conformity to the spirit of the 4th of the Preliminary Articles, that both Great Britain and France should be placed upon a footing of perfect equality with regard to the individuals who are to compose the order of St. John of Jerusalem. After M. Bonaparte had readily assented to the justice of this proposition, I proceeded to enquire how far it might be in the power or in the intention of France to re-establish the Langues which it formerly held in the Order of Malta, observing that it would of course be necessary in that case that Great Britain should have the faculty of re-establishing Langues, consisting of the same number of Knights and enjoying equal privileges.

M. Bonaparte answered that he could not make himself responsible for any events which time and circumstances might hereafter produce; and was only able to say that, according to the present constitution of France, the citizens of that country could not possibly be made Knights of Malta, as it was an indispensable requisite for the attainment of that honour to produce proofs of nobility, which by their laws was strictly prohibited. He added, that he conceived us to be as absolutely excluded as themselves, by our secession from the Church of Rome. After discussing at some

length the difficulties which oppose the re-establishment of the Langues of either country, M. Bonaparte admitted that France would undoubtedly have a considerable preponderance if, contrary to all present probability, French Knights were received into the Order, and especially if a Frenchman could become Grand Master; and proceeded to observe that it was no object for either Government to put itself to much trouble and expense to prevent the other from having a better prospect, either of obtaining possession or securing a superior influence in an island which derived its chief consequence from the extraordinary strength of its fortifications. Let us, said he, blow up the works, and there will be an end of all jealousy on the subject.

I informed him that the Chief Consul had strongly recommended this expedient, and that I had stated to His Majesty's Ministers the arguments which he had used in favour of it; in the mean time, I said, that I believed there would be no material objection on the part of His Majesty's Government to the plan which he had proposed in our former conversation on this subject at Paris, adding only, that the garrison should be maintained by Great Britain and France until the Knights should be able to provide for their own security; and that I wished it to be further understood, that if France should ever be in a condition to re-establish her Langues, no opposition should be made on her part to the revival of those of England, in which propositions he appeared to acquiesce.

When I mentioned to M. Bonaparte what your Lordship stated respecting the pecuniary indemnification which Portugal had agreed to give to France by a secret article in the treaty of Madrid, he assured me that there was a secret article to the same effect in the treaty of Badajoz;[1] and this assertion is indeed corroborated by M. Otto's note of the 18th of June (referred to in the secret article of the preliminary articles of peace between Great Britain and France), as the paragraph beginning "De plus le Traité," &c., most clearly refers to the latter treaty.

The French Plenipotentiary made no objection to the proposal stated in your Lordship's despatch, No. 9, that the Powers engaged in the war should not conclude separate treaties of peace, but should agree to one general treaty which should embrace the interests of each of them, and to which they should all become parties.

[1] In a despatch, Dec. 8, to Talleyrand, Joseph complains that he has no knowledge of these three secret articles, and that he is compelled to answer Lord Cornwallis by guess. The articles were not transmitted to him till Dec. 23.

On my taking leave of M. Bonaparte, he observed that there remained nothing now to be settled but the business of Malta and that of the prisoners, from which I hope that it is not his intention to bring forward any proposition about the fisheries.

I have desired Mr. Merry to deliver a statement, a copy of which is enclosed, of the sum that Great Britain has expended for the maintenance of prisoners, to the French Secretary of Legation, with a request that the claims on the part of France may be prepared as soon as possible, in order that the balance may be finally adjusted.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Amiens, Dec. 15, 1801.

I have waited for Littlehales's departure to acknowledge the receipt of your letters dated the 28th ult. and the 1st instant. No messenger has gone all the way to London from here, since the day after my arrival.

However averse I am to all contraband concerns, you will tell Lady Spencer that she shall be an exception to my general rule, and that I will take care that her glass shall be brought over with my baggage when I return to England, if she will send through you the proper directions.

There is no material difficulty in our negotiation, but still I am afraid that I shall be detained here for a considerable time.

Joseph Bonaparte is a very sensible, modest, gentlemanlike man, totally free from diplomatic chicanery, and fair and open in all his dealings.

You will probably have heard reports of confusion at Paris, and of the First Consul's intentions to unite the Cisalpine and Ligurian Republics,[1] but all these stories have little or no foundation, and I have great confidence in the strength and stability of his Government. His death would naturally occasion violent convulsions.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] No steps were taken about the Ligurian Republic, but on Jan. 26, 1802, Bonaparte accepted the supreme authority of the Cisalpine Republic, which was mainly composed of the Austrian possessions in Italy.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY LORD, Downing Street, Dec. 17, 1801.

In the 15th article respecting the sequestration on funded property, &c., it should be understood that the contracting parties will pay to the persons concerned in that species of property, all the interest that may have accrued upon it in the course of the war, and of which they have been deprived by the effect of the sequestrations.[1] By this you will, however, understand that the foreign should be placed on the same, and on no better or worse footing than the national creditors. The French creditor will, in point of fact, have a great advantage in this respect, in consequence of the British Government having strictly fulfilled all its engagements.

The British creditor must on the other hand submit to the losses which French citizens have sustained, as his situation as an enemy, consistently with the spirit of this article, ought to operate neither to his advantage or prejudice. I have, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Downing Street, Dec. 17, 1801.

I have great satisfaction in being able to inform you that by the vigorous and spirited conduct of Rear-Admiral Campbell,[2] the mutiny on board the 'Temeraire'[3] has been completely suppressed, the ringleaders secured and carried on board the 'Windsor Castle' for trial. No doubt was entertained that the crew of the 'Formidable,' the other ship where there had been open appear-

[1] To this proposition the French made the most strenuous resistance, but they could not disclose their real objections. The fact was that they were aware that the property of foreigners, especially in the funds, had been honourably preserved in England, and could be restored with little or no difficulty. In France the confiscations had been generally for the benefit of the State, and the reimbursements, which had been tendered in some cases, were in assignats, of so depreciated a value as to make such tenders absurd. The war which broke out in the ensuing year put an end to all legal proceedings, and it was only in 1815 that compensation was ultimately made.

[2] Rear-Admiral, afterwards Admiral, Sir George Campbell, G.C.B., brother of John, 1st Lord Cawdor, b. Aug. 13, 1761, d. Jan. 23, 1821; m. Feb. 1, 1805, his cousin, Eustatia, dau. of — Campbell, Esq. Groom of the Bedchamber from Oct. 1817 till his death. M.P. for Carmarthen Borough from Dec. 1806 to Dec. 1813.

[3] The mutiny broke out on Dec. 1, the crew of the 'Temeraire' objecting to go to the West Indies, to which station they believed the ship to have been ordered. They demanded from Admiral Campbell information as to where she was to go. "To hell if she is ordered, and we must go with her." The trials took place, not at Cork, but at Portsmouth, from the 6th to the 15th of Jan. 1802, and Vice-Admiral Mitchell was President. Twenty seamen were tried, of whom two were sentenced to be flogged. The rest were capitally convicted, and six executed.

ances of mutiny, would immediately return to their duty, and that by a severe example the disorder would be prevented from spreading. I am sure you will be glad to hear that the marines behaved in the most exemplary manner. Admiral Cornwallis is ordered to Beerhaven to superintend the court-martial. I hope we shall be able to form some judgment in the course of a week or ten days of the probable duration of the negotiation. I confess I should be very much inclined personally (but this is not official), if every other point could be satisfactorily settled and a Spanish Minister should not arrive within a certain time, to sign the treaty with the Plenipotentiaries who were at that time at Amiens, and to insert an article similar to that respecting the Ottoman Porte, inviting the King of Spain to accede to the treaty; it being understood that if he did not accede, this country would keep possession of Minorca as well as Trinidad.

There has been a very severe frost here for some days. I hope you have found good accommodation at Amiens, though I am afraid the place is particularly dull, and the country around it very dreary.

I am, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Amiens, Dec. 19, 1801.

His Majesty's messenger Schaw, delivered to me on the 13th instant the honour of your Lordship's despatch No. 10.

As soon as it reached me I communicated to the French plenipotentiary by a note—of which I transmit a copy inclosed—the nomination of the Chevalier de Souza[1] to be Minister on the part of Portugal to the Congress at this place. I could not but be greatly surprised to receive on the 16th, in the evening, the answer to it, of which I also enclose a copy, containing a positive refusal on the part of the French Government to admit a plenipotentiary from His Majesty's ally. The reply was accompanied with a notice from M. Bonaparte that he would call on me the following day. I therefore thought it necessary to prepare a *note verbale* on the subject—a copy of which I transmit herewith—

[1] Don Jose Maria Souza Botelho, b. March 9, 1758, d. June 1, 1825; m. 1st, Dona —— de Noronha, by whom he had one son, the Comte de Villa Real; 2nd, Adelaide Marie Emilie, dau. of M. de Filleul, and widow of the Comte Flahaut de la Billarderie, Minister in Sweden from 1791 to 1795, then at Copenhagen to 1799. He refused to sign the Treaty of Madrid, and came to England. The French Government would not allow him to go to Amiens, but he was Minister at Paris from 1802 to 1805, when, having declined to go to Russia, he returned to Lisbon and devoted himself to literature.

which I delivered to the French Minister at our meeting. Your Lordship will perceive by it that I on my part as positively refuse to admit the explanations upon which the French Government ground their objection, until I shall be honoured with His Majesty's further commands in consequence of it.

The French plenipotentiary appeared a little embarrassed on reading my note, and admitted that he had not, when we before conversed on the subject, expressed any objection to the reception of a Portuguese Minister, and that he had promised, if one should arrive, to obtain an enlargement of his powers. The only arguments which he offered in defence of the present conduct of his Government were, that as the 6th article in the preliminary treaty and the secret article, which were favourable to Portugal, had been granted solely for the purpose of giving satisfaction to England, the latter power seemed to be perfectly capable of securing the interests of her ally in the adjustment of the definitive treaty, and that as it was the earnest desire of the French Government to lose no time in concluding the peace, it appeared very essential for that purpose to limit as much as possible the number of the plenipotentiaries who were to be assembled at Amiens. He then promised to return me an answer to my note in the course of the next day, and ended the conversation by the strongest assurances of the determination of his Government to adhere strictly to the terms of the secret article.

His reply, however, of which your Lordship will find a copy herewith, did not reach me till a few hours since. I am sorry to observe that the farther explanations it offers are not more conformable to what appears to be the wish of His Majesty's Government.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Downing Street, Dec. 21, 1801.

I perceive from your Lordship's despatch, No. 13, which was received here on Friday last, that in the statement delivered by Mr. Merry of the sums expended for the maintenance of French prisoners of war by this Government, he has inserted the sums expended on that service by the Transport Board alone, from the year 1796 to 1801, and has omitted the statement of the sums disbursed by the Commissioners of Sick and Wounded Seamen, amounting to 1,132,692*l.* from the year 1793 to 1796, during

which period that Board of Commissioners had the direction of prisoners of war.[1]

Lest by an accident the last-mentioned statement should have been mislaid, I herewith transmit it to your Lordship; and I have to signify to you His Majesty's pleasure that you direct Mr. Merry to correct the statement delivered by him to the French Government, by the addition of the sums disbursed by the Commissioners of Sick and Wounded Seamen.

A more detailed abstract of this statement will be transmitted to your Lordship in the course of a few days; and the vouchers for the sums specified in it, as well as for those expended by the Commissioners of the Transport Board, are now collecting and preparing for the inspection of the French Government if they should require it.

I have, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Dec. 25, 1801.

In your despatch, No. 12, accompanying the projet of the definitive treaty of peace, there is a paragraph respecting the restoration of the French possessions in the East Indies, which I must confess that I do not perfectly understand, and of which I enclose a copy.

If it is meant to replace the *fortifications* in the condition in which they were previously to the commencement of the war, the works of Pondicherry, which were completely levelled by my orders immediately after the capture of the place, must be again constructed, which measure would not only be attended with an enormous expense to the Company, but be highly prejudicial to their interests and to the prospect of future tranquillity in that country.

The practice, however, which has been invariably observed by the French and English in India of destroying the fortifications of captured places ever since the demolition of Fort St. David by the former, and the provision in the fourteenth of the preliminary articles of peace, induce me to believe that it cannot be intended to replace the works of Pondicherry in the condition in which they were previously to the commencement of the war; and as I am at a loss to find out what other interpretation I can put upon the paragraph to which I allude, I am under the neces-

[1] The first sum was 1,238,950*l.*, making in all 2,371,642*l.*

sity of requesting that your Lordship will favour me with a further explanation.[1]

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Amiens, Dec. 25, 1801.

Brome leaves us to-morrow, which throws a gloom over our reduced society, as he has been very pleasant and contributed much to keep up our spirits. There now remain only Moore, Nightingall, and myself, of the original party: Mr. Merry lives with us; but although he is by no means an inefficient man in business, and has good qualities, he does not conduce much to our amusement. I am besides confined by one of those attacks in my legs and feet to which I am subject. Bonaparte certainly goes to Lyons on the 28th or 30th, to return to Paris in twelve days. This excursion, especially as Talleyrand has preceded him, will, I am afraid, occasion some delay in our business.

From what I have lately heard I am inclined to look on the Consul's situation as more precarious than I have done; and I believe that he will be under the necessity of taking some strong measures to secure himself. God grant that he may at least preserve his power until the definitive treaty is signed.

Littlehales assures me that Addington is perfectly satisfied with our proceedings here, and that he is determined to persevere in the support of Lord Hardwicke, and the line of conduct which I recommended with respect to Ireland.

I dare not guess when I shall be so happy as to leave this dismal town and the wretched society which it affords.

Most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY ADDINGTON.

[Private.]

DEAR SIR, Amiens, Dec. 27, 1801.

I have transmitted to Lord Hawkesbury the contre-projet, or rather an entirely new projet of a treaty which I received last night from M. Bonaparte, in order that His Majesty's confidential servants may be enabled to determine as soon as possible

[1] It does not appear from the French documents that there was any expectation of the fortifications being repaired before the restoration of Pondicherry, &c. The intention was merely to stipulate for permission to rebuild them.

on what principles the definitive treaty should be negotiated. I have desired to see J. Bonaparte to-morrow morning, and shall immediately acquaint Lord Hawkesbury with the substance of our conversation.

Unless the French Government had manifested a much more liberal and conciliatory disposition than we have hitherto experienced on their part, it appears to me that the present congress may last as long and terminate as unfavourably as that of Radstadt,[1] if we depart on either side from the letter and spirit of the preliminary articles.

The repetition of the proposal of our keeping Tobago, which the First Consul had before told me he considered as disgraceful, and to which he most explicitly declared that he never would give his consent, and the insertion of the clause respecting the Prince of Orange, whose interests had perhaps better have been left on the footing on which they stood after the conversation which I was authorized to hold with the First Consul, gave an opening to the introduction of new matter of every species, and of this the French Government have not failed to avail themselves most completely.

The relative situation of the two nations with regard to their territorial property and their political and commercial arrangements in the East Indies, not having been noticed in the preliminaries, must be understood to remain precisely in the state in which they were before the commencement of the war. But the security of Portugal against the operation of the treaty of Madrid, and our refusal to make any cessions at Newfoundland or in the Fisheries, which shall not appear just and reciprocally useful, cannot be better maintained than by a strict adherence to the preliminaries.

I have ventured to give you my opinion with the freedom of a friend, and have proposed the only mode which occurs to me for extricating ourselves from our present difficulties.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] The Congress of Radstadt opened on Dec. 12, 1797, and closed on the 29th April, 1798. The French plenipotentiaries left the town that night, but within half a mile of the gates were attacked by a body of armed men. Out of the three, the two who belonged to the moderate party were murdered, the only one who escaped being Debry, who in 1792 had proposed to raise a volunteer corps of 1200 men, whose business it should be to assassinate all Princes or Generals who should invade France. By whom the murder of these plenipotentiaries was ordered has never been satisfactorily ascertained, but many have not scrupled to affirm that it was done by the violent section in France, to excite the people, and to afford them an opportunity of charging a monarchical government—Austria—with this atrocious act. The Congress had previously been dissolved without being productive of any result.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Dec. 30, 1801.

You will see by my despatch, No. 20, that I have had long discussions with the French plenipotentiary, and that very little progress has hitherto been made; and I feel it as the most unpleasant circumstance attending this business, that, after I have obtained his acquiescence on any point, I can have no confidence that it is finally settled, and that he will not recede from it in our next conversation.

After what passed in my first conference with Joseph Bonaparte at Paris on the subject of Malta, and in my subsequent interview with the First Consul, you will easily judge of my surprise at the proposal of the King of Naples for guarantee. I talked very seriously to Joseph last night, and assured him that I was persuaded that our Government could not submit to accept of the King of Naples for guarantee, nor to make the article in favour of Portugal a secret article in the definitive treaty, and stated that he must be sensible from what he saw in our newspapers, that our Minister, even if he was so inclined, could not venture to do it: and I then observed how very ungenerous such a proposition appeared after the conduct of the British Government respecting the departure of their fleet. He appeared to feel what I said, and declared that he did not approve of proposing the King of Naples for guarantee, and saw no objection to the Emperor of Russia, and that he would immediately write in the strongest terms to Paris. But when the appeal is to be made to a man so devoid of honour and principle as Talleyrand, much good is not to be expected.

In no instance is there any show of candour in the negotiation; all consideration of what passed between your Lordship and M. Otto, and of the encouraging assurances which you received from him respecting particular points, are totally overlooked: nor, when I have urged them, has it been in my power to obtain an answer. Your Lordship will see how unfavourably this line of conduct must operate on several questions, and especially on the article respecting the maintenance of prisoners, when we are left to the bare discussion of the law of nations and the conformity to established usage.

I have thought it my duty to state the conduct of the French plenipotentiary and the spirit by which that Government appears to be actuated in the clearest manner, in order that His Majesty's confidential servants may be enabled to take precautions in time to prevent any serious ill-consequences from the sailing of the

French fleet; and I shall endeavour in our proceedings here to unite firmness with as much moderation as circumstances will admit.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Amiens, Dec. 30, 1801.

Upon meeting the French plenipotentiary the day before yesterday, agreeably to what I had the honour to announce to your Lordship in my despatch No. 18, my first endeavours were naturally directed to obtain from him such explanations and declarations as should remove the uneasiness which must have been occasioned:—First, by the omission in the projet from this Government, transmitted in that despatch, of the two articles inserted in the English projet, and always usual and necessary in such cases, by which His Catholic Majesty and the Batavian Republic cede to His Majesty the island of Trinidad and the Dutch possessions in Ceylon. Secondly, by a similar omission of an article which should stipulate for the integrity of the Portuguese possessions. Thirdly, by the following clause in the article on the subject of the restitution of prisoners, "et ce, sans répétition quelconque," which entirely lays aside His Majesty's just claim for payment of the sums advanced for maintaining the French prisoners. Lastly, by the substitution, in the article relative to Malta, of His Sicilian Majesty to be the guarantee of that island to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, in lieu of the Emperor of Russia, to whom no objection had been made before by this Government. My inquiries upon which important points I prefaced by asking again if it was clearly understood that the treaty was to be concluded in the two languages, as I had mentioned in my first conference at this place three weeks ago, and had particularly stated afresh in my note accompanying the projet which I delivered on the 21st instant, notwithstanding which, no answer has as yet been given by this Government.

After a long conversation upon the foregoing points, which really should have admitted of none, it was settled that the result of it should be stated by the respective secretaries in the form of a protocol, and that they should meet the same evening to compare and agree upon their statement, which should be signed the following morning by the plenipotentiaries. Mr. Merry accordingly drew up a protocol, of which I transmit a copy inclosed, and which, although unsatisfactory in many respects, was certainly the

result of the conference. Upon his meeting the French secretary in the evening he was surprised—particularly after the latter upon reading over his paper had acknowledged it to be exact—to be shown the draft of a statement full of corrections made by M. Bonaparte himself, replete with matter and expressions calculated to ensnare, to throw upon me the odium of the delay (which now appears but too evidently to be the aim of the French Government), and, upon the whole, to create a confusion in our proceedings. The two secretaries adjourned to M. Bonaparte's Cabinet to endeavour to come to an agreement upon the protocol. There the Minister himself said that he could not put his name to the paper which Mr. Merry produced. The latter resisted as strongly that which had been prepared by the French secretary, and only after a conversation of above three hours was able to get the protocol confined to the terms in which your Lordship will see it expressed in the copy which, not to bring our differences to any extremity all at once by a further resistance on my side, I consented to sign with the French plenipotentiary when I met him again yesterday morning.

At this second meeting, which also lasted several hours, I objected to the supposed absence of the Batavian plenipotentiary expressed in the protocol of our proceedings the day before, as a reason for any delay in inserting the article for the cession of the Dutch possessions in Ceylon, since that Minister had arrived at Amiens above a fortnight ago; and in order to bring M. Bonaparte to a more satisfactory explanation altogether on this important point, my objection, together with the proper answer which should be given to it, was stated by Mr. Merry in the inclosed minute as a second protocol to be signed by the plenipotentiaries. M. Bonaparte confessed that he could not but feel his embarrassment, because he did not like to put his name to an avowal of his having, even at this period, no full powers[1] to meet anybody but myself at the congress, a neglect which he wished me to believe had been personal on his own part by having omitted to ask for them. He therefore took up his pen, and, in lieu of the answer stated for him by Mr. Merry in the above-mentioned minute, drew up one deviating entirely from the question, and very ingeniously calculated not only to establish a system of delay in our proceedings, but again to throw the odium of it, to a certain degree, upon me. It being impossible for me to subscribe to such a paper, and the

[1] In a despatch to Talleyrand, dated Dec. 29, Joseph says he cannot admit that he has no full powers to treat with the Batavian Minister, and therefore is reduced to assign other and false reasons for his not being admitted to the conferences.

hour having become late, we separated upon a verbal assurance which he gave me, that, by a messenger whom he was about to despatch immediately, he would ask for full powers, in order to be able to call the Dutch plenipotentiary to the meeting.

Your Lordship will perceive by the protocol which was signed, and which is the only paper that can be considered as authentic, that the French Government do not as yet agree to the treaty being concluded in the two languages; that although they continue to warrant the cession of Trinidad and Ceylon, they still waive the insertion of the necessary articles to that effect till the Spanish and Batavian plenipotentiaries shall be present at the congress; that the payment of the advances made by His Majesty for the maintenance of French prisoners of war is attempted to be eluded;[1] that the stipulation by a secret article for the integrity of the Portuguese dominions is only consented to in a mode which can hardly be admissible; and that the difficulty on the subject of an arrangement in regard to Malta, is considerably increased by the French plenipotentiary still adhering to the proposal of making His Sicilian Majesty the guarantee in this case.

On the latter point I have to mention to your Lordship that M. Bonaparte pretended to acknowledge to me and to Mr. Merry that his answer on the subject of Malta was in fact an evasive one, and that it was calculated to avoid any particular explanation of the objection which his Government had to the choice of the Emperor of Russia as guarantee; because, as having already taken so great a part in the affairs of the Order, it would afford His Imperial Majesty such a degree of influence as might terminate in his acquiring even the territorial possession. But, my Lord, such an excuse being not only ill-founded in itself, but contradictory to what the French plenipotentiary has separately expressed to me, even since our conference yesterday morning, I am afraid that the only avowal which is evaded by the answer in the protocol, is that of the difficulty being made to procure a delay in the termination of any point whatever.

When our conference broke up yesterday we agreed to meet again as to-morrow.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] In the same despatch Joseph admits that if the statement of Lord Cornwallis, which he has no means of refuting, were correct, and that England had paid for the maintenance of her own prisoners, as well as of the French, France was bound to repay those advances.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Dec. 31, 1801, 10 o'clock P.M.

You will see by the conversations which have passed this day between me and the French plenipotentiary, contained in my despatch No. 21, that affairs are much changed for the better since I wrote to you yesterday. I cannot account for the sudden alteration, but conclude that it must proceed from some unexpected difficulties which have occurred, and which have induced the First Consul to press the conclusion of the treaty.

In this fluctuating Government, we must not feel too confident that this pacific paroxysm will continue, but it appears to be our interest to make the best use of our time. With respect to Malta I confess that I incline to the proposal of demolition, and this is no new opinion that I have formed; but I think that the other plan, however eccentric it may appear, is better than the idea of a Neapolitan garrison, by which we should be sure to be betrayed, notwithstanding the guarantee of the Emperor of Russia, whenever the French should insist on being put into possession of the place.

There remains now no material subject of contention, except the article respecting the prisoners, and when all other matters shall be arranged, I think it probable that His Majesty's confidential servants would rather consent to some considerable modification, than materially retard the signature of the treaty.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

PROJET FOR CARRYING INTO EXECUTION THE FOURTH ARTICLE OF THE PRELIMINARY TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE.

ARTICLE 1. The islands of Malta, Gozo, and Camino, shall be restored to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, upon the conditions and under the stipulations hereinafter mentioned.

2. The Knights of the Order whose Langues shall continue to subsist after the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, are invited to return to Malta as soon as that exchange shall have taken place: they shall there form a General Chapter, and shall proceed to the election of a Grand Master, if such election shall not previously have been made in consequence of the declaration of the Emperor of Russia of 16th March. It being understood that, as far as may be consistent with the provisions contained in the fourth article of the present arrangement, the Order shall be deemed to consist of those Knights only, who were qualified to

vote at the election of a Grand Master at the period of that declaration.

3. The forces of His Britannic Majesty shall evacuate the island and its dependencies within three months after the exchange of the ratifications, at which period the island shall be delivered up to the Order in the state in which it now is. Provided that the Grand Master, or Commissioners fully empowered according to the statutes of the Order, be at that time upon the island to receive possession; and that the provisional force, to be furnished by His Sicilian Majesty according to Article 12, be actually arrived in Malta.

4. The discontinuance of the French as well as the English Langues being agreed upon between the contracting parties, a *Maltese Langue* shall be established, to be supported out of the land revenue and commercial duties of the island. Specific dignities with adequate appointments, and an Auberge, shall be annexed to this Langue, the Knights of which shall require no other qualification than *actual nobility;* and shall be competent to hold any situations in the Order, and be entitled to every privilege enjoyed by the Knights of the other Langues. The native inhabitants of Malta to be admissible to all the municipal, revenue, and other offices under the government of the island.

5. The garrison of the island shall at all times consist at least one-half of native Maltese, and the Order shall have the liberty of recruiting for the remainder of the garrison from the natives of those countries only that continue to possess Langues in the Order. The native Maltese troops shall be officered by Maltese; and the supreme command of the garrison, as well as the appointment of the officers, shall be vested in the Grand Master of the Order.

6. The independence of the islands of Malta and Gozo, as well as the present arrangement, shall be under the protection and guaranty of Great Britain, France, Austria, Russia, Spain, and Prussia.

7. The perpetual neutrality of the Order of Malta is hereby declared.

8. The ports of Malta shall be open to the commerce and navigation of all nations, who shall pay equal and moderate duties. These duties shall be applied to the support of the *Maltese Langue* in the manner specified in Article 4; to that of the civil and military establishments of the island; and to a general lazaretto open to all flags.

9. The Barbary powers are alone excepted from the provisions of the preceding article, until a favourable opportunity shall occur for abolishing the system of hostility that has prevailed between the Order of St. John and those states.

10. The Order shall be governed, both in spiritual and temporal matters, by the same Statutes that were in force at the time of the surrender of Malta by the Knights, so far as the same shall be compatible with the several regulations herein stipulated.

11. The stipulations contained in Articles 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10, "shall be converted into laws and perpetual statutes of the Order, in the customary manner. And the Grand Master at the time of the restitution of the island, and his successors, shall be bound to make oath to observe punctually the said stipulations, which shall be observed by the Order for ever."

12. The paramount rights of the King of Naples over the islands of Malta, Gozo, and Camino, shall be formally recognised, confirmed, and *unalienably annexed* to the Crown of the Two Sicilies; in consideration of which His Sicilian Majesty shall furnish a force of two thousand men, in addition to the Maltese troops, for the purpose of supplying garrisons for the several fortresses upon the island, until the Order shall be in a condition to raise a sufficient number of men in the manner proposed in the fifth article. And the Grand Master, or his representative, shall renew at the time of the restitution of the island, the oath of fidelity to the Crown of Sicily that was taken at the time of the original donation of the island to the Knights; and shall likewise take an oath (similar to that which was taken by the Commissioners of the Order at the same period) to maintain all the rights and privileges of the people of Malta and Gozo.

13. The several Powers specified in Article 6, viz.: Great Britain, France, Austria, Russia, Spain, and Prussia, shall be invited to accede to the present arrangement.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret.]

MY LORD, Downing Street, Jan. 1, 1802.

Your Lordship's despatches, Nos. 16, 17, and 18, together with the contre-projet of a definitive treaty which was transmitted to you by the French plenipotentiary, have been received and laid before the King.

I cannot refrain from expressing the surprise which has been felt here on observing that the French Government, after having professed their determination to adhere to the preliminaries, should have thought proper to introduce so much new matter into the contre-projet of the definitive treaty; particularly as His Majesty had cautiously avoided bringing forward any new pretensions in the projet which you presented in His name: an indemnification

for the Prince of Orange having been under discussion antecedent to the signature of the preliminary articles, and having been understood to be reserved for adjustment in the definitive treaty if not previously settled, and expectations having been held out at the same time that a satisfactory arrangement might be agreed upon respecting the island of Tobago.

There are five points inserted in the projet of His Majesty's Government, and which are wholly omitted in the contre-projet of the French Government.

1st. That part of the article respecting prisoners of war which obliges the contracting parties to pay the debts due on account of their maintenance.

2ndly. The omission of any article respecting Portugal.

3rdly. The interests of the Prince of Orange.

4thly. The engagement to deliver up persons accused of high treason, &c., on sufficient evidence being adduced against them.

5thly. The separate article relative to the cession of the island of Tobago to His Majesty.

There are six points in the contre-projet of the French Government which are either wholly new, or were discussed and positively rejected before the signature of the preliminaries.

1st. The conditions on which the settlements and factories of the French Government in India are to be restored.

2ndly. The arrangement for the Newfoundland fisheries.

3rdly. The proposition respecting an establishment in Falkland Islands.

4thly. The engagement that the fishermen and fisheries of both countries shall be protected and considered as neutral in time of war.

5thly. The abolition of the salute at sea.

6thly. The proposed regulation respecting ambassadors and ministers of the contracting parties.

I shall proceed to give your Lordship the necessary instructions upon the several points, taking them in the order in which they are above arranged.

PROJET OF HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

1st. That part of the article respecting prisoners of war which obliges the contracting parties to pay the debts due on account of their maintenance.

By the 10th Article of the preliminaries, this question was to

be decided by the definitive treaty, according to the law of nations, and conformably to established usage. There can be no doubt that by the usage of modern times, the proposition of His Majesty's Government is completely borne out. In the treaties of 1763 and 1783, articles to this effect were introduced; and during the war, the justice of this principle has been recognised by the French Government itself, in the Arrêté of the Directory of November 29th, 1799, and in the letter of M. Talleyrand of November 17th, 1800, and has never since been attempted to be controverted in the course of the present negotiation.

Your Lordship is desired to press this point upon the French Government with all the weight its importance requires. You are at the same time at liberty to listen to any proposal which they may make (after admitting the principle) to secure to His Majesty an equivalent for the sums so due to him.

2ndly. The omission of any article respecting Portugal.

His Majesty has felt the greatest concern at the omission of such an article in the contre-projet of the French Government. This article not only makes a part of the preliminaries of the 1st of October, but has been distinctly recognised as a condition of the peace by the French plenipotentiary even at the time that he was objecting to the admission of a Minister from Portugal at Amiens. If you should find any difficulty on this subject (which it is to be hoped cannot be the case) you are at liberty, at a proper time and in a proper manner, to state to the French plenipotentiary, that His Majesty considers the adoption in substance of the 6th article of the preliminaries with the explanation and qualifications of the secret article, as absolutely indispensable to the successful issue of the negotiation.

3rdly. The interests of the Prince of Orange.

The first part of this article, which proposes the restoration of the property, real and personal, of the Prince of Orange, or that an adequate indemnity should be given to him, is of essential importance, and must be insisted on. The justice of this claim was never disputed when it was under consideration previous to the signature of the preliminaries, and the French Government can have no interest in opposing such an arrangement. The latter part of the article which relates to a territorial indemnification to the House of Orange for the loss of the office of Stadtholder, may be given up, provided it is clearly understood, that the omission of it in the definitive treaty shall not operate any prejudice to

such claims as may be otherwise made with reference thereto, by or on the behalf of the Prince of Orange.

4thly. The engagement to deliver up persons accused of high treason, &c., on sufficient evidence being adduced against them.

It is not necessary to insist upon this article if serious objections should be made to it.

5thly. The separate article relative to the cession of Tobago to His Majesty.

Your Lordship is referred on this point to the instructions contained in my despatch, No. 13.

It is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to insist on the cession of this island; although they consider the ground on which the article respecting Tobago has been brought forward by them, as by no means liable to the same observations as may be applied to the new pretensions advanced in the contre-projet of the French Government.

CONTRE-PROJET OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT.

1st. The conditions on which the settlements and factories of the French Government in India are to be restored.

Your Lordship is better informed on this subject than any other person, but it is the opinion of His Majesty's Government, that the article as proposed, as well as the article which follows it, are wholly inadmissible; and that it is not proper to grant to the French Government any advantages, with respect to their settlements, factories, or trade in the East Indies, which shall place them on a better footing than they were previous to the commencement of hostilities.

2ndly. The arrangements for the Newfoundland fisheries.

The French projet proposes that His Majesty should cede in full sovereignty the most important part of the island of Newfoundland, in consideration of the barren rocks of St. Pierre and Miquelon. An article to the same effect was introduced into the first projet of the preliminary treaty presented by the French Government, and was rejected by His Majesty. He will not consent to cede any part of his territory in this quarter, nor to extend the limits of the French fisheries. The right of fishery on the Great Bank and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, within a certain distance of the shore, belonged to the French before the commencement of

the war, and may be inserted in an article in the definitive treaty if desired.

3rdly. The proposition respecting an establishment in Falkland's Island.

This article was likewise brought forward in the projet of preliminaries, and likewise rejected. It cannot therefore form a part of the definitive treaty.

4thly. The engagement that the fishermen and fisheries of both countries shall be protected and considered as neutral in time of war.

It is wholly unprecedented to stipulate in a treaty of peace, any limitation of the powers which the parties may think it expedient to make use of in case of war. The experience of the conduct of the British Government at all times, is a sufficient security that they will be disposed to act with proper liberality. His Majesty will never consent, however, to place out of his hands in a treaty of peace, those means which may be necessary for the security of his dominions in time of war. This article was also rejected when proposed as part of the preliminary treaty.

5thly. The abolition of the salute at sea.

His Majesty cannot agree to this article. It is without precedent, and called for by no circumstances arising out of it, or connected with the war.

6thly. The proposed regulation respecting ambassadors and ministers of the contracting parties.

This article is new, and appears to be liable to some objections; but if any considerable importance is attached to it by the French Government, and if the giving way upon it will facilitate the other objects of the treaty, there is no sufficient reason for rejecting it.

The article respecting Malta is the remaining point to which I shall advert in the present despatch. The article of the French projet now proposed is objectionable on account of its insufficiency, and its omitting many points which I understood were agreed upon, particularly the guarantee of the arrangement by Russia.

The admission of a Maltese Langue, the opening the ports to the vessels of all countries on moderate and equal duties, and the occupation of the forts by a garrison under the King of Naples for a certain number of years, at the joint expense of Great Britain and France. If these points can be satisfactorily adjusted, His Majesty's Government will have no objection to the subjects of the British

and French Governments being equally excluded from the Order; and it will be an important additional stipulation, if it can be agreed that in the event of any war amongst the European Powers, the neutrality of Malta should be respected.

I have, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

RIGHT HON. HENRY ADDINGTON TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Downing Street, Jan. ye 2nd, 1802.

I have to thank your Lordship for two letters—one of the 12th and another of the 27th December—the first relating to the island of Malta, the second to the complexion and general state of the negotiation.

You will probably have learnt from Lord Hawkesbury that, in consideration of the natural strength of Malta, and of the reasoning which that circumstance suggests,—in consideration also of the difficulty, if not actual impossibility of an effectual demolition of the fortifications, joined to the knowledge we have obtained of the feelings of the Maltese, and of the sentiments and wishes of the Court of St. Petersburgh,—His Majesty's confidential servants are disposed, though not without diffidence and reluctance, to adhere to the alternative of preserving the works, and of incurring the eventual inconveniences, to say the least, of a Neapolitan garrison.

With respect to the course to be pursued at Amiens, it appears to me that no other can be prudently and safely taken but that of an adherence to the preliminaries, with the exception only of the claims for compensation to the Prince of Orange for the loss of his property,—a point to which great importance is attached by His Majesty, and which was eventually reserved for discussion by a distinct understanding between the two Governments. The refusal to enter into a suitable arrangement for the purpose of continuing Tobago in the hands of its present possessors is also deeply felt by the King. After all it appears probable that the principal difficulty will arise from the claim for compensation to the Prince of Orange, which perhaps will be got over by an arrangement with the Batavian Government, which appears to be desirous of cultivating a good understanding with our own—an object, the attainment of which would be greatly facilitated by an agreement on their part to do justice to His Serene Highness with reference to the matter in question. The fair objects of the negotiation are now so few, and the principles on which they

ought to rest so plain and obvious, that the final arrangement cannot be long suspended but by a wilful delay on the part of one Government or the other. We shall not, I hope and believe, incur that imputation, and, as your Lordship well knows, we certainly will not deserve it. Our conduct with respect to the armament which has recently quitted the ports of France and Holland, and our permission to La Crosse[1] to return to Guadaloupe in a vessel provided for him at Martinico, are, amongst many others, decisive indications of the sincerity of the disposition we have professed. A similar disposition on the part of the French Government in the remaining stages of the negotiation will ensure the speedy accomplishment of its object, and afford an encouraging and satisfactory prospect of a real reconciliation and a lasting peace between the two countries.

I beg your Lordship's pardon for having detained you so long, and will only add that it is an inexpressible comfort to me to reflect that the business at Amiens, as far as this country is concerned, is in your hands; and that

I am, &c.,

HENRY ADDINGTON.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, Jan. 10, 1802.

The difficulties which have occurred in stating in the protocol, the points which were agitated at my conference with the French plenipotentiary on the 3rd instant, as I mentioned in my last communication, have required two subsequent meetings to adjust; and it was not till late last night that the protocol to be signed by us this morning was finally agreed upon between me and M. Joseph Bonaparte. I have the honour to transmit a copy of it inclosed, as it has been signed accordingly.

The difficulties above alluded to, have arisen principally from the wish of the French plenipotentiary (manifested evidently by a variety of circumstances, with the detail of which it is not necessary to trouble your Lordship) at least to defer as long as possible[2] calling

[1] Jean Raimond de la Crosse, of a noble family, one of the few naval officers who at the commencement of the Revolution declared themselves Republicans, b. Sept. 7, 1760, d. Sept. 10, 1829; m. 1790, Mlle. de Keranguen, dau. of a Capitaine de Vaisseau. He saw a good deal of service. Commanded Les Droits de l'Homme, an 84, when she was attacked, in Audierne Bay, by two frigates, the Indefatigable and Amazon. She was driven on shore by them, Jan. 14, 1797, and totally wrecked. Out of 1600 men on board, scarcely 300 were saved. The Amazon was also wrecked, but lost only six men. M. de la Crosse, then a Rear-Admiral, commanded the Boulogne flotilla, 1803.

[2] In a letter from Joseph to Talleyrand, Dec. 29, 1801, he states that he could not admit the Batavian Minister to the Conferences, until he had received full powers to treat with him, and that he was therefore obliged, as he would not own the truth, to have recourse to some subterfuge.

the Dutch Minister to the meeting, for the sake of delaying the negotiation, if not to endeavour to make the insertion of the article in the treaty, expressing the formal cession of Ceylon, dependent upon the previous settlement of the claims which the Batavian Government has to bring forward, or, finally, for some other concealed purpose, which it is not easy to conceive. The inexplicable conduct of M. Bonaparte on this subject, which had filled me with suspicions and uneasiness, from the moment I observed what he inserted in the protocol of the 28th December in regard to the supposed absence of the Batavian Plenipotentiary, made me think it necessary to push this point to an issue: first, in order to bring to light any mischief which might be intended; and next, to accelerate the negotiation, by inserting in the protocol the observations which your Lordship will see distinguished by a perpendicular line in the margin. M. Bonaparte resisted the insertion of them at the time, and continued the same opposition till yesterday evening, when I only brought him to a compliance by adhering firmly to my demand. Your Lordship will perceive that it has finally answered the good purpose of securing the accession to the preliminary articles of the Batavian Republic without further difficulty. In consequence of the note from the Batavian plenipotentiary inserted in the protocol (which had been delivered a week ago) M. Bonaparte informed me that he would invite him to attend at our next meeting, which is to take place to-morrow.

His Majesty's confidential servants will also see in the enclosed paper, the long arguments which are adduced to resist his claim for the payment of the advances made to French prisoners of war; in addition to which, I am sorry to say, that from every expression which has dropped from M. Bonaparte, the decided resolution of his Government not to come to any compromise whatever on this head has been but too evident. It is therefore now become quite necessary that I should be honoured with His Majesty's final commands in regard to this object.

When M. Bonaparte insisted, on his side, upon inserting in the protocol his objection to acknowledge the communication which I made to him by a minute relative to His Majesty's pretensions in favour of the Prince of Orange, and the payment by the Batavian Government of the advances made for the maintenance of Dutch prisoners, I did not fail to represent to him that it was perfectly conformable to diplomatic usage to make communications in that manner, and that the same usage considered them as equally valid, even when made only by word of mouth in a formal con-

ference. The resistance, therefore, which he has shown in this particular must, I am afraid, be regarded as a strong indication of the intention of his Government not to admit the claims in question in any stage of the negotiation, notwithstanding the favourable disposition which he has manifested at different times to facilitate an indemnity for the Prince of Orange.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, Jan. 10, 1802.

In the occasional conversations which I have had of late with M. Schimmelpenninck, he has expressed to me his surprise at not being called upon by M. Bonaparte to partake in the negotiation of the definitive treaty, particularly since he delivered to that Minister a week ago a notification of the accession of his Government to the preliminary articles, and he has appeared to be as much at a loss as myself to account for the conduct of the French plenipotentiary. Having dined at my house the day before yesterday, he waited till the rest of the company had retired, to speak to me again on the same subject, when he said that the delay in regard to his participation in the proceedings of the congress as to the points in which his Government was concerned, had now become so long that he had determined to address himself directly to me by a note which he put into my hands, and of which I enclose a copy.

I did not peruse it till after M. Schimmelpenninck had left me, when, upon observing that his accession to the preliminary articles is only expressed in a conditional manner, I thought it necessary to lose no time in replying to it in the terms which your Lordship will perceive by the inclosed copy, and by which I have, more especially for that reason, taken the whole of his exposition ad referendum.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Jan. 10, 1802.

My despatch will show you that we are getting forward, although not with the expedition, nor perhaps with the success, that may be expected: I trust, however, that the difficulties which we have to encounter will not be overlooked.

Instead of meeting with a return for the liberal tenor of our conduct, we have found no kindly disposition upon any occasion, but have always been kept strictly to the letter of the preliminaries.

After what passed yesterday at our meeting on the subject of the *projet* for Malta, it does not appear probable that there will be much difficulty on any other essential points, except those of the prisoners and the Prince of Orange.

On the former of these, circumscribed as we are by the setting aside of all previous communication with M. Otto, I confess that I hardly see a prospect of our obtaining even the acknowledgment of a hopeless debt.

On the subject of the Prince of Orange we are likewise reduced to negotiate under great disadvantages, as well from the circumstance of the Prince's not having been noticed in the preliminaries, as from the delicacy which must be observed in making references to, or in any material degree bringing forward M. Schimmelpenninck, who, whatever his private sentiments may be, can only appear at a meeting of the plenipotentiaries as an humble and dependent ally of France.

I can, however, hardly believe, after what the First Consul said at Paris, that it is not in his contemplation to give his Highness some territorial indemnity; and the proposal for the resignation of the office of Stadtholder and the sequestered property belonging to the Dutch which is in our hands, will give weight to our further claims, in addition to which no practicable exertion shall be wanting on my part to endeavour to obtain a suitable provision for the Prince and his illustrious family.

I have not mentioned the recognition of the King of Etruria or of the new Italian Republics amongst the means of assisting the Prince of Orange, as it appears to be His Majesty's wish to turn those concessions to some advantage for the unfortunate King of Sardinia.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LIEUT.-COLONEL NIGHTINGALL TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

MY DEAR GENERAL, Amiens, Jan. 10, 1802.

. . . You desire me to tell you how we live and with whom we live. In answer to the first, I can only say that nobody need envy us; the only thing like comfort is on those days when we dine quietly at home by ourselves, and as for amusements,

there are none of any kind.[1] With whom we live might be answered in very few words; and indeed many of the male part of our society might, without deviating from truth, be called *rogues*, and many of the female part, with equal propriety, ——. This, you will allow, is not a very flattering prospect, or exactly the sort of society Lord Cornwallis would mix with by choice. We meet every day the same people, and always the same formal parties at dinner. The company consists of Joseph Bonaparte, who is rather the best among them, though he has not at all the manners of a gentleman; he means, however, to do well and to be civil. His wife[2] is a very short, very thin, very ugly, and very vulgar little woman, without anything to say for herself. The Dutch Ambassador is, I think, rather above par, and his wife, who has been pretty, has more the manners of a gentlewoman than any one here. The next in the list are the Prefet[3] of the Department (our English servants call him the *Perfect*) and his wife. He is a very ill-looking scoundrel, and was a member of the National Convention, and, being absent during the poor King's trial, sent his vote in writing, which was "la mort, sans appel" (as some of the members who voted for death wished an appeal to be made to the people). This man is not very likely to become a bosom friend of ours. His wife is a tall, plain, vulgar woman, therefore may probably pass for being more virtuous than some of the others. The next are the Mayor and his wife. She is good-looking, and has more the appearance of a lady of easy virtue than any of them, and I am informed she does not belie her appearance. These are the principal people: the other ladies are the wives of the French Secretaries of Legation, which, with the principal military officers and civil authorities, form the whole of our society; and I am sure you will agree with me, that it is a great deal too bad Lord Cornwallis should be obliged to live with, and be civil to, such a set.

We have generally one or two great dinners a-week,—dine once at Joseph's and once at Schimmelpenninck's, and sometimes

[1] The Municipality requested Lord Cornwallis to fix the hour which would suit him for the play to begin at the theatre. This he declined doing, but they found out that his usual dinner-hour was six, and they postponed the commencement of the performances to seven.

[2] Marie Julie Clary, b. Dec. 26, 1777, d. April 7, 1845; m. Aug. 1, 1794.

[3] Nicholas Marie Quinette, b. Sept. 1762, d. June 14, 1821. Originally a notary at Soissons. A violent republican, and voted for the death of the King, personally, and not by writing as Colonel Nightingall had heard. One of the Commissioners sent to arrest Dumouriez, by whom, however, they were seized, April 1, 1793, and sent prisoners to the Austrians. He and his colleagues were exchanged, Dec. 25, 1795, for the Duchesse d'Angoulême. Minister of the Interior, 1799. Préfet de la Somme from 1800 to 1810. One of Fouché's Provisional Government, 1815, when Paris surrendered to the Allies. Being banished as a regicide, he went to America in 1819. Latterly he called himself Baron de Rochemont.

with the Mayor or the Prefet. As there is no variety whatever, you are now in possession of our style of living at Amiens. Lord C. rides out every day when the weather permits, which is our only recreation; and when we dine by ourselves, it is always considered a great treat and a most fortunate event. I forgot to mention that when we dine out we get nothing fit to eat or drink, which does not add much to the pleasure or satisfaction of the party. Lord Cornwallis, I am sorry to say, has not been able to walk out for some time, having been much troubled with the old complaint in one of his feet, which prevents his going out during the frost: it is now a little swelling upon the heel. It is unlucky it should have attacked him just as this severe weather set in, for a little exercise on horseback would be of the greatest service. I am in hopes, however, that the frost is breaking up.

I remain, &c.,

M. NIGHTINGALL.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Amiens, Jan. 16, 1802.

I have not written to you lately, having nothing very particular to communicate, especially that I should have chosen to transmit by the post to Brighton; for in the business in which I am employed, my letters, which might be supposed to be written confidentially, would be an object of curiosity to speculators in money as well as politics.

You are by this time settled in town, and your letters will go to the Ordnance Office. I shall now, therefore, tell you frankly that I have suffered much uneasiness and anxiety, and at times entertained great doubts whether the French really meant peace, or whether Bonaparte did not wish to keep the door open, so as to enable him to take either line as might best suit his purposes for the security of his powers.

The negotiation, however, has now taken a more favourable turn, and will, I have no doubt, terminate pacifically; but the conclusion, I apprehend, is still distant, and we shall carry no points that would do any peculiar credit to those concerned in the embassy. Convinced, however, as I was of the ruinous consequences of our persevering in a hopeless war, I shall be satisfied if I sign a peace that will not dishonour the country, and will afford as reasonable a prospect of future safety as the present very extraordinary circumstances of Europe will admit.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.] Received Jan. 18.

MY DEAR LORD, London, Jan. 16, 1802.

I think it important to inform you that I have persuaded the Portuguese Minister destined for the congress at Amiens, not to press his claim to be admitted as plenipotentiary there. This removes a considerable difficulty. You will communicate it of course to J. Bonaparte, and state it as a proof of our wishing to give every facility to the negotiation consistent with our honour and our essential interests. The dilatory conduct of Spain creates great dissatisfaction here, as it is difficult for us to arrange our finances till the peace is actually concluded, and as Parliament must meet for the despatch of business before the end of this month, it will be impossible for Mr. Addington to bring forward the budget before the completion of the definitive treaty, and we may therefore be placed in a very embarrassing situation, and shall certainly be exposed to perpetual importunities. It is impossible, however, for us to conclude the treaty (consistently with the principles on which we have hitherto acted) unless Spain is a party to it, or unless it is understood in some way or other, that the restitutions are not to take place till Spain has actually acceded.

I am, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Received Jan. 18.]

MY LORD, Stephen's Green, Jan. 8, 1802.

I have been prevented, partly by a severe fit of illness under which I still labour, but principally by not knowing how to address a letter to your Excellency, from conveying to you sooner my sincere and grateful thanks for my translation to the See of Dublin,[1] in consequence of your Excellency's recommendation of me. The patent passed on the 8th day of last month, since which time I have been confined to my house.

Your Excellency's most important business proceeds, I sincerely hope, to your satisfaction. That it may soon be brought to a happy conclusion, and your Excellency return in health to your own country to receive the well-earned rewards of signal services and the tranquil pleasures of domestic happiness, is the sincere wish of,

My Lord, &c.,

CHAS. DUBLIN.

[1] From the See of Cashel.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

MY LORD, Amiens, Jan. 19, 1802.

It gave me great concern to learn by your Grace's letter, dated the 8th instant, that you have for some time laboured under a severe fit of illness, from which you had not then recovered. I trust, however, that you have by this time made considerable progress towards the perfect re-establishment of your health.

Although it was highly gratifying to me to be the official instrument in your appointment to the See of Dublin, I can take no merit to myself for a promotion to which your Grace in every sense was so eminently and so justly entitled.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Amiens, Jan. 21, 1802.

I trust that things are coming rather more rapidly towards a conclusion than they appeared likely to do when I wrote last, but in the whole course of the business I have found so much unsteadiness and tergiversation, that I dare not speak too confidently. What can be expected from a nation naturally overbearing and insolent, when all the Powers of Europe are prostrating themselves at its feet and supplicating for forgiveness and future favour, except one little island, which, by land at least, is reduced to a strict and at best a very inconvenient defensive?

I am afraid that matters are in a disagreeable state between us and the Turks in Egypt: the latter have certainly acted with the cruelty and treachery which have so long marked their character. I have, however, heard reports that give reason to suspect that there has been want of temper on our part. My information with regard to the latter, however, is very imperfect, and may perhaps be totally unfounded.

Brome has, I find, an idea of buying Sir John Call's[1] house, and I have encouraged him to do it; for as it is freehold, subject only for the next six years to a ground-rent of 120*l.* to the Duke of Devonshire, we should be sure at any time of nearly getting back the purchase-money, if we wished to dispose of it again, and it would be no objection that it was so near to Savile Row.[2]

Believe me ever most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Sir John Call, Bart., so created July 28, 1791, b. 1732, d. March 7, 1801; m. March 28, 1772, Philadelphia, dau. and co-heir of William Batty, Esq., M.D. He had served in India with considerable reputation as an Engineer. M.P. for Callington from May, 1784, till his death. His house was situated in Old Burlington Street.

[2] Where General Ross lived.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Jan. 21, 1802.

You will see that we have had our difficulties, and that if there had not been more temper on our side than there was disposition to accommodate on the other, the negotiation might now have borne an unpromising aspect.

The projet of J. Bonaparte for Malta will not come up to the wishes of His Majesty's confidential servants, but I am convinced that it is all that can be obtained; and, although I made the best battle in my power, I do not in my private opinion believe that a Neapolitan garrison would in the smallest degree secure the island from falling into the hands of the French, if they should at any time be determined to obtain possession.

As far as we can depend on what falls from M. J. Bonaparte *unofficially* in conversation, I am inclined to think that he will not seriously contend for any alteration in the article of the sequestrations; but I am convinced that both the First Consul and himself have decidedly made up their minds to resist the principle of paying for the maintenance of their prisoners.

Persuaded as I am that His Majesty's Ministers are not more sanguine than myself in the hope of receiving any part of the money, and that they would not think the object of sufficient importance to attempt the attainment of it by a renewal of the war, I conceive that we might set the question at rest without loss of honour, if the French would say that, although they do not admit the principle, yet, as the article was suffered to stand in the preliminaries, and as there were the examples of the two last treaties of peace between Great Britain and France in our favour, they would agree that commissioners should be appointed by both parties to examine the account, in order that it might be put into a channel of liquidation.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, Jan. 23, 1802.

. . . Your Lordship will perceive by the protocol agreed to yesterday, that, instead of detailing the arguments used on both sides on the several points to which it refers, we determined to abridge the work, and to state at once liberally those concessions which it was in our power to make. It contains, accordingly, my consent to adopt the form of preamble used in the French projet, as well as to admit the articles respecting a regulation of the

privileges of the ambassadors and ministers of the contracting parties, and that of M. J. Bonaparte to adopt the form used in the projet of His Majesty's Government, of expressing the restitutions which are to take place in consequence of the treaty instead of the detail specified in the French projet. For the rest, the protocol contains nothing definitive on any other subject. Your Lordship will see in it the fresh demands which are made, in lieu of those which I have rejected for some acquisitions to facilitate the French trade in the East Indies, as well as their fisheries on the coast of Newfoundland, on both which points I shall wait to be honoured with His Majesty's commands.

Although M. J. Bonaparte still resists the adoption of the article on the subject of the sequestrations, as it is expressed in the projet delivered by me, I have hopes that he may be brought ultimately to consent to it. . . .

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Jan. 23, 1802.

You will see in the protocol that accompanies my despatch, a long string of requests respecting India and Newfoundland.

Those which relate to the former were brought forward by M. Dupuy, the Secretary of Legation, who has been at Mauritius; and M. J. Bonaparte, although he gave them his sanction, did not appear to take much concern about them. I told the French plenipotentiary that I was perfectly assured that the extension of land at Mahe and the establishment of a Resident in the country of the Rajah of Travancore, could not be admitted, and that, although the circumstances of the other propositions were not accurately known to me, I thought it highly improbable that they would meet with the concurrence of the British Government.

If the Bengal commercial system should be *now* established at the other Presidencies, it might not only be fair and liberal, but be a means of preventing future disputes, if the regulations of trade, and the privileges granted to foreign European merchants were likewise assimilated, and it is very probable that such an arrangement may have been actually made.

But it will be enough to say at present that an inquiry will be directed into the inconveniences to which the French pretend that their commerce is subjected on the coasts of Coromandel and Malabar.

I shall not trouble your Lordship with any observations on their further pretensions with regard to the fisheries, on which subject you are better informed than myself.

At our conference yesterday M. J. Bonaparte repeated *privately* his sentiments, that no alteration should be required in the article of the sequestrations, but said that, as the interests of many individuals were concerned, he could take no step until he received an answer to the reference which he had made to his Government.

After this he proceeded to the article of the prisoners, which is the only remaining point on which we are still at issue, when he scouted *Vattel* as being no authority, and showed the most determined resolution to resist all payment.

When the conference broke up, I took him aside, and after expressing my surprise at the manner in which he rejected this demand, which had, I understood, been very differently received at the time of negotiating the preliminaries, I stated how very useless and unpleasant it would be to meet every day for the renewal of warm and unavailing altercations, and asked him whether, if I could obtain the consent of my Government, he would agree to a vague article which would at least save our honour, and proposed something like what I mentioned to your Lordship in my last private letter, assuring him however in the strongest terms that I was perfectly unauthorized in what I had suggested on this occasion.

He seemed well-disposed to agree to the appointment of Commissioners for the investigation and liquidation of the account, provided there was a secret article to prevent their being named till it was convenient to both parties, and then told me that he had received a letter from the First Consul, who informed him that he thought that I had understood what he said with respect to the Prince of Orange, when he saw me at Paris, rather in too strong a light; but, as he wished to show his disposition to be civil to the King, he authorized him to say that he would allow the engagement of the French Government to provide a suitable territorial possession in Germany for the Prince of Orange, to make a *public* article in our treaty. The publicity of the article is in fact the only boon, for the matter has long since been arranged with the King of Prussia and with Holland.

He then added, but not as being connected with the above, that he hoped His Majesty would be inclined to do the First Consul a favour, by acknowledging the Ligurian and Cisalpine Republics, which sooner or later must in the course of things be done. I answered that I was so far from being authorized to give

him any encouragement on this head, that I knew that His Majesty was not inclined to admit any article of this nature into the definitive treaty, and that I believed it would be very difficult at any time to induce him to acknowledge the Cisalpine Republic, unless some territorial provision was made for the King of Sardinia. I thought it possible that he might not be so averse to the acknowledgment of the Ligurian Republic under its present charge, but on this subject I could by no means make myself responsible.

I have perhaps gone a little further than personal prudence would warrant, but I have committed my Government to no concession, and by a step that will, I trust, materially tend to expedite the ultimate object which it is of so great importance to His Majesty's affairs that we should speedily attain, I have only rendered it a little more difficult for myself to support a contest, which, according to my conviction, could be productive of no public advantage.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Jan. 29, 1802.

In my conference yesterday with the French and Dutch Ministers, the latter on the subject of the Cape of Good Hope said, that he concluded that the right of sovereignty was to be acknowledged to exist in the Batavian Republic, and that no other nation should claim a title to have factories or commercial establishments in that colony; he proposed therefore that the word *commercial* should be omitted in the article, and that it should be confined to the admission of ships of every description belonging to Great Britain and France. M. Bonaparte made no objection, and as I was persuaded that the Dutch Minister was more apprehensive of encroachments on the part of France than of England, and that he knew as well as I did that nothing could be more prejudicial to the interests of the East India Company and of the British nation, than that the Cape of Good Hope should become the great mart for India goods, to be transported from thence in French bottoms to every port in Europe, I readily gave my consent.

I then showed to M. Bonaparte the article respecting the territorial indemnification to the Prince of Orange, and proposed that it should be added to the protocol; but he desired that it might be postponed for the present, and then told me privately that he had received letters from his Government directing him to withdraw the request which he had so strongly urged in favour of the Cisal-

pine Republic, and on the other hand to press in the most earnest manner the acknowledgment of the King of Etruria, to which, as he possessed no part of his Sardinian Majesty's dominions, he trusted the British Court would not feel so much repugnance. He then stated the anxiety of Spain on this head, and how much his Government was distressed by its embarrassing solicitations.

I answered that I could only repeat what I had before told him, that I did not believe that His Britannic Majesty could be by any means induced to acknowledge either the King of Etruria, or the Cisalpine or Ligurian Republics in the definitive treaty of peace, and especially the two former, but that, as he desired it, I would lose no time in transmitting his request.

I then asked whether I was to understand that his signing the public article respecting the Prince of Orange was to depend on the acknowledgment of the King of Etruria, when he replied that he would not say that it was, but he could tell me that he had as yet received no orders to sign that article.

I am to meet M. Schimmelpenninck to-morrow on the subject of the private property of the Prince of Orange, on which occasion I shall pay due attention to your Lordship's instructions.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, Feb. 1, 1802.

I had a meeting the day before yesterday with the Batavian plenipotentiary, for the purpose of discussing the points in which his Government is separately concerned in the present negotiation, as they are included in the projets for the definitive treaty, and are otherwise stated in the note which he delivered to me on the 8th of last month.

M. Schimmelpenninck manifested on this occasion the same good disposition he has uniformly professed, to see a perfectly good understanding re-established between the two countries, by acceding without hesitation to the insertion in the definitive treaty, of an article which should stipulate an indemnification to the Prince of Orange for the loss of his Serene Highness's personal property in Holland, as it is expressed in the projet of His Majesty's Government; and he, at the same time, waived his pretension to the unconditional restitution of the ships of war, which are held by His Majesty in the Prince of Orange's name, by adopting the expedient upon this subject, which I was induced to suggest to him,

as the only one to which His Majesty could possibly consent, of the value of those ships being deducted from the amount of the indemnification to be paid by the Batavian Republic, and of such an agreement taking place by a private convention.

M. Schimmelpenninck observed, that the words in the article of the projets, respecting the sequestrations, could not well be understood to comprehend ships, because they are not particularly expressed. He wished therefore a clause to be added to it, which should distinctly include all the Dutch property which was shipped in the British ports before the commencement of hostilities, and which was placed by Act of Parliament under the care of Commissioners.

Having represented to him, that I had as yet no other authority from His Majesty's Government than to say in general terms, that such property as had been seized and condemned as prize could not be restored, nor any equivalent given in lieu of it, and that only the property which had been sequestrated, exclusively of what stood in the name of the Stadtholder, could be restored to its former owners, it was agreed that the protocol of our conference should state the foregoing particulars only as propositions to be transmitted to our respective Governments, whilst he informed me that he could nearly insure the acquiescence of his, and that he should probably receive it in the course of a week. I transmit enclosed a copy of the protocol which was signed by us on the occasion.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Feb. 1, 1802.

I received on the 30th ult. your Lordship's private letter of the 27th.

You will be surprised to see the note from Joseph Bonaparte which accompanies my public letter of this date. Whether it is of essential consequence that he should have the full powers to treat with Holland and Spain, His Majesty's confidential servants will decide, but I confess that I am at a loss to conjecture for what purpose they are withheld; and although he has at different times shuffled about sending immediately for them, I can hardly bring myself to think that he would have committed himself so far in what he calls *private* conversation, as to admit in the presence of M. Dupuy, Mr. Merry, and myself, that he could not with propriety sign the article respecting the Cape of Good Hope without full powers, and

on another day to tell me that he had actually got the full powers to treat with Holland, if he had known that it was the intention of his Government to refuse them.

I took an opportunity of telling J. Bonaparte, at whose house I was on Saturday evening, that, although I had not yet received official answers to my references, I found my Government were hardly inclined to give credit to my account of the refusal on the part of France to pay the half of the expense of a Neapolitan garrison for a limited period at Malta, that they concluded from what passed at Paris that it was a matter arranged, and they thought it impossible, if the First Consul was really desirous of peace, that he should object to so trifling an expense, which was absolutely necessary in order to carry into effect the important article in the preliminary treaty of putting the Order of Malta into possession of the island, by securing the persons of the Knights from the violence of the people. He asked rather eagerly whether the Knights wanted such a force to protect them from the inhabitants, when I assured him that they considered it to be absolutely necessary, and urged him to write immediately to his Government, that he might be prepared, against my official instructions should arrive. There is however no great reason to expect from his late conduct, that he will go much out of his way to endeavour to expedite the negotiation.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Feb. 5, 1802.

(You will be surprised to see the question of a temporary Neapolitan garrison for Malta, not only totally rejected, but even treated as a novel proposition.) From what I have seen of the Government of this country, their present conduct does not surprise me, for in no instance have they appeared to feel themselves bound by any thing that has passed at private interviews, when it has suited their convenience to set it aside, and it was my apprehension of this line of conduct that made me so anxious to leave Paris, and to adopt a more formal mode of proceeding at this place.

It is now for His Majesty's Ministers to determine whether they will on this point break off, or give way, or bring forward another plan of accommodation, which may save our honour with those nations who have Langues, and who take a concern in the welfare of the Order, without leaving the island in its present formidable

state, to be seized by France whenever she shall think proper to take possession.

In the latter of these alternatives, I now see nothing that we can propose, except that we should hold Malta for three months after the signature of the definitive treaty, and give every assistance in the establishment of the Grand Master and the Knights, who should be invited to repair thither with all possible despatch. But if the Grand Master and a reasonable proportion of Knights should not arrive in that time, and there appeared to be no prospect that the Order could, within the limited period, be established in the island with any degree of security, that we should proceed to the demolition of the works. It is needless to enter farther into the details of the execution, until a decision is formed on the expediency of the measure.

M. J. Bonaparte read to me yesterday a letter which he had received from the First Consul, complaining in the strongest terms of the gross and scandalous personalities which were published against him in Le Peltier's[1] paper, and which he did not think the author would have ventured to insert, if he had imagined that they would have met with the disapprobation of the British Government. He expressly desired that I would myself state his complaint to His Majesty's Ministers, and observe that if we were at open war, when it might be allowable to animadvert on his Government and his public conduct, it would not be justifiable to use such vile means to traduce his private character; but that now his own feelings and those of the French nation must naturally be more affected, when the most malignant libels against the first magistrate of the Republic were published by a man who was known to be dependent on the Government now negotiating a treaty of peace and amity.

I repeated what I had often urged on similar occasions, respecting the difficulty in our country of repressing libellous publications, but M. J. Bonaparte gave me to understand that he well knew that there were means by which M. Le Peltier's writings at least might be controlled.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Jean Gabriel Peltier, d. March 31, 1825. At this time he edited a French newspaper in London, called 'L'Ambigu,' which was constantly filled with violent and personal attacks on Bonaparte, for two of which, in the 1st and 3rd Nos., practically advising assassination, he was prosecuted, Feb. 21, 1803, by Mr. Perceval, then Attorney-General, and defended by Sir James Mackintosh. He was convicted, but before he could be called up for judgment war was declared, and all further proceedings waived.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, Feb. 5, 1802.

I had a separate conference the day before yesterday with His Catholic Majesty's plenipotentiary, by invitation of the latter. M. d'Azara[1] opened it by a pretended frank explanation of his sentiments in regard to the political operations of the French Government, which he did not scruple to say that he knew to a certainty, were calculated according to a settled system of warfare, however sincere they might in reality be just at the present moment, in wishing to subscribe to a general pacification by the treaty now on the carpet. This he stated as a preface to his opinion, that the other Powers in general ought to endeavour to come to such an understanding amongst themselves, as should leave no room for France to interfere in the concerns between them, and by that means to succeed in embroiling them, and in finding a pretext to take a part in the war. Such an observation was, he said, particularly applicable to Spain in consequence of her close connexions with France. He therefore considered it as highly important that no material point of interest between His Majesty and the King his master, should, on the present occasion, be left for an after discussion, because it was uncertain how soon the First Consul might find it convenient to his purposes to renew the war. He was then as much surprised as he was concerned to find, that I had no proposition to make to him for renewing, by an article in the definitive treaty, the former treaties which subsisted between His Majesty and the King of Spain, and which had been annulled by the war, at least such of them as related to territorial objects (he instanced the British privileges in Yucatan), which had so often become matter of serious difference between the two Governments. He observed, however, at the same time, that perhaps it might not be convenient to renew every treaty except those of the above description, proposing very ably that in lieu of those which related to a commercial intercourse, a general stipulation should take place for its being renewed on a principle of perfect reciprocity, considering that without something of the kind there would be no footing upon which the commercial relations between the two countries could be resumed, without their being subject to great difficulties, such as might be productive of an almost immediate misunderstanding between the two

[1] The Chevalier d'Azara, b. 1731, d. Jan. 26, 1804. He was a great antiquary and patron of the arts, and made a large collection of objects of vertù—Mengs was one of his protégés.

Courts, which it was so much the wish of his Government to prevent.

With such palliations, M. d'Azara introduced the following demands which he said he had been instructed to make:—

1st. That the Portuguese territories in Europe should be declared to remain as they were settled by the treaty of Badajoz.

2ndly. That His Majesty should recognise the King of Tuscany.

3rdly. That Spain should be included with Great Britain and France in the privilege of navigating to the Cape of Good Hope.

4thly. That Spain should be allowed to navigate and trade to the East Indies, upon conforming to whatever laws and regulations may be in force in the British possessions in that country.

I of course only took these propositions ad referendum, without suffering myself to make any observations, except upon the last, to which I said that I thought it not improbable that there might hereafter be some communication between Manilla and the British settlements in India, which might be for the interest of both countries.

For the rest, knowing that the Chevalier d'Azara is completely upheld by this Government against his own, I must naturally suspect that his political observations, having been so unfavourable to the First Consul, were only calculated to serve as an introduction to his claims. I have, however, thought it right to detail them to your Lordship for whatever degree of truth and sincerity there may possibly have been in them.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Lord Hawkesbury, February 4, informed Lord Cornwallis, in answer to his several despatches, that the Cabinet were disposed to accede to most of the articles as provisionally agreed upon; but that they thought that the Ottoman Porte ought to have been inserted in the first article, as, whether they were an acceding or contracting party, they were equally parties to the treaty. England could not allow that the Batavian Republic had any claim for indemnity for the Dutch ships seized in British ports, but was perfectly satisfied with the proposed arrangement about the Prince of Orange. The recognition of the King of Etruria could only be agreed to, if Olivenza were restored to Portugal.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY LORD, Amiens, Feb. 9, 1802.

You will easily conceive the uneasiness which I have felt in consequence of the extraordinary protocol which was delivered by Mons. J. Bonaparte, and the desire that I must have had to sound him as soon as possible on the intentions of his Government. I proposed, therefore, when I met him at the Dutch plenipotentiary's on the 7th, to call on him the next day, in order that we might converse unofficially and with freedom on what had lately passed.

I had accordingly a private interview with him yesterday, at which neither of the Secretaries of Legation were present, when I told him that although I could not talk on business until I had received His Majesty's commands on the subject of our last conference, I was desirous of knowing, as far as he might think himself authorised to communicate to me, whether any change had taken place in the disposition of his Government, which I could not help suspecting from the style and tenor of his protocol, which differed so much from any of the papers that had hitherto been presented on either side during the course of the negotiation.

He began his answer by the strongest assurances that the desire of his Government for peace with our country was not in any degree changed; that although the protocol was drawn rather in firmer language, he trusted that there was no expression in it which could be said to be offensive, and he rather believed that it was occasioned by some ill-humour about the King of Naples, who was thought to take too much upon him with regard to his rights over the island. And he concluded by saying, as a proof of the wish of the French Government to terminate the negotiation in the most amicable manner, that he was directed to propose three articles for reciprocal engagements of friendly offices in the West Indian Colonies, which he would communicate to me at the conclusion of our conversation, and to express a desire that they might be inserted in the treaty, as a proof of our perfect reconciliation, and as an earnest of its permanency.

I said if the pacific professions of his Government were sincere, that any difficulties which their conduct on this occasion may have created might probably by some means be got over, although I confessed that any practicable mode of obviating them did not at that moment occur to me. He then suggested that our garrison should remain six months after the ratification instead of three;

that the Grand Master should in the mean time be enabled to recruit 200 men in each of the countries which had Langues, or to engage 1000 or 1200 men from some Prince in Germany; and held out the guarantee of the principal powers of Europe as the great and ultimate security. On this I observed that it must be a very powerful interference that would induce the Princes in Germany to suffer any person to enlist soldiers in their dominions; and that none of those of inferior consequence, to which class he seemed to point in his second proposition, would venture to allow the Grand Master of Malta to subsidize their troops without the consent of France. I hinted once, that if the only obstacle to the Neapolitan force had been of a pecuniary nature, means might perhaps have been found to have adjusted that business; but as Mons. J. Bonaparte took no notice of it, I did not think it advisable, in the present state of things, to press that subject any further.

Your Lordship knows from experience how little dependence is to be placed on these kind of conversations; but still it may afford you some satisfaction to know in what manner he attempted to explain and account for the conduct of his Government.

I am entirely ignorant of the present state of things in regard to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, not having heard whether any effect has been given to the measures which according to the papers transmitted by Lord St. Helens, and enclosed to me some months since from your Lordship, were intended to be pursued for obtaining the election of a Grand Master.

The nomination of a chief to the Order appears to be the most necessary and urgent of all measures that can be adopted, as being the most likely to relieve the difficulties under which we now labour, if we persevere in the plan of endeavouring to re-establish the Order in Malta; and it may be serviceable that your Lordship should communicate to me whatever information you may possess on the subject, as I may possibly be able to turn it to some advantage even in the present stage of the business.

In a conversation which I had lately with the Chevalier d'Azara, who is himself a Knight, he told me that Hompesch[1] was still Grand Master, from which office he could not be removed, according to the laws of the Institution, unless his resignation was accepted by the Pope, which in the present instance he did not understand to have been the case. There appears to me,

[1] Ferdinand Baron Hompesch, 69th and last Grand Master, and the only German one, b. at Dusseldorf Nov. 9, 1744, d. May, 1805. Elected Grand Master July 19, 1797, resigned 1799. He sold Malta to the French for a pension of 300,000 francs, which, however, was never paid. He received only a single sum of 15,000 francs about 1804.

indeed, in the whole of the business, to be an unlimited field for cavil and chicane.

I transmit two of the proposed articles respecting the West Indies, which I received from Mons. J. Bonaparte, and which, as far as I can judge, are unobjectionable. The third, which was contrary to the principles of our Government, I desired him to omit.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private and Confidential.]

MY LORD, Downing Street, Feb. 12, 1802.

. . . It is impossible for me adequately to express the surprise which has been occasioned by the conduct of the French Government respecting the proposed arrangement for the island of Malta; nor is it easy to conceive the motives on which the French Government are disposed, under the present circumstances, to resist that arrangement, which in fact originated with themselves, and which, as far as the interests of France are concerned, is the mildest possible application of the principle of the 4th article of the preliminaries—unless they are desirous that the negotiation should terminate in an unfavourable manner. In your Lordship's despatch No. 9, it appears that the French plenipotentiary actually proposed the plan to which he now objects; and though in subsequent periods of the negotiation several different projets have been brought forward for the arrangement respecting Malta on different principles from that to which I have before alluded, yet your Lordship had always reason to believe that these were brought forward as plans of preference, and that no serious objections would be made to the ultimate adoption of the first proposed arrangement. The form of the last protocol on this subject has excited as much surprise as the substance of it, and demands on our part an explicit declaration of the principles by which we are determined to abide.

1st. We are ready to adhere to the 4th article of the preliminaries in the sense and spirit in which it must be understood by all who read it—and in which sense and spirit it was actually understood by the French Government themselves—that by the insertion of the word *protection*, in addition to that of guarantee, effective and not nominal protection must have been intended. It appears by your despatch No. 9, that objections were made to the Emperor of Russia as protector of the Order, on account of the

right it would give him of introducing a Russian garrison into Malta, and of the effect his military possession of that island might have on the general system of Europe. It appears in the same despatch that when Naples was suggested as the protecting power, the introduction of a Neapolitan garrison into the forts of the island, was considered as a consequence of that arrangement. It is unnecessary for me to repeat what I have so often stated, and which the French plenipotentiary has never endeavoured to controvert, that it is impossible that the Order should be in a condition for some time either to maintain the independence of the island against any power that might attack it, or to support its own just and lawful privileges.

2ndly. The questions which by this article in the preliminaries remain to be settled in the definitive treaty are,—who shall be considered as constituting the Order; and who shall be acknowledged as the protecting Power.

It appears from what has been already said, that the sentiments of His Majesty and of the French Government were the same as to the nature of the protection to be afforded; but to prevent any ground for future cavil or dispute, it is advisable, and even necessary, to define as much as possible in the treaty, the nature of that protection.

3rdly. Naples has been hitherto considered by both of the contracting parties as the power to whom the protection of the island could be most properly, or rather least objectionably, entrusted. If the French Government now entertain any serious objections to this trust being conferred on His Sicilian Majesty, it is for them to propose some other Power to whom the protection should be assigned, and His Majesty's Government will be ready to consider such a proposition.

4thly. That the 4th article of the preliminaries—according to the sense in which it was understood by both the contracting parties—implied a right to keep a garrison in the island to a much larger extent, and for an indefinite time; and His Majesty notwithstanding has shown his readiness to qualify the article, by limiting the number of the garrison and the period of its occupation.

5thly. No effectual mode has ever been stated for providing for the security of the island, except by the introduction of troops belonging to the third Power, who should form a part of the garrison. His Majesty's Government must continue, therefore, to adhere to their proposition, unless the French Government can propose some other mode by which, in the opinion of His Majesty,

the object of the 4th article of the preliminaries can be equally obtained. I send your Lordship another detailed projet of the arrangements for Malta, founded upon the same principles as those which I have before forwarded, with little variation from that proposed by the French Government, except as far as respects the Neapolitan garrison, and calculated as much as possible to meet their ideas.

I have, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Feb. 13, 1802.

You will see by the paper which I enclose, that I have endeavoured to put the business of Malta again into some train of arrangement, without which we could make no progress. Many difficulties must undoubtedly arise, and much time will be required in carrying the propositions of M. J. Bonaparte into effect, if he should himself adhere to them, and if they should be adopted by our respective Governments. It would, however, at all events be advisable in my opinion, that we should take such steps as may be in our power to hasten the election of a Grand Master.

What the object of the French can be in obtruding their generosity upon the Dutch, and voluntarily undertaking to indemnify the Prince of Orange for the loss of his personal property, it is difficult to conceive, but we cannot suppose it possible that they mean to pay a farthing of the money.

I never saw a man more confused than M. J. Bonaparte was, when I mentioned the circumstance to him, and he seemed for a little time in doubt whether he should acknowledge or deny it; and then (although not with a very confident voice or countenance) he owned that his Government had two days before authorized him to relieve the Dutch from this engagement in consequence of their earnest request and the representations which they made of the losses which they had sustained, and particularly by the cession of their establishments in Ceylon. This required some effrontery, as he well knew that M. Schimmelpenninck must have told me a very different story.

Whatever turn this matter may take, it cannot fail to occasion delay.

The French plenipotentiary seems determined to press for some further indulgences at Newfoundland; but I am too well apprized of the importance of those fisheries to make the smallest

concessions without His Majesty's commands—and I have taken pains to discourage M. J. Bonaparte from entertaining any hopes that our Government can give way on that point.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MEMORANDUM.

[Indorsed on Lord Cornwallis's Private Letter, Feb. 13.]

After conversing upon other matters on the 11th February, when the plenipotentiaries and secretaries of legation had left their seats at the table, Lord Cornwallis said to M. Joseph Bonaparte, that he wished some propositions could be arranged about Malta so as to put that business in a train of being settled, and asked M. J. Bonaparte whether he (Lord Cornwallis) had not understood him rightly in conceiving that he had at their last interview, intimated an objection on the part of the French Government to a temporary Neapolitan garrison for Malta, even although the French should not be called upon to contribute towards its support. To this M. Joseph Bonaparte assented, at least as far as it related to a garrison composed entirely of troops of that nation, and gave as a reason, the strict alliance which had subsisted between the Courts of London and of Naples during the whole course of the war.

Lord Cornwallis then said that, as it appeared to be absolutely necessary that some military force should be for a time stationed upon the island, in order to put the Knights in possession of the Government, he wished the French plenipotentiary to explain what garrison he would desire; and added that His Majesty had no predilection for Neapolitan troops, and had proposed them only because they could be more easily obtained and were more conveniently situated than any others, and lastly because he thought they were the least likely to give jealousy or umbrage to France.

M. Joseph Bonaparte said that he thought that the most unobjectionable plan,—and that which came the nearest to the spirit of the preliminaries, would be to enable the Grand Master to subsidize such troops as he should think necessary for the purposes above-mentioned, from any Powers without exception that had Langues in the Order, according to his own choice and discretion, and that this would exclude both the French and the English, which was the most material point.

Lord Cornwallis asked whether he had heard of the election of a Grand Master, to which he answered in the negative; the former

then said that he concluded it must be a matter of absolute necessity that the English garrison should remain six months, as a measure of this nature could not possibly be carried into effect in less time. In this opinion M. J. Bonaparte entirely acquiesced. It was understood that the French Government were not to be called upon for any pecuniary aid.

M. J. Bonaparte said that he would immediately write on these points to his Government.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, Feb. 13, 1802.

. . . It could not but be with great concern that I have learnt from the Batavian plenipotentiary, that the separate arrangement which I had every reason to consider as concluded with him, for a pecuniary indemnification to the Prince of Orange for the loss of His Serene Highness's personal property, had been annulled by a communication recently made by the French to the Batavian Government, conveying assurances that the former would engage to provide a pecuniary, as well as a territorial indemnification for that Prince. . . .

I had luckily appointed a meeting to take place with the French plenipotentiary immediately after, when I did not fail to observe to him the information which I had just received from the Batavian minister, and to solicit of him an explicit answer on this important point. Your Lordship will peruse it in the copy which I also enclose, of the protocol which was formed of what passed at the conference, and will have the dissatisfaction to perceive that, instead of any confirmation of the engagement which France appears to have entered into with the Batavian Republic, this Government offers no more than to employ their good offices to procure for the Prince of Orange the indemnifications in question. This step on the part of France has probably been adopted for the double purpose of prolonging the negotiation, and of endeavouring to secure some concession from His Majesty in regard to the points of the treaty and the pretensions from hence which are still pending.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Amiens, Feb. 13, 1802.

I am sorry to say that for some time past we can hardly be said to have advanced, for, although we have gained ground on

some points, we have lost as much on others which we had a right to look upon as settled, and on which new matter has been brought forward on the part of the French. Every means is studiously sought for by them to occasion delay, and much pains afterwards taken to lay it at our door. God defend me from ever being again a negotiator! especially if I am to be opposed to two such characters as the French Plenipotentiary and his Secretary of Legation.

I can give no guess at the probable period of our being released, but I have assurances, *in secrecy*, that I shall be allowed to return when the treaty is signed, and that Mr. Merry will be appointed to exchange the ratifications.

Yours most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.] Received Feb. 15.

MY DEAR LORD, London, Feb. 12, 1802.

I have little to say in addition to my public despatches of this day. This is however a crisis in the negotiation, and must be considered as such. The proceedings at Lyons[1] have created the greatest alarm in this country, and there are many persons who were pacifically disposed, and who since this event are desirous of renewing the war. It is impossible to be surprised at this feeling, when we consider the inordinate ambition, the gross breach of faith, and the inclination to insult Europe, manifested by the conduct of the First Consul on this occasion. The Government here are desirous of avoiding to take notice of these proceedings, and are sincerely desirous to conclude the peace if it can be obtained on terms consistent with our honour. The business of Lyons, however, makes it important for us to be more firm than ever upon our own rights, and more determined to resist all new pretensions as far as respects British objects on the part of the French Government. If we do not adopt this as our policy, we shall be exposed to perpetual insults. I cannot believe that the French Government will be ultimately disposed to make any serious difficulty on the arrangement we propose respecting Malta, and they have an evident policy in concluding the definitive treaty, even if they are determined to break it in the course of six months. With respect to Peltier, I wish you would take a proper opportunity of stating to J. Bona-

[1] The First Consul had gone to Lyons early in January, and on the 11th met there the deputies of the *Cisalpine* Republic, said to have been 500 in number. Agreeably to a preconcerted plan, they offered to make him President of the *Italian* Republic, which he accepted on the 26th.

parte, that he has no connexion whatever with the present Government in this country, and that he is in the receipt of no pension or allowance whatever from them.

I am, with great truth, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

The Irish Roman Catholics took alarm at the article under which sequestrated property was to be restored. They thought that it did not sufficiently embrace the estates of the colleges in France destined for the education of the Irish clergy. The small number of pupils at Maynooth, only 200, could not furnish enough scholars to fill the annual vacancies in the priesthood, and they were therefore desirous of re-opening the French colleges. The President of Maynooth was accordingly sent to Paris to endeavour to arrange the business, and Dr. Troy earnestly solicited the interference of Lord Cornwallis. But it was not found possible to make any distinction in their favour, and they were placed on the same footing as other English creditors.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, Feb. 22, 1802.

You will see by the inclosed copy of a separate Protocol which I signed with the French plenipotentiary on the 18th inst., that I have demanded of this Government that the Ottoman Porte should be admitted, either as a contracting or an acceding party to the definitive treaty; and that I have communicated His Majesty's answer to the pretension repeatedly brought forward by France, of his acknowledging the King of Tuscany, precisely in the terms in which it is stated in your Lordship's despatch, No. 10.

I have made the same communication to the Chevalier d'Azara, and have also informed the latter minister of the sentiments of His Majesty's Government upon the other points proposed by him in a former conference.

Your Lordship will have observed the insinuation, as I reported it in my No. 34, which M. Bonaparte had thrown out, of the Spanish plenipotentiary having orders not to sign the treaty unless it should contain a recognition, on the part of His Majesty, of the King of Tuscany. The French Minister repeated the same to me when I made to him the communication above mentioned. I was therefore not only much but very agreeably surprised to hear M. d'Azara express distinctly and spontaneously the following day, in answer to the same communication which I then made to

him, that although it would have been very satisfactory to his Court and to himself, to have obtained the recognition in question upon his demand, His Majesty's refusal would be no bar to the conclusion of the treaty, which he, M. d'Azara, was ready to sign at that moment. To this declaration he added an explanation, that the recognition of the new King was in fact an affair more to be solicited by the French Government than by his own, since the former was under an engagement to procure it; informing me at the same time (with a request however that I would take no notice of the circumstance to M. Bonaparte), as a proof of the manner in which the affair really stood, that the latter was actually in possession of a letter from the King of Tuscany to His Majesty, which had been sent to the French Government to procure its reception by His Majesty, a circumstance which now explains the further propositions on this head which M. Bonaparte lately brought forward.

Upon my mentioning to the Spanish plenipotentiary, in answer to what he himself had suggested respecting the renewal of former treaties between Great Britain and Spain, that His Majesty's Government thought it might be advisable to agree to a separate convention to this effect, and at the same time to stipulate that the commercial relations between the two countries should be placed upon the same footing as they were previously to the war, M. d'Azara now explained, that in making the suggestion he meant only to allude to the treaty which defines the British privileges in the Bay of Honduras, which he had thought it might be advisable to renew, in order to prevent the immediate revival of former disputes, but that, with respect to the renewal of commercial treaties, he had no instructions from his Government, and that he knew it was not in their wish to enter into any agreement upon that head, or indeed to enter into any negotiation whatever, till peace should be finally concluded. The moment that event had taken place, communications on this subject might commence between the two Courts; indeed in order to be prepared for an immediate negotiation as soon as it should happen, he said that he would, if I thought proper, apply now for the necessary instructions. I however declined giving any encouragement to the idea, by observing silence upon M. d'Azara's proposition.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Amiens, Feb. 22, 1802.

I have had as serious difficulties, and have suffered as much painful anxiety of mind, as you have ever known me to experience, and you have been witness to some severe trials. The apprehension that an unguarded expression, or an error in judgment on my part, might be the cause of renewing a bloody and, in my opinion, a hopeless war, or, what would be still more dreadful, might dishonour and degrade my country, has constantly preyed upon me, and I have often wished myself either in the backwoods of America, at 200 miles' distance from my supplies, or on the banks of the Caveri, without the means of either using or withdrawing my heavy artillery. Temper and firmness have however, I trust, carried me through all dangers. The French Government have begun to lower their tone, and I trust that all will be well. We have no reason to complain of either the Spaniards or Dutch; they have shown on every occasion the most conciliatory disposition, and appear to like us much better than their allies. I cannot yet guess at the probable period of our bringing matters to a conclusion.

I will tell Brome and Lady Louisa, that if they want assistance in putting some furniture into their house in Burlington Street, they may venture to trouble Mrs. Ross. This is a busy day, and I write in great haste.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Feb. 26, 1802.

The French plenipotentiary in our conference yesterday, seemed more in earnest to bring the treaty to a speedy conclusion than he has appeared to be at any former meeting that has taken place since the commencement of the negotiation.

I told him that I was persuaded that the article respecting the Prince of Orange could not be admitted, upon which he said that he was instructed to deliver it in those words, but if our Government should refuse to accede to it in that form, and insist that France should engage to obtain the indemnities, they should acquiesce in our proposal, rather than put any serious difficulty in the way of the conclusion of the treaty. It is true that this is but unofficial conversation; in the present instance, however, I am inclined to give him more credit than by his former conduct he may appear to merit.

You will observe that in M. J. Bonaparte's protocol, he again mentions India; but on the arrival of the next courier from England, I shall communicate to him your Lordship's decided sentiment on that subject, which will be a complete answer to what is now transmitted.

The British Government is not committed in any agreement about the prisoners, but as we cannot hope to obtain anything on that score, and it would not be worth while to continue the war establishment and incur the attending inconveniences for any length of time, whilst we should be engaged in an unavailing contest of verbal and written altercation, it appears to me, when we have made up our minds on all other matters, that this disagreeable business cannot be more conveniently laid aside than by the proposed public and secret articles which I have now the honour to enclose.[1]

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, Feb. 28, 1802.

I take the opportunity of Major-General Craddock's passing, to inform your Lordship that I last night saw M. J. Bonaparte at the Chevalier d'Azara's, who informed me that he had received the powers which he expected from Paris relating to the Prince of Orange: I hope therefore that we may be able to bring that business to a satisfactory arrangement.

M. J. Bonaparte afterwards told Mr. Merry that he had said his last word with regard to Malta, and that if we wished for peace, it must be made according to one of the two last plans which they have proposed. He added, in his conversation with Mr. Merry, that we must come to a perfect agreement on all other matters before he could enter upon the indemnities for the Prince of Orange, but when everything else was adjusted, his powers enabled him to do all that he thought we should require. I have written these lines in great haste, as I am unwilling to detain General Craddock.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] The public article was, that Commissioners should be appointed to decide how much was due by each party, but by the secret article no such Commissioners should be appointed without the consent of both parties. It was notorious that France would never agree to any appointment; but by the wording of the two articles the rights of England were maintained, and in 1815 a large sum was paid on account of these very claims.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, Feb. 28, 1802.

I had the honour to transmit to your Lordship in my last despatch, the copy of a letter which I had written to Aly Effendy at Paris. The messenger whom I despatched with it has just returned with the answer, which you will see by the inclosed copy.

This answer seems to be perfectly distinct in that part where it states, that if I consent to his negotiating a separate treaty at Paris, he has sufficient instructions so to do. It cannot but appear to me obvious, that His Majesty's Government may feel great inconvenience in allowing a definitive treaty to be concluded separately between France and the Porte, upon the basis of the preliminaries; by which separate negotiation, particularly when carried on with a Minister so devoted to France as Aly Effendy is known to be, there can be little doubt that this Government would obtain greater advantages with respect to the Porte than are held out by the preliminaries. This reflection has then, made me think it necessary to lose no time in referring so important a point for the decision of His Majesty's confidential servants, and is the occasion of my despatching the present messenger.

I should add, that when I conversed on this subject with M. Bonaparte, at the time when I demanded the admission of the Porte to be either a contracting or an acceding party to the definitive treaty, he observed, that if His Majesty's Government had no other wish than to place the Porte completely at peace with France, it might be sufficient to insert an article (in addition to that which stipulates for the integrity of the Turkish dominions) by which the treaty should be declared common to the Porte. His Majesty's confidential servants will determine how far it may be advisable to adopt such an expedient, for the purpose on the one hand of avoiding delay of a reference to Constantinople, and on the other of preventing the necessity of Aly Effendy's entering into a negotiation at Paris which might be disadvantageous to the Porte.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

THE RIGHT HON. HENRY ADDINGTON TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Secret.]

MY DEAR LORD, Downing Street, March y^e^ 2nd, 1802, 10 P.M.

The present state of my family,[1] though less distressing than it has been (as well as that of my own health) will not allow

[1] The dangerous illness of one of his daughters.

me to write to your Lordship so fully as I had once intended. I am however the less disposed to regret this inability, as I understand that an ample communication from Lord Hawkesbury will accompany the public despatches. Every consideration arising from public feeling and public convenience, indicates the importance of bringing the business at Amiens to a speedy termination. Notwithstanding the fresh causes of dissatisfaction and distrust which have been afforded by the French Government, I remain convinced that a definitive treaty on the basis of the preliminaries should continue to be our object; but it is not fit that we should seek for the attainment of peace by means which could not fail to diminish its security, if they did not immediately defeat their own purpose, by giving birth to new projects and additional pretensions. Under this impression, His Majesty's servants think it right to adhere to their determination, which after much consideration has been unanimous, and which, I am sure, is called for by what is due to the honour of His Majesty, as well as to the character and true interests of this country.

I am grieved to think that your situation must have been in many respects extremely uncomfortable, but I am persuaded that you will never reflect upon it with regret; particularly if the business should terminate as I am convinced we both sincerely wish, and, as I must own, I am induced to expect from the tenor of your Lordship's last despatches.

With the truest respect and regard,

I am, &c.,

HENRY ADDINGTON.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, March 10, 1802.

Your No. 13, enclosing a fresh and definitive projet of an arrangement on the subject of Malta, having reached me on the 5th instant, I lost no time in appointing a meeting to take place with the French plenipotentiary on the following day, when I laid before him a protocol, which I had prepared in consequence of the instructions contained in that despatch, conceived in the terms which your Lordship will see by the enclosed copy.

M. Bonaparte presented at the same time, a protocol which he also had prepared, containing some general and ill-founded observations on the state of the negotiation, by way of preface to a projet of a definitive treaty which he brought forward. I have the honour to transmit enclosed a copy of this paper.

Having at the opening of our conference on that day, acquainted the French Minister with the dissatisfaction which had been occasioned to His Majesty's Government, by the long protraction of the negotiation, and by the seeming unwillingness on the part of France to bring it to a termination on just and reasonable grounds, he renewed his assurances of the sincere disposition which was felt by his Government to arrive, as soon as possible, at a pacification, and conceived that he had given a proof of it, on the one hand, by having offered in the preface to his protocol to increase the Neapolitan garrison for Malta to two thousand men, and, on the other, by having inserted in his projet of a treaty, an article for an indemnification to the Prince of Orange for all His Serene Highness's losses, in such terms as he considered might be fully satisfactory to His Majesty's Government. Finding however by the protocol which I had presented, that we were still considerably at variance on the subject of Malta, and his instructions on that head being equally positive as those which I had received, he proposed that we should endeavour to find a mode of accommodating the redaction of that article, as nearly as possible to the ideas and intentions of both Governments.

The projet of which I enclose a copy was accordingly drawn up. Your Lordship will I trust find it sufficiently conformable, in the most essential point—that of the garrison, to what His Majesty's confidential servants have thought necessary on this head. The French Minister having persisted in his objections to the insertion of the declaration of the Emperor of Russia, as a rule by which the proceedings as to the election of a Grand Master should be governed, on the ostensible principle that such an insertion might give offence to other Powers; I say, my Lord, those objections having been persisted in so strongly by M. Bonaparte that I could not possibly overcome them, I adopted in lieu of the clause which should specify the Emperor's declaration, the explanation which you will see in the projet commencing with the words "Il est entendu" to the end of that paragraph, the last sentence of which, in the following words, "et de concert avec les principales Puissances de l'Europe, intéressées au rétablissement de l'Ordre de St. Jean de Jérusalem," may, I hope, be considered as conveying the same meaning as the declaration in question. But after all the modifications to which I had agreed, the French Plenipotentiary still found the projet in regard to Malta so wide of that upon which he had been instructed to insist, and which is inserted in the above-mentioned protocol that he told me he could not finally agree to it without referring to his Government, as he

promised to do immediately, whilst he wished me, on my side, to refer also his projet and observations to mine. I then let him know distinctly, that I could make no farther reference on the subject of Malta, the instructions I had received being so definitive, that I even doubted whether the modifications I had consented to would be approved; and that I could even make no report to my Government before I had received his answer. Upon this it was settled that we should meet again as yesterday.

Notwithstanding that M. Bonaparte's conversation on that occasion seemed to bear altogether a very conciliatory tendency, I deemed it important for whatever might still possibly be the result of the negotiation, to prepare, against our next meeting, an answer, as well to refute several of the observations stated in the protocol which he had presented, as to express the inadmissibility of the two new articles in his projet of a definitive treaty—the one declaring the treaty to be common to the Ligurian Republic, the other (a secret one) stipulating for the continuance of the French troops at Otranto till Malta should be evacuated by the British, and to require the rectification of some alterations which he had made in articles already agreed upon, and which you will see pointed out in the margin of the paper.

I accordingly laid before him yesterday the answer, which your Lordship will see by the enclosed copy of it.

I must preface my report of what passed at this second meeting by mentioning that, at the close of our former conference, M. Bonaparte had said, that if the article touching the prisoners, which I had told him I was daily expecting to receive, drawn up by His Majesty's Ministers, should be expressed in terms which could be admitted by him, he had great hopes of our arriving at once at a conclusion of the business. His first inquiry then yesterday was whether I had received that article. Upon my replying in the negative, he observed that matters were becoming in a very critical situation between the two countries, in consequence of the information which his Government had received of the warlike preparations which had been recommenced in England in the naval line, and that it was therefore extremely important that the jealousies and uneasiness, which must naturally be excited on both sides by such measures, should be completely removed with as little delay as possible, by the conclusion of the definitive peace. He then informed me, that I might rely upon the acquiescence of his Government in the proposal with respect to Malta, as it is stated in the above-mentioned paper: but that he was not authorized to sign that consent till the point respecting the prisoners should

be adjusted. At the same time he gave me to understand, that he would withdraw the articles inserted in his projet of a treaty in regard to the Ligurian Republic and the continuance of the French troops at Otranto, if His Majesty's Government should ultimately refuse to admit them; whilst he also consented to rectify the articles which he had altered, according to the words in which they had already been agreed upon.

I have now to state, that the messenger Basset having arrived here the day before yesterday, with your Lordship's final instructions to me on the subject of the Ottoman Porte, I lost no time in sending him on to Paris, with an answer to Aly Effendy, of which I enclose a copy, and in preparing a reply to what the French plenipotentiary had set forth in writing on this head at a former conference, to be ready against our meeting yesterday.

Accordingly, I also laid before him a protocol on this subject, to the effect which your Lordship will see by the enclosed copy.

M. Bonaparte, upon perusing it, entered into a long explanation of the state of things between France and the Ottoman Porte, and of what he knew to be the nature of Aly Effendy's instructions, which, if he came to Amiens, would require the presence here also of the Russian Minister, because the Porte had ordered him to concert his operations with the latter as much as with me, for which reasons M. Bonaparte urged strongly the adoption of what he had proposed on this subject in the protocol of the 21st of last month, offering to enter into any engagement I might think proper to that effect, in order to induce me to desist from my demand; but upon my adhering stedfastly to it, he said finally that he would transmit the paper to Paris without delay, and he gave me great reason to hope, from the desire his Government had to accelerate the peace, that the Porte would be admitted as an acceding party to the treaty.

Your Lordship will observe the addition which the French Minister has made to the article in his projet, which defines the limits of the Portuguese and French territories in Guiana, declaring that the frontier between Spain and Portugal, in Europe, is to be regulated according to the stipulation in the treaty of Badajoz. I naturally objected, in the strongest manner, to such an insertion, whilst M. Bonaparte contended that, his Government having consented to make a public article of the stipulations respecting the frontiers in Guiana, which had only been inserted in a secret one in the preliminary treaty, and the integrity of the Portuguese dominions having been expressed in a public article of the preliminaries, it was indispensably necessary that a public explanation on

the subject should take place in the definitive treaty. They owed it to themselves, and they owed it to Spain. Sensible, however, that such an insertion would meet with opposition on our side, he had taken pains to word it in such a general way, as, he flattered himself, would render it the least objectionable. This was all he could do, for he did not think the clause could possibly be withdrawn.

In regard to the manner in which the 18th article of the French projet of a treaty, now transmitted, is expressed, the French plenipotentiary explained to me that the Prince of Orange had never been known even to the former Government of this country by that title; that therefore in a formal stipulation it could not be mentioned, whilst he thought that the words by which his Serene Highness is described in the article would fully explain the person to whom it alluded.

Having now, my Lord, had the honour to state to you the most material circumstances of my two last conferences with the French Minister, I have the satisfaction to conclude this report, by observing, that M. Bonaparte manifested throughout not only a sincere disposition but an anxiety to come, with as little delay as possible, to a happy termination of our discussion, upon which seemingly favourable inclination I ground my hopes that the points on which he has not yet acquiesced in writing (on the contrary, his written answers to my protocols express an adherence to his former declarations) will ultimately be acceded to by the French Government. At the close of our conference yesterday evening he expressed so much eagerness to see peace re-established definitely between the two countries, as to say that he trusted it would take place immediately upon my receiving an answer from your Lordship, with the article respecting the prisoners conceived in admissible terms, and that he hoped I would be authorized to conclude the treaty at once without further reference.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

P.S. Whilst the foregoing despatch was transcribing, I had the satisfaction to receive from the French plenipotentiary an official note (in his own handwriting) of which I enclose a copy, and with which he accompanied the passport for the messenger. The two words in it "et autres," which follow the words "sur l'article des prisonniers," I imagine meant to apply principally to the articles respecting the Ligurian republic, and the continuance of the French troops at Otranto till Malta shall be evacuated by the British.

On March 7, Napoleon Bonaparte wrote to Joseph to say that the French and English projets about Malta differed in his opinion very little; and on the 8th he agreed, though unwillingly, to accept the phrase, "La Sublime Porte est invitée à accéder à ce présent traité," but urged the conclusion of the treaty, which he expected to hear of the following day.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO MAJOR-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Amiens, March 10, 1802.

I have only time to tell you that I am much more easy in my mind than I have been.

The business here is of such a nature as perhaps to tempt people who ought to be trustworthy, to peep into a letter from me directed to a confidential friend; I have therefore determined not to trust to their honesty, and to be silent on political points.

Yours truly affectionate,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY ADDINGTON.

DEAR SIR, Amiens, March 10, 1802.

You will see by my letters to Lord Hawkesbury, and especially by the copy of a note which I have just received from M. J. Bonaparte, that things are going on as well as possible, on which I very sincerely congratulate you.

It will be a more gratifying reflexion for me in the decline of life to have been the instrument in bringing the negotiation to a successful and honourable issue, and I shall feel a pride in having received so strong a mark of your confidence as to be selected for so arduous and important an undertaking.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, March 10, 1802.

Although it does not appear by my public despatch that much has actually been done, yet, from the manner and expression of M. J. Bonaparte, I feel very confident that our business here is drawing speedily to a favourable conclusion, unless some unexpected change of humour should intervene.

It was not without much uneasiness that I ventured to deviate from the letter, although I trust that I have not done so from the spirit, of your instructions with regard to Malta; but as nearly the words, as well as the sentiments of the Emperor of Russia are adopted with regard to the qualification of the Knights and the steps for proceeding to the election of a Grand Master, that monarch cannot in my opinion be offended; and at the moment when this most difficult and important article was on the point of being settled, I thought it of the utmost consequence to remove all pretext for further reference and delay.

The present arrangement has an advantage over that which was proposed, as far as it goes to remove any plausible excuse that either of the principal Powers might have made for declining to become a guarantee.

I should wish that your Lordship would send over with all convenient despatch the article of the prisoners, about which the French plenipotentiary expresses much impatience, and I am persuaded that I need not urge you to use every means in your power to hasten the further necessary steps for the completion of the great work of peace.

You will naturally choose to translate the treaty in England, but it would greatly expedite the business if you could allow us to make small verbal alterations, to satisfy any doubts or objections that may arise in the discussion with the French Legation when the treaties are read over and compared, without waiting for the result of a reference. I should not readily undertake this task if I did not place the greatest reliance on the abilities, experience, and correctness of Mr. Merry, whose talents and assiduity merit every degree of praise that I can bestow, and will I hope give him a claim to the favourable attention of Government.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, March 13, 1802.

I have now the honour to report to your Lordship the satisfactory result of a conference I had yesterday with the French plenipotentiary, and of another which I held this evening with that Minister, and with those of his Catholic Majesty and of the Batavian Republic.

At my meeting yesterday with M. Joseph Bonaparte, he acquainted me with the final acquiescence of his Government in the

just demand made by His Majesty of the Ottoman Porte being admitted as an acceding party to the definitive treaty, and he consented to withdraw his pretensions altogether on the subject of the French troops remaining in the Neapolitan States till Malta should be evacuated by the British, upon my agreeing to insert in the paragraph (the 4th) of the article respecting Malta which stipulates the evacuation, the words "ou plutôt si faire se peut," after the word "ratifications."

Those material difficulties to the conclusion of the treaty being thus removed, we proceeded to consider of what was still wanting to complete it, when I renewed my demand for the insertion of the article which had been originally proposed by His Majesty's Government for the delivery respectively by the contracting parties of persons accused of crime, and of that article which stands as the 19th in the projet of a treaty transmitted to me by your Lordship (but which had been omitted in all the French projets), containing the usual engagement of the contracting parties to observe the treaty and to cause it to be observed by their citizens and subjects. To the latter the French plenipotentiary readily acceded, upon my explaining to him the necessity of it; but in regard to the former, he repeated the general objections which he had at first stated, and particularly those which occurred to the word "high-treason," a word which was not known in the present laws of France. Upon my consenting, however, to add to that word, which was applicable to the British laws, an expression to the same effect which should suit the French Government, and which he suggested in the words, "ou de conspiration contre la sûreté et le régime intérieur de l'Etat," he agreed to the article in other respects in the terms in which it is expressed in your Lordship's projet.

The other articles of the treaty which had been already agreed upon, but in which M. Bonaparte had made some alterations, as I had the honour to observe to your Lordship in my despatch, No. 43, were then rectified according to the words in which they had before been expressed, and we altered slightly those of some other articles, in order that their meaning might be more clearly explained.

Having thus arranged definitively every article of the treaty which regarded His Majesty and the French Republic separately, except that respecting the prisoners, it was settled that we should hold a meeting this evening with the Spanish and Batavian plenipotentiaries in order to come to a conclusion with them upon the stipulation in which they were concerned.

Upon this occasion M. de Schimmelpenninck resisted strongly

the pretension which the Chevalier d'Azara brought forward, and in which he was supported by M. Bonaparte and by me, to be admitted to an equal participation with Great Britain and France in the right of navigating to the Cape of Good Hope; whilst he opposed as forcibly the point, upon which I insisted, of its being clearly expressed that the ships of the contracting parties should be liable to pay no duties or charges upon the vessels. Upon its having however been taken into consideration that there would probably be some port charges (such as are usual at most ports) to which even Dutch ships are liable, it was finally settled, upon the Batavian plenipotentiary waiving his objection to the admission of Spanish ships, that the article should be worded so as to secure the ships of the other contracting parties from the payment of any other duties or charges than those to which Dutch ships should be subject.

There only then remained to adjust the article which regards the cession of the Dutch possessions in Ceylon to His Majesty. The redaction of this article, as it was proposed by M. Schimmelpenninck in the protocol which I transmitted in my despatch, No. 36, appeared to me, for the reasons which were then explained, to be preferable to that which had been adopted in your Lordship's projet, whilst your subsequent silence on this head has made me imagine that you may have acquiesced in it. I should however have deferred giving a final answer on the subject till I had had a reply from you, had not the French plenipotentiary now pressed very strongly that the conference might not be adjourned without the parties coming to a definitive agreement upon every point, that of the prisoners always excepted. I therefore consented to adopt that version of the article in question.

With this the whole treaty was settled, and I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship inclosed a copy of it, as it is to be signed as soon as I receive from you the article touching the prisoners, which is now the only one wanting.

I have to add, that our agreement in regard to the substance, was followed by a difference as to the form of the treaty, in consequence of the Chevalier d'Azara having insisted that the Spanish language should be used as well as the English and French. This difficulty was, however, at length removed by a proposal which was suggested, and in which M. Schimmelpenninck acquiesced, that a separate article should be added to the treaty, similar to that which it has been usual to insert on other occasions, and which took place in the definitive treaty of 1783, expressing that the two

languages which are now to be used, shall not prejudice in any manner, either of the other two contracting parties whose particular languages are not used.

The words of the separate article in question are to be agreed upon to-morrow with the Spanish and Batavian plenipotentiaries.

Upon the whole, I trust His Majesty's confidential servants will not find in the treaty I inclose, any material deviation from the literal tenor of the instructions which your Lordship has from time to time communicated to me from His Majesty. It would doubtlessly have been a most heartfelt satisfaction to me, if circumstances could possibly have allowed of my obtaining any advantage beyond them.

It is meant that the treaty shall be signed as soon as I receive from your Lordship the remaining article, and as soon as the English translation can be made.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY LORD, Downing Street, March 14, 1802.

Your Lordship's despatches, Nos. 43 and 44, were received here late on Friday night, and have been laid before the King.

At the same time that His Majesty has felt great satisfaction at the apparent change of disposition in the French Government, and at their desire of concluding the definitive treaty on terms conformable to the preliminaries, it is notwithstanding of the utmost importance that no further delay whatever should arise in bringing this business to an issue. I send you therefore a draft of a definitive treaty. In drawing it up, every endeavour has been made to render it as far as possible conformable to the last projet delivered to you by the French plenipotentiary. You will immediately communicate this draft to the plenipotentiaries of the other Powers, and you are authorized to sign the treaty if they shall agree to it in its present form. If, however, any new demand should be insisted on, or if the plenipotentiaries of the other Powers should object to signing the treaty conformably to the articles in the inclosed draft, it is His Majesty's pleasure that you inform the Ministers of the Congress, that you have gone to the utmost extent of your instructions, and that in obedience to the orders of your Court, you must leave Amiens in eight days from the period of that declaration, unless the treaty is concluded within that time.

I entertain the strongest hopes that such a declaration will be unnecessary, and that upon perusing the inclosed draft, the plenipotentiaries of the other Powers will find no reason to object to concluding the treaty on the terms in which it is now proposed. If however you should be under the necessity, contrary to my expectations, to have recourse to a declaration of the nature above mentioned, you will give it to be understood, that the limitation of the period assigned for your continuance at Amiens is not thrown out as a menace, but is the fixed and unalterable determination of His Majesty's Government.

I shall now proceed to state to you in detail, such observations as appear to me to be necessary on the several articles in the inclosed draft, compared with the articles in the projet inclosed in your No. 43.

The preamble is a literal translation of the preamble in the French projet.

The only variation in the 1st article is the introduction of the Ottoman Porte as an integral party to the peace. This addition is conformable to instructions which have been already frequently given to you, and is indispensably necessary, whether the Porte be a contracting, or an acceding party to the treaty.

The 2nd article, respecting the prisoners,[1] will, I trust, prove satisfactory to the French plenipotentiary. It affirms the principle with respect to the contracting parties, conformably to the two last treaties of peace; and by referring the details to be arranged by Commissioners, it seems to meet the ideas of the French Government. Any differences with respect to the application of the principle will be open to the decision of the Commissioners, whenever they shall be appointed; and His Majesty will not object to any sums which may be due to the French Government for the maintenance of foreign subsidiary troops which may have been attached to the British army, and acted under a British officer, being deducted from the balance due to him on account of the maintenance of French prisoners in this country.

The 3rd article, respecting the restitutions, is the same as in the French projet, with the alterations made by your Lordship in the margin.

The 4th article is conformable to the French projet.

[1] It is probable, from Napoleon's letter to Joseph, March 11, that he would have given way still further on the article about the prisoners, for he says he does not much care how that article is worded, provided the secret article which bound Portugal to pay to France 20,000,000 francs were retained. It is to be observed that the French had previously disclaimed that secret article, and this was probably the real reason for excluding M. de Souza from the Conference.

The 5th article is altered in consequence of the suggestion of the Batavian plenipotentiary.

The 6th article, respecting the Cape of Good Hope, is altered so as to meet more exactly the spirit of the article in the preliminaries, and to obviate at the same time the objection which your Lordship made to the article inserted on this subject in our former projet. If, however, you have in any degree expressed an opinion in favour of the article in the French projet, and if it should be adhered to with any tenacity by the Batavian plenipotentiary, there will be no objection to adopting it in the terms in which it is there proposed.

The 7th article is the same in both projets.

With respect to the 8th article relative to Portugal, the arrangement respecting the limitation of the two Guianas, is unobjectionable. The exception relative to the alteration in the limits of Spain and Portugal may be admitted, provided the integrity of the Portuguese dominions is in other respects affirmed; but it appears equitable either that the exception to which His Majesty is no direct party should be omitted, or that Portugal should have the advantage of the integrity of her dominions being confirmed in the present general treaty.

The 9th article, respecting the Republic of the Seven Islands, is translated from the French projet.

His Majesty's Government have endeavoured to render the article 10, respecting Malta, as nearly as possible conformable to the projet C in your despatch No. 43.

The preamble is the same in both projets.

In the first paragraph the material objection of the French Government to any allusion to the declaration of the Emperor of Russia may be obviated by an omission of that part of the paragraph in my former projet, provided they will consent to the words at the end of the paragraph, declaring the office of Grand Master to have been considered as vacant at the time of the signature of the preliminaries. To this there cannot be any solid objection, as it may in fact be inferred from the former part of the paragraph, which stipulates that an election shall take place—a proceeding which would be wholly irregular, if the office of Grand Master had not been considered as vacant. But it is of the greatest importance to be precise on this point, as there is reason to believe that the French Government are desirous that Baron Hompesch should resume his functions in that island. You will therefore consent to withdraw the reference to the Emperor of Russia's declaration in the former projet, only on the express condition of the addition here proposed being acquiesced in.

The 2nd paragraph is the same in both projets.

The 3rd paragraph differs with respect to the proofs of nobility which shall be required for the admission of Maltese into the Order. Unless the terms of our paragraph 3 are adopted, confining the proofs to actual nobility, this part of the arrangement will be wholly illusory: and as this respects not the Order in general, but only the Maltese Langue, there appears to be no solid objection to the stipulation as we have proposed it.

The 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th paragraphs, are the same in both projets. In the 11th paragraph, as it stands in the French projet, these words are omitted—"as the conditions upon which the island shall be restored to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem." These words are extremely important, as they are an acknowledgment of the right, which we certainly possess after the conquest of the island, of restoring it to the Order upon such terms as we judge equitable.

In the 12th paragraph of the French projet, with reference to the Neapolitan garrison, it is stipulated that these troops shall be natives of his Sicilian Majesty's dominions. It is very desirable to omit these words. The only pretence for inserting them can be the idea of His Majesty, or some other European Power, transferring to the King of Naples a body of their troops for the garrison of the island, which might be supposed to place the island in fact in the hands of such Power. To obviate this objection it may be proposed, that the limitation should be confined not to native troops only, but to such as had actually formed a part of the army of his Sicilian Majesty. This alteration would remove every fair objection, and would give the King of Naples the right of employing the Swiss and Albanian regiments which he has in his pay, and which are in truth the most efficient part of his army.

The 13th paragraph is the same in both projets.

The 11th, 12th, 13th, and 14th articles are, with the exception of a verbal alteration or two, literally translated from the French articles.

The 15th article is likewise literally translated. It would be more desirable that the latter part of this article should form a declaration at the end of the treaty, but if any importance is attached to it as a stipulation, there is no sufficient reason to object to it.

The 16th and 17th articles are the same in both projets.

The 18th article, relative to the Prince of Orange, is very objectionable as proposed by the French plenipotentiary. In the first place it would directly implicate the Government of this country

in the question of the indemnities in Germany, in which they are particularly desirous of having no share. In the second place, according to this article, our claim to compensation for the Prince of Orange would be confined to the French Government; whereas we have a more just and natural claim on the Batavian Republic. The terms of the article 18 inclosed in my draft of this day appear wholly unobjectionable, as it will leave it open to the Prince of Orange to waive his claim to a part of the pecuniary compensation, if a territorial indemnity should be given to him in lieu of it, which would be more satisfactory to him, and it does not engage the French Government necessarily to procure for him any territorial indemnity. If the French plenipotentiary perseveres in his objection to the Prince being styled in the treaty Prince of Orange, it may be proposed that he should be described in the following manner—The Prince designed by His Majesty as Prince of Orange, and by the French Government as Prince of Nassau.

The 19th article in the French projet relative to the Ligurian Republic, I consider as abandoned. I need not repeat, after all that has been said on the subject, that the 19th article in my projet of this day, relative to the accession of the Ottoman Porte, is indispensable.

The 20th article is literally translated from the French.

From the tenor of your Lordship's last despatches, I am inclined to hope, that you will meet with no further difficulty respecting the continuance of the French troops in Otranto. It is impossible that His Majesty can agree to any stipulation on that subject. The continuance of the French troops at the present time in the kingdom of Naples is a violation of their treaty of peace with that Power, and His Majesty could never be induced to become a party to such a transaction.

The proposition of the Dutch plenipotentiary in your No. 44, for the restitution of the ships and property which were seized in the ports of this country, previous to the commencement of hostilities, has already been answered. It is the opinion of the best authorities, that the ships and this property were lawfully seized. They have been condemned by the regular tribunal, and it is impossible therefore to consent to any stipulation of the sort advised.

With regard to the ships that have been taken in the name of the Prince of Orange, and have not been condemned, His Majesty will be ready to adhere to the proposition which he has already made, that the value of those ships may be deducted from the compensation to be made by the Batavian Republic to the Prince

of Orange, for the loss of his personal property, and His Majesty will be ready to arrange this account with His Serene Highness.

I have thus stated to your Lordship all the observations which occur on the remaining points of the negotiation. I am inclined to hope you will be able to bring them to a speedy and successful issue.

I cannot avoid however repeating, that His Majesty feels he has made every concession in his power for the attainment of peace, and that the fate of the negotiation will be determined by the acceptance or rejection of these his last propositions.

I have, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, March 17, 1802.

I received yesterday afternoon the honour of your Lordship's despatches Nos. 15 and 16, with their enclosures.

After the anxious desire for peace which the French plenipotentiary manifested when I held my last conference with him—of which I transmitted to you an account in my No. 46—I considered that it might indicate strongly a disposition of a contrary tendency on the part of his Majesty, if I carried literally into execution the instructions conveyed to me in your Lordship's No. 15, without trying previously how far the conditions prescribed by them might be accepted by M. Joseph Bonaparte, when laid before him in a conciliatory manner. I therefore determined to take upon myself to appoint an interview with him for that purpose this evening.

I accordingly prepared a paper, of which I enclose a copy, containing all the most material alterations which his Majesty's confidential servants have thought it necessary to make in the projet of a definitive treaty proposed by this Government,—and I put it into the French plenipotentiary's hands when we met.

Although M. Bonaparte expressed much surprise and concern to see that we were still so wide of an agreement upon the treaty altogether, particularly upon the article respecting the prisoners, he did not relax in his endeavours to find a means of coming to an accommodation upon the whole.

In regard to that article, he had flattered himself, from what he had been given to be understood on the subject, that it would have been expressed in more admissible terms. He had been particularly led to hope so from what he knew had passed lately

respecting it between your Lordship and M. Otto, who had transmitted to his Government the sketch of an article which he considered as infinitely less objectionable than that which I had now brought forward. He did not as yet know exactly the final determination of his Government as to the admission of it; but he had some expectation that if it were worded in the manner suggested in M. Otto's report, and which he believed to be nearly conformable to what is stated in the enclosed paper, it might possibly be consented to.

In discussing the subject of Malta in a former conference, M. Bonaparte had told me frankly, that he knew our object in regard to the election of a Grand Master, tended principally to the exclusion of Baron Hompesch whom he had named; and he confessed our object to be a just one, since the man who had once delivered up the island to the French might very well be suspected to be disposed to act the same part on any future occasion. He assured me, however, at the time that his Government had no such plan in view in resisting the mode of arrangement which we had proposed on this head; and he now confirmed the same assurances by saying that he was ready to adopt any form of words which should produce the same effect, but which should not declare in direct terms that the place of Grand Master was considered as vacant, because it would be an ungrateful return on the part of his brother the First Consul, to the man who had rendered him so essential a service. The mode which your Lordship will see in the enclosed paper of wording that part of the arrangement was then suggested, and I conceive that it might effectually answer the purpose of excluding Baron Hompesch.

You will find stated in the same paper a mode of expression with respect to the admission of Knights into the Maltese Langue, which includes the words "actual nobility."

The French plenipotentiary found a greater difficulty in omitting the words "native of his dominions" in the paragraph of the projet which speaks of the Neapolitan garrison for Malta, because the latitude which the omission would give, would allow His Sicilian Majesty to send there all the French emigrants who are in his kingdom, as well as the Swiss corps, which happens to be the remainder which escaped from the massacre at Paris, and which must therefore be considered in fully as inimical a light by this Government as any emigrants whatsoever.

The other less material alterations wished to be made in the arrangement for Malta he thought might be adopted.

With respect to the Ottoman Porte, he contended that the

act of inserting it in the 1st article of the treaty, and of specifying in the 19th that the Porte is to send its ratifications, was making it a contracting, and not merely an acceding party; and he had therefore very little hope that his Government would consent to any other form of article on this subject, than that which was stated in the projet of a treaty transmitted in my No. 46.

He made the same observation in regard to that which stipulates an indemnification to the Prince of Orange for his losses in Holland, saying that the mode proposed by us of wording that article was particularly inadmissible, because it called to mind and made France avow, the plunder she had committed when her troops entered that country.

The other alterations of inferior consequence specified in the paper which I had laid before him he trusted might not be attended with any serious difficulty.

The French Minister wished the paper to be communicated to him in the shape of a protocol, or in some other official form, when I explained to him that my object in our present meeting was merely to apprise him of the sentiments of my Government preparatory to a more formal discussion and explanation upon the present state of the negotiation.

He confessed that he saw but little prospect of so many differences in the propositions of the two Governments being adjusted, notwithstanding which, he was disposed to transmit the paper to Paris. He regretted it the more since the differences no longer regarded the substance, but merely the words which were thought necessary to explain clearly the meaning on both sides, and which were inadmissible partly on the one side and partly on the other.

This observation he considered as applicable to all the points now remaining in dispute, namely,—the prisoners, for which we did not mean France to pay, though we could not express it; the Prince of Orange, whom they meant to indemnify fully for all his losses, yet they could not suffer them to be explained in the manner we thought it necessary to state them; the Ottoman Porte, whom they will admit as a party to the peace, but cannot allow to be inserted in words which bear the sense of its being included as a contracting party; Baron Hompesch, whom they are willing to exclude, but at whom they cannot point so distinctly as we insist upon; lastly, the Neapolitan garrison for Malta, the quality of which they require to be defined by words which we demand to be omitted.

I have thought it right to lose no time in acquainting your Lordship with the manner in which I have commenced the execution of His Majesty's commands signified to me in your despatch No. 15, and in transmitting to you this detail of the conversation I have had this evening with the French plenipotentiary. He will probably have received an answer from Paris by the day after to-morrow, when, according to what it may be, I shall proceed to comply to the full extent with the instructions I have received.

I have the honour to be,

With great truth and regard, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, March 20, 1802.

I collected last night from the Batavian plenipotentiary that, on the one hand, the answer which M. Bonaparte had received from Paris upon the paper which I communicated to him on the 17th instant,—and of which I had the honour to transmit a copy to your Lordship in my despatch of that date, had afforded him some latitude to comply with the alteration in the treaty required by His Majesty's Government; but that, on the other, any strong coercive measure which I might be instructed to use, would be instantaneously fatal to the success of the negotiation. The same Minister has just acquainted me with the result of a long conversation which he had to-day with the French plenipotentiary, in which the latter did in fact manifest the strongest disposition to arrive at an amicable termination of the discussions, assuring him even that he was ready to sign the treaty immediately, provided the articles could be worded in such a manner as might not militate against the feelings of the First Consul so strongly as that in which they were expressed in the above-mentioned paper.

Under such circumstances, and M. de Schimmelpenninck having at the same time suggested a mode of expressing the articles which he had every reason to believe would be accepted by M. Bonaparte, and that mode appearing to me to contain the substance of what is wished for by His Majesty's Government, I have determined to take upon myself still to suspend the execution of His Majesty's commands, till I shall receive an answer from your Lordship to this letter.

You will see in the enclosed paper the modes suggested by the Batavian plenipotentiary.

I had the honour to explain to your Lordship in my last despatch, that the objections which had been made to the articles as they were worded in the paper delivered by me respecting Baron Hompesch and the Prince of Orange, had proceeded from personal motives. I now find, what indeed it was obvious to suppose, that the strong difficulty which is made to the insertion of the Ottoman Porte in the first article of the treaty, proceeds from the same cause—the First Consul having committed himself to the world by publishing the treaty made at Paris with Aly Effendy before it had been ratified. It is therefore thought that a little of the flagrancy of that transaction will be saved by the Porte's not making so prominent a figure in the treaty, as it would by being mentioned in the first article.

The same cause again operates against the omission of the clause which excepts foreigners from being admitted into the Neapolitan garrison for Malta, the insertion of which clause is therefore, I find, a point which is considered as of the first importance by the First Consul.

The two words "de concert," which are inserted in the present paper towards the end of the second paragraph, respecting the prisoners, may, it is conceived, serve as means of defence to France should His Majesty's Government press for the settlement of the account.

I omitted to state in my last despatch that M. Bonaparte had consented to insert the following clause at the end of the 8th article of the treaty, which regards Portugal: "Les territoires et possessions de Sa Majesté très fidèle devant au surplus être maintenues dans leur intégrité."

At M. de Schimmelpenninck's earnest request I beg leave to trouble your Lordship with the enclosed *note verbale*, which he has put into my hands to-day, in support of his claim for the restitution of the Dutch ships seized in the British ports at the commencement of the war with Holland.

I have the honour to be,

With great truth and regard, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Separate and most Confidential.]

MY LORD, Downing Street, March 22, 1802.

I received late last night your Lordship's despatch and private letter of the 20th instant.

Under the circumstances which came to your knowledge, your determination to delay the declaration you were instructed to make till you received an answer, appears to be judicious. I should observe, however, that the communication which has been made to you, and the memorandum which you received not being of an official nature, the French Government are in no respect pledged to it. It is of great importance, if the negotiation should end unfavourably, that the ground upon which it ends should not be too much narrowed.

You will therefore convey the conditional acquiescence of His Majesty's Government to the modifications in the enclosed paper, in as confidential a manner as the communication was made to you by the Batavian plenipotentiary; and if it should not lead to a successful termination of the negotiation without delay, you will revert to the instructions contained in my despatches Nos. 15 and 17.

I have, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

LORD HAWKESBURY TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Downing Street, March 22, 1802.

I think it right to inform you that I have had a private and confidential communication with Otto, who will use his utmost endeavours to induce his Government to agree to the articles respecting the Prince of Orange and the prisoners, in the shape in which they are now proposed. I have very little doubt of his success, and I should hope therefore that you will soon be released. I need not remind you of the importance of sending your most expeditious messenger the moment our fate is determined. The Treasury is almost exhausted, and Mr. Addington cannot well make his loan in the present state of uncertainty. I hope your health will not have suffered in consequence of the disagreeable winter you must have passed at Amiens.

I am, with great truth, yours, &c.,

HAWKESBURY.

THE RIGHT HON. HENRY ADDINGTON TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Downing Street, March 22, 1802.

I cannot forbear assuring you that, though I was by no means surprised, I was relieved and gratified by the discretion

exercised by your Lordship in suspending at least the execution of the whole of the last instructions, till you could hear again from this country. The modifications agreed upon by His Majesty's confidential servants will, I trust, free the negotiation from its remaining embarrassment and bring it to an immediate conclusion. Under the present circumstances despatch is of the utmost importance on all accounts, and particularly with a view to the financial arrangements for the year.

I cannot conclude without returning your Lordship my warmest thanks for your most kind and friendly letter. Mrs. Addington's and my anxiety is nearly removed; as, after having been in a state which was extremely dangerous for several days, and hopeless for some hours, my daughter, by the blessing of God, appears to be gradually though slowly advancing to a perfect recovery.

I am not without hopes of hearing again from your Lordship on Friday evening, considering the expedition with which, if the wind prove favourable, a messenger may pass to and from Amiens; and I cannot help flattering myself that in the course of the ensuing week I shall have the happiness of shaking you again by the hand, and of expressing the deep sense of obligation which you have added to the sentiments of true attachment and respect with which I have long been

Your Lordship's faithful and obedient servant,

HENRY ADDINGTON.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Separate and Secret.]

MY LORD, Amiens, March 25, 1802.

The messenger, Hunter, delivered to me yesterday morning your Lordship's separate and confidential despatch of the 22nd instant.

I lost no time in communicating to M. Joseph Bonaparte, through the channel of the Batavian plenipotentiary, the modifications, in which His Majesty's Government have thought proper to acquiesce, of the projet of a definitive treaty lately under discussion. I was sorry to find that they were not altogether sufficient to procure a termination of the negotiation precisely in the terms stated in the paper transmitted to me by your Lordship. The propositions, however, which were communicated to me by M. Schimmelpenninck from the French plenipotentiary having approached so near to those prescribed by your instructions, as to give me hopes that the great work of peace might still be accom-

plished in terms admissible by His Majesty, I agreed to an interview with M. Bonaparte last night, at which the Batavian minister assisted.

Our discussions began at 10 o'clock, and I have the satisfaction to acquaint your Lordship that they terminated happily at 3 this morning by the signature of a declaration, of which I enclose a copy, and by which you will perceive that peace is made, each party being bound to sign the treaty (as soon as the several copies can be prepared, which I trust will be by the day after to-morrow) verbatim et literatim, according to the draft to which the declaration is annexed.

In order to finish the work, I was obliged to consent to an alteration in the manner of wording the article respecting the Prince of Orange; but I trust your Lordship will find that the object wished for by His Majesty's Government has not been lost by its present form; and I was also under the necessity of acquiescing in two other points of less importance. I shall assign the reasons which were urged in regard to them when I transmit the treaty.

M. Bonaparte requests that M. Otto may not be informed of the event before the treaty reaches you.

I have the honour to be,

With great truth and regard, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Amiens, March 27, 1802.

In consequence of your obliging intentions signified to me that Mr. Merry should be authorized to exchange the ratifications, I transmit the definitive treaty by the hands of Mr. Moore, whose zeal and abilities have been most usefully exerted during the whole course of our business, and whom I beg leave to recommend in the warmest terms to your Lordship's future favour and protection.

I cannot avoid taking this opportunity of once more expressing my sense of Mr. Merry's important services, and of the very powerful assistance which I derived in a line which was perfectly new to me, from his diplomatic skill and experience.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD HAWKESBURY.

MY LORD, Amiens, March 28, 1802.

The several articles of the definitive treaty of peace which I signed, and had the honour to transmit to your Lordship yesterday, had been approved by His Majesty's Government, except those to which reference is made in your despatch of the 22nd of this month. In rendering then, an account of my last proceedings with the Ministers of the Congress previous to the signature of the treaty, it may be only necessary to attend to the instructions contained in that despatch.

The principal points to which they allude are those respecting the prisoners, the Prince of Orange, the Ottoman Porte, Portugal, and some clauses of the arrangement relative to Malta.

With respect to the prisoners, your Lordship will have seen that I obtained from the French plenipotentiary the adoption of the article transmitted to me with that despatch, with no other alteration than the addition of the words "de concert" after those "il sera nommé," to which I considered that there could be no material objection, since the same words "de concert" were inserted in the following part of the article which you sent me, and since the great principle which His Majesty's Government was desirous to have confirmed by the provision altogether is not affected by that expression.

The arrangement of the stipulation for an indemnity to the Prince of Orange, was attended ultimately with such difficulties as had nearly proved fatal to the negotiation, in consequence of the declaration which France made lately to the Batavian Government that she alone would provide the compensation in question. M. de Schimmelpenninck had, therefore, absolutely refused for a time to conclude the treaty with the article as it is now inserted (which binds all the contracting parties) unless a secret article were added, by which France should renew that engagement to his Government in a more formal manner, and this difficulty was at last only overcome by the common desire on both sides not to stop any longer the great work of peace; whilst I on my side consented to the omission of His Serene Highness's title of Prince of Orange, provided the other plenipotentiaries would acquiesce in the insertion of the first paragraph of the separate article to the treaty, which I proposed as a means to prevent the omission being prejudicial to the Prince. (It may, I conceive, also be serviceable in other respects.) It was understood, although the plenipotentiaries objected to the meaning being more clearly expressed, that the

words "branch of the House of Nassau" should include the Prince's family as well as his individual person. For the rest, the manner in which I drew up the article, by its expressing as well all the losses which the Prince has suffered as the occasion of them, without any reference to the German indemnities, may, I trust, meet the wishes of His Majesty's Government. At all events, the acquiescence in it of the plenipotentiaries was considered by them as a great concession on their part, particularly as being an object which they maintained to be foreign to the preliminaries.

In consequence of the adjustment of the foregoing point, I consented to the omission of any mention of the Porte in the first article of the treaty, obtaining however at the same time, the adoption of the article which immediately relates to the Porte in the terms prescribed by my instructions.

In that which concerns Portugal, I could only procure the integrity of Her Most Faithful Majesty's dominions to be inserted at the beginning of it, upon consenting to the transposition of the other clauses in the order insisted upon by M. Bonaparte.

On the subject of Malta, your Lordship will have seen that I obtained the insertion of that part of the first paragraph of the article which relates to the election of the Grand Master, precisely in the words approved of by you. But that I was obliged to cede in other respects upon M. Bonaparte's resisting obstinately the insertion of the clauses in the 3rd, 11th, and 12th paragraphs which relate—in the 3rd, to the proofs of actual nobility—in the 11th, to the oath to be taken by the Grand Master, and in the 12th, to the admission of the Albanians in His Sicilian Majesty's service as a part of the garrison of Malta. M. Bonaparte contended, that the words "noblesse actuelle" would require a definition to be annexed to them,—that the oath, otherwise than as it was already expressed, was a superfluous stipulation, since the circumstance of the provisions to which it alluded being converted into laws and statutes of the Order would sufficiently insure their execution, observing that the addition which we desired to be made to the oath might, by its applying merely to the provisions contained in the paragraphs enumerated, even weaken considerably the conditions specified in the first part of the article, which I had proposed as an alternative in order to secure His Sicilian Majesty's paramount rights. Lastly, that as he did not know of what description Albanian troops might be, he could not consent to their admission, because they might include Austrians or others of an exceptionable quality.

Having thus stated to your Lordship the points upon which the

French plenipotentiary strenuously insisted, and which appeared to me to be by no means of sufficient importance to justify any further delay in concluding the treaty, much less the rupture of the negotiation, the success of which would in fact have been endangered by any longer protraction of it; I have only to conclude this report by acquainting you that when the plenipotentiaries had assembled yesterday for the purpose of signing the treaty, M. Schimmelpenninck gave information that he had just received instructions to solicit an alteration being made in the manner in which the Batavian Government is expressed in the preamble, by adding the word "d'état," which had just been adopted by them for some particular purpose. The other Ministers having made no objection to the alteration, I consented to it in the French copy, but said that it could not be translated into the English language.

After these explanations I trust that the determination to which I came to conclude the treaty may meet with His Majesty's gracious approbation.

Immediately after its signature, I transmitted a copy of it by a messenger to Mr. Jackson, with a request to that gentleman to communicate it in my name to the Ottoman Minister at Paris.

I have the honour to be, with great truth and regard, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The table on which this treaty was signed is still preserved in the Hôtel de Ville at Amiens, though removed from the room in which it formerly stood, where many of the conferences took place. At one end of that apartment hangs a full-length picture, representing the Plenipotentiaries (among whom Lord Cornwallis holds a prominent position) and their suites. The portrait of Lord Cornwallis is not unlike, but the execution of the painting is very indifferent. In the back-ground an English officer is cordially embracing one of the French suite.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Lord Cornwallis returns home — His views in regard to the defence of Ireland — Contested election for Eye — Lord Wellesley — Apprehensions of War with France — Colonel Despard — Affairs of Ireland — Rumours of invasion by Bonaparte — Indian Affairs — Mr. Pitt's conduct — Military arrangements — Letter to Lord Fingall — Lord Cornwallis accepts the Governor-Generalship of India for the third time.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO SIR JOHN KENNAWAY.

DEAR KENNAWAY, Burlington Street, April 10, 1802.

I return you many thanks for your kind congratulations on the successful issue of my mission, and I can assure you I am not sorry to have got back to my own country, from whence I hope no more to depart.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO H. R. H. THE DUKE OF YORK.

SIR, Burlington Street, May, 1802.

I have read attentively the report drawn up by Colonel Hope on the defence of Ireland, which your Royal Highness transmitted to me, and am of opinion that the soundness of the military principles, the justice of the observations, and the perspicuity of the language, do great credit to the abilities of the author.

Unprovided as I am at present with memorandums and sketches of the country, I do not mean to enter into the detail of the proposed positions and movements, the general propriety of which there can be no reason to doubt, but shall content myself with saying, that I perfectly agree with Colonel Hope in the belief that there is no position in the country which he describes that cannot be turned, as well as in thinking that a serious invasion of Ireland can only be attempted at Bantry Bay or Lough Swilly, or the different bays or harbours on the western coast situated between those points; and I moreover hardly can conceive that even a predatory expedition would be undertaken to the eastward of Cork and Belfast.

On the question of the expediency of fortifying some points in Ireland, I confess that I have not entirely made up my mind, but I am rather biassed in favour of the measure, and during the period of my government, I represented to the Secretary of State that I thought it advisable that His Majesty's permission should be obtained for my directing Colonel Twiss and two or three officers of the English corps of Engineers of inferior rank, to examine the parts of the country where I thought that fortresses might be most useful, and report on such situations as might appear to them to be best adapted to the purpose, and to be most likely to render essential service in the defence of the island. But as I received no answer from the Duke of Portland, I concluded that it was not thought proper that the question should be at that time agitated.

My idea was, that one fortress should be constructed in the neighbourhood of Omagh, one to the westward of Cork, and a third somewhere about Tullamore, or on any centrical spot a few miles retired from the Shannon. This last was meant as a barrier and security for the capital in the event of an enemy forcing the passage of that river; but it may be a matter well worthy of reflexion, whether the advantages to be derived from a work near Loughrea, which are certainly very important, ought not to be preferred. The objection however made by Colonel Hope to a fortress in the vicinity of Bandon, operates still more forcibly in my opinion against the construction of one to the westward of the river Shannon.

I shall now proceed to the part of the report which more immediately presses, and in which your Royal Highness is probably at this moment most desirous of collecting the opinions of those officers whom you may have honoured by calling for their sentiments—I mean the peace establishment which should be now adopted for Ireland.

This very material point cannot be decided as an abstract question, or on local circumstances only. The necessary attention to the finances of the country, without which we should forfeit the high and respectable station which we hold amongst the great Powers of Europe, the warning which we must receive before the enemy could at the commencement of a war prepare an armament of sufficient magnitude for a descent, and the obstacles which our fleet could interpose, as well as the prompt succours which might be derived from England, unless both countries were equally menaced, which circumstance, from the difference of the necessary craft, must require an additional period of preparation on the part

of the invaders, are all subjects to be well weighed before Government can form its final determination.

A maritime defence, although it must be looked upon as the great bulwark of the British Empire, is undoubtedly liable to some uncertainty; but the same inclemency of the seasons which may occasionally deprive us of its protection, is very likely to frustrate the attempts of the enemy; and Colonel Hope must recollect (when he states that a *powerful armament* remained near three weeks unmolested upon the coast of Ireland), that the portion of the French fleet which was so fortunate as to get into Bantry Bay, owed its security during its continuance on the coast, to that very tempestuous weather which entirely defeated the object of their expedition.

I do not admit as a general axiom the statements of Colonel Hope that the regular army required for the defence of Ireland should amount to 60,000 men, exclusive of a numerous yeomanry, which for many purposes is by no means an inefficient force; nor even at the period of my command, which was at a dangerous crisis, that 20,000 of that number should be left stationary when the army was to be called into the field. The species of what was then deemed *regular force* is to be considered.

The number of troops of the line or Guards did not, I believe, on the average of the three years during which I was in Ireland exceed 5000, and even of those, a part was occasionally in a very unserviceable state: the remainder of the regular force consisted of militia and fencibles, commanded in general by officers without experience or indeed any knowledge of the military profession, and many of the corps were in so wretched a condition that they would have been a great incumbrance to an army, instead of being able to render any service against a respectable enemy; and it was on this account that in my first movement, I proposed to leave so considerable a body stationary in the country.

I should have undertaken the defence of Ireland with much more confidence, if what was called my regular force, had been reduced to 45,000 men, provided 20,000 of that number had been composed of regiments of the line actually fit for service, and as capable of doing honour to their country as those who acquired so much reputation in Egypt. But I need not dwell on this subject in writing to your Royal Highness, as you have had occasions during the late war to observe the inefficacy of undisciplined numbers.

The regulations proposed by Colonel Hope for balloting the militia, and holding it in such a state of preparation as to enable

Government to avail itself of their services on the shortest notice, and for the permanent establishment of the yeomanry, are exceedingly proper and necessary, and if they should be effectually carried into execution, I think that a force of 20,000 good infantry of the line may be considered as sufficient to place Ireland in a reasonable state of security.

With regard to cavalry, I have only to observe that there is no part of the whole island where that species of troops can act in a body, and that it would be unsafe ever to put them forward, unless in small parties under the command of very capable officers, and I therefore do not conceive that any General would wish to attach 1000 Light Dragoons (for I consider heavy cavalry to be out of the question) to any army, however numerous, that was to take the field in Ireland. For these reasons I am of opinion that 2500 *mounted* men would be sufficient for any purpose which the services of that country could require.

I shall consider the honour which your Royal Highness has done me, in asking my opinion on the defence of Ireland, as a mark of your confidence; I have given my sentiments with the frankness which my duty, and the sincere regard which I entertain for your Royal Highness demand, and you may be assured that I shall not mention the contents of this letter to any other person.

I have the honour, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Brome, June 30, 1802.

Election matters still look gloomy, and I think we shall either be defeated, or obtain such a victory as would determine my giving up all connexion with the borough of Eye. I have resolved neither to bribe or open any house except Brome Hall, where I can take care that nothing shall be charged that is not properly expended. Our election will be fixed for Tuesday, as Norwich is to take place on Monday, and we should lose two or three votes if they happened the same day.

Singleton is a freeman, which may possibly have escaped his recollection. If he should be in town, I wish you would let him know the day of election, as I am not certain where a letter from me might find him.

I should suppose that we must have at least one counsel.

Yours most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, July 13, 1802.

I am at a loss to conceive what object our opposers could have in view. Of the actual success of a poll they could have no hopes; and as we neither bribed or treated, and had evidently for some days before the election a secure majority of at least four to one incontestable voters, after deducting paupers and those who had purchased meal at a reduced price during the scarcity, there could be no opening for a petition. By standing a poll they proved to me that several persons, who had to my knowledge encouraged the Opposition, dared not, when it came to the point, do otherwise than vote for me.[1] The Admiral got very drunk at the election, and the next day insisted upon my steward's taking 500*l.* towards defraying the expenses. Without having given a vote in the H. of C. for many years past, and perhaps never intending to give one again, no youth of one-and-twenty was ever more pleased at coming into Parliament. What unaccountable creatures we are!

I wish you would tell Lord Chatham that I am very glad to hear that he has determined to send Twiss to Ireland. This is the time for maturely considering whether any, and what steps should be taken for the future security of that country. No efficient measures can be undertaken during a war.

Our county election is fixed for the 15th, and there is every reason to expect the most perfect unanimity. It might, however, have taken place on Monday, and Brome grumbles a little at Sir Charles Bunbury's having put it off for three days, on account of the Newmarket meeting.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Sept. 2, 1802.

Lord Castlereagh called and passed two days with me on his way from Ireland, and from Mr. Dundas's in the Highlands, to London. He had before his arrival sent me many India papers, and you will easily suppose that we went deeply into that business.

It gave me much pleasure to find that Lord Wellesley went upon good grounds in the business of the Carnatic.[2] He may

[1] The poll was—

Admiral Cornwallis .	114
James Cornwallis . .	114
Thomas Cobb . . .	15
G. F. Stratten . . .	15

[2] In 1800 Lord Wellesley had endeavoured, but in vain, to persuade the Nabob of the Carnatic to agree to modify the Treaty of 1792. However, upon examining Tippoo's papers, found when Seringapatam was taken,

have been extravagant, and acted unguardedly and with violence on some occasions, but the Court of Directors have certainly used him very ill, and grossly insulted him.[1] Some part of these transactions passed in Dundas's time, which surprises me. Lord W. has written very sensibly to Addington, and stated several points of ill-usage with great clearness and perspicuity, and has offered to continue another year in the Government on certain conditions, some of which are reasonable enough, but others rather too lofty.

I advised Lord C. to endeavour to keep him there another year, if some of his most objectionable propositions could be a little modified; and after ordering a considerable reduction of the native troops, and after urging the necessity of diminishing the European force, to postpone for a time any specific instructions on the latter head. The Directors proposed *seven* King's regiments of infantry, with three of their own, for the whole continent of India. That will not do: it is too much the fashion in all quarters to believe that it is by artillery and cavalry that our Indian possessions are to be secured.

Littlehales is, I find, on a tour with the Lord-Lieutenant. I shall therefore send this letter[2] to Marsden, who will either forward it to you directly, or through Littlehales. From what I hear, things are going on well in Ireland, and Lord H. conducts himself with great good sense, moderation, and propriety.

I am going to-morrow to Brome, where I shall remain till about the 26th or 27th of this month.

Yours very sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Oct. 10, 1802.

From the account you give in your letter of the 1st of this month, I conclude that this will find you at Horton. Lord Spencer was with us three days last week: he appeared in good spirits and

documents were discovered from which it appeared that the Nabob had been prepared to make war upon the English. Witnesses were examined on this point, and their evidence convinced Lord Wellesley that the charge was well founded. Pending the investigation Omdat ul Omra d. July 15, 1801, and very shortly after the British Government assumed possession of all the territories of the Nabob. Ali Hussein, who was thus deposed, d. April 6, 1802.

[1] The Court had on more than one occasion rescinded, in a very offensive manner, the appointments he had made, especially that of his brother, the Hon. Henry Wellesley, afterwards 1st Lord Cowley, as Commissioner for settling the affairs of the conquered districts, &c., of Mysore. In this instance the Board of Control interfered and supported Lord Wellesley's nomination. For his complaints, see Wellesley Papers, vol. iii. p. iv. *et seq.* of Introduction.

[2] General Ross was then making an official tour in Ireland.

perfect good humour, and, considering the badness of the season, had tolerable sport shooting.

Marsden gave me a hint of what you mention respecting the disposition of Mr. Wickham, and the apparent intentions of Administration respecting the Catholic Clergy.[1] Mr. A. cannot, I think, possibly have changed his opinion on the subject, and I trust he will not want firmness on so very important a point. I have expressed my apprehensions to Lord Castlereagh, who is in the habit of seeing him.

Believe me to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Oct. 27, 1802.

Brome will, I believe, go up for a few days about the time of the meeting of Parliament; but I do not think that I shall go, unless I should be pressed to do so. I have not hitherto heard a word, except from Lord Castlereagh, of public matters, and he only mentioned apprehensions of a rupture in the most general terms.

If the emancipation of Switzerland is the object, it can only be

[1] A plan of paying the Roman-Catholic clergy was certainly contemplated by some members of the Cabinet, and although no trace of it is to be found in the public correspondence with the Lord-Lieutenant, the following letter clearly establishes the fact:—

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH TO THE R.G:IT HON. MAURICE FITZGERALD.

(Extract.)

London, June 22, 1802.

MY DEAR FITZGERALD,

. . . The Irish Government have been directed to communicate to the Synod, that an addition will be made to their Regium Donum. The Catholics hearing of this may possibly conclude that the measure, as far as it related to them, is absolutely negatived. This is not the fact; and if you observe this impression should be made, I should wish you cautiously to intimate to Dr. Troy that you have reason to know that no such decision has been taken, that the subject is under consideration, that this communication has been made to the Presbyterians in order that their Synod, which meets on the 29th, might not meet and separate in ignorance of the intentions of Government. . . .

The Catholics are to draw no inference from this circumstance one way or another as to the ultimate decision of Government, which is, I believe, by no means taken, and upon the issue of which I dare not speculate.

. . . I should be glad you would ascertain, as if from yourself, what would be the probable wish of the Catholic clergy at this moment as to receiving a provision from the State, supposing Government prepared to give it. When we retired I know Moylan entertained great doubts whether they would feel themselves at liberty to accept of it under the circumstances which then occurred, and whether in doing so they might not expose themselves to a loss of influence over their people. Time has since softened feelings, and the true obstacle to the measure is better understood and acquiesced in by all the loyal and liberal Catholics. Moylan was lately in London, and told Lord Cornwallis he was of opinion they would now cheerfully accept it. Let me know what your opinion is. I need not suggest any additional caution as to the mode of using this suggestion; your own judgment will point out better than I can do the means of applying it to prevent misconception, avoiding at the same time making it a subject of éclat and public observation. I think it probable that we shall be dissolved early in the next week.

Yours, &c.,

CASTLEREAGH.

attained by a formidable combination upon the Continent, but will never be effected by our fleet, or the capture of some French islands in the West Indies. I find that after all Barlow is to be Governor-General, and I believe Lord William Bentinck[1] will go to Madras. I know not whether this is publicly known.

Yours ever, most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE REV. B. GRISDALE.

DEAR GRISDALE, Culford, Nov. 12, 1802.

I am much afraid that our golden dreams of peace have entirely vanished, which I lament as sincerely as any man in this kingdom, because I cannot form to myself a prospect of any advantage that this country can derive from a naval war with France, and I see too plainly the dangers and misfortunes to which it must be liable. The mischief which we can do to the commerce of France, will be a poor compensation for an annual expenditure of fifty millions sterling; besides, the encouragement which will be given to the factious and ill-disposed, the yet precarious situation of Ireland, and the apprehension which must always in some degree exist of invasion, all sit heavy on my mind. I know not precisely the present cause of dispute, but if the emancipation of Switzerland is the principal object, I do not think it will be effected by our men of war.

I am still equal to a pretty good day's fag in shooting, but I think that I rather train off as a marksman; the sport however amuses me, and is an inducement to take exercise, which I am persuaded is right.

Poor Lothian's situation is very melancholy, and when he reflected that if he had chose to turn his abilities to any useful purpose, he might have provided in a very different manner for his family, he must feel it very sensibly; there is however no remedy for what is passed, and I am happy to show him any attention that can be pleasing to him.

Brome and Lady Louisa desire to be remembered. My two

[1] Lord William Bentinck, a General and Colonel 11th Dragoons, G.C.B., son of William Henry, 3rd Duke of Portland, b. Sept. 14, 1774, d. June 17, 1839; m. Feb. 19, 1803, Mary, dau. of Arthur, 1st Earl of Gosford. M.P. for Camelford, March to May, 1796; then Nottinghamshire to April, 1803, Nottinghamshire again from 1812 to April, 1814, and from June, 1816, to 1826; then King's Lynn to Feb. 1828, and Glasgow from Feb. 1836 till his death. Governor of Madras, April, 1803, to Sept. 1807, and Governor-General of India from July, 1827, to March, 1835. He was also Minister Plenipotentiary in Sicily in 1811, while he commanded the English army in that island.

grand-daughters are quite well, and the eldest, who is now at my elbow, is asking me so many questions, that I am obliged to leave off writing.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Nov. 18, 1802.

I have received your letters dated the 15th and 16th. It appeared to me from what I heard here, that we had represented *very rashly*, and it is to be lamented for the honour of the nation and the character of the present Government that we did so; but I still think that it would be more unfortunate if we were to engage without an ally in a naval war with France, which would probably run us 500 millions more in debt, and which, if we are to judge from what is past, would not in any degree promote the only object which Britain ought to have in view, viz. to counteract the ambitious designs of France on the Continent, to play the game against Bonaparte that our ancestors did against Louis XIV. My opinion is that unless we are ourselves assaulted, we ought, until some of the principal Powers of Europe are able and willing to take up arms, to remain quiet and restore our finances.

With regard to my going to town, I thought after all that had passed between Addington and myself, that it would be more handsome to go up and show myself the first day in the House of Lords, than to stay here; and as Brome meant to go at all events, it made it a matter of very little inconvenience or expense. We propose to go up on Sunday and return on Thursday, and we shall be at an hotel that can receive only two persons in Cork Street, just behind our own house, which will give us an opportunity of expediting what is going forward.

You may be assured that I shall not touch on the private business with Mr. A. unless he should mention it to me, which I think on the present occasion is not likely to happen.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Dec. 19, 1802.

Lord Castlereagh has consulted me on a plan of placing Duncan in the Council at Bengal, at the head of the Revenue

Department. I have looked over the letters which I have kept from Duncan, but do not feel confident to say that he would under the present circumstances be satisfied with the exchange, however he might have felt formerly on the subject.

I wish you would turn this matter in your thoughts, and bring down with you any letters that you may have from Duncan. We expect the pleasure of seeing you and Mrs. Ross and the young people on Thursday.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

P.S. It is thought in the present situation of things, that Bombay ought to be in military hands.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Feb. 10, 1803.

I communicated to Lord Castlereagh a very sensible and satisfactory letter that I received from Barlow dated the 20th of July, with which he was much pleased; and appears to be happy in the prospect of having such a Governor General.

In his acknowledgment of the receipt of my letter, Lord C. says that after considering the time which is yet to elapse before any arrangement in respect to Bombay could take place, and also the wish that I expressed that we might if possible learn Mr. Duncan's sentiments before the decision was absolutely taken at home, he has explained to Maitland the expediency of proceeding with deliberation in the business; it being the universal wish not to do anything either harsh or unpleasant by Duncan. In the mean time as the report of Maitland's going out has become very general, and may reach Duncan in a way to excite uneasiness in his mind, he earnestly requests that I will assure him that I have *reason to believe* that there is every disposition at home to consider his feelings and interests, but that I am confident nothing will be done without a communication with him.

This task I have cheerfully undertaken, and have written a letter to be forwarded to Duncan by the first opportunity. Our weather is very severe, but I take a long walk every day on the Bury road, which is the only beaten track.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Feb. 13, 1803.

Despard[1] must be a madman, his plan for revolutionizing England was more wild and extravagant than any scheme that ever entered into Windham's head in his maddest moments, for bringing about a counter-revolution in France.

I had written so far when I received your letter. The political state of Europe is truly alarming, and I much doubt whether it is possible to avoid a war. I had a long conversation with Merry, who told me many curious circumstances which we will talk over when we meet.

Lord Melville cannot, I think, accept a Cabinet office, and God forbid that Lord Pelham should have the direction of our navy in the event of a war, or even in profound peace.

Mr. Pitt's gout will I hope perfectly re-establish his health, and I confess that I have no doubts about his political sentiments.

Your intelligence about a certain Marquis[2] is very interesting. no reversion can be given until a vacancy happens, but Addington told me that Brome should have any that I would point out, and particularly mentioned that as Lord Thurlow[3] was in a precarious state of health, it was probable that he might soon have an opportunity of giving him the reversion of a tellership. I therefore conceive that point to be as secure as possible.

It is at present my intention to stay here a day after the family, but if I should find it convenient to alter my plan, and go up a day before them, I shall wait upon you with great pleasure; and I will give you notice in due time.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Aug. 1, 1803.

I am exceedingly glad that the communication between us is again opened, although at this time we have no pleasant matter to communicate. The affairs of Ireland have given me the most sincere concern. I shall have the misfortune of living to see any

[1] Edward Marcus Despard, b. 1750, executed Feb. 21, 1803. He entered the army in 1766 as an Ensign in the 50th Regt., and acquired some reputation. The plot in which he was engaged was as reckless as it was absurd. See State Trials, vol. xxviii. p. 346.

[2] The Marquis of Buckingham, then Teller of the Exchequer.

[3] Lord Thurlow did not die till Sept. 12, 1806.

little services that I have rendered to the State completely done away. I have received only a few lines from Littlehales, not saying so much as is stated in the newspapers. I am vexed about my friend Marsden, who will undoubtedly be blamed for not having better channels of intelligence.[1]

It is a melancholy thing, at my time of life, to go for an indefinite period to Ireland,[2] but if I thought it would be advantageous to my family, that consideration would console me. I can, however, entertain no hope of that kind.

Our assizes are just over, and the judges dined with me yesterday in their way to Norfolk. Brome returns to his regiment at Ipswich to-morrow and Lady Louisa and the children will follow in a few days.

I am glad that you found Mrs. Ross and my godson perfectly well. When I was last in town I took the opportunity of giving Mr. Hoppner[3] a long sitting, which has, in my opinion, much improved the picture.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Aug. 9, 1803.

I am to thank you for your two letters, which I have received by this day's post, at the time that I return Marsden's letter. I cannot account for the supineness in the military depart-

[1] Emmett's conspiracy broke out July 23, and was put down in a few hours, but not in time to save the lives of Lord Kilwarden, and a few others, who were inhumanly murdered. It was only on the morning of that day, that the Irish Government received any certain information of the intended rising, though an explosion of a gunpowder store on the 18th had occasioned alarm, and some intelligence had been conveyed to General Fox on the 20th. The Lord-Lieutenant considered that the Commander-in-Chief, General Fox, had not taken sufficient precautions, and a good deal of unpleasant recrimination passed between them. For the details of the conspiracy, see Howell's State Trials, vol. xxviii. p. 683.

[2] There is no trace to be found in the Irish Correspondence in the State Paper Office of any proposal of this nature having been made to Lord Cornwallis; but in Dean Pellew's Life of Lord Sidmouth several allusions to it may be found, and some feelings about the Roman Catholics seem to have prevented the appointment. In a diary of Mr. Abbot (Lord Colchester), under date of Dec. 28, 1803, it is stated that Lord Cornwallis was sent for to take the command of the Central Army. In the months of March, May, and June, 1797, a good deal of correspondence passed between Lord Camden and the Duke of Portland, about giving the command in Ireland to Lord Cornwallis, who reluctantly consented to take it, on condition that it should be considered a military, and not a political appointment. In the early part of June he further objected to go there, unless the Catholics and Dissenters could be separated, as he did not consider the force in Ireland sufficient to maintain tranquillity if both those parties united against Government, and he looked upon the settlement of the Catholic question as necessary. But he expressed his readiness to go, if either invasion or rebellion took place, or were imminent.

[3] John Hoppner, the celebrated portrait-painter, b. 1759, d. Jan. 23, 1810; m. July 8, 1781, Phœbe, dau. of — Wright, Esq. The engraving in the first volume of this work is taken from the picture alluded to.

ment, and should rather have suspected Fox to have erred in the opposite extreme. Yorke[1] may do very well as Secretary of State; he is certainly not inferior in abilities to the person whom he is to succeed, but I should doubt Bragge's[2] having sufficient weight for the Board of Control, and I dread the downfall of our Asiatic empire whenever the administration of that department falls into weak hands.

Yours most truly,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Aug. 19, 1803.

I am exceedingly obliged to you for your several kind communications, which are very interesting to a person who is truly anxious, and at the same time entertains the most serious apprehensions for the public safety. I should have acknowledged them more frequently if I had not had a good deal of trifling correspondence about the execution of the Act in the Tower Hamlets, besides a number of applications to my *great power* and *unbounded influence*. Some attacks on my purse, as usual, and solicitations for becoming my Aides-de-Camp; amongst others, one from my friend Herbert Taylor, asking the latter favour for an officer who had been in the Romney Fencibles, made me think that I was likely to be soon called upon. Neither Staff, British or Irish, holds out any tempting objects to a man who is desirous of military reputation, but I confess that I think if a respectable body of the enemy could be landed, the prospect is most gloomy here. Of David Dundas's talents I have no opinion. (I wonder what his friend Harry Fox will say when he hears that he is repairing the Lines at Chatham?) Alex. Hope appeared formerly to me to be a good-humoured pleasant fellow, and I was partial to him, but his presumption, and the nonsense he has written, have much altered my opinion. I see by the papers that they are going to fortify *his*

[1] Right Hon. Charles Philip Yorke, younger son of Lord Morden, and brother of Lord Hardwicke, b. March 12, 1764, d. March 13, 1834; m. July 1, 1790, Harriet, dau. of Charles Manningham, Esq. Secretary-at-War Feb. 1801 to Aug. 1803; then Secretary of State in succession to Lord Pelham to May, 1804. First Lord of the Admiralty, May, 1810, to March, 1812. M.P. for Cambridgeshire from June, 1790, to 1810; then St. Germans to 1812, and Liskeard to 1818. Teller of the Exchequer from 1810 till his death.

[2] Right Hon. Charles Bragge, who afterwards took the name of Bathurst, b. 1753, d. Aug. 13, 1831; m. Aug. 1, 1788, Charlotte, dau. of Antony Addington, Esq., M.D., and sister of Henry, 1st Viscount Sidmouth. Treasurer of the Navy May, 1801, and then Secretary-at-War from Aug. 1803 to May, 1804. Master of the Mint Oct. 1806 to April, 1807. Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster June, 1812, to Feb. 1823. M.P. Bristol Nov. 1796 to 1812; Bodmin to 1818; Harwich to Feb. 1823.

position near Chelmsford, which must draw them into endless works, for there is no making a left flank, and in my opinion it can never be made tolerably secure for forty-eight hours. There is a tract of very inclosed country near Writtle, where I was told in 1801 that it was intended to level all the fences to enable cavalry to act. Lord Chatham seems to take it very quietly for a general commanding an advanced post.

I should almost doubt Fox's being on good terms with the Lord-Lieutenant, for Sir C. Davers[1] assured me that he had received a letter from an old brother-officer, who said that Fox had told him that until two o'clock on the day of the insurrection, he had no knowledge of the state of the country.

I have just heard from Lord Cadogan[2] that Lady Charlotte[3] is going to be married to Henry Wellesley.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Aug. 28, 1803.

Mr. Addington told me before I left London that it was probable he should wish to have some conversation with me in the course of the summer, when I assured him that I would most readily come to town for a day or two whenever he might signify his desire to see me.

I yesterday received my summons, and have acquainted him by this day's post that I will wait upon him at Richmond Park either on Wednesday or Thursday.[4]

It is my intention to be in town early on Tuesday, on which day I propose to take up my quarters with you at Brompton.

I do not believe that what Mr. A. has to say to me has any reference to my being employed; and Lord Bayning told me that he said lately to him, that he did not think it likely that I should go to Ireland.

[1] Sir Charles Davers, 5th and last Baronet, b. June 4, 1736, d. June 4, 1806, unm. M.P. for Bury St. Edmunds from Nov. 1774 to June, 1802.

[2] Charles Sloane, 3rd Lord Cadogan, raised to the Earldom Dec. 27, 1800, b. Oct. 29, 1728, d. April 3, 1807; m. 1st, May 28, 1747, Frances, dau. of Henry, 1st Lord Montfort; 2nd, Aug. 10, 1777, Mary, dau. of Charles Churchill, Esq. M.P. for Cambridge town from Jan. 1755 till he succeeded to the Peerage Sept. 24, 1776. Surveyor of His Majesty's Gardens and Waters, and then Master of the Mint from April, 1764, to Jan. 1784.

[3] Charlotte, dau. of Charles, 1st Earl Cadogan, b. June 11, 1781, d. July 8, 1853; m. 1st, Sept. 20, 1803, Hon. Henry Wellesley, afterwards 1st Lord Cowley; 2nd, 1810, Henry, 1st Marquis of Anglesey.

[4] Probably about going to Ireland. Mr. Addington wrote to Lord Hardwicke, Aug. 23 that difficulties had arisen.

You will send a note for me on Tuesday morning to Burlington Street.

Yours ever,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Sept. 6, 1803.

On my return to this place, where, in the solitary life I lead I have considerable time for meditation, I felt myself to be placed under the most unpleasant circumstances. To sit down quietly by myself, without occupation or object, to contemplate the dangers of my country, with the prospect of being a mere cypher, without arms in my hands, if they should be realised.

I wrote, therefore, yesterday a letter to the Duke of York of which the inclosed is a copy.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO H. R. H. THE DUKE OF YORK.

SIR, Culford, Sept. 6, 1803.

Soon after I had the honour of stating to your R. H. on the appearance of immediate war, that I was ready to serve in any part of the world in which H. M. might think proper to employ me, I had reason to believe that General Fox, with whose situation I would on no account have interfered, was likely to be removed to a service that was more agreeable to him, and that in such event H. M. might probably appoint me to the military command in Ireland.

Circumstances have since occurred which have induced His Majesty's Councils to think that it would not be advisable that I should be sent to that country; I must, therefore, without wishing to disturb or derange your present Staff, throw myself upon your Royal Highness's goodness to call me, in the event of invasion, to the point of the most serious attack, or dispose of me as you may think proper, and I can truly assure you that you will find no General Officer more zealous for your honour or more anxious to execute your commands.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

H. R. H. THE DUKE OF YORK TO THE MARQUIS CORNWALLIS.

MY DEAR LORD, Horse Guards, Sept. 8, 1803.

I have received your Lordship's letter of the 6th instant, and take the earliest opportunity of assuring you how sensible I am of the zealous and handsome manner in which you are pleased to make an offer of your services in case of invasion, and of returning you thanks for the obliging expressions which your letter contains towards me.

I shall not fail to lay your Lordship's letter before His Majesty, who will, I am persuaded, receive it with infinite satisfaction, and will be eager to avail himself of your ability and experience in the event of an invasion.

I am, &c.,

FREDERICK.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Brome, Sept. 16, 1803.

The papers have so obstinately insisted on my having gone down on a shooting party, that, although in truth I have had neither shooting nor party, I found myself called upon to send you some game, and accordingly despatched three brace by the last night's coach, which have, I hope, come safe to your hands.

The French have had fine winds and weather for their English expedition, and as they have not made use of them, I begin to think we shall not see them this year, and by next spring we ought rather to wish than to apprehend an invasion. You know that it is a subject on which I do not feel particularly bold, but when I consider the number of men that we shall have in arms, and that they are all Britons, I cannot be afraid.

Poor Peter Murray![1] It must have been a shocking scene for his wife, but I think she may get the better of it.

Yours ever, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE REV. B. GRISDALE.

DEAR GRISDALE, Brome, Sept. 26, 1803.

I conclude that Bonaparte must make some attempt, but I think he will find it very difficult to land such a force as can make

[1] Colonel Peter Murray was killed Aug. 14, 1803, on board the Lord Nelson Indiaman, by a shot from the Bellone French privateer, who engaged and took the Lord Nelson, but she was retaken 13 days later His wife was on board the ship.

any impression upon this country; at least, we, who are on a kind of advanced post, do not feel any great apprehensions. It was not my fault that I did not go to Ireland; I offered my services in the military command, and promised not to meddle with politics, and to be as obedient in every respect to the Lord-Lieutenant as any General Officer in the service.

I rather think that the Administration have been unjustly accused of protraction in bringing forward the measures for the defence of the country. The ballots have, even as things were managed, interfered very much with each other, and had they all taken place at the same time they would have thrown all things into confusion, distracted our country magistrates, and with an appearance of quickness and decision, have occasioned much more real delay than has occurred under the present arrangement. Such at least are the opinions of many of our sage justices in this county.

We leave this place on Wednesday next. I return to Culford by myself, and Brome and his family join the East Suffolk Militia at Ipswich. For my part I think I may now fairly consider myself as laid quietly on the shelf.

I am very glad to hear so good an account of your family, and am, with best wishes to you and Mrs. Grisdale, and all belonging to you,

Most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Oct. 5, 1803.

I have been so plagued lately with letters on Tower Hamlet business,[1] and various other applications which required at least civil answers, that I have not had time to thank you for your several communications respecting the threatened invasion, which, although they are dreadful enough to frighten a poor country-gentleman out of his wits, are very interesting to those who take the trouble to think seriously on our present condition.

Without more knowledge of our naval force in the Channel, I cannot calculate on the probability of our seeing a formidable French army in this island, a circumstance which I most devoutly

[1] Among the American papers at the Royal Institution, there are many references to Lord Cornwallis, as Constable of the Tower, on matters connected with the Tower Hamlets. One question which he was called upon to decide, while in the back-woods of North Carolina, was whether a new theatre should be opened in the Tower Hamlets, and to whom the licence should be given.

deprecate. But I am of opinion that we are by degrees lessening the awe in which our powers at sea have been held, by the ineffectual attacks which we are daily making on the enemy's ports.

We are so much on the alert on the eastern coast, that Brome is not likely to get leave to come over to Bury fair; and, indeed, he is determined not to ask, if it would be considered in any degree improper. The Duke of Rutland, whose regiment is at Dover Castle, is not quite so scrupulous, having come down to pass this month at Cheveley.

I do not see that I can, with propriety, take any further steps about my own situation. It has sometimes occurred to me that I ought to go to town in order to put myself in the way of being noticed; but it would not only be exceedingly inconvenient and unpleasant to me, but it would appear rather ridiculous to go to London to wait for the invasion. I think, besides, that it is most likely that I should be employed on the eastern coast, as the Duke might not choose to have any officer to the southward, of a rank superior to David Dundas.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Nov. 1, 1803.

We have had a long continuance of fair wind and fine weather for the French, who yet do not make their appearance on our coast. Indeed, I understood from one of my late visitors who may be supposed to know something, that they were not considered to be in a state of immediate preparation.

Our company all left us a fortnight ago, and I have since been living with Lady Louisa, and, for the last three or four days, with my daughter Mary; and I have been myself laid up, at least as far as from all walking exercise, during this last period, by my old complaint in both feet. I am now, however, convalescent, and although from reasons of prudence I do not yet take the field against the partridges, I am perfectly well able to do it against the French.

I have not yet made up my mind about coming up to the meeting of Parliament. I confess that I do not see what good purpose it will answer, or what benefit can arise from my showing myself at Court. Not that I suspect any ill-will in that quarter, nor that any objection was made there to my going to Ireland. The B. of Lichfield, who from his Windsor connections when he was Dean, knows something of what is going forward there, says, that for the

first days after the account arrived of the rising in Dublin, His Majesty was constantly repeating, "Cornwallis must go to Ireland. Cornwallis must go to Ireland." I collected from my conversations with Lord C. that it was the violent Protestant feeling in the Cabinet which prevented my going, which had been considered as a matter determined before the insurrection took place.

At present I am living in one of the counties most threatened. If the enemy comes, the D. of Y. may appoint me to the immediate command in Suffolk if he wishes to employ me. If he has no intention of that kind, whether I am at Court or in the country, it will be easy to find a pretext for leaving me on the shelf.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Nov. 6, 1803.

I am very sorry to find you are to have the trouble of another journey to Birmingham, but it is certainly expedient at this time to take every possible means to prevent clamour, and endeavour to keep the people in good humour.[1]

Bonaparte has had a long spell of easterly wind in his favour, and I therefore conclude that either his preparations are not so forward as it has been reported, or that he has not quite made up his mind to the thing.

In regard to the warmth of friendship of any of the Ministers, I cannot say that I ever flattered myself with such expectation, and as for my friend Lord Castlereagh, he is so cold that nothing can warm him; but I confess that, without any feelings of personal attachment, I was a little disappointed that they should not think my going to command the troops a measure of public utility, et mecum confertur?[2] The present appointment[3] certainly lowered my pride.

I give you an extract of a letter which I received from Littlehales:—

"Lord Enniskillen (late Lord Cole) said to me not long since,

[1] General Ross went to Birmingham to make arrangements with the gun manufacturers, who had taken offence at the arrangements of Government.

[2] "Agimus pro Jupiter, inquit,
Ante rates caussam, et mecum confertur Ulixes."
Ov. Met., lib. xiii.

[3] William Schaw, 10th Lord Cathcart, K.T., created an English Viscount Nov. 3, 1807, and made an Earl July 16, 1814, b. Sept. 17, 1755, d. June 16, 1843; m. April 10, 1779, Elizabeth, dau. of Andrew Elliott, Esq., of New York. A General and Colonel 2nd Life Guards. Commander-in-Chief in Ireland from Oct. 1803 to 1806. In 1807 he commanded the Copenhagen expedition.

You know I am Grand Master of the Orange Lodges, and I sincerely assure you that there is not, as far as I can understand, a single loyal Orangeman who does not, at this crisis, lament that your friend Lord Cornwallis is not to command the king's troops in Ireland.'"

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Dec. 8, 1803.

I have been so much occupied about Lady Maria Waldegrave's[1] marriage, and other matters respecting claims of promises from Ireland, &c. &c., that I have not had leisure to acknowledge your letter of the 30th ult., with the "Plain Answer to the Cursory Remarks."

The pamphlet is certainly very able, but there are two points which are not stated in such a manner as to afford me complete satisfaction. In the first place I do not see any reason assigned, after the affectionate, and almost brotherly, friendship which had for so many years subsisted between Pitt and Addington, and the zealous support which the former gave during the first year of A.'s administration, for Pitt's totally estranging himself from him at the latter end of last year, except a blunder or two which Addington is said to have made in his financial statements. It was, indeed, reported, although I never heard it from any authority, that Pitt was angry that we did not persevere in enforcing the orders, which he is said to have recommended, for retaining, or rather re-occupying, the Cape of Good Hope, in consequence of the conduct of the French towards Switzerland; but as that would have been a gross violation of the Treaty of Amiens, and must have produced an immediate renewal of hostilities, it was, in my opinion, too strong a measure to be pressed upon any Minister, by a person who had no responsibility.

Secondly, I do not think in the negotiation in March last, that Addington, supported as he was by a large and very respectable majority in both Houses of Parliament, and by no means unpopular with the nation at large, could have been justified in laying the King, his colleagues in office, and all his friends in Parliament, at the feet of Mr. Pitt, without venturing to enquire to what degree of

[1] Maria, dau. of George, 4th Earl Waldegrave, b. July 14, 1783, d. Feb. 20, 1805; m. Jan. 26, 1804, Nathaniel Micklethwaite, Esq., of Taverham.

humiliation they were to be expected to submit, by a public declaration of his own total inability to go on with the Government.

I am very sorry on all accounts to hear of the amount of the Ordnance estimates. It is a cruel thing at this time that so important a department should be placed in hands so incapable and improper.[1]

When I saw the D. of Y. he told me that he would send me some papers, which I concluded would contain his plan for the conduct of the officers commanding on or near the part of the coast to which the attack was directed, and for assembling his armies for subsequent operations; but to my disappointment, I received through Brownrigg, by the Duke's order, no other confidential communication than a copy of a letter signed by H. R. H., and, I believe, written by A. Hope, dated in August, and containing only his propositions for intrenched camps, redoubts, &c. &c., in which the western heights of Dover and Shooter's Hill were not omitted.

I returned it to Brownrigg without making any observation, and desired him to make my acknowledgments to H. R. H. for the mark of his favour and confidence.

I am still not very stout on my feet, but in this weather I am obliged to walk. Remember me kindly to Mrs. Ross, and

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

Fox sent me his papers. It does not appear by them that in the business of that night[2] any blame can be imputed to him.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Dec. 18, 1803.

I return Duncan's letter, and conclude that his resolution will have been so fixed on the subject of his going to Bengal, that nothing contained in my letter will make any alteration.[3]

As I took particular care to state clearly that the removal was to be optional on his part, I can hardly suppose that Government would afterwards attempt to force it upon him, or, in the event of his not acquiescing, to supersede him. If however such thoughts should be entertained, I shall feel from the part which I consented to take in the business, that I have a right to speak on the occa-

[1] John, 2nd Earl of Chatham.

[2] General Fox was supposed to have neglected information tendered to him the day that Emmett's insurrection broke out. The feeling against him in Ireland was so strong, that it was considered advisable to replace him by Lord Cathcart. In 1804 some discussion on this subject took place in the House of Commons.

[3] Mr. Duncan remained Governor of Bombay till his death.

sion, and you may be assured that I will do it in the most pointed terms. Had not Duncan in former letters expressed so much dislike of Bombay, and so great a desire to be removed from it, I would not have taken any concern in the transaction.

The appointment of Duncan to be the eventual permanent successor to Barlow I conceive to be totally out of the question.

Whatever ideas Lord Wellesley may entertain of the extension of our territories, or of those under our influence and protection, we must at last fix some boundary, and I think he could not easily have found a more convenient neighbour on his northern frontier than the Maratta State, which would tend very much to secure our possessions against any other northern invader, and which by good management we might easily keep in order, by making a prudent use of their intestine jealousies and quarrels.

I do not imagine, from words that have occasionally fallen from him, that Lord Castlereagh means to confine his political views to the Board of Controul, and if he sees an early prospect of an exchange that would be agreeable to him, it is not probable that he will apply himself in earnest to form a permanent system for the future conduct of our Asiatic empire.[1]

What Duncan says about my going *now*, is wild; but I am not sure that I acted wisely in declining to return in 1797.

Windham's[2] speeches have created much dissatisfaction and disgust amongst the volunteers in this part of the country, and I am afraid they will have that effect generally throughout the kingdom.

Mr. Pitt's plan of attaching field officers or captains of the line to each corps, if at all practicable, would in my opinion be very unwise, for I am persuaded that our army could not produce several hundred men of that description, the majority of whom would not do a great deal more harm than good in a situation which, besides their military qualifications, would require much good sense, temper, and judgment.

Pitt wants to make the volunteers more of soldiers than their constitution can possibly admit; and Fox on the contrary, so little of soldiers as to be entirely useless.

Government have acted properly in endeavouring only to make them as much soldiers as it was possible to render a force so com-

[1] Lord Castlereagh became Secretary of State for the Colonies July, 1805.

[2] Mr. Windham had just made two very indiscreet speeches, one, Dec. 9, on the Army Estimates, and another, which was the most offensive, Dec. 13, on the 3rd reading of the Volunteer Exemption Bill.

posed, and no man, whether civil or military, will persuade me that 300,000 men, trained as the volunteers at present are, do not add very materially to the confidence, and to the actual security of this country.

Yours most truly,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Dec. 25, 1803.

I yesterday received a summons to attend the D. of York either to-morrow or Tuesday, for the purpose of his conversing with me on the subject of the late intelligence from France.[1]

I propose therefore to set out to-day after church, and to reach Hockrill to-night, and be at the Horse Guards about two o'clock to-morrow.

Perhaps I may see something of you after my interview; I find from Singleton that you are still at Brompton, and I doubt whether I should come out to you to-morrow, especially if you have company. I confess that I cannot make up my mind to the probability of seeing a French army in this island.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Feb. 3, 1804.

Your letter of Wednesday revived me a little from the gloomy sensations with which I was impressed by the second letter of the preceding day. A greater calamity could hardly have happened than that which you had reason to suppose. If he is not quite *wrong*, we must be satisfied with his not being quite *right*.[2]

I have received, and transmitted to Lord Castlereagh, Duncan's answer, in which he adheres to what he said in his letter to you, offering however in the event of Barlow's vacancy not to avail himself of the provisional appointment, on condition that the offer should now be kept secret.

[1] Letters, dated Dec. 18, had been received from Paris, stating that the French troops were all in motion, and the Army of Reserve marching to the coast.

[2] The King had certainly a return of his former complaint about Jan. 14, 1804, and for some days was unfit to attend to business. He had taken an aversion to Dr. Willis, and therefore Dr. Symonds was called in. The illness was not of long duration, and Ministers did not consider it necessary to make any application to Parliament, but questions were asked in both Houses on the subject.

I inclose a rough copy, from which I made some trifling verbal alterations, of what I said on the subject to Lord Castlereagh.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Culford, Feb. 3, 1804.

I inclose a letter from Duncan, which you may probably think deserving of very serious attention; I will pass over the question whether it is desirable for the public interests that a very sensible, upright, and moderate man, who has been several years in the situation of Governor, and highly respected by Europeans and natives, should be removed; although I confess, it has great weight with me. But I conceive that you will see considerable objection to your engaging in so awkward a transaction as to recommend to the Court of Directors a provisional appointment, to which an article, that is to be kept secret from *them*, is to be annexed, that in the event of a vacancy the appointment is not to take effect if the Board of Controul should think proper to propose a different arrangement.

We are now engaged in a war with Scindia,[1] which may extend to other of the Maratta States, and which I have no doubt will prevent Lord W. from coming home this year, so that you will probably have time to turn this matter in your mind.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Feb. 13, 1804.

I am much more astonished at Lord Spencer's being able to tell you what he did, than I am at the transaction itself.

The present coalition appears to me to be full as profligate as that of Fox and Lord North,[2] without holding out a prospect of the same benefit to the country. The object of the coalition of 1783

[1] The war with Sindia began about May, 1803. It ended in his complete defeat. The battle of Assaye was fought Sept. 23, that of Laswarree, Nov. 1, and peace was concluded in December, 1803.

[2] Without any avowed, or even understood coalition, Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox united to eject Mr. Addington from office, but no very active steps were taken till April, when on the 23rd, on a motion of Mr. Fox about the defence of the country, Ministers had a majority of only 256 to 204, and on the 25th, on an amendment moved by Mr. Pitt, on the Army Reserve Suspension Bill, of only 240 to 203. After some hesitation, Mr. Addington tendered his resignation about May 9.

as far as the public was concerned, was to place two men of the first abilities of those days at the head of the Government. What is proposed by that of 1804?—to pull down the present Administration, whose only crime is that they are weak, in order either to put in their room one composed of Fox and the Grenvilles, who have for these last ten years most violently differed on every point either constitutional or political, and who both avow that they have not relinquished any of those opinions which they held when their differences first began, or to make Fox sole Minister with all his unrepented iniquities upon his head, or by way of giving the nation a *showy* and *popular* Government, to set up an Administration composed only of the Grenville party. Admitting as I do their weakness, and lamenting that the present Ministers are not more able, I do not think that at this time a more efficient Administration could be formed, without including either Pitt or Fox.

The line which it is understood that Mr. Pitt intends to take, is in my opinion very injudicious, and highly discreditable to himself. He knew the talents of the Ministers or their want of them, as well when he recommended them to the public favour, as he does now; if they fail from weakness of head, he is bound in honour to them, to the King, and to the nation, to assist them, or at least to support them; if their failings proceed from the heart, and they show an intention to destroy the constitution of their country, as an honest man he ought to oppose them.

The great Mr. Pitt laying by, to carp at a blunder in the Property Tax, or the volunteer regulations. Quelle misère![1]

Brome and Lady Louisa go on Thursday next to Kimbolton, and from thence proceed to Wooburne, in their way to London.

I shall remain here till Monday next, and shall probably be time enough on that day in town for your dinner; but I will write again, when I shall be able to speak with more certainty.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, July 7, 1804.

It is too true that Brome's regiment is gone to Hull, and he, and, I am sorry to say, Lady Louisa are to set out for their new quarters on Monday se'nnight. The children, thank God, are not

[1] Feb. 27, Mr. Pitt spoke on the Volunteer Consolidation Bill, and attacked the Government. July 13, he moved an amendment on the Property Tax Bill, but was beat by 150 to 50.

to be of the party as it was first intended. The removal of the corps from Ipswich, was I believe owing to the ill offices of Lord C. Fitzroy, who has on all occasions shown the most hostile disposition to the regiment, although Brome's conduct to his brothers, gave him some claim to a more friendly treatment.

After the professions of the family, and even of the virtuous Lord Glastonbury,[1] that Lord Buckingham's interest would not be benefited by the admission of the Hundreds, the Grenvilles have shown the cloven foot too soon to entitle them to any claim for public spirit, in the violent part which they took in the Aylesbury disfranchisement.

I am glad to hear that the Court of Vienna has not degraded itself by taking the lead in the acknowledgment of the Emperor Napoleon, although I entertain no sanguine hopes from the spirit, or, even if she were willing, from the power of Austria. God only knows how Europe is to be saved, the present prospect is by no means encouraging.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

You will easily conceive that I was much surprised to hear that Lord Moira was to be married to Lady Loudon.[2]

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, July 23, 1804.

Brome and Lady Louisa left us on the 16th to proceed to Hull, they had a prosperous journey, but on their arrival it appeared that no decent house could be got under eight guineas a week for three months certain; and when Lady Louisa wrote to me they were living in a very bad inn, in which there were the messes of two regiments, besides several officers lodging in the house. What they will do God knows; but I suppose they must

[1] James, Lord Glastonbury, so created Oct. 20, 1797, grandson of Hester, Countess Temple, and therefore first cousin to the Marquis of Buckingham; b. July 6, 1742, d. April 26, 1825, unm. M.P. Thirsk Dec. 1765 to March, 1768; Buckingham town Nov. 1770 to Dec. 1790; and then for the county of Buckingham to July, 1797. Lord of the Treasury March, 1782, to April, 1783.

The election of Mr. Bent for Aylesbury in 1802 was declared void for bribery, and a bill was passed to throw Aylesbury into the Hundreds, in which district Lord Buckingham was supposed to have much interest. Mr. Thomas Grenville vacated Buckingham to stand for Aylesbury; but the poll was—William Cavendish, 485; Grenville, 418; and Mr. Grenville was rechosen for Buckingham. It does not appear that the Grenvilles took any active part in the debates on the Aylesbury Bill.

[2] Flora, Countess of Loudon in her own right, b. Sept. 2, 1780, d. Jan. 8, 1840; m. July 12, 1804.

take the eight guinea house, although Lady L. had determined to come away in the beginning of September.

The Admiral you will see has at last come into port, whilst the Ville de Paris is refitting. He gives some reasons in his letter to me, for not shifting his flag; but if he is quite well, which seems to be the case, I wish he had done so. He talks of returning, and observes how unfortunate he shall be if the enemy was to come out during his absence.

Lord Melville has been very civil to me about Skelton,[1] and asked whether I wished that he should be put into a line-of-battle ship, a frigate or a gun-brig. I thought the frigate the safest choice.

I am very sorry that Whitelocke[2] succeeds Hewett, as I consider that district very essential to the general good of the service, and one that requires a diligent and a humane attention, as nothing can be of greater consequence than the care of the recruits at the depôt, and the manner in which they are sent out to their regiments. Nothing however, I believe, is thought of consequence in which the Guards are not concerned. The Duke of Cambridge[3] has got the Home Department, and has commenced a correspondence with me about the Tower Hamlet volunteers. He has appointed a Brigadier-General Turner,[4] whom I never heard of, but find by the list of the army to be a Guardsman, to act under him.

You are now I conclude settled at Russel Farm, going up occasionally for a day or two in the week; I shall however direct to London, as you will have papers daily sent to you from the Board. It will give me pleasure to hear that the sea air has perfectly re-established the health of Mrs. Ross and of Charles. My young people are perfectly well and very riotous.

Raymond informs me that the encampment on the Curragh of about 12,000 men for five weeks, by the good management of Hardfield, will not cost more than 6000*l*. But the temporary for-

[1] William Skelton, Lieut. R.N., d. 1809, unmarried.

[2] Major, afterwards Lieut.-General, Whitelocke, Colonel 89th Regt. After having served in the West Indies and various other places, he was intrusted with the command of the expedition against Buenos Ayres in 1807, which ended in a very discreditable repulse of the British army. He was brought to a Court-Martial, Jan. 28, 1808, for his conduct on this occasion; some of the charges were capital, but he was only sentenced to be cashiered. The Editor's father was a member of that Court-Martial.

[3] The Duke of Cambridge, K.G., b. Feb. 24, 1774, d. July 8, 1850; m. May 7, 1818, Augusta Wilhelmina Louisa, dau. of Frederick, Landgrave of Hesse Cassel. A Field-Marshal and Colonel of the Coldstream Guards. Viceroy of Hanover from Dec. 1813 to the accession of Queen Victoria.

[4] Brigadier, afterwards General, Sir Tomkins Hilgrove Turner, Colonel 19th regiment, b. about 1766, d. May, 1843. Originally in the 3rd Guards.

ifications on the Shannon, and the martello towers that are constructing between Bray Head and the Black Rock will be more expensive. I know not what the former are, but I can safely pronounce the latter to be totally useless.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Aug. 6, 1804.

. . . After the immense sum of money which Government has expended to build sufficient barracks to contain a very large garrison at Ipswich and at Colchester, the greater part of the troops from the former place are gone to encamp on Lexden Heath, near Colchester; John Bull's pocket does not seem to be much spared in these encampments, and marches, and countermarches. The staff in Kent seems to be calculated solely for the purpose of placing the defence of the country in the hands of Sir David. However he may succeed with other people, I think he cannot persuade Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville that he is a clever fellow; and surely they must have too much sense to believe that it is possible that a man without talents, and who can neither write nor talk intelligibly, can be a good General.

The papers talk of the Admiral having been in town, and of his being to go out in the first ship that sails to join the fleet, but I have heard nothing of the matter. I have received only two letters from him, the first was written just before he left the fleet; in the last, dated from Hampshire, he talked of the length of time that it would take to dock the Ville de Paris, and stated his readiness to go out in any vessel to join the fleet, if it was thought likely that the French would come out; these sentiments agree very well with the newspaper account. I confess that I never felt more disappointed than at his not shifting his flag; it would have been purchasing great reputation and popularity at a cheap rate, for after having been off Brest a whole winter, it can be no great punishment to remain a month or six weeks in August. In his letter to me he talked of not being able to take officers out of his ship, and I am convinced that he determined to come home in the ship from some trifling consideration of that kind.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Aug. 9, 1804.

I have to acknowledge your letters dated the 7th and 8th for which I am much obliged to you. The intelligence, however, contained in the last, if it should prove true, as I am too much inclined to suspect, is so disastrous as to drive away every other consideration from our thoughts.[1]

Lord Melville quite won the Admiral's heart at their interview. I much apprehend that the latter will not get out of the Channel with the winds that we have had, and I should be very sorry that any little affair should happen, even of such a nature that could not have admitted of his personal participation, before he resumes the command.

I have written this scrawl in great haste, with the children making a great noise about me.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Aug. 12, 1804.

The Admiral I see was driven back, and, as the winds have been for some time, is probably still at Spithead or St. Helens.

The first grand *faux pas* that he made in '96, and this second mistake, which might have proved fatal for the future repose and comfort of his life, have both been occasioned by his attachment to Whitby,[2] and his earnest desire to have him for Captain of his ship. What trifles direct the fortune of men whom nature has qualified to be great! I should conceive that by this time it must be in a degree ascertained whether Gantheaume's[3] Squadron had troops on board, which would enable our Government to form some guess at their probable destination.

Mr. Pitt's mind must have been perfectly easy about the defence of the country, after the dinner you mention ; indeed his Kentish staff must give confidence to the most desponding coward.

[1] Francis II. had renounced the title of Emperor of Germany, assumed that of Emperor of Austria, and recognised Napoleon Bonaparte as Emperor of France.

[2] Captain John Whitby, a Post Captain of 1793, d. 1806.

[3] Comte Honoré Gantheaume, son of a captain of a merchantman, b. April 13, 1755, d. Sept. 28, 1818, a Pair de France. He commanded the Mourion, which carried Bonaparte from Egypt to Frejus. It repeatedly happened, while commanding at Brest, that, after putting to sea, he returned to port without going further than Bertheaume, a small village on that coast:

Vaisseaux lestés, tête sans lest,
Ainsi part l'Amiral Gantheaume.
Il s'en va de Brest à Bertheaume,
Et revient de Bertheaume à Brest.

I wrote a few lines to Lord Melville, upon his interview with the Admiral, and had a very kind answer; he is I believe inclined to be on the old footing of friendship with me, but I do not feel certain that Pitt is in the same mind.[1] Brome is desirous of obtaining leave of absence after the 15th of September, as Lady Louisa expects to be brought to bed early in October. I have promised to write to Calvert[2] to desire him to sound the Duke of York, but the regular application must, I conclude, be transmitted by the commanding officer of the district. It is not, I think, probable that, at so late a period of the season, H.R.H. will object, under such circumstances, to his leave of absence.

I have for some days had a very troublesome cold, and little Louisa[3] has a cough, which they think may ultimately prove the hooping-cough, although there are at present no positive appearances of it.

Yours most truly,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Sept. 2, 1804.

I yesterday received your letter, dated the 31st, enclosing a Calcutta gazette, which indeed I had seen before, and which is perfectly in character. Speke must be much altered if he is pleased with being the first figure in those scenes of flattery and adulation.

People seem to expect an attack from Boulogne; I still, however, retain my opinion that such a measure is nearly impracticable, as a combination of many improbable circumstances are necessary in order to carry it into execution, which every day, as the season advances, are less likely to occur.

General Mackenzie, on seeing Calvert's letter to me, not only agreed most readily to forward Brome's application for two months' leave of absence from the 14th of this month, but said that he had himself a power of giving leave for a fortnight, and encouraged Brome and Lady Louisa to set out for Thoresby after the review of his regiment, which was to take place yesterday.

They are to be here on Thursday next the 6th instant, and we

[1] It was the impression on Lord Sidmouth's mind, as the Editor has often heard him say, that Mr. Pitt was offended at Lord Cornwallis supporting him, then Mr. Addington, to the close of his administration. The above remark seems to confirm that view.

[2] Colonel Calvert, then Adjutant-General, afterwards General Sir Harry Calvert, Bart. (so created Dec. 3, 1818), G.C.B., Colonel 14th regiment, and Lieutenant-Governor Chelsea Hospital; b. March, 1762, d. Sept. 3, 1826; m. June 8, 1799, Caroline, dau. of Henry Hammersley, Esq.

[3] Louisa, 2nd dau. of Viscount Brome, b. Feb. 24, 1801.

shall all go to Brome together on Saturday the 8th. Little Louisa is perfectly recovered; so that our family affairs are all smooth at present. I have no confidence in the health of a certain personage, and although I am more an infidel than most people about a flotilla invasion, I have as gloomy thoughts as any man on the state of public affairs.

The Admiral, I conclude, has by this time resumed his command, although I believe that no accounts of it have been received. When he was at Portsmouth I sent him my reasons in detail for doubting of the practicability of the flotilla attack, and he said in answer that he perfectly agreed with me. Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Brome, Sept. 11, 1804.

The account you give of a certain personage is truly lamentable. To what scenes of faction and confusion may we not look forward?

I did not expect any very satisfactory answer to my letter,[1] but I thought as an old friend and colleague, I might have had two or three civil lines, mais il faut se consoler, and indeed in the present state of things, it is not probable that he would have the power to do me any essential kindness. I know of no offence that I can have committed, except by voting to the end of Addington's Administration, with six of his present brethren in the Cabinet.

Whatever my opinion may be of the probability of invasion, I perfectly approve of taking the most vigorous measures both by land and sea to frustrate the attempt. We have too much at stake to run any hazards. Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE REV. B. GRISDALE.

DEAR GRISDALE, Culford, Oct. 6, 1804.

I have received your letter, dated the 1st of this month, and am concerned to hear so melancholy an account of poor Lothian; the course of his life has not been such as to improve his constitution, and his abandoning, as he has of late years, all idea of air and exercise, must I am afraid soon destroy him. God

[1] This letter to Mr. Pitt cannot be found.

nows what is to become of Lord Charles,[1] or indeed of Lady Elizabeth or Sidney.[2]

Lady Louisa is *expecting* about the end of this month, and she has to my great satisfaction determined to remain here, which will, in my opinion, be better for herself, as well as much more convenient for the rest of the family. I sincerely hope that she will have no more daughters, as I do not see a possibility of an adequate provision being made for them.

I know nothing of public affairs, and, with the exception of Lord Melville who has behaved to me with his accustomed kindness, I have not been in the most distant manner noticed by the present Administration. I have very little apprehension of invasion, by any means, and by that of a flotilla, I conceive it to be almost entirely impossible. The expense, however, in both men and money is most ruinous, and I dare not flatter myself that I shall ever see an end to the war. Believe me to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Oct. 14, 1804.

If your account of Lord Wellesley's conduct did not come from so good authority, I should scarcely believe it possible that after having escaped the extreme hazards to which our interests in India were at various times exposed during the late contests with the Marattas, he should so soon, not only wantonly, but, according to Charles Grant's statement, criminally involve himself in all the difficulties of another war against an able and powerful Chief of that nation.[3] I should conceive that the Ministers would be inclined to bring him away, although they might be disposed to let him down easy.

If it should be thought that a temporary appointment from hence ought to be made previously to Barlow's assuming the Government, circumstanced as I am, I should not refuse.

Lord Castlereagh was called to Walmer the day before he was to have come to us, which I regretted, as I should have liked to have had some conversation with him. Lord and Lady Hinchin-

[1] Lord Charles Kerr, son of William, 5th Marquis of Lothian, b. July 19, 1775, d. March 20, 1816; m. Oct. 10, 1799, Elizabeth, dau. of William Crump, Esq.

[2] Caroline Sidney, sister of Lord Charles, b. Sept. 8, 1766, d. Feb. 1829 unm.

[3] Lord Wellesley declared war against Holkar, April, 1804. Colonel Monson's defeat took place in July, and peace was not re-established when Lord Cornwallis returned to India in 1805.

brook [1] and Lord Waldegrave [2] are here, the latter is so shy that it is not easy to get much acquainted with him.

Most sincerely yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Oct. 18, 1804.

Marsden arrived in time for our dinner on Monday, and left us about one o'clock yesterday, to go across the country to Ireland.

I do not conceive that the present plan of governing Ireland by a King's lieutenant acting under a Minister's deputy, can long succeed, especially when the said deputy declares himself highly discontented, and dissatisfied with the Minister who appointed him, when he possesses both the abilities and inclination to be factious, and by his intemperate violence was one of the principal causes of precipitating that unfortunate island into rebellion, at the very moment in which this country, beset with dangers on all sides, and without any disposable force, was least prepared to meet such a calamity. . . .

Believe me to be most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Oct. 23, 1804.

I have just received your letter, dated the 21st, and have only time to say in answer that you may be assured that no consideration would prevail upon me at present to go to town, or to appear to have any feeling about the business but that of willingness to sacrifice some part of the small remainder of my life to the public service, if it should appear to Government and myself that any benefit could be derived from my resuming for a short period the management of affairs in India.

Yours most truly,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] George John Lord Hinchinbrook, afterwards, June 6, 1814, 6th Earl of Sandwich, b. March 5, 1773, d. May 20, 1818; m. July 9, 1804, Louisa, dau. of Armar, 1st Earl of Belmore. She was b. April 3, 1781, and is still (1859) alive.

[2] John James, 6th Earl Waldegrave, b. July 30, 1785, d. July 30, 1835; m. Oct. 30, 1815, Anne, dau. of Mr. William King.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Oct. 24, 1804.

Although I was busy yesterday morning (as the justices were to come and sanction the turning of our road, and I was engaged afterwards to shoot with Sir Charles Davers), I could not allow you to remain for twenty-four hours longer than it was absolutely necessary, with any doubt upon your mind with regard to my going to town.

Nothing could induce me to return to India but the firm persuasion that it was the earnest wish of Government and of the respectable part of the Directors.

If I stood on less independent ground, I might sacrifice my own good name without being able to render any essential service to my country.

It is a desperate act to embark for India at the age of sixty-six; prepared, however, as I am to forego all further comforts and gratifications in this world for the sake of my family, I cannot sacrifice my character and my honour.

Yours very sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE EARL OF FINGALL.

[Private.]

MY DEAR LORD, Culford, Nov. 16, 1804.

I yesterday received your kind letter, dated the 8th instant, and am truly sensible of the flattering confidence with which you honour me.

Your Lordship had the opportunity of witnessing the earnest endeavours of my Administration, to put an end to those civil and religious animosities which had so long distracted the country committed to my charge, and which, at the time of my appointment, raged with so much violence as imminently to threaten its immediate destruction. I succeeded in some degree, partly by example and representation, and sometimes by a little exercise of authority, to put a stop to those acts of violence, or summary justice, which the horrors of rebellion had introduced. But I felt it to be necessary to act with more circumspection in my attempt to apply an effectual remedy for the religious distractions.

However persuaded I might be that the abolition of certain civil disqualifications and exclusions on account of theological differences, would tend to allay those feuds and jealousies which

were so prejudicial to the state, I was at the same time of opinion, that an unsuccessful attempt to remove them might increase the evil. I proceeded therefore with the utmost secrecy in all the steps which I took to promote that desirable object, and had it not been for the explosion which so unfortunately took place in England, it would not in all probability be publicly known in either country that such a measure had been in agitation. Retired as I now am from public life and from all political connexions, it may appear presumptuous in me to speak decidedly; but I am most firmly of opinion that an appeal to the Legislature however moderate, at this period, will not succeed, and that, if supported by factious violence, it will, under the present circumstances of the country, create much dissatisfaction in the minds of well-disposed persons, and have a very unfavourable effect on a future occasion when the question might, with more propriety, be introduced.

I am sensible of the difficulties under which your Lordship labours, and should lament on every account both public and private, any diminution of your influence; but I think for the satisfaction of your own mind, as well as for the general welfare of the United Kingdom, that you should earnestly recommend that the question might be postponed, and that, if you cannot prevail, you should declare your total disapprobation of any intemperate proceedings, which might tend to increase those heats and animosities that, however they may differ about the means, it must be the wish of all good subjects, and honest and benevolent men to compose.

I have written to you, my dear Lord, the sentiments of a private friend who is biassed by no selfish political views, and who sincerely wishes well to all his fellow subjects of every persuasion, who in this hour of danger will look, as their first object, to the preservation of their country.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Dec. 6, 1804.

Lord Castlereagh came here yesterday early from Lord Paget's,[1] and as it was a rainy day, we had an immediate con-

[1] Henry William, Lord Paget, afterwards, March 13, 1812, 4th Earl of Uxbridge, and made, June 23, 1815, Marquis of Anglesey, b. May 17, 1768, d. April 29, 1854; m. 1st, July 25, 1795, Caroline Elizabeth, dau. of George, 4th Earl of Jersey; 2nd, 1810, Charlotte, dau. of Charles, 1st Earl Cadogan. A Field Marshal and Colonel of the Blues. M.P. Carnarvon Boroughs Nov. 1790 to 1796, then Melborne Port to June, 1804. Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland from March, 1828, to March, 1829, and from Dec. 1830 to Sept. 1833. Master-General of the Ordnance from April, 1827, to April, 1828, and from July, 1846, to March, 1852.

versation on the papers which he had previously sent to me. He told me that Mr. Pitt had entered thoroughly into the business, and, although he was disposed to show Lord W. all the attention which the circumstances could admit, he was decidedly of opinion that he had acted most imprudently and illegally, and that he could not be suffered to remain in the Government. He then said that Mr. P., Lord M., and himself, were of opinion that it would be of the utmost advantage to this country that I should succeed him; that Barlow or any Company's servant was at present out of the question. I answered that they might easily suppose that it was no pleasant undertaking for a man of my age, but as I had still good health, and felt myself, in times like the present, rather awkwardly circumstanced by being totally laid aside, I would not refuse any situation in which it was thought I might be useful; the mischief, however, I observed, had gone so far as to render it very difficult to apply a remedy. Lord C. replied that they were well aware that the subsidiary treaties could not at present be done away,[1] but that it was highly necessary to bring back things to the state which the Legislature had prescribed, that they would talk the business over with me frequently during the winter, and should wish me to embark about the time that would carry me to Bengal by the latter end of the south-west monsoon.

I have no time to write more at present.

Yours most truly,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Dec. 7, 1804.

I have little at present to add to the information which I gave you yesterday. I pressed Lord C. strongly for as much assurance as the nature of the case could admit, of Barlow's being named in succession to me; but he did not give much encouragement on that head, intimating that the inveteracy of the Court of Directors against Lord W. had produced a disinclination in that quarter towards Barlow. Amongst other charges, Lord W. is attacked on account of the order for the commencement of hostilities against Holkar being signed only by himself, without any

[1] Lord Wellesley had entered into treaties with many of the native princes, under which they were bound, in return for the guarantee given by the English, to provide a certain fixed number of troops to be at the disposal of the Company, if a war should break out. These were called Subsidiary Treaties, and the Court of Directors had disapproved of this system, which they thought very onerous upon them. See Wellesley Papers, vol. iii., Introduction, p. xxvi. et seq.

notification of its being done with the concurrence of his Council. Lord C. asked me in what cases the Governor General's signature alone was used; I said that I could not at this distance of time charge my memory exactly, but that I thought it was in the correspondence with the Princes of the country, and with our Residents at their Courts, but that they were either read in Council or circulated to the Members.[1]

If your recollection is clearer than mine on this subject, you will let me know. . . .

Yours, most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Dec. 26, 1804.

Your letter dated the 23rd has afforded me much satisfaction, and I shall in future not forget to recommend secresy on similar occasions.

Lord Castlereagh writes to me from the Priory Dec. 24th. "I am just returned from Coombe (Lord Hawkesbury's), Pitt and Addington met yesterday and again this morning, their interview was long, and I have reason to know entirely satisfactory to both their feelings. There is every prospect of their being perfectly restored to old habits, both public and private."

Yours, most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

Best respects to Lord and Lady Spencer; you need not however tell them all I say of the interview.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Jan. 4, 1805.

I conclude that this letter will find you at Russell Farm, as you mentioned in a former letter that you should return thither in the week after Christmas.

I yesterday received a letter from Lord Castlereagh, informing me that on Wednesday last the Chairs would give notice, and on the Wednesday following propose to the Court my nomination to

[1] The only occasions on which the Governor-General signed alone were when he wrote to native Princes, and then the letters were countersigned by the Persian translator.

the Supreme Government, and that therefore there would be no occasion for reserve upon the subject.

I propose to be in town on the 16th, and shall set about my preparations in earnest. I cannot make up my mind about any person or persons to accompany me; if Robinson would go, he would be in my opinion the most useful man that I could take; but he is attached to his family, has other views, and would not return willingly to India.

Lady Louisa had determined to remain in the country all the winter, but as I must have an establishment in town, the family will come up in the beginning of February, and I shall endeavour to persuade Brome to accompany me for the birthday and meeting of Parliament, after which he may return, until the whole move. I have had no conversation with Lady L. on the subject of my going, poor Mary is very melancholy.

Lord C. adds in his letter—"I have only to confirm that the reconciliation in which you felt so much interest seems to have given great satisfaction to the parties, as well as to their mutual friends."

Believe me to be, with the greatest regard, most sincerely yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Jan. 7, 1805.

I yesterday received your letter of the 5th, as well as the letter from the Chairs, which I answered in a few civil lines, saying—"that although the time of life at which I had arrived, ought to make me hesitate at the thoughts of again embarking in so arduous an undertaking, yet I owed too much to the East India Company to admit of my offering any excuse, when their partial opinion should induce them to think that my services might be essentially useful." There was no direct attack on Lord W. in their letter, but it contained some allusions not very favourable.

I have received no *offer* but from Welsh, to whom I sent a kind answer, but said that I would on no account be the occasion of taking him from his family, unless I could place him in a situation that would be likely to improve the future comforts of his life, which was a matter of some difficulty. I should doubt his being equal to the business of private Secretary, and you know he *cannot* be Military Secretary. I am almost tempted to get Robinson sounded, as I think him in every respect the fittest person; and it

surely must be a great object to him, as I have understood that he is pinched in his circumstances.

If I should ascertain that there will be a levée on Wednesday, I shall go up on Tuesday; if that should not be the case, either on Wednesday, or Thursday, of which I shall apprise you.

With regard to my departure for India, I can have no reason to wish for a longer delay than a month or six weeks for my preparations, except from my doubt of Lord Wellesley's coming away in the course of this season. Should I arrive in July and find him there, you will be sensible that I must be very unpleasantly circumstanced for three or four months.

I sent yesterday a letter for Barlow, to be forwarded by the first safe conveyance, in which I have explained to him what has passed relative to my appointment, and to the prospect of his succession; I shall in a few days send a duplicate, to be transmitted by the second good opportunity.

It is not probable that I could conveniently go to Russell Farm after the birthday, and I am therefore glad that you have determined to come to town at the time you mention.

Believe me to be, most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Jan. 9, 1805.

Your letter of the 6th gave me great satisfaction, and I wrote immediately to Robinson in the manner you proposed.

I this day received a very kind offer from Captain Gore[1] of the Medusa to carry me out, which would be very agreeable to me, as I should feel so much at my ease on board of his ship. Dick[2] also has offered to go with me, but as he rather stated it as an attendance upon myself and family, I told him that if he chose to return to India, I should be glad to show him every kindness in my power; but that I did not like to ask the Court of Directors to let me take a physician to attend me, as it might subject me to a degree of ridicule on the score of alarm about my health, which I was conscious I did not merit. *Lord Cornwallis embarked with his*

[1] Captain, afterwards Vice-Admiral, Sir John Gore, K.C.B., son of Colonel Gore, Lieut.-Colonel of the 33rd, Lord Cornwallis's own regiment; d. Aug. 21, 1836; m. Aug. 15, 1808, Georgiana, dau. of Admiral Sir George Montagu, G.C.B.

[2] Dr. William Dick, who had been Lord Cornwallis's physician in India, b. Dec. 25, 1758, d. Jan. 1821; m. 1786, Charlotte, dau. of —— M'Laven, Esq. He was sincerely attached both to Lord Cornwallis and General Ross, from neither of whose families would he ever accept a fee for his professional attendance.

Secretary and his Physician. That might do very well for Lord Glastonbury.

Yours ever most sincerely,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO SIR JOHN KENNAWAY.

DEAR KENNAWAY, Culford, Jan. 13, 1805.

. . . I propose to remove to town on Tuesday next, and will either talk the business over with you there, or give the most serious consideration to what you may write to me on the subject, notwithstanding the distraction in which I live, of the most absurd letters and applications.

If the Company were to hire 40 large vessels, they could not carry half the people that have asked to go to India.

Believe me, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Culford, Jan. 13, 1805.

I shall endeavour to be in town by six o'clock on Tuesday, and will order some little matter to be prepared for our dinner.

It is all settled about my going in the Medusa, and I have received a letter from Fleming,[1] who is in great joy and determined to return immediately to Bengal, which with him is a matter of course, without asking any favour. I have told Fleming that if he pleases, I will ask Captain Gore to give him a passage.

I am so stupified with the numberless absurd and ridiculous applications which I have received, that I scarcely know what I write.

Yours most truly,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

MY DEAR LORD, Burlington Street, Feb. 1, 1805.

I have received your Grace's very kind letter, for which I beg leave to return you my best acknowledgments. It is with great diffidence that I have undertaken the task imposed upon me,

[1] Dr. John Fleming had been in India with Lord Cornwallis before; d. Dec. 25, 1827; M.P. for Gatton, 1818 to 1820; Saltash to 1826.

of endeavouring to arrange our extensive and I may almost say unwieldy Empire in the East; but as it was thought that from my name being known amongst the native powers, I might find more facility than a stranger, although I am of an age more calculated for retirement, I did not feel that I had a right to refuse my services.

I shall ever remember with gratitude the favour and powerful assistance which I experienced from my numerous friends in Ireland, which could alone have carried me through the various difficulties which I had to encounter, when I first entered upon the Government of that country.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

CHAPTER XXV.

Policy of Sir John Shore and Lord Wellesley — General approbation of Lord Cornwallis's appointment — His arrival at Calcutta — Instructions to Lord Lake — Irregular troops in the Company's service — Policy towards Native Powers — Lord Lake dissents from the views of the Governor-General — Decline of Lord Cornwallis's health — His death — Marks of universal esteem — His public conduct and private character.

Sir John Shore (Lord Teignmouth) succeeded to the supreme authority in India on the departure of Lord Cornwallis in 1793. The uniform policy of the latter had been to preserve peace as long as it was consistent with the honour and safety of the State, and to avoid being fettered by engagements with native Princes, which might involve the Company in difficulties. Sir John Shore carried this pacific policy still further. No man was ever more anxious to execute all engagements with fidelity; but it may be doubted whether his desire of peace did not occasionally induce him to adopt measures inconsistent with existing treaties.

Whether the conduct of Sir John Shore would have restored tranquillity to Hindostan, it is impossible to say, as Lord Mornington (Lord Wellesley), when he became Governor-General, disregarding all that had heretofore passed, determined to pursue a very different policy, and to interpose his authority to settle the disputes between the several native Princes. He was equally resolved to bring the various independent Powers under British influence. His first step was to disarm the whole of the corps formerly under the orders of M. de Boigne,[1] and to make the Nizam dependent solely upon British councils; this he effected without the loss of a single life. In 1803 he seized the first opportunity that presented itself, and broke up with equal facility the corps in the service of Sindia, commanded by M. Perron.[2]

The war with Tippoo[3] broke out soon afterwards, and Serin-

[1] When M. de Boigne returned to Europe, a M. Piron, a Fleming, succeeded to the command, but he was not equal to his position.

[2] M. Perron was a Frenchman, and early in life entered a French corps in India; b. 1752, d. 1834. He had been second in command to M. Raymond, and when the latter died, in 1798, succeeded to the command of the corps he had levied, consisting of nearly 20,000 men, officered mostly by Europeans. M. Perron quitted Sindia's service Nov. 1803, and shortly after returned to Europe.

[3] The French Government, and especially the Colonial authorities at the Mauritius, had

gapatam was taken May 4, 1799. This success encouraged Lord Wellesley to persevere in his system. Besides a portion of Mysore, he obtained possession of the Carnatic, a large part of Oude, Cuttack, Canara, parts of Guzerat, and some districts on the Malabar coast. He further proposed to occupy the whole of the Duab, Delhi, Agra, and a chain of posts on the right of the Jumna, and to subdue Bundelcund. With the Princes beyond that line of demarcation he was desirous of entering into subsidiary treaties. This desire of conquest, evidently at variance with the spirit if not with the letter of the Act of 1786, alarmed both the Court of Directors and the Board of Control; nor were they more inclined to approve of those subsidiary treaties, which in the case of disputes between native Powers, rendered British interference almost inevitable, and might very probably involve the Company in unadvisable and expensive warfare.

It was with a view to establish a more pacific line of policy and to put an end to these schemes of conquest, that Lord Cornwallis was urged to accept, for the third time, the office of Governor-General.

"No one can be surprised," says Sir John Malcolm,[1] an ardent admirer of Lord Wellesley, "that the choice of Lord Cornwallis met with almost universal approbation in England at such a moment; and to those acquainted with that venerable nobleman's character, it will be a subject of still less surprise, that his accumulated years and infirmities did not render him insensible to such a call. Though his health was in a very declining state, he caught —with the enthusiasm which belongs to good and great minds— at the prospect of performing one more important service to his country before he died, and he listened, as was natural, with avidity to those, who, desirous of the authority of his great name to their plans, represented to him that his presence alone could save from inevitable ruin the empire which he had before ruled with so much glory."

Lord Cornwallis arrived in Calcutta July 29th, and was sworn in on the following day. His first object was to restore peace; he wrote to Lord Lake to say that he would himself proceed without

urged Tippoo to undertake the war, and had furnished him with some officers, a few men, a certain quantity of stores, and many proclamations. But when these proclamations were to be translated into Persian great difficulties arose. For how was it possible to find Persian words for "Liberté," "Fraternité," "Egalité"?—terms which no Eastern could understand; or how turn into an Oriental date "L'an VI. de la République, une et indivisible?"

[1] Major-General Sir John Malcolm, G.C.B., b. May 2, 1769, d. May 31, 1833; m. June 4, 1807, Charlotte, dau. of Sir Archibald Campbell, Bart. Governor of Bombay from Nov. 1827 to Dec. 1830. M.P. for Launceston from 1831 to Dec. 1832.

lay to the upper provinces to terminate the war, and he accordgly left Calcutta on the 8th of August. Neither his time nor his ealth—for he had arrived in India much indisposed—allowed him enter personally upon many of the subjects that required his terference, and he was therefore compelled to leave to his Council ie management of all those details which, during his first administration, had always engaged his most sedulous attention.

But there was one exception. Before he proceeded to the orthward, he wrote in strong terms on the question of the irreular cavalry. He considered those corps to be an unnecessary rain on the Company's finances, and ordered them to be greatly educed, if not entirely disbanded, as soon as money could be btained to discharge their arrears of pay. Lord Lake had dopted the views of Lord Wellesley, from whom he had received despatch dated July 25th, fully approving of all he had done, nd he was therefore completely opposed to the policy of Lord Cornwallis. Colonel Malcolm also preferred rather to resign his ppointments than to carry out instructions contrary to his own pinions. But neither this circumstance, nor the remonstrances f Lord Lake, could deter Lord Cornwallis from persevering in the ourse which he thought right, and he was willing to make great oncessions for the re-establishment of peace. His views upon the subject are embodied in the despatch of September 19th.

The state of Lord Cornwallis's health rendered it advisable that he should travel as much as possible by water; but in spite of every precaution his bodily and mental exertions proved too great for his enfeebled frame. During the last month of his life it was only for some hours of each day that he was able to attend to business, though his mind was as clear and firm as ever, until within a week or ten days of his death. He reached Ghazipore September 27, and died there October 5, 1805.

"Thus," says Sir John Malcolm, "closed the life of this distinguished nobleman, whose memory will be revered, as long as the sacred attributes of virtue and patriotism shall command the approbation of mankind. To a dignified simplicity of character he added a soundness of understanding and a strength of judgment, which admirably fitted him for the exercise of both civil and military power; and his first administration of the British empire in India must ever be a theme of just and unqualified applause. His second administration, in which he seemed to act upon a different system, was of so short a duration as to make it difficult to pronounce what would have been the results had his life been prolonged. Thus far is certain, that the evil effects of those con-

cessions which he seemed disposed to make, would have been counteracted by his great personal reputation,—as every state in India was aware of his character, and of the spirit and promptness with which he had formerly asserted the honour and interests of the British Government. But however questionable the policy of some of the last acts of this nobleman may be to many, or whatever may be their speculations upon the causes which produced such an apparent deviation from the high and unyielding spirit of his former administration, no man can doubt the exalted purity of the motive which led him to revisit that country. Loaded with years, as he was with honour, he desired that his life should terminate as it had commenced; and he died, as he had lived, in the active service of his country."

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Port Praya Bay, May 6, 1805.

We arrived yesterday in this bay—made famous by Johnstone's[1] fight—after a prosperous passage, and shall proceed on the 8th or 9th, without intending to touch at any port before we reach Madras. We are in a good ship and well accommodated, and as pleasantly circumstanced in every respect, as landsmen can be in a long voyage.

You can expect no news from the miserable island of St. Iago.

Remember me kindly to Mrs. Ross and to Charles.

Yours ever most truly,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT BROME.

MY DEAREST BROME, Madras, July 23, 1805.

I take the opportunity of an overland despatch to acquaint you that I arrived at this place on the 19th, and shall proceed this evening on my voyage to Bengal.

The prospect of affairs in this country is by no means promising in any respect, and I apprehend that I have undertaken a task too arduous for a man of my age. If, however, I should be so fortunate as to be able to render any real service to

[1] George Johnstone, Captain R.N., younger brother of Sir William Pulteney, Bart.; usually known as Governor Johnstone; d. Jan. 8, 1787; m. Jan. 31, 1782, Charlotte, dau. of —— Dee, Esq. M.P. for Appleby from Nov. 1774 to 1780; Lostwithiel, to March, 1784; Ilchester, from Jan. 1785 till his death. The action alluded to was fought April 16, 1782, when Suffrein attacked the English squadron at anchor in a neutral port, and was ignominiously repulsed.

my country and to my family, I shall close my eyes without repining.

Give my kindest love to Lady Louisa and the dear children, and

Believe me to be,

Your truly affectionate father,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO GENERAL LORD LAKE.

MY DEAR LORD, Calcutta, July 30, 1805.

I have this day taken upon me the office of Governor-General and Commander-in-Chief, and I lose no time in acquainting you with my intention of proceeding up the country in a very few days.

It is my earnest desire, if it should be possible, to put an end to this most unprofitable and ruinous warfare, and as the actual season of the rains must necessarily suspend any material military operations, I should wish that you would not engage in any act of aggression, unless it might appear to be necessary in order to secure your own army from *serious* danger, until I can come to you, or you can have further communication with me.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE SECRET COMMITTEE.

GENTLEMEN, Calcutta, Aug. 1, 1805.

I take the earliest opportunity of an overland despatch to inform you of my arrival at this place, and of my having taken upon me the office of Governor-General on the 30th ultimo.

Finding to my great concern that we are still at war with Holkar,[1] and that we can hardly be said to be at peace with Scindia,[2] I have determined to proceed immediately to the Upper Provinces, that I may be at hand to avail myself of the interval which the present rainy season must occasion in the military operations, to endeavour, if it can be done without a sacrifice of our honour, to terminate by negotiation, a contest in which the most brilliant success can afford us no solid benefit, and which, if it should con-

[1] Jeswunt Rao Holcar, a natural son of Tookajee Holcar, to whose dominions he succeeded after the deaths of several of his brothers. He was a cruel and unprincipled Prince; became deranged in 1808, and d. Oct. 20, 1811.

[2] Dowlut Row Sindia, great-nephew and heir of Madajee Sindia; d. March, 1827.

tinue, must involve us in pecuniary difficulties, which we shall hardly be able to surmount.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

MY DEAR LORD, Calcutta, Aug. 1, 1805.

I have scarcely anything to add to the melancholy statements exhibited in my letters to the Court of Directors and to the Secret Committee.

I entertain scarcely any hope that it will be in my power to come to an amicable accommodation with Scindia, who still keeps the Assistant[1] of our Residency under restraint, as I understand that Lord Wellesley has guaranteed to the Rana of Gohud[2] the supremacy which Scindia claims over Gohud and the fortress of Gwalior.

These possessions are too remote in my opinion to make it desirable for us to have anything to do with them, but the difficulty lies in the danger of receding from a claim to which, according to what are called treaties in this country, it appears that we have in our late negotiations obtained an undoubted right.

My statements of our poverty are by no means overcharged, notwithstanding the former violent transactions in Oude.[3] Lord Wellesley has borrowed 20 lacs of the Vizier, and has written to press him for 10 more. Our credit has, I believe, been tried to the utmost at Benares and other places.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

P.S. I shall send the first material despatch that I can transmit, by the Medusa, under the sanction of Sir Edward Pellew.[4]

[1] Mr., afterwards Sir Richard Jenkins, G.C.B., b. Feb. 18, 1785, d. Dec. 30, 1853; m. 1824, Eliza Helen, dau. of Hugh Spottiswoode, Esq. East India Director from about 1830 till his death. M.P. for Shrewsbury from 1830 to 1832, and from 1837 to 1841.

[2] Gohud had been conquered by Scindia in 1784, and had remained ever since in his possession. In 1805 the Rana, Kekvich Sing, in compensation for his losses, was put into possession of Dholpoor and Rajkerrah.

[3] Lord Wellesley had in 1800 increased the subsidy to be paid by the Nabob to the Company by 50 lacs, and, Nov. 10, 1801, compelled him to sign a treaty, ceding territory producing 1,35,23,000, at the same time largely diminishing the subsidiary force which the Nabob had been bound to pay.

[4] Rear-Admiral Sir Edward Pellew, Bart., afterwards Admiral of the Red, G.C.B., created Lord Exmouth May 14, 1814, and made a Viscount Sept. 21, 1816; b. April 14, 1757, d. Jan. 23, 1833; m. May, 1783, Susanna, dau. of James Frowd, Esq., of Knoyle. M.P. for Barnstaple from Nov. 1802 to Aug. 1804.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE COURT OF DIRECTORS.

GENTLEMEN, Calcutta, Aug. 1, 1805.

I arrived here early on the morning of the 30th ultimo, and a few hours afterwards took the oaths in Council and assumed the Government.

I cannot at so early a period attempt to enter into a particular account of the state of your affairs, and can only at present say with concern that we are not yet at peace, and that the pressure on your finances is so severe, that had the bullion sent out in the ships of the present season been withheld, I know not how our difficulties could have been overcome. Sir John Gore was so kind as to take on board the Medusa a considerable sum out of one of your ships at Madras, which he engaged to deliver free of freight at this Presidency; this treasure has already had some effect in lowering the discount upon the paper.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO GENERAL LORD LAKE.

MY DEAR LORD, Calcutta, Aug. 4, 1805.

I yesterday saw with much pleasure the letter from Mr. Jenkins signifying the intention of Scindia to send him forthwith to you, accompanied by Vakeels from that chief and from Holkar.

As I suspect that my opinions may differ very widely from those of some of the gentlemen in the political line who attend upon you, I feel myself obliged, in the very responsible situation in which I stand, seriously to require that you will take no step without a reference to me. I shall leave this place on Thursday next the 8th instant, after which every day will bring me into nearer communication with you.

Lord Wellesley assured me yesterday (to my great satisfaction) that the Rajah of Jeynugur[1] had by his conduct, forfeited all claim to our protection. Would to God that we could as easily get rid of the Rana of Gohud, and many more of our burthensome allies or dependents.

Yours, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

[1] Juggett Sing, Raja of Jeynugar (or Jeypore, as it is often spelt), succeeded in 1803; d. Dec. 21, 1818. Colonel Tod describes him as the most dissolute Prince of his race or age.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

DEAR ROSS, Calcutta, Aug. 4, 1805.

We still, I believe, conceive ourselves to be at war with Holkar, and can hardly be said to be at peace with Scindia; no hostilities are however going forward. I shall embark for the Upper Provinces on the 8th instant, and have sent the most positive injunctions to Lake not to stir till I come, nor to adopt any measure without my concurrence.

Scindia has given notice to the Assistant of our late Resident with him, whom he has detained under a gentle restraint, that he will send him in a few days to Lord Lake's quarters, accompanied by a Vakeel from himself and one from Holkar. They cannot in their present circumstances wish for war, and I entertain great hopes that we shall soon make up matters with them, which will be very convenient in the present state of our finances.

I was not well during the whole of the passage, am greatly reduced in flesh, and since I landed have had those swellings with which I have been so often troubled in my feet, knees, &c. I trust, however, that I shall get the better of all this during my passage up the river.

Remember me kindly to Mrs. Ross and Charles, and

Believe me ever, most truly yours,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO GENERAL LORD LAKE.

MY DEAR LORD, Calcutta, Aug. 7, 1805.

I propose going to-morrow as far as Barrackpore in my way to the Upper Country, and hope to be able to proceed on my voyage on Friday.

The mode of obtaining relief from the intolerable burthen of the irregular troops[1] has occupied much of my thoughts, and I hope in a short time, by the arrival of the treasure from Europe, to get up a sufficient sum to effect this most urgent object.

It is my intention that the chiefs and all who have any claims upon us, shall have jaeedad lands[2] in Mewath, which shall be arranged by Colonel Malcolm, and that the others should be dismissed as soon as we can get money to pay them their arrears. You will be kind enough to consider of the arrangements necessary

[1] The irregular troops had cost 5,83,000 rupees per mensem, but the expense was lowered to 3,90,000, and Lord Cornwallis at once reduced it more.

[2] Jaeedad lands, nearly the same as jaghires, but with fewer feudal claims attached.

to carry these intentions into effect with as little delay as possible, when we may possess the necessary means to put them in execution.

I most sensibly feel for the distress to which the native troops must be reduced by the long arrear which is due to them, and shall omit no means in my power to afford them relief.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE COURT OF DIRECTORS.

HONOURABLE SIRS, On the river, Aug. 9, 1805.

One of the first objects to which my attention has been directed since my accession to this Government, was an inquiry into the state of our finances, the result of which affords the most discouraging prospects, and has convinced me that, unless some very speedy measures are taken to reduce our expenses, it will be impossible to meet with effect, the contingency of a renewed war with Scindia and those Powers who may be disposed to confederate with him; and however anxious I feel to promote any accommodation with Scindia, that shall not be attended with a loss of our honour, or with any sacrifice that would be injurious to the national character, I deem it equally incumbent on me to be prepared to resist his demands, if they should prove to be founded on claims that are inadmissible.

The most burthensome, and at the same time the least useful, part of the existing military expenses, arises from very numerous bodies of irregular troops, which I find have been entertained, some of them under implied specific engagements that will render the immediate dismissal of them a measure of some difficulty, but by far the greatest proportion of them under no other obligation than that of expediency, and these we are at liberty of course to discharge, whenever that expediency shall, in the opinion of your Government, no longer exist.

I am aware that it may be urged that the dismission of any great number of these troops may be attended with the consequence of their taking service with our enemies; but weighing the probability of that circumstance in its utmost extent, and considering that at this period your regular troops are little short of five months, and many of the public departments, on which any movement of your armies depend, still more, in arrear, and that this description of irregular troops are a drain upon your treasury of near six lacs of rupees per month, I see no possible means of

keeping your regular army properly paid and equipped, and of retaining at the same time in pay so expensive an establishment, which would certainly be less formidable if opposed to us in the field, than while they remain so distressing a drain upon our revenues.

However well convinced I am of the propriety of getting rid of so serious a burthen as soon as possible, I find an almost insuperable impediment to it in the present exhausted state of your treasuries, unless I can obtain the command of a sum of money, in the first instance, sufficient to pay off the arrears now due to these men, or unless I was to suffer the arrears of your own troops to accumulate to a still greater degree; and of that, even in the fullest confidence in the attachment of your native soldiery, it would not be either wise, just, or politick to risk the possible consequences.

I am necessitated therefore to look to an extraordinary source in this state of things, and that which has presented itself to my mind as the most expedient, is the detention of the treasure destined for China, and expected in the ships under the convoy of Sir Thomas Troubridge,[1] whether that may be to the full extent of the 200,000*l.* advised to be intended for China, or whether a proportion of it only is in these ships, I am not informed; but the urgency of the case is so great here, that I have taken upon myself to direct the whole of what may be imported on that part of the China fleet, to be landed at Madras, and to be forwarded immediately to this Presidency, and I have also strongly urged the Madras Government, if they find they can spare 50,000*l.* of the specie allotted for the service of that Presidency, to consign that sum also to Bengal, applying to the Admiral for such protection for the despatch of the treasure to Bengal, as may obviate all risk from the danger of an enemy.

I am aware that a measure of a similar kind had formerly not met your approbation.[2] I trust, however, that you will give me credit for an anxious desire to regulate the principles of my government, on all occasions, as much in conformity to the known expressions of your sentiments as may be practicable; and you may likewise be assured, that if the provision of your full investment from China could be affected in any degree by the consequences of the

[1] Rear-Admiral Sir Thomas Troubridge, Bart., so created Nov. 30, 1799, b. 1760. He sailed from Madras in the Blenheim Jan. 12, 1807, and she is supposed to have foundered at sea, as she was never seen after Feb. 5, when she was off the Rodrigues making signals of distress; m. Dec. 20, 1787, Frances, dau. of John Northall, Esq., and widow of Henry Richardson, Esq.

[2] In 1791 the Court of Directors thought that it interfered with their pecuniary advantages as merchants, overlooking the political necessity for that step.

measure I have adopted, I should have preferred struggling through our difficulties under every possible disadvantage, rather than have subjected you to the disappointment which an insufficiency of funds in China might have occasioned; but upon the fullest information I can obtain of the present state of the trade between the ports of India and Canton, it is evident it will only require, that permission should be given to your Select Committee there to extend the receipt of money for bills on Bengal to an amount equivalent to the treasure detained at Madras; and such is the astonishing increase of the exports from India, especially in the articles of opium and cotton from this place, within these few years, that there cannot be a doubt of the amplest supplies being tendered for their acceptance, the experience of last year having proved that offers of money exceeded the demands of your treasury there to the amount of near forty lacs of rupees, and as the exports of the present year are increased, even beyond those of the last, there can be as little doubt of an equal abundant resource being open this season, to the acceptance of your supercargoes at Canton.

I have sent this despatch by a packet which was taken up previous to my arrival, and as I do not yet feel myself enabled to transmit, either to your Honourable Court or to your Secret Committee, any satisfactory account of the present state of our political affairs, I shall defer saying anything on that subject until the despatch of the Medusa, which ship Sir Edward Pellew has been so good as to order to be held in readiness to carry home such intelligence as I may wish to transmit, after I have been able to render myself more completely master of the effects or changes in our situation which the late very important occurrences are likely to produce.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

MY DEAR LORD, On the river, Aug. 9, 1805.

I am now proceeding to join the army, but under difficulties through which, I confess, I am not sanguine enough to see my way.

Lake's army, the pay of which amounts to about five lacs per month, is above five months in arrear. An army of irregulars, composed chiefly of deserters from the enemy, which, with the approbation of Government, the General assembled by proclamation, and which costs about six lacs per month, is likewise somewhat in arrear.

This latter force I conceive not only to be useless, but in some measure dangerous. There is, however, no possibility of getting rid of it without paying up the arrears, and giving money to carry home those who have no claims upon us, and to enable the others to repair to, and take possession of, jaeedad lands which have been promised to them in particular parts of the ceded countries, which it would evidently be undesirable for us to retain.

How is all this to be done, or, indeed, any army to be kept together, with an empty treasury? For the next two months we can expect nothing from the collectors, and our only dependence is on the small supply of bullion sent from England.

I intend, but am afraid I shall be too late, to take the bullion out of the ships at Madras that are destined for China, where it can be of no use, and is very hurtful to the trade of Bengal to that country. The exportation from hence of cotton and opium to China has increased in a degree hardly to be credited. Last season the supercargoes could only take half the money which was tendered to them by our merchants, and above forty lacs were necessarily returned in specie or bullion to this country, to the great hazard or loss of the proprietors, who could not obtain the bills they desired on our treasury. We have ascertained that the assets that have been sent this year are at least as valuable as those of the last; indeed we have reason to believe that they are much more considerable.

I have written at large on this subject to the Court of Directors. I know that a few years ago they highly disapproved of the conduct of this Government stopping the money destined for China, but I trust it is impossible that under a total change of circumstances they can retain their old opinion.

We have obtained by our former victories and treaties a great acquisition of very unprofitable territory, and of useless and burthensome allies and dependents. The enclosed account from Lake of the Rana of Gohud will serve as a specimen. Some have luckily, by their subsequent conduct, forfeited all claim to our protection, amongst whom is the Rajah of Jeynagur; and I shall, with great pleasure, avail myself of every opportunity of this nature to get rid of such embarrassment.

Mr. Jenkins, the Assistant to the late Resident with Scindia, and who has for some time past been detained under restraint by that chief, has lately acquainted General Lake that Scindia has notified to him that he shall, in a few days, send him to his quarters accompanied by a Vakeel from himself and one from Holkar. I have desired the General to take no step of conse-

quence without consulting me, and I shall now get nearer to him every day.

By the bye, I do not suspect head-quarters to be very pacifically disposed.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LIEUT.-COLONEL MALCOLM.

SIR, On the river at Augaurdeep, Aug. 14, 1805.

Lord Wellesley was so obliging as to send me an extract of your letter, dated the 28th of June, 1805, relating principally to the settlement of the conquered countries in Hindostan. Your suggestions on that head contain undoubtedly much good sense and solid reasoning, and it is most certain that it can only be by some means of that nature, that those savage districts can ever be brought to form an useful, or even a safe, appendage to any civilized society. I entertain, however, great doubts whether it would be advisable or suitable for us to form such an establishment under our own immediate Government.

There appears to be a large tract of country that nobody is very desirous of possessing—I mean that which I mentioned in a late letter to Lord Lake for the irregular corps. It is possible that you might be able to settle the friendly chiefs who have joined us in jaghire tenures in that quarter in preference to jaeedads, as the latter term imposes more of subjection on them, and implies an absolute sovereignty in us; I would promise them all friendly intercourse and accommodation at their first setting out, but I would have it distinctly understood that I will take no part in their quarrels.

Knowing, as I do, the confidential footing on which you acted with Lord Wellesley, for whose talents nobody entertains an higher respect than myself, I wish to give you some outline of my political thoughts, which on mature reflection I conceive to be the most consonant to the British interests as well in Europe as in India.

I think that no success could indemnify us for continuing this ruinous war one moment longer than the first occasion which may present itself for our getting out of it without dishonour, that there is no acquisition which we can obtain by it that would not be productive of the greatest inconvenience to us.

We are now waging war against two chieftains who have neither territory nor army to lose: our prospects surely of advantage or losses are not equally balanced.

Our treasury is now completely emptied; we can send home no investment, and I am reduced to the necessity of taking the very disagreeable step of stopping the treasure destined by the Court of Directors for China, in order to have a chance of being able to get rid of a part of our irregular forces.

I consider our possession of the person of Shah Allum and the town of Delhi as events truly unfortunate; and unless I should be able to persuade H. M. to move further to the eastward, we can only secure him from the danger of being carried off, by the maintenance of a large army in the field, which will be an expense that our funds cannot bear. I deprecate the effects of the almost universal frenzy, which has seized even some of the heads which I thought the soundest in the country, for conquest and victory, as opposite to the interests, as it is to the laws, of our country.

I need only add that I shall come to the army with a determination not to submit to insult or aggression, but with an anxious desire to have an opportunity of showing my generosity.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

P.S. I beg you will present my kindest compliments to my friend Lord Lake, to whom you may, if you please, communicate the contents of this letter.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE HON. MAJOR-GENERAL SIR ARTHUR WELLESLEY, K.B.

MY DEAR SIR, On the river near Augaurdeep, Aug. 16, 1805.

Lord Wellesley has communicated to me some remarks, which he says were written by you on a paper entitled observations on the treaty of Bassien, in which remarks the following circumstances are stated:—

"Lord Cornwallis, who foresaw the difficulties and dangers to which the alliance would be exposed from the claims of the Mahrattas upon the Nizam, endeavoured to establish the alliance upon a more firm basis, by interposing the arbitration of the British Government in their disputes. But the Mahrattas, who knew that their claims were without foundation, that they depended entirely upon their superior strength, and that the result of an arbitration by the British Government must be unfavourable to them, declined to accept the offer made by Lord Cornwallis.

"I conceive this to be the real history of the refusal of Lord

Cornwallis to allow the Mahrattas to subsidize two British battalions, as mentioned by the anonymous observer, if such a proposal was ever made to him."

I am persuaded that, both as to the fact which is there mentioned of a proposition made by me to the Mahrattas, as well as in respect to the inference you have drawn from it, of my motives for refusing to give a British subsidiary force to that Power, you must have conceived that you had obtained the most correct information. I am, however, entirely at a loss to guess from whence you could have derived it, as I assure you that no proposition of any interference in the disputes between the Mahrattas and the Nizam was ever made by me, and that it was the invariable principle of my Government, to avoid involving the British power in the consequences of any internal disputes that might exist either amongst the Mahrattas themselves, or between them and the Nizam.

Hurry Punt, a few days before the separation of the armies on their return from Seringapatam, said to me: "No states can be on more friendly terms than that of the Peshwa, and the British Government. Now we are going to separate, let me ask you why you will not give a subsidiary force to the Peshwa, as you have to the Nizam?" I replied that I disapproved very much of all subsidiary treaties, as they tended to involve the British Government in quarrels in which they had no concern; that the treaty with the Nizam was made many years before I came to India, and it was not in my power to release myself from it, but that I was determined not to enter into any more engagements of that kind; that if it were otherwise, there was no person with whom I would more readily form such a connexion than the Peshwa.

This, of course, is not given as a literal statement of what passed so long as thirteen years ago, in a conversation of which I have no notes, but in the substance of it I am sure I am very correct; and it cannot fail to convince you that you have been misled in the information upon which that part of your remarks was founded.

I was very sorry to find that you had left the country before my arrival. Sincerely hoping that you enjoy your health perfectly in England,

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE SECRET COMMITTEE,

HONOURABLE SIRS, On the river near Rajmohl, Aug. 28, 1805.

. . . One of the most important, and in my opinion not the least unfortunate consequences of the subsisting state of our

alliances, has been the gradual increasing ascendancy of the British influence and authority exercised through the medium of our Residents at the Courts of Poonah and Hyderabad. The weak and wretched state of the Peshwa's internal government cannot be more forcibly described than in the inclosed despatch recently received from Colonel Close,[1] and I have reason to believe that the authority of the Soubah of the Deccan[2] over his dominions is approaching fast to the same state of inefficiency and weakness. The evils likely to ensue from the above statement are sufficiently obvious, but the remedy to be applied to them is unhappily not so apparent. The positive obligations of existing treaties, provide in the most express terms for the uncontrolled exercise of the internal government of both States being left in the hands of their respective chiefs; but accustomed as they have been to the very limited exertion of their own authority, and dependent as the Minister of the Nizam, in particular, has felt himself, on the aid and support of our Resident to retain his office, it might hazard perhaps the immediate destruction of both Powers, if I was suddenly to act upon the strict principles which the obligations of those treaties impose upon us.

I have endeavoured to call the attention of the Powers above mentioned, to that article in the treaties which so materially concerns themselves, and I have forcibly impressed on the minds of the Residents, the necessity of strengthening my representations, by encouraging the most active exertion of that authority and control, on which the prosperity of their dominions and the security of their subjects so greatly depend.

With these views, and in the hope that by degrees we may be able to withdraw ourselves from the disgraceful participation in which we should be involved by mixing ourselves in all the intrigues, oppression, and chicanery of the native management of distracted and desolated provinces, I have ordered those letters to be addressed to the Residents at the Courts of Hyderabad and Poonah, of which copies are herewith inclosed, and to which I must refer your Honourable Committee, for an explanation of the footing to which I wish to restore the character of the British alliance, as most consonant to the interests, as well as to the laws of our country. . . .

I have already represented to your Honourable Committee the extreme pecuniary embarrassment in which I have found the

[1] Colonel, afterwards Major-General Sir Barry Close, Bart., so created Dec. 12, 1812. A most distinguished officer; b. Dec. 1756, d. April 20, 1813, unm.

[2] Another name for the Nizam.

Government involved; every part of the army, and every branch of the public departments attached to it, even in their present stationary positions, are suffering severe distress from an accumulation of arrears, and if unfortunately it should become indispensably necessary to put the troops again in motion, I hardly know how the difficulties of providing funds for such an event are to be surmounted.

I have, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO THE RIGHT HON. LORD LAKE.

MY DEAR LORD, Near Caragola, Aug. 30, 1805.

I received yesterday with great satisfaction your very kind letter of the 11th instant, and have no doubt that we shall act together with as perfect harmony as we ever have done on former occasions.

You will easily imagine it was no slight cause that urged the Ministers at home to press me to return once more to this country, and that I would not, without seeing very great necessity, have engaged at my time of life in so difficult and, I may say, so rash an undertaking.

The real circumstances are, that it is not the opinion only of Ministers, or of a party, but of all reflecting men of every description, that it is physically impracticable for Great Britain, in addition to all other embarrassments, to maintain so vast and so unwieldy an empire in India, which annually calls for reinforcements of men and for remittances of money, and which yields little other profit except brilliant Gazettes. It is in vain for us to conceal from ourselves that our finances are at the lowest ebb, and that we literally have not the means of carrying on the ordinary business of Government.

If necessity should require it, the armies that are prepared must, at all hazards, be put in action; but I certainly would postpone that measure until the last extremity, as I sincerely believe that if all other necessary payments of Government were suspended it would scarcely be possible for us to provide for their support.

With regard to any movement of your own, I certainly do not wish that you should submit to any measure of insult or aggression, but I very much deprecate its taking place. The situation of Scindia and Holkar are in a very considerable degree different, and perhaps it would not be necessary to observe exactly the same conduct towards both of them. I cannot easily define, in the multiplicity of cessions and conquests, what may be considered actually,

or what may be regarded virtually, as our territory; but wherever our own government has been regularly established, I would promptly resist an invasion by either of them.

From the reports I have received from our Residents, I am sorry to find that the States who are most intimately connected with us, such as the Peshwa and the Nizam, are reduced to the most forlorn condition; that these Powers possess no funds or troops on whom they can depend; that anarchy and disaffection prevail universally throughout their dominions, and that unless the British Residents exercised a power and an ascendancy that they ought not to exert, those Governments would be immediately dissolved.

The Rajah of Berar, and other chiefs who have suffered great deprivations, can certainly entertain no friendly disposition towards us, and unless a very great change can be effected in the minds of the natives of India, and in the ideas they must now harbour of our views, I confess that, under all these impressions, I cannot look forward with any sanguine hope to the establishment, by any means in our power, of that happy and permanent peace, which is so much to be desired, and of which you see so fair a prospect.

I have been indisposed for some time, and the complaint has now fallen into my feet, which puts me to great pain; I cannot therefore, at present, without considerable inconvenience make more use of my own pen than by signing my name to any letters I have occasion to write.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD LAKE.

MY DEAR LORD, Calgong, Sept. 1, 1805.

Nothing could make me believe that you would be induced to deviate in the slightest degree from any of my views while acting under my command; I have had too many proofs of your attention to my wishes ever to admit of that becoming a question, but from our very old acquaintance, beginning almost with the commencement of our lives, and the very sincere regard I have always entertained for you, I should hardly be satisfied that you should act *only* according to my directions. I feel, I confess, a considerable degree of anxiety, that your sentiments and opinions should accord with the impressions I have received of what constitutes the true policy of our Indian administration, and finding an almost universal opinion prevailing among the gentlemen in the political line, that a system of power was preferable to one of conciliation, I doubted how far its influence might have extended to those who

would naturally be consulted by you, and it was therefore principally to guard you against taking any material step in respect to measures in which you were not furnished with my instructions, that I enjoined a previous reference to me.

I entertain the most favourable opinion of the gentleman to whom these observations may be thought more immediately to apply, and I some time ago wrote a very friendly letter to Colonel Malcolm explaining candidly to him my political views and sentiments, and I can assure you that I feel as perfectly confident of his zealous exertion being united with your own in accomplishing whatever I may wish to effect by negotiation, as I do of your cordial co-operation with me, in the event of our being driven to the unfortunate necessity of resorting again to a state of war, which is the evil of all others that I most wish to avoid.

When the instructions were despatched to you relative to the Rajah of Jaypoor, I had the strongest assurances from Lord Wellesley that his misconduct had afforded us fair ground for withdrawing ourselves from that alliance; the events which have subsequently led to a renewal of assurances of the support of our Government were then unknown to me, and though I should have been better pleased if we had still been free of that connexion, you will find from the public instructions you will receive, that I consider the preservation of any pledge given by you as sacred, and that the former orders will therefore be so modified, as to secure you from any imputed breach of faith to the Rajah.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD LAKE.

MY LORD, Sept. 19, 1805.

In the actual state of the communication which your Lordship has been enabled to open with Dowlut Row Scindia, it appears to me to be indispensably necessary, with a view to the speedy and satisfactory adjustment of all questions depending between the British Government and Dowlut Row Scindia, to determine without delay the general principles of the arrangement to be finally concluded with that chieftain. This subject is necessarily connected with the disposal of the territories now in our possession on the west side of the Jumna, and with a consideration of the means by which, without a positive violation of public faith, we may be relieved from the evils and embarrassments inseparably connected (in my decided judgment) with the maintenance of the alliances

concluded with the several petty chieftains on the north of Hindostan. It is my intention in this despatch, therefore, to state to your Lordship my general sentiments upon these several points for your Lordship's information and guidance. The detail of these proposed arrangements must necessarily form the subjects of future deliberation, under the advantages to be derived from your Lordship's future communication.

Your Lordship will have inferred from the general tenor of my letters to your address, and of the instructions issued under my authority to Lieut.-Colonel Malcolm, that I am desirous of abandoning all concern in the territories on the west of the Jumna, with the exception of Bundlekhund, and of such portion of land as it may appear necessary to retain in the vicinity of Agra, for purposes connected with the possession of that fortress, and to render the river Jumna the frontier of the Company's dominions to the northward of Bundlekhund. Your Lordship has also been apprized of my anxiety to abandon the alliances at present subsisting with the Rajahs of Jeynugur, Bhurtpore,[1] and Macherry,[2] and with the Rana of Gohud. It is foreign to the immediate subject of this despatch to enter into a discussion of the general principles of policy in which these sentiments and resolutions originate. Your Lordship will have traced the nature of those principles in the various communications which I have had occasion to make to you, or which have been made to your Lordship by my special authority.

The first and most important object of my attention, is a satisfactory adjustment of all differences between the British Government and Dowlut Row Scindia, the principal obstacles to which appear to be—on the part of Scindia, the release of the British Resident,—and on our part the cession to that chieftain of the fortress of Gwalior and the province of Gohud. I am aware of the disadvantages of immediately relinquishing, or even of compromising, the demand which has been so repeatedly and so urgently made for the release of the British Resident; but I deem it proper to apprise your Lordship that, as a mere point of honour, I am disposed to compromise or even to abandon that demand, if it should ultimately prove to be the only obstacle to a satisfactory adjustment of affairs with Dowlut Row Scindia; and that I have hitherto been induced to support it by the apprehension that the motives of such a concession might be misinterpreted, and that it might lead to demands on the part of Scindia, with which we could

[1] Raja Runjeet Sing, d. 1812. He was a Jaut. [2] Rao Raja Buckliar Sing, d. 1815.

not comply without a sacrifice of dignity and interest incompatible with our security, and thereby render still more difficult of attainment the desirable object of a general pacification.

With regard to the cession of Gwalior and Gohud, in my decided opinion it is desirable to abandon our possession of the former, and our connexion with the latter, independently of any reference to a settlement of differences with Dowlut Row Scindia. I have therefore no hesitation in resolving to transfer to Dowlut Row Scindia the possession of that fortress and territory; securing, however, a suitable provision for the Rana, an arrangement which, under actual circumstances, I am satisfied is entirely consistent with our public faith. Upon this point I propose to state my sentiments more in detail in a subsequent part of this despatch.

But, however desirous I am to relinquish our possession of Gwalior and our connexion with Gohud, it is not my intention to accede to the unconditional surrender of those places. It appears by the communications made by Scindia directly to your Lordship, and indirectly through the agency of Moonshee Kavil Kyne,[1] that he demands the unconditional grant of those places, the continuance of the pensions and jaghires granted by the treaty of peace; the payment of the arrears of those pensions, the surrender of the districts of Dholpoor, Baree, and Rajkerree, and the discharge of the net revenue collected from those places, according to the provisions of the 7th article of the treaty of peace, as the price of his separation from the interests of Holkar. Scindia also appears to expect the grant of a portion of the territory conquered from Holkar. On the other hand I am extremely desirous of relieving the Company from the burthen of these pensions and jaghires; and it is just that Scindia should bear the charge of a suitable provision for the Rana of Gohud, the secure establishment of which can alone enable us to transfer that province to Scindia. We possess an undoubted claim also to reimbursement for the public and private losses occasioned by the plunder of the Residency in the months of December, 1804, and January, 1805, by Dowlut Row Scindia's servants.

These are the only demands which I am disposed to make upon Dowlut Row Scindia in a general settlement of affairs; at the same time it will be at our option to augment the cessions to Scindia by a portion of the territory now in our possession to the westward and southward of Delhi. Being desirous of abandoning that territory altogether, the expediency of that additional cession

[1] Monshee Kavil Kyne was a confidential servant of Sindia's.

is to be determined exclusively by political considerations; and if circumstances should admit of the dissolution of the alliance with the Rajah of Jeynugur, the amount of the tribute which Scindia will in that event be at liberty to demand from the Rajah, may be considered as an additional benefit of the general arrangement.

With regard to the expediency of granting to Scindia any portion of the territory to the westward and southward of Delhi, and thereby re-establishing the Mahratta power in a territory contiguous to the Duab, I am of opinion that it is very desirable, if possible, to establish any other power in that quarter, and by that means place a barrier between our territory in the Duab, and that of Scindia in Hindostan; but I should consider either of those arrangements to be more advisable than to maintain the possession of the territory in question, or to preserve any connexion with it. I shall state to your Lordship in a subsequent part of this despatch, the plan which occurs to me for the disposal of that territory, without assigning any portion of it to Dowlut Row Scindia.

In conformity to the preceding observations, the following is the general plan of arrangement which I am desirous of concluding with Dowlut Row Scindia:—

1st. To make over to Scindia the possessions of Gwalior and Gohud.

2nd. To transfer to him, according to the provisions of the treaty of peace, the districts of Dholpoor, Baree, and Rajkerree; and to account to Scindia for the collections from those districts since the peace.

I am aware that this is not to be considered in the light of a concession; but I am willing to relinquish that stipulation of the treaty which prohibits Scindia from stationing a force in those districts, an object which I should suppose to be highly desirable to that chieftain.

3rd. The eventual restoration of the Jeynugur tribute, amounting, I understand, to the annual sum of 3 lacs of rupees.

4th. To require from Scindia his consent to the abrogation of the pensions, and to the resumption of the jaghires in the Duab, established by the treaty of peace.

5th. To require from Scindia the relinquishment of his claim to the arrears of the pension.

6th. To demand a compensation for the public and private losses sustained by the plunder of the Residency.

7th. To require Scindia to make a provision for the Rana of

Gohud to the extent of 2½ or 3 lacs of rupees per annum, which I should conceive to be amply sufficient.

8th. Your Lordship will understand this to be the arrangement which I am desirous of concluding with Dowlut Row Scindia; but I shall be disposed to relax in some of the demands in favour of the Company, and even to extend the cessions to Scindia, if it should appear to be necessary for the satisfactory adjustment of affairs between the two States; but it is my desire that the negotiation should be commenced upon the basis of this proposed arrangement. The shortness of the communication between your Lordship and me, will admit of references upon subsidiary points without materially impeding the progress of the negotiation. Your Lordship will observe that I propose to cede nothing to Scindia which it is in my judgment an object to retain, whilst the advantages of the arrangement to the Company are considerable and important.

In any communications with Scindia or his officers, respecting the cession of Gohud and Gwalior, Scindia must be given to understand, that the British Government does not admit his claim to those places, and that the transfer of them to his possession is totally unconnected with the question of right, and must be considered to be an act entirely gratuitous on our part.

With regard to Scindia's own expectations of obtaining the grant of a portion of the territory conquered from Holkar by the British arms, your Lordship is apprised of my inclination to restore the whole of those conquests to Holkar; your Lordship, therefore, will not encourage any such expectation on the part of Scindia.

From the general tenor of the sentiments which I have stated, relative to an adjustment of affairs with Dowlut Row Scindia, your Lordship will have concluded that it is not my intention, under any circumstances, to renew our late defensive engagements with Dowlut Row Scindia. Your Lordship, however, will have inferred from the instructions addressed to Lieut.-Colonel Malcolm, by my authority, under date the 9th instant, that I am disposed to act in concert with Dowlut Row Scindia as an ally against Holkar, until Holkar shall manifest a disposition to accede to reasonable terms of peace.

From the tenor of the communications which I have received relative to the views and disposition of Dowlut Row Scindia, there is every reason to believe that, if assured of the cession of Gwalior and Gohud, he would be ready, not only to open a negotiation with the British Government for the adjustment of other points, but also

to comply with the demand which has hitherto been declared to be an indispensable preliminary to any negotiation. Your Lordship has acted in strict conformity to the declared resolutions of Government in maintaining that demand, unaccompanied by any specific assurance in your reply to Scindia's late letter, and in the corresponding communications made to Scindia and his Minister, under your Lordship's authority, through the channel of Lieut.-Colonel Malcolm and Moonshee Kavil Nyne. But being anxious to remove every obstacle to the proposed negotiation, and being resolved eventually to cede to Scindia the possession of Gwalior and Gohud, I am not aware of any material objection to a candid declaration to Scindia of my intentions in his favour, on the condition of his separation from Holkar, and his compliance with the demand for the release of the British Resident. I have accordingly judged proper to address a letter to Scindia upon that subject, which will be transmitted by the Secretary to Lieut.-Colonel Malcolm, for the purpose of being forwarded: a copy of it is enclosed for your Lordship's information.[1] Your Lordship will observe that I have given Dowlut Row Scindia reason to be assured of the cession of Gwalior and Gohud, after he shall have separated from Holkar, and dismissed Mr. Jenkins; and I have deemed it advisable to combine with a declaration to that effect, a statement of the general principles of policy by which I am desirous of regulating the conduct of the British Government towards all the States of India. I am anxious to promulgate those principles, with a view to restore to the Native States that confidence in the justice and moderation of the British Government, which past events have considerably impaired, and which appears to me to be essential to the security and tranquillity of the Company's dominions. Your Lordship will also observe, that I have endeavoured to repress any expectation on the part of Dowlut Row Scindia of deriving advantage from a perseverance in his late equivocal course of conduct, and to induce him to apprehend that procrastination or evasion will expose to hazard the fulfiment of the intentions I have declared in his favour.

As connected with this subject, I now proceed to state to your Lordship my sentiments and resolutions with regard to the question of obtaining the disposal of Gohud. The description contained in one of your Lordship's despatches to the late Governor-General of the character and conduct of the Rana of Gohud, and the general

[1] This letter was never forwarded. Lord Lake assigned strong reasons for withholding it, but his despatch was not received till after the death of Lord Cornwallis. Sir George Barlow, however, acquiesced in the reasons.

tenor of the information I have received upon that subject, afford abundant proof of the utter inability of that chieftain to regulate the affairs of his country, to preserve its tranquillity, or to realize its revenue under the supremacy of such a chieftain. The territory must exhibit a constant scene of turbulence and disorder unless it shall be placed under the absolute management and control of a local British authority. The British Government must be burthened and embarrassed with the charge of administering the affairs of that country, without the advantage of our own laws and regulations, and without any other benefit than that of securing the amount of the stipulated subsidy for the payment of the subsidised troops, which it would be necessary to keep in a state of constant and active employment for the preservation of tranquillity, and the regulation of the revenues. The Rana would, in fact, become a pensioner upon the British Government, although the nominal sovereign of a country estimated to yield a revenue of twenty-five lacs of rupees per annum. I am aware of the stipulation in the treaty with the Rana, which secures to the British Government the realization of the amount of the subsidy, by giving us a right to appoint a person to superintend the collection of that amount, in the event of a failure on the part of the Rana in the payment of it. But there are duties and obligations imposed upon the Rana by the terms of the treaty, beyond the mere payment of the subsidy, and his neglect, refusal, or inability to fulfil them would unquestionably justify the dissolution of the alliance. But independently of this consideration it may be observed that, according to the acknowledged principles of public law, an alliance which exposes to hazard the most essential interests of either of the allied States, and, consequently, endangers the very existence of that State, may be abandoned without any implication of its public faith. At the same time it is incumbent upon a State so situated, to make such compensation to the other contracting party as circumstances may render practicable. I have no hesitation in stating my decided opinion, that the necessity of acquiring a right to dispose of the territory of Gohud, considered as a means indispensably requisite to lay the foundation of a general pacification, (which in my judgment it unquestionably is) renders the preceding observation precisely applicable to the case of the alliance subsisting between the British Government and the Rana of Gohud. Under either or both of the points of view in which I have considered our alliance with Gohud, my mind is entirely satisfied of the justice of annulling it, securing at the same time a suitable provision for the Rana, and affording ample protec-

tion to his person and family. It is superfluous to add that the abrogation of the treaty by which alone the Rana obtained the sovereignty of Gohud, leaves the British Government at liberty to dispose of that territory in the manner most consistent with its interests. At the same time I am anxious that, if possible, the right of disposing of that territory should be the result of a negotiation with the Rana of Gohud; and it appears to me to be probable that the Rana, sensible of his utter incapacity to govern his country, or even to derive from it a sufficient maintenance, and exposed to the difficulties, dangers, and vexations of such a charge, will be disposed to exchange it for a certain annual income, which will afford him, without effort or trouble, the means of living in comfort, ease, and independence. . . .

Agreeably to the intimation contained in the 7th paragraph of this despatch, I now proceed to state to your Lordship the plan which occurs to me for the disposal of the territory to the westward and southward of Delhi, without assigning any portion of it to Dowlut Row Scindia.

The plan which I propose is to assign from it, jaghires to the several chiefs who have joined our cause, and for whom, with the irregular troops under their command, we are bound to provide, and to divide the remainder between the Rajahs of Macherry and Bhurtpoor, those chieftains consenting to relinquish their alliance with the British Government.

It appears to me that those chieftains must be interested in excluding the Marhattas, and that their territories, thus extended, would constitute the desirable barrier between the possessions of Scindia in Hindostan and our possessions in the Duab, provided they should be able to resist the power of Scindia. It appears to me to be probable that in the reduced condition of Scindia's military force, those chieftains would be able to maintain their possessions and their independence against his utmost efforts, especially if aided by the jaghiredars, who would of course be interested in opposing him. But even the probability of Scindia's ultimate success would not, in my opinion, constitute a sufficient objection to the proposed arrangement, being satisfied of the expediency even of admitting into the territories in question the power of Dowlut Row Scindia, rather than we should preserve any control over or connection with them. But Scindia's endeavours to wrest those territories from the hands of the Rajahs of Macherry and Bhurtpoor, may be expected to lay the foundation of interminable contests, which will afford ample and permanent employment to Scindia; and, under any circumstances, I cannot admit the appre-

hension of any hostile attempt on the part of Scindia against the British possessions in the Duab, still less should I deem it probable in the event of his rendering the chiefs of Macherry and Bhurtpoor his perpetual enemies, which must be the consequence of his endeavours to deprive them of a portion of their dominions.

The arrangement with the Rajah of Bhurtpoor, including the restoration of the fortress of Deeg, may probably afford the means of obtaining an earlier payment of the whole, or a part of, the contribution due by that chieftain to the British Grvernment. It may, however, be a question whether it would not be both just and expedient, under the abrogation of the subsisting treaty, to compromise that demand.

With regard to the chieftains for whom we propose to provide by jaghires in the country on the west of the Jumna, I am anxious on the general principle of withdrawing from all connexion with that country (with the exception before stated), to avoid any engagement which will impose upon us the obligation to protect them. It is my wish, if possible, that they should be placed in a condition entirely independent of us.

It may perhaps be found practicable to render them dependent upon the States of Macherry and Bhurtpoor; but I shall deem any arrangement with regard to them, preferable to one which should render them dependent upon our protection.

Your Lordship's local knowledge and experience will enable you to judge of the practicability of this general plan, and I request to be favoured with your Lordship's sentiments upon it, combined with such further suggestions as may occur to your Lordship's judgment. The details of it must necessarily form the subject of future communications.

I request also to be favoured with your Lordship's sentiments and suggestions upon all the points stated in this despatch.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

The answer of Lord Lake to this despatch was dated a few days subsequent to the death of Lord Cornwallis,—it is therefore not given; but he did not assent to the views expressed in the foregoing paper.

MARQUIS CORNWALLIS TO LORD LAKE.

MY DEAR LORD, Sept. 23, 1805.

It would be difficult to describe to you the feelings of regret and concern that have been produced on my mind, by the receipt

of your Lordship's public and private letters of the 13th instant which arrived yesterday, especially after the full persuasion I had been impressed with, of the thorough cordiality with which you had contemplated my arrival in India in the stations of Governor-General and Commander-in-Chief. If anything could exceed my disappointment at this change, as it appears to me, in your sentiments, it would be the very unexpected, and I am sure the very unfounded interpretation you have put upon the General Order of the 28th ultimo, as conveying the most distant idea of a censure upon you; nothing, my dear Lord, believe me, could have been more foreign to my thoughts or intentions, and it is therefore the first and most anxious of my wishes to acquit myself fully of any such design, which would have been as inconsistent with the sentiments of friendship and regard we have so long entertained for each other, as it would have been derogatory to the respectability of those stations we severally enjoy.

If, my dear Lord, a misconception has taken place, either in respect to the powers with which I was vested from home, or in regard to my assumption and exercise of them here, for God's sake let us come to a thorough understanding upon this subject in the first instance, as the surest means of enabling both of us to act with a thorough candour and cordiality, even though we should unfortunately differ so much in our ideas as to render it impracticable for you, consistently with your feelings, to continue to me the aid of those services, which have been so zealously and so successfully exerted in the cause of your country, and which I could not be deprived of without experiencing very strong feelings of sincere regret.

Your Lordship well knows that I have never yet accepted a civil government to which the military authority was not also annexed, and that both in India before, as well as in Ireland, (where I had the benefit of your zealous co-operation and assistance), the exercise of that branch of my public duties which belonged to the military part of my appointment was conducted under my own orders and direction. It is therefore no novelty in my practice, and I solemnly assure you it never was in my contemplation, to relinquish the superintendence and direction of the details of the army. If this therefore, my dear Lord, is the point, I will not say in contest, but in question, between us, I can only trust that in this candid exposition of my ideas you will at once see, that an order issued in conformity to the fulfilment of those duties could not have been published with any such views towards your Lordship, as have been imputed to it.

I wish, before you take any decisive steps in regard to a return to Europe, that you would as candidly and freely explain to me, my dear Lord, the ideas which you had formed of the powers and authority intended to be vested in you, and favour me with an explanation of that description of a divided authority which could, in your judgment, be exercised in our relative situations, so as to combine the interests of the public and the efficiency of my controlling powers, with the continuance of a distinct authority to be exercised by your Lordship over the troops of this establishment; and you may rely upon my disposition to give it as liberal and as candid a consideration as your utmost wishes could desire.

I am, &c.,

CORNWALLIS.

GEORGE ABERCROMBIE ROBINSON, ESQ., TO VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH.

MY LORD, Near Buxor, Sept. 25, 1805.

A more distressing representation than I have now to make of Lord Cornwallis's health can hardly be imagined. The last overland despatch conveyed reports that would probably inform your Lordship of the precarious state in which we then thought him, and would prepare you in some measure for the still more afflicting accounts you will now receive.

On his Lordship landing at Madras, it was very obvious that his constitution was less equal to contend against the effects of this climate than during his former residence in India.[1] From that time to the present, without suffering from the influence of any specific complaint, a gradual state of increasing weakness and debility has reduced him at length to a condition that affords no actual hopes of recovery; and although he has continued till within these few days to give his attention to the course of all political business on which his mind has been constantly and intensely bent, I am persuaded he can no longer conduct it to any efficient purpose, without a change so great and rapid as to amount almost to a miracle; and we have written accordingly to Sir George Barlow to recommend his coming up immediately by dawk to join his Lordship at Benares.

I have, &c.,

G. A. ROBINSON.

26th September.

P.S. Letters were received from Muttra last night, copies of

[1] The first proof of his bodily weakness, was his reluctance to ride the hard-trotting horses which, with reference to his former habits, had been selected for him.

which are sent to Mr. Grant, by which it appears that Scindia has resolved to dismiss Mr. Jenkins, an event that will remove the only stumbling-block now in the way of negotiation with him. Lord Cornwallis's good name, I am persuaded, has effected this. How much is it to be regretted that he should not live to accomplish this great work of peace! He is much the same to-day as yesterday.

GEORGE ABERCROMBIE ROBINSON, ESQ., TO LIEUT.-GENERAL ROSS.

Above Buxor, Sept. 26, 1805.

You cannot conceive a more melancholy and distressing state than we are now in, my dear General. Since my letter by the last overland despatch, if we have had occasional gleams of hope, they have been very transitory, and must in the end prove illusive, for I think it is hardly possible for any human being to retain existence much longer, in the weak and reduced state in which good Lord Cornwallis now is; but, alas, it is not only the loss of bodily strength that we have to deplore, the powers of his mind are unfortunately failing him fast, he dozes away the remnant of life that is left to him and wakes but to a perfect unconsciousness of what is passing around him. I have lived in short, my dear General, to see the day when the dissolution of this great and good man is more to be wished for, than existence in his present state. I cannot describe to you what my feelings are, and have been for some time past, from being constantly with him. I had seen the gradual approaches of this state of weakness; they have however been so gradual, that, until within these four or five days he has been capable of comprehending the course of the political business on which his mind to the last has been intensely and anxiously bent, but he rallies not now even to that object; and as Nightingall and myself have long felt that no small responsibility might attach to us, we have constantly kept Sir George Barlow informed of his state, advised his laying bearers to be ready to proceed immediately up the country in the event of Lord C.'s death, and now have urged him strenuously to join us immediately, that the efficiency of the Government may be supported by his presence, which is the only expedient that the present distressing state of things admits of. I once proposed an immediate return to Calcutta and an embarkation for Europe, but Fleming thinks if there is a chance left, it is in the effects of a cold climate, which we shall sooner arrive at here than below.

I think it proper that Lord Brome should know how little hope

we have of Lord Cornwallis's recovery, but I see no good that can be answered by wounding his feelings still deeper by a description of his imbecility; I shall accordingly enclose within this a few lines calculated to be shown to Lord Brome, and trust the communication of it to you. Pray offer my respectful remembrances to Mrs. Ross, who I hope is well, and

Believe me, my dear General, &c.,

G. A. ROBINSON.

P.S. While I have been writing, Lord Cornwallis has asked a question about the release of our Resident with Scindia, that shows his mind is still alive to that subject, and that after a considerable interval, he recollects an important despatch I read to him this morning.

Mr. Robinson had written to various persons during the preceding ten days, giving an almost daily account of Lord Cornwallis's health. Up to September 25 there had frequently been symptoms of returning strength. But after that all hope was abandoned.

SIR GEORGE BARLOW TO THE COURT OF DIRECTORS.

HONOURABLE SIRS, Ghazepore, Oct. 5, 1805.

. . . With sentiments of the deepest concern and regret I have to announce to your Honourable Court, the melancholy event of the decease of the Governor-General, Marquis Cornwallis, on the 5th instant at Ghazepore, in the province of Benares, at which place he had arrived on his journey to the Upper Provinces. . . .

I have the honour, &c.,

GEORGE H. BARLOW.

The two following letters, written a few months later than the above, are inserted, as they contain some account of the close of Lord Cornwallis's life. They are addressed to "Viscount Brome," though he had then, by his father's death, become second Marquis Cornwallis.

LIEUT.-COLONEL NIGHTINGALL TO VISCOUNT BROME.

MY DEAR LORD, On the Ganges near Monghir, Jan. 15, 1806.

The arrival of the Medusa and various overland packets, will long since have conveyed to you the mournful intelligence of the irreparable loss we have sustained. I could only address a very few lines to you by my friend Robinson, being at that period too much overwhelmed with grief to enter fully into the melancholy particulars of that sad event. It was however the less necessary, as Robinson was so fully able to relate to you the whole progress of the weakness (for I cannot call it disease) which gradually deprived us of one of the greatest as well as best of men. From the period of his Lordship's arrival in India, he grew daily weaker and totally lost all appetite, and I understand this was also the case from the very day he sailed from England;[1] I was in hopes however, that his proceeding immediately after his arrival up the country, and getting into a cooler climate might have proved of service, and perhaps in some degree have restored his strength and appetite; but you will find by Robinson's account that in this respect we were all miserably deceived, for he continued declining and sinking every day more and more, though perfectly unaware of his own immediate danger. I was unfortunately at one period so extremely and dangerously ill myself as to be confined to my bed for ten days, and consequently unable to see him; as soon as I was sufficiently recovered to walk, I went on board his boat, and was much shocked to see what a sad change the ten days I had been absent had made in his appearance; he seemed, however, in some degree revived at seeing me again, and expressed himself (in his usual kind and affectionate manner) most happy at my recovery. After this period, about three weeks before his death, I never quitted him during the day, and latterly, when we were obliged to remove him from his boat to a house on the bank of the river, Robinson and I always slept in the next room; in fact, my dear Lord, you may rely upon it that every attention and care was paid to him which the most sincere affection could possibly bestow, and it will afford you some small consolation, that I was present to administer every possible comfort to him in his last moments. Notwithstanding his extreme weak and reduced state, he nobly supported his high character to the last, never once thinking of his own deplorable condition, but ever anxious to pursue his journey

[1] The food on board ship did not suit him, and he objected to the fowls which had been provided, being reserved exclusively for his use. In the same way, when the water became bad, he would not avail himself of the Bristol water which had been laid in especially for him.

in order to accomplish the great end for which he came out, and for which he has, unhappily for his friends and his country, fallen a sacrifice.

I will not, however, dwell any longer on this truly melancholy subject (though it is ever uppermost in my thoughts), as in fact it will be merely a repetition of what Robinson must have already made you fully acquainted with; I shall therefore briefly remark, that there has been but one universal sentiment of the most sincere regret expressed all over India, both by Europeans and natives, who have, at the three Presidencies, unanimously joined in paying that respectful tribute to his memory which was due to his exalted patriotism, his numerous virtues, and his revered character.

I have experienced every consolation under my heavy and irreparable loss, which my good friend Sir George Barlow could possibly bestow. . . .

I need not say how extremely happy I should be to receive a line from you whenever you have a leisure moment; in the mean time believe me always with the most sincere esteem and regard,

My dear Lord, very faithfully and affectionately yours,

M. NIGHTINGALL.

LIEUT.-COLONEL NIGHTINGALL TO VISCOUNT BROME.

MY DEAR LORD, Fort William, March 16, 1806.

Before this letter reaches England I sincerely hope you will have recovered, in some degree, from the severe shock you must have experienced on the arrival of the Medusa. I can easily judge of your feelings on that truly melancholy occasion by my own, and will endeavour in future to avoid as much as possible recalling such painful ideas to your recollection; one or two circumstances must, however, be stated for your information. When Robinson left us at Ghazeepore, it was agreed between us that all the expenses attending the funeral and place of interment should be defrayed by me; but Government have insisted on discharging the amount of the temporary masonry erected round the tomb, in order to preserve it till the mausoleum should be built, and nothing has been left for me to pay but some small presents and other trifling expenses incurred on that sad melancholy occasion, and which will not exceed one hundred, or at most one hundred and fifty pounds; the account was sent to me some time ago but has been mislaid, and I have written to my friend Mr. Crommelin, the Commercial Resident at Ghazeepore, for another copy which I expect in a few days, and will transmit to you by the next ship.

. . . I have reserved to myself an old sword which I remember to have seen his Lordship wear in the Mysore war, a sash, and a cane; these articles are to me invaluable, particularly the first, which, with your permission I shall religiously keep till the day of my death; independent of the desire of inheriting a sword which has been worn by so distinguished a soldier, it is natural for me to wish for the possession of some small token which belonged to one I ever loved and revered with the truest affection.

As all letters addressed to his Lordship are opened by me to ascertain whether they contain any information of a public nature, I shall send all such as are merely private to you, in case they are of any importance; I have, of course, returned your own letters unopened. . . .

I shall ever maintain the most sincere regard and affection for you and all your family, nor do I ever intend to trouble you in any shape or ask you to forward my views in life by your interest. If there is one thing in the world I abhor more than another, it is that of asking a favour, and fortunately my prospects are so good that there is no chance of my being driven to this necessity.

Mrs. N. is very well and desires her best love to you and Lady Louisa (for so I must for this once call her), not forgetting her favourites Jane and little Louisa; and,

Believe me, &c.,

M. NIGHTINGALL.

Besides the civil and military honours conferred upon him by his sovereign, Lord Cornwallis repeatedly during his lifetime received such marks of approbation as a grateful country could bestow. On more than one occasion, the thanks of both Houses of Parliament were voted him. The Corporations of London,[1] Dublin, Waterford, and many other towns enrolled him among their freemen, and on his return from India, in 1794, the East India Company settled upon him a pension of 5000*l.* certain for 20 years.

But his death called forth still stronger proofs of the universal

[1] The Lord Mayor and a deputation of the Corporation went in state on April 5, 1794, with banners and a band of music, to Old Burlington Street, to present Lord Cornwallis with a gold box containing the Freedom of the City. Lord Cornwallis returned with them to the Mansion House, the populace taking the horses from his carriage, and drawing him through the streets. He was then sworn in, and entertained at a great dinner at the Mansion House, which was decorated with a transparency representing the delivery of the Hostages.—See Gent. Mag., vol. lxiv. p. 379. The freedoms of the Irish towns were voted, some during, some after, the discussions on the Union.

esteem in which he was held, and of the deep regret felt for his loss. As soon as the intelligence of his decease reached Calcutta, the Supreme Council ordered, besides the usual marks of respect, that the whole army should wear mourning for three months. At a public meeting which was immediately convened, it was resolved, without one dissentient voice, to erect by subscription a mausoleum to his memory at Ghazipore.[1] The inhabitants of Bombay not only cordially joined in this subscription, but also determined to place a statue in the most conspicuous locality of their city. At Madras,[2] and in the Prince of Wales Island, it was decided to erect cenotaphs to his memory. Nor were the contributions for these objects confined to Europeans, as many of the natives requested permission to testify their feelings by liberal subscriptions.

In England Lord Castlereagh, Feb. 3, 1806, moved in the House of Commons to erect a statue of him in St. Paul's. Objections were raised to this proposal by two members only—Mr. O'Hara, avowedly because Lord Cornwallis had carried the Union—and Mr. Windham, from one of those singular crotchets which so often biassed his mind and influenced his conduct. It is unnecessary to say that the Court of Directors, who had at all times so warmly concurred in the views of Lord Cornwallis, deeply lamented his death. As a mark of private respect they wore mourning for some weeks, and they cordially joined with the Court of Proprietors in voting a sum of 40,000*l.* to his family, as a more substantial token of their approbation.

No person who devotes himself to the service of his country, can hope that his conduct will be exempt from harsh criticism, and unmerited blame. To this general rule Lord Cornwallis was no exception. On the other hand it would be easy to quote from the speeches and writings of most distinguished politicians and historians, the strongest eulogies on his conduct. By many his military talents have been highly extolled, by others as much depreciated. The great measures he carried out in India were, at the time, regarded as the strongest proofs of just philanthropy, and enlightened statesmanship. By some, especially in more recent days, they have been condemned in no measured terms. The same variety of opinion with respect to his general policy and public conduct has also been expressed, both in writing and in public discussions during his life, as well as subsequent to his death. But it has always been a high gratification to those connected with him,

[1] The first stone of the mausoleum was laid Dec. 22, 1809, and the building has been kept in repair by the Government ever since.

[2] A statue had already been inaugurated to him at Madras in 1800.

either by ties of blood or friendship, to know that with one or two exceptions, arising from private malevolence or general hatred of all that is good and great, his private character has been ever held in the highest estimation, and that even those who have most impugned his public policy, have looked upon him as a man whose motives were as pure, as his honour and integrity were unimpeachable.

"Quod si habitum quoque ejus posteri noscere velint, decentior quam sublimior fuit: nihil metûs in vultu: gratia oris supererat: bonum virum facilè crederes, magnum libenter. Et ipse quidem, quamquam medio in spatio integræ ætatis ereptus, quantùm ad gloriam, longissimum ævum peregit. Opibus nimiis non gaudebat; speciosæ contigerant: natis superstitibus, potest videri etiam beatus, incolumi dignitate, florente famâ, salvis adfinitatibus et amicitiis, futura effugisse.

* * * * * *

Quidquid ex illo amavimus, quidquid mirati sumus, manet, mansurumque est in animis hominum, in æternitate temporum, famâ rerum. Nam multos veterum, velut inglorios et ignobiles, oblivio obruet: Ille posteritati narratus et traditus, superstes erit."[1]

[1] Tacit., Vit. Ag.

INDEX.

A.

ABERCORN, Lord, iii. 321, 323, 324.

ABERDEEN (3rd Earl of), i. 304.

ABERCROMBY, Sir Ralph, i. 202; commands the British in Flanders, ii. 278, 284, 286; commands in Ireland, 335, 415; opinion of the Irish militia, 536, 538, 539, 540, 544; commands in Scotland, iii. 78, 123, 126, 127, 130, 145, 148, 294, 361; ii. 521; skirmish by, 527, 528, 529, 531, 534.

ABERCROMBY, Sir Robert, i. 128, 130, 389, 407, 413, 427, 559; ii. 67, 71, 73, 90, 135, 138, 141, 153, 154, 216, 217, 277, 293, 296, 307, 317, 322, 491, 514, 515, 518-521, 527-529, 533, 534, 536, 538-540, 544.

ABKARRY, tax, ii. 497.

ABUSES in recruiting Company's army, i. 258; of patronage, 458; inquiry into frauds at Madras, ii. 34.

ACCOUNTS between the Company and the Vizier, confused mode of stating, i. 265.

ACHESON, Hon. A., iii. 50.

——, Sir Arthur, mention of, by Swift, iii. 50.

ADAIR, Sergt., made Recorder of London, ii. 379; Solicitor to the Ordnance, 379, 381.

ACBAR, Prince, i. 453.

ADARE, Lord; *see* Dunraven.

ADAULET, judges of, improper influence of, i. 283; regulations about courts of, 424; judge of, ii. 29; court of Nizamut, 550; abolition of Maal Adaulets, 562.

ADDINGTON, Right Hon. H.; *see* Sidmouth.

ADOPTION, ii. 207, 208, 212; Hindoo law of, 213, 221, 552, 566-568.

ADMINISTRATION of criminal justice in India, ii. 487, 549.

AFFGHANS, ii. 294.

AGENTS of native princes in England, dissatisfaction of the Court of Directors with unrecognised, i. 254.

AGISTMENT tithe, iii. 221, 226, 227.

AGITATION in Ireland, ii. 339-349; in Antrim, 352; Wicklow, 357, 387; Kildare and Meath, 358, 359, 363, 379; iii. 12, 21, 51, 61, 66, 77, 86, 141; in Waterford and Tipperary, 132; in Dublin, 51, 161, 168, 169, 283, 290.

AGRICULTURE, decline of Indian, i. 554; state of, in Bengal, ii. 476, 477; waste lands, 558-560.

AGRA, Lord Wellesley's proposal of occupying, iii. 530, 548.

AHMUTY, Col. Arthur, i. 457.

AILESBURY, Earl of, i. 285, 322.

ALBANIAN troops, admission to the garrison of Malta of, iii. 486.

ALCOCK, Wm. Congreve, shoots Mr. Colclough in a duel, iii. 124.

ALDBOROUGH, Earl of, compensation to, iii. 322.

ALEXANDER, Henry, iii. 43, 98; letter from, 161, 333.

ALI Behauder, conquests of, i. 440, 453.

ALI Hussein, deposition and death of, iii. 493.

ALI Ibrahim Khan, Criminal Judge at Benares, ii. 29; high character of, 35.

ALI Jah, revolts against his father, ii. 304.

ALI Reza Khan, ii. 211, 534.

ALKMAAR, armistice signed at, on the part of the English, iii. 137, 141.

ALLAHABAD, proposed resumption of, i. 238.

ALLAN, Major Sir Alexander, iii. 174.

ALLIANCE with Mahratta princes, i. 345, 406, 496; between England and Holland in India, 369; with Northern powers, ii. 9; between Prussia and Austria, 164.

ALLIANCES, Frederick the Great's opinion upon existing, i. 204, 207; Earl Cornwallis's opinion of, 275.

ALLIED armies, command of the, ii. 263, 267-271.

ALLIES, dilatory movements of the Indian, ii. 89, 91, 92; intrigues of, with Tippoo, 139; treaty of guarantee with, 177.

ALMAS Ali Khan, i. 258.

ALTAMONT, Earl of; *see* Sligo.

ALVANLEY, Lord, i. 269, 299.

ALY Effendy, Turkish minister at the Amiens conferences, iii. 462, 466, 481.

AMALGAMATION of the King's and Company's armies, i. 258, 332, 341, 344; Lord Cornwallis's plan of, ii. 572-582.

AMBOOR, ii. 510, 511; supplies from, 522.

AMEER Sing, Raja of Tanjore, i. 222; his succession to Tanjore decided, but afterwards reconsidered, 251; the succession of, ii. 566-568.

AMEER ul Omra, i. 254.

AMERICA, causes of the revolt, and progress of the war, i. 17-21; battles of Brooklyn and White Plains, 23; of Trenton, 26; comparative force of the two armies, 29, 39; secret negotiations between France and, 32; aid from France, 32; cruelty to the loyalists, 34, 62, 72, 73, 504, 517, 519; gross violation of her engagements, 36; her financial resources dependent on Virginian tobacco, 43; defeat of the rebels at Waxhaws, 45; battle of Camden, 56; surprise and death of Major Ferguson, 59; garbled extracts from letters of Lords Cornwallis and Rawdon quoted by Washington, 62; evasion of Congress as to ex-

change of prisoners, 81; battle of Cowpens, 83; of Guilford, 86; communications intercepted by the rebels, 89, 96; battle of Hobkirk's Hill, 98; repudiates its bargain with Baron Steuben, 105; difficulties of, 116; want of courtesy to the English army when defeated, 126; war with, practically ended on Lord Cornwallis's surrender, 138; remarks on the termination of the war with, 139; refusal of, to exchange Lord Cornwallis, 141; confiscation of the property of the American loyalists, 193; loyalists, compensation to, 193, 194; after long delays pays 42*l.* per cent., 195; supply of arms from the Tower to, ii. 409; refuses to receive the banished Irish rebels, 376, 425, 427, 432.
AMHERST, Jeffrey, Lord, ii. 283.
AMIENS, mission of Lord Cornwallis, iii. 383; documents relating to the peace of, 387; conferences at, 399-436, 439-484; society at, 437; conclusion of the treaty of, 485-487, 507.
ANCRAM, Earl of, i. 215.
——, *see* Lothian.
ANDAMAN Islands, ii. 155, 302.
ANDERSON, David, proposed as successor in Council to Sir J. Macpherson, i. 370.
ANDERSON, James, i. 224.
ANDRÉ, Major, execution of, i. 78; his mother pensioned and brother created baronet, 79.
ANIMALLY hills, ii. 490.
ANKERVILLE, Lord, i. 169.
ANNESLEY, Rt. Hon. Richard, iii. 164, 166, 321.
ANSTRUTHER, Rt. Hon. Sir J., ii. 43.
ANTI-Unionists equally violent as Anti-Catholics, iii. 51; tactics of, 54; dismissal of, from office, 57, 62; amendments proposed by, 41, 42, 162, 163, 202, 203, 212, 248; inflame the minds of the people, 168, 180.
ANTRIM, outrages in, iii. 19, 21, 61, 67; seizure of persons in, 73; reception of Lord Cornwallis at, 139, 140, 141; agitation in, 168; tranquillity restored, 283.
——, Countess of, 312, 321.
APAJEE Ram sent by Tippoo to make terms with Lord Cornwallis, ii. 73, 99, 110, 119.
APPA Saheb, ii. 520.
APPEALS from the Court of Requests, evils of, ii. 314; courts of, establishment of Indian, 563; finality of decrees of, 563.
APPOINTMENTS, Government, at the Unfon, iii. 107.
APSLEY, Capt., ii. 322; iii. 15, 16, 317.
ARAB horses, present of, ii. 557.
ARBUTHNOT, Admiral, i. 48, 52; action with Chev. Destouches, 88.
ARCHDUKE Charles; *see* Charles.
ARCHER, Wm. Henry, ii. 376.
AROOT, Nabob of, Mahomet Ali, i. 222;

debts of, 224, 248, 353; succession of, 254; his creditors, 388, 547; death of his son Ameer, 397, ii. 2; petulance of his creditors, i. 558; creditors of, not to be members of Council, ii. 13; his debt to the E.I. Company, 25; character of, 26; complaints against Messrs. Hollond, 65, 156; suit in Chancery by, 174, 180; his private creditors, 481; 486; accounts of, 484, 485, 493, 495, 496, 498; complaints by, 503, 510, 526, 527; new arrangement with, 545, 570; iii. 289.
ARDEE, disfranchised, iii. 321.
ARDEN; *see* Alvanley.
ARDFERT, disfranchised, iii. 321.
ARMAGH, Archbishop of, iii. 139; vacancy in see of, 160; claims of Archbishop of Cashel to see of, 217.
——, Lord Cornwallis's reception at, iii. 139, 234.
ARMED Neutrality, i. 373.
ARMIES on the continent, Lord Cornwallis sent to investigate state of, ii. 230-232; proposed to command the allied force, 233, 234, 260; instructions to, 239; conduct of the Emperor, 245-247; staff of Lord Cornwallis, 248; Lord Cornwallis's interview with Marshal Mullendorf, 253; Prince of Cobourg removed, 257, 258; proposed removal of the Duke of York, 263; state of the allied, 267, 269, 275, 277, 281; gallant conduct of the Guards, 283.
ARMS, manufacture of small, iii. 111.
ARMSTRONG, Capt. J. W., pension to, ii. 375; iii. 106.
ARMY in India, promotion and patronage in the, i. 179; state of the, 235; promotion in the, 235; the Bengal, its condition, 239; expense of German troops, 245; tent allowance, 248; a large reduction of Vizier's troops recommended by Lord Cornwallis, 250; abandonment of the proposed amalgamation of the King's and the Company's, 251; rank of officers, 252; jealousies between Company's and King's troops, 260; Lord Cornwallis's efforts to improve the, 276; contrast between Company's native and European troops, 311, 317; condition and discipline of the native troops, 311; amalgamation of the Company's European troops with the King's army, 320, 534; mode of recruiting, 322; rank of Company's officers, 332; augmentation of King's troops, 342; number of troops in India, 341, 342, 343, 344; alteration of the military establishments of India, 342; rank of the Company's officers, 343; local rank in India, 381; interference of Mr. Hollond with movements of, 416; impropriety of officers borrowing of natives, 451; operations of the, 479, 480, 481; Lord Cornwallis objects to selling staff appointments in,

495; return of officers on furlough, 529; necessity of European troops, 531; discipline of the Indian army, aided by annual reliefs, 537; admission of Company's officers to the King's service in India, 550; allowance to invalid pensioners, 550; pensions to officers, 550; promotion in India, 551; necessity of a large military establishment in the west of Hindostan, 557; military defence of the western coast of India, 558; Company's inefficient, ii. 18; European and native troops, 19; Hanoverian regiments, ineffective state of contingent sent to Nizam, 64; general order against outrages, 87; conveyance of the sick on a march, 95; doolies and platform carts required, 96; the transmission of military orders, 213, 214; Lord Cornwallis's plan for new-modelling the, 265; proposed military arrangement for India disapproved of by Directors, 286; Lord Harris' views on, 300; claims of King's officers in India, 289; discontents as to promotion, 288; military arrangement for, 297; discontent in the Indian, 298; army promotions, 298; state of Indian, 301-302; native troops, 302; rank, retiring allowances, and furloughs to Indian officers, 304; alarming state of the Bengal, 306; discontent of Bengal officers, 311, 316, 317; mutinous combinations in the, 312; officers appoint delegates, 316; their demands, 317, 318; Bengal officers return to their duty, 319; projected transfer of the Company's army to the King's service, 234, 285; military regulations for India, 323; information required as to the, 501, 502; amalgamation of the King's with the Company's, 572; Lord Cornwallis's plan of, 572-582; present to Lord Cornwallis from the Indian, iii. 275.

ARMY, British—compared with the American, i. 29; its want of discipline and its dissipation at Philadelphia, 31; loss of, at the siege of Charlestown, 44; important posts of, in America, 48; sickness in, 58; defeat of Major Ferguson, 59; winter and summer difficulties of, 81; loss of, at Cowpens, 84; failure of provisions, 86, 87; its distress and suffering, 107; critical position of, at Yorktown, 123; inactivity of Sir H. Clinton's army, 123; capitulation and surrender of, to America and France combined, 127; its difficulties in America, 515; military allowances, 396; formation of Life-guards, 402; discipline in the, ii. 525; prize money of, 536; pay of Ordnance Staff, iii. 15; military patronage, 25; conduct of departments of, during the American war, 103; brevet rank, 127; the Guards, 143; Mr. Pitt's remarks on the English, 154; military arrangements, 115; wants

of, in Holland, 133-135; withdrawal of, 136.

ARMY in Ireland—conduct of the military in Ireland, ii. 371; military arrangements in Ireland, 389; general order on excesses of the troops, 397; want of discipline of the Irish militia, 408; misconduct of Irish troops at Castlebar, 412; habits of the Guards and English regiments in Ireland, 408-415; exemplary conduct of the 100th Regiment, 415, the (5th) Royal Irish Dragoons disbanded, 423; misconduct of officers of a fencible regiment in Ireland, 439; dismissal of a lieutenant for sending a mutinous letter, 439, 440; desire of English militia to return to England, 450; allowances to the, 573, 577, 580; leave of absence, 575, 576, 578, 579; military arrangements in Irish rebellion, iii. 79; state of, in Ireland, 81; conduct of the military, 95; heavy cavalry useless in Ireland, 110; strength of, in Ireland, 117, 118; Irish militia, 133; state of the army in Ireland, 299; defensive English, 490; military appointments, 514; expenses, 537.

ARMY (Prussian), reviews of, i. 212.

ARNEE, magazines at, ii. 501.

ARNOLD, General, i. 20, 89.

ARRAKERRY, camp at, ii. 515, 518.

ARRAN, Earl of, iii. 244; compensation to, 322.

ARRAS, Bishop of, Buonaparte's suspicions of, iii. 403.

ARTILLERY, employment of, in England, ii. 334-336; recruiting from the militia to the, 292; effective service of, at Castlebar, 412; of the Indian army, 500, 576; brevet rank in the, iii. 127; Lord Cornwallis on the reform of the, 229; plan of incorporation of Irish and English, 331.

ARTOIS, Count d', Buonaparte's suspicions of, iii. 403.

ASGILL, Captain, i. 144, 148.

——, Lady, her letter on behalf of her son, i. 145.

ASHTOWN, Lord, iii. 304, 318.

ASKEATON, disfranchised, iii. 321.

ASOPH UL DOULAH, incapacity of, ii. 319.

ASSAM, mission to, ii. 183; state of, 188, 189.

ASSAYE, battle of, iii. 511.

ASSESSMENT, permanent, question of, i. 400, 456, 462, 466, 548, 553, 554, 561-565; ii. 463-478, 547, 559-562; annual, 195, 196.

ASSUD ALI, ii. 128.

ASSUD ALI KHAN, character of, ii. 85, 102, 508, 509, 512.

ASTURIAS, Prince of, i. 210.

ATHBOY, disfranchised, iii. 321.

ATHENRY, disfranchised, iii. 321.

ATHLONE, iii. 234; military defence again invasion at, 361.

ATHY, disfranchised, iii. 321.

ATTACHMENT of Indian criminals' property, ii. 550.
ATTORNEYS, included in the Irish "Lawyers' Infantry Corps," iii. 5.
AUCKLAND, Lord, i. 255, 256; iii. 225, 313, 325; negotiates a commercial treaty with France, i. 268.
AUDITOR, civil, constitution of the new office of, i. 541.
AUGHER, disfranchised, iii. 321.
AUGUSTA, i. 91.
AUMILS, Mussulman, connivance of the, in arbitrary taxes imposed by the zemindars, i. 564; native, appointed by Hastings, ii. 194; exactions by, 554.
AUSTRIA, source of her influence over Russia, i. 209; at war with Turkey, 373, 381; Emperor of, weakness and perverseness of, ii. 31; alliance between Prussia and Turkey against, 45; treaty of Pilnitz, 164; defeat of Clairfait, 230; objects to a Prussian general commanding, 231, 245; bad feeling towards the Duke of York, 232; incapacity of Austrian generals, 232, 233; claims an indemnity from France for war expenses, 233; conduct of, 234; refuses to accede to English conditions, 235; jealousy of Prussia, 239-241; military policy of, 244; desires to abandon Flanders, 246, 257; objects to proposed movements of Prussians, 250, 257; discussions as to commander-in-chief, 259; proposals by, as to Flanders, 261; proposed loan to, 262; rejects English proposals, 270, 280; troops of, in Flanders, 281; England guarantees a loan to, 304; conduct of, 486; army of, on the Leck, iii. 77; defeat the French, 102; ill-success of, in Switzerland, 130; disgust of Suwarrow and the allies with, 143, 158; advance of, on Genoa, 223, 270, 277; armistice between France and, 287; ratification of treaty with France refused by the Emperor of, 287, 317, 413, 419, 426, 486; spirit and power of, 513; Francis II. recognises Napoleon, and assumes the title of Emperor of, 516.
AVE-ACOMCHY, the aumildar of, seizes villages, ii. 211.
AVONMORE, Viscount, ii. 453; iii. 319, 365, 369,
AYCOTTAH, ii. 114.
AYLMER, William, an Irish rebel, career of, ii. 368, 374.
——, Gerald, appointment of, iii. 363.
AZARA, the Chevalier d', character and observations of, iii. 448; demands of, 449, 451, 458, 459, 461, 471.
AZEEM ul Omrah, ii. 77, 161, 222, 510, 523, 528, 529, 534, 535, 536, 537, 541, 542; reserve of, 543.

B.

BACK-Mountain enemies, i. 76.
BAGWELL, Colonel John, defection of, iii. 152, 180, 182, 183, 266.
BAGWELL, Benjamin, iii. 163.
——, Richard, jun., speech of, iii. 163.
——, Right Hon. William, iii. 180.
BAHAR, i. 284; settlement of the province of, 400; the land revenues of, 456, 460, 462; duties levied on the frontiers of, 540; manufactures of, 541; the ten years' settlement of revenue in, 549; zemindars in, 549; lands let on farm, 549; settlement of land-revenue of, 553, 564, ii. 463, 464, 471-504; East India Company collect the revenue of, 192; system of revenue in, 196, 197; collectors in, 473, 474, 547, 548.
BADAJOZ, treaty of, iii. 398, 407, 466.
BAILLIE, Major J. W., i. 169.
——, Colonel, of Dunain, death of, i. 288.
BAILLY, M. de, speech of, to Louis XVI., ii. 6.
BAIRD, Sir David, made prisoner by Hyder, i. 288; Lieut.-Colonel, ii. 147; in the night attack on Tippoo, 531.
BAKER, Sir George, Bart., physician to George III., i. 445, 474.
BALAJI Baji Rao, usurpation of, i. 228.
BALAN, M. Louis, Prussian Chargé d'Affaires, iii. 71.
BALANCE of Power, Frederick the Great upon the, i. 208.
BALFOUR, Colonel, i. 46, 68; a commissioner to examine into losses of loyalists at Florida, 272, 500, 503, ii. 280.
——, B. T., iii. 97, 99, 183, 193.
BALHARI, fortress of, ii. 179, 180.
BALL; *see* White's Club.
BALL, John, opposes the Union, iii. 238.
BALLANAKILL, disfranchised, iii. 321.
BALLASORE, factory of, secured to France, i. 352.
BALLINDALLOCH, i. 190.
BALOO Meah, i. 387, 565.
BALLYSHANON, disfranchised, iii. 321.
BALTIC, Russian trade through the, iii. 401.
BALTINGLASS, disfranchised, iii. 322.
BALTIMORE, disfranchised, iii. 322.
BANAGHER, disfranchised, iii. 322.
BANDITTI, Irish, iii. 12.
BANDON, Francis, Earl of, iii. 245, 286, 319.
BANDON, iii. 234; objectionable point for a fortress, 489.
BANG, intoxicating qualities of, ii. 137.
BANGALORE, siege of, ii. 70, 506, 510.
BANGOR, disfranchised, iii. 322.
BANIANS, i. 554.
BANISHMENT, expediency of legalising sentences of, in Ireland, iii. 12.
BANKING, suspension of cash payments, ii.

325; exorbitant interest paid to Indian bankers, 554.
BANKES, Henry, i. 446.
BANNERMAN, Colonel J. A., ii. 115, 126.
BANNOW, disfranchised, iii. 322.
BANTRY, Lord, iii. 10, 319.
BANTRY Bay, possible invasion at, iii. 488; French ships in, 490.
BAR, the English, etiquette of, as to the circuit, i. 299; of Calcutta, right of admitting or rejecting barristers at the, ii. 182; the Irish, 446, 454, 458; independence of the, iii. 48, 51; eligibility for Parliament, 81, 87; violence of, 361; the Lawyers' Infantry Corps, iii. 5, 6, 27; violent language of, 18, 48.
BARA Gokaing, treason of, ii. 188.
BARBARY, fruitless armament of Spain against, i. 373; pirates, iii. 409; powers, 425.
BARBARITIES on the Ryots, ii. 506.
BAREE, proposed surrender to Sindia of, iii. 549, 550.
BARILLY, battle near, ii. 294.
BARING, Sir F., i. 264; ii. 123.
BARLOW, Sir G., Bart., his knowledge of Indian revenue, i. 466; Mr. B. Roebuck's conduct to, ii. 34, 196; alters police and judicial regulations, 204, 296; named Governor-General of India, iii. 495, 497, 509, 519, 523, 526, 552, 558, 559, 561.
BARRACKPORE, iii. 536.
BARRAMAUL, ii. 509, 522, 538, 539.
BARRINGTON, Sir Jonah, iii. 67, 69, 97.
———, Hon. Shute, Bishop of Durham, an Eton schoolfellow of the Marquis Cornwallis, i. 3; letter to, on Missions, 397.
BARRY, Lieut.-Colonel H., ii. 143; iii. 207, 210, 233.
——, Hon. Colonel John, iii. 50.
BARRYMORE, Lord, anecdote of, i. 375.
BARTON, Thomas, iii. 322.
BASSEIN, treaty of, iii. 542.
BATAVIAN Republic, Plenipotentiaries of, iii. 387, 404, 407, 421-423, 431, 433, 443, 449, 456, 470, 472, 473, 476, 480, 484.
BATHURST, Henry, 2nd Earl, i. 404, 455.
———, General Peter, i. 171, 172, ii. 122.
———, Right Hon. C. Bragge, iii. 500.
———, R., i. 460.
BATTA, ii. 574; in Bombay and Bengal, 574.
BATTERING train, ii. 502.
BATTLE, Minden, i. 8; Kirch Donkern, 8; Lutterberg, 9; Bunker's Hill, 20; Brandywine, 30; Camden, 55, 506; Guilford, 86, 520; casualties at, 87; Hobkirk's Hill, 98; before Seringapatam, ii. 92, 105, 147.
BAVARIA, Elector of, i. 198, 275; rumour as to the garrisons of, 209; alienation of, agreed to by France notwithstanding a guarantee, 208.
BAYNING, Lord, i. 156; iii. 501.
BAZARS, military, regulations of, i. 262, 564; ii. 97; Mahratta, 71; duties on, 475, 497.
BAZALET Jung, i. 320.
BEACHCROFT, Mr., i. 435.
BEARCROFT, Edward, i. 270, 299.
BEATSON, Major-General, iii. 174.
BEAUFORT, 5th Duke of, i. 348.
BEAUFOY, H., i. 172.
BEAULIAH, silk trade of, i. 433.
BEAUMARCHAIS, P. A. C. de, his agency between France and America, i. 32.
BECTIVE, Earl of; *see* Headfort.
BEDFORD, Francis, 5th Duke, i. 273.
——, John, 6th Duke of, evidence of, ii. 381.
BEDFORDSHIRE militia, iii. 4; in Ireland, 126, 132.
BEDNORE, province of, ii. 528, 529.
BEER, or Vira Rajindra, fidelity of, ii. 73.
BEERBHOOM, zemindary of, ii. 192.
BEG, Ismael, character of, ii. 116.
BEGUM, the (mother of Mozuffer Jung), i. 313.
BEHAUDER Shah, Regent of Nepaul, ii. 191, 569, 570.
BEHROO Punt, i. 565, 567.
BELFAST, the "United Irishmen" at, ii. 340; opinion of, on the Union, iii. 18, 29, 139, 204, 234; the Marquis Cornwallis's reception at, 141; military position of, 488.
BELHARY Fort, Tippoo's cession of, ii. 158.
BELLAMONT, Earl of, iii. 41, 200, 220.
BELLEW, William, iii. 22.
BELLISLE, contemplated attack by the British on, iii. 152, 154, 231.
BELMORE, 2nd Earl of, iii. 64, 322, 324.
BELTURBET, disfranchised, iii. 322, 361.
BELVEDERE, Earl of, iii. 323.
BENARES, the "Augean stable" of, i. 244, 250, 264, 282, 284; description of the Resident at, 282; improvement of, 314, 318, 321; pilgrimages to, 411; settlement of, 456; Mr. Duncan's services in, 460; reform of, 540; state of, 540, 541; manufactures of, 541; addresses from, in favour of Hastings, 548; buildings and prosperity at, 553; opium of, 555; administration of justice in, ii. 35, 204, 237; land-revenue obtained from, 197, 470, 504, 547, 551; maladministration in, 470; pundits of, 567; English credit at, iii. 533.
BENCOOLEN, civil establishment at, i. 390; sepoys sent to protect, 468.
BENERAM, Pundit, envoy to Calcutta, i. 309.
BENFIELD, Paul, one of the Nabob's six members, i. 388; suspension of, for improper conduct, 548.
BENGAL, state of army in, i. 239; government of, 331; financial prosperity of, 409; officers on the establishment of, 428; demands on the revenues of, 452;

the settlement of, 489; Supreme Council of, 466; manufactures of, 541; settlement of revenue in, 549, 553; opium of, 558; zemindars of, ii. 160; the landed property of, 184; berkendosses of, 188; East India Company collect the revenue of, 192; the Nabob of, makes the Company his Dewan, 192; system of revenue in, 196; administration of justice in, 218; committees, 284; probable mutiny in the army of, 284; government of, 296; import of rice from, 304; discontent of officers in, 304, 306, 307, 311, 317, 319; government, 308; military, judicial, and land-revenue system of, 319; discontent in, 323; cultivation in, 469, 471, 472; zemindars in, 473-474; internal traffic in, 475; agriculture of, 476; reports of collectors in, 478; exhaustion of the resources of, 493, 495; settlement of, 504; revenue of, 546, 547, 548; commerce of, 551, 558, 567; iii. 441, 539; batta in, ii. 573; troops in, 575; European and native infantry, 576; Chinese trade with, iii. 539, 540.

BENT, Mr., bribery on the election of, iii. 513.

BENTINCK, General, ii. 242.

——, Lord Wm., iii. 495.

BERAR, Rajah of, i. 394; Moodajee Boosla, 308, 309, 310; the Rajah's dependency on the Mahrattas, 453; English deprivations of, iii. 546.

BERESFORD, Rt. Hon. John, ii. 387, 406, 424; commercial knowledge of, 424, 442, iii. 29.

——, J. Claudius, iii. 35; anecdotes of, 50; resigns office, 51, 60, 97, 98, 108, 122, 162, 195, 199, 200, 215, 248.

——, George de la Poer, bp. of Kilmore, iii. 169, 314.

BERESFORDS, parliamentary influence of the, iii. 324.

BERGE, Rajah, ii. 189.

BERKELEY, Admiral, ii. 287, 289, 290; resigns the Ordnance, 292.

——, 5th Earl, ii. 290.

——, Lady Emily, ii. 287.

BERKENDOSSES of Bengal, expulsion of, from Assam, ii. 207.

BERNADOTTE, anecdote of, ii. 64.

BERRY, Rear-Admiral Sir Edward, iii. 379.

BEVERLEY, Earl of, i. 376.

BHARAT, Sougha, leader of the Assamese rebels, ii. 188.

BHURTPORE, the Rajah of, English alliance with, iii. 548, 554, 555.

BIDDULPH, R., iii. 23.

BIE, Colonel, Governor at Serampore, ii. 55.

"BILLY Blue," a name given to Admiral W. Cornwallis in the Navy, i. 50.

BIRD, James, the spy, ii. 350.

BIRMINGHAM, manufacture of arms, ii. 409, 410; manufacturers of arms take advantage of times of difficulty and distress, 410; iii. 506.

BISHOPS, Irish Representative, iii. 26; English and Irish, 160, 169, 172, 209, 210, 218; annual income of Irish, 224; Irish, 26, 373, 374; bishopric of Munster, 384; of Osnaburg, 385.

BLACKSTOCK'S Hill, i. 70.

BLACKWELL, the Irish rebel, iii. 142, 284, 285.

BLACKWOOD, Sir James, iii. 215; serves in Ireland, 254; Lady Blackwood, 263.

BLAKE, Colonel, iii. 264.

——, Mr. J. H., iii. 129.

BLAKENEY, Theophilus, iii. 321.

BLAQUIERE, Sir John, aids the Irish Union, ii. 455; iii. 4; services of, in Ireland, 253, 260, 269, 276-278, 286; desires a peerage for Lady, 30, 190, 212, 246.

BLAYNEY, Lord, iii. 200; heiresses of Lady, 268.

BLESSINGTON, disfranchised, iii. 322.

"BLOODY Friday" at Gorey, ii. 368.

BOARD of Control, established by Pitt, i. 220; its importance, 220; dissensions with the Court of Directors, 248; increased powers of, 321, 380; its want of power, 476; attack by Lord Porchester upon the, ii. 118, 156, 215; iii. 500, 509, 511; alarm of, 530.

BOARD of Revenue for India, formation of, ii. 194.

BOARD of Trade, frauds of the, i. 333.

BOATS, duties on, ii. 475.

BOCCAMOOTAH, renters in, ii. 471.

BOIGNE, Comte de, organizes Sindia's army, ii. 317; iii. 529.

BOLTON, Duke of, the 6th and last, i. 164.

——, Lord; *see* Orde.

BOMPART, Commodore, commands the French invading fleet, ii. 415.

BOMBAY Establishment, Lord Cornwallis's suggestion for abolishing the, i. 321; Governors of, ought to be soldiers, 324, 336; civil establishment at, 390, 391, officers, 395; establishment, fund for maintaining the, 459; its importance relatively to India, 534, 535, 559; Governor of, conflict between the Court of Directors and the Minister, as to the, ii. 266; Mr. Duncan's appointment to, 297; proposed charters of justice for, 314; gallantry of the battalions of, 529, 533; government of, 539; batta allowance in, 574; troops in, 575; native infantry in, 577; marine battalion in, 577, iii. 497, 509; subscription and statue to Lord Cornwallis by the inhabitants of, 563.

BOND, Oliver, convicted of treason, ii. 345, 372, 373, 376, 377, 378, 379; respited, 381, 398, 425, 427, 428.

BONDS, Indian, value of, i. 461.

BONTAN.

BONTAN, trade of, ii. 568.
BOOSLA family, the, i. 410, 411, 453.
BOROUGHS, disfranchisement of Irish, iii. 26; compensation for, 81, 110; retained, 234; list of, 321, 324.
BOROUGH, Sir Richard, Bart., iii. 334.
BOSTON, Port Bill, i. 11, 19; evacuated, 20.
BOUILLÉ, Marquis de, loyalty of, to Louis XVI., ii. 279.
BOULOGNE flotilla, iii. 517.
BOURBON, the house of, ii. 5.
BOUVERIE, Mrs., canvasses for FOX, i. 173.
BOYD, General Sir Robert, i. 5.
——, and Benfield, contract for Austrian loan, ii. 262.
——, James, iii. 108.
——, Captain David Hamilton, letter from, iii. 178, 179.
BOYLE, Lord, ii. 148.
BOYLE, disfranchised, iii. 322.
BRAHMIN, duplicity in the, i. 359; prejudices of the high caste, 478; character of the, 566; ii. 187; ambassadors, i. 566.
BRAMSTON, T. B. long parliamentary connexion with Essex by the family of, iii. 134.
BRANDYWINE; *see* Battle.
BRATHWAITE, Major-General Sir J., Bart., ii. 27; good conduct of, ii. 227, 311.
BREAD, scarcity of, in 1799, iii. 144.
BREST, French Naval preparations at, iii. 66, 73, 77, 96, 103, 110, 123, 132, 154, 225, 230, 247, 364, 515.
BREVET commissions, i. 428; form of, 457; suppression of, by the Governor-General, ii. 318; rank, iii. 127.
BRIDGEWATER, Duke of, i. 377.
BRIDPORT, Viscount, stops the French fleet, ii. 415; raises the blockade of the French, iii. 77, 96.
BRIENNE, Etienne Lomenie de, i. 329; Archbishop of Toulouse, 371.
BRINJARRIES, ii. 129, 510, 511, 528.
BRISSOT, J. P., ii. 238.
BRISTOL'S, 3rd Earl of, motion to remove Lord Sandwich, i. 39.
BRISTOL, 4th Earl of, ii. 340; iii. 271.
BRITTANY, contemplated attack on, iii. 158.
BROAD river, i. 64, 74, 82, 83.
BROCAS, committed for breach of privilege, iii. 180.
BRODRICK, Hon. Henry, i, 86; arrives at New York, 122, 145; Colonel, recommended to the Duke of York, 152, 178, 192.
——, the family of, i. 166.
——, Hon. Charles, ii. 5.
BROGLIE, Maréchal Duc de, his recall and disgrace, i. 8.
BROKE, Philip, ii. 305.
——, Sir Philip Captain of the Chesapeake, ii. 305, 448, 449; iii. 337.
BROME, Viscount, the title created, i. 3; his residence abroad, 4, 5; in Germany, 6-8; elected for Eye, 9.
——, son of Marquis Cornwallis, his health, 153; placed with Rev. Dr. Wakeham, 172, 272; his education, 494; ii. 52; advice to, 53, 54; Lord Cornwallis's plan of education for, 98, 99, 144; stays at Cambridge, 220; resides at Vienna, 256; a county member, 306; illness of, 313; iii. 24, 102, 115, 119, 126, 341; goes to France with Lord Whitworth, 354, 362, 377, 383, 384; describes Buonaparte, 410; character of, 418, 492, 494, 498; returns to his militia regiment, 499, 504, 512, 513, 517, 525, 558-562.
——, Lady Louisa, iii. 119.
BROOKE, T. father of Sir James, i. 460.
——, H. V. iii. 140.
BROOKES'S Club, i. 375.
BROOKLYN, Americans defeated at, i. 23.
BROWN, General Archibald, ii. 95, 257, 259, 272, 273, 302.
——, General, ii. 257.
——, Lancelot, iii. 309.
BROWNE, Governor, i. 55.
——, Sir Valentine; *see* Kenmare.
——, Daniel, i. 55.
BROWNRIGG, General Sir Robert, ii. 352, 455; iii. 157, 177, 508.
BRUCE, Colonel Robert, ii. 213.
BRUEN, H., his "patriotism," i. 157; and the volunteers, 166; his vote on Parliamentary Reform, 166; his exculpation, 166; iii. 322, 323, 324.
——, Mrs., iii. 108, 109.
BRUIX, French Minister of Marine, iii. 77.
BRUNSWICK, Prince Ferdinand of, i. 5; Lord Cornwallis's letter to, 73.
——, Charles Ferdinand Duke of, i. 201; success of, against Amsterdam, 361; Mirabeau's praise of, ii. 39; throws up his command, 230, 276.
BRYAN, Colonel (the loyalist), effects junction with Major McArthur, i. 51.
BUCCLEUGH, 4th Duke of, ii. 285.
——, Duchess of (Anne), i. 2.
BUCKINGHAM, Marquis of, communication of George III. to, i. 159; rumoured appointments of, 160, 162; his resignation, 170; rejection of his artillery plan, ii. 334; his militia regiment, 450, 459; goes to Ireland, iii. 9; peerage conferred on his 2nd son, 313, 379, 498, 513.
BUDÉ, General Jacob, career of, iii. 278.
BUDDER-ul-Zamaun Khan, release of, ii. 178.
BULLER, Sir F., Bart., i. 269, 377.
BULLOCKS, and drivers, for the Indian war, ii. 66, 501, 502, 510, 519.
BUNBURY, Sir C., his celebrity on the turf, i. 172.
BUNDELCUND, iii. 530, 548.
BUNKER'S Hill; *see* Battle.
BUONAPARTE, enters on his Italian cam-

BUONAPARTE.

paign, ii. 304; returns from Egypt, iii. 142; First Consul, 148; offers to negociate, 154, 158, 236, 238, 339; crosses St. Bernard, and fights at Marengo, 270, 294, 300, 317, 353; Lord Cornwallis's interview with, 383; duplicity of, 386, 387, 390; Lord Cornwallis's conversation with, 390, 395, 398, 399, 400, 404, 406; Viscount Brome's description of, 410, 413, 418, 419, 422, 424, 437, 440, 442; complains of Le Peltier's libels in England, 447, 457, 468, 473; threatened invasion by, 503, 513, 516.
BUONAPARTE, Joseph, negotiations by Lord Cornwallis with, iii. 387, 388; character of, 395, 396; heads of conversation between Lord Cornwallis and, 397, 398, 400, 402, 413; frankness of, 413, 415, 419, 420, 422, 434; Colonel Nightingall's description of, 436; wife of, 436; views and suggestions of, 440-486.
BURDON, Rowland, ii. 282.
BURDWAN, Zemindary of, ii. 192; Rajah of, enormous rent paid by the, 478; compelled to sell lands, 478, 546, 547.
BURFORD, Colonel, defeated, i. 45.
BURGH, T., iii. 107, 108, 353.
BURGOYNE, General, commands at Boston, i. 20; his comedy, 20; his surrender at Saratoga, 31, 76; exchanged, 146, 197.
BURKE, Edmund, his celebrated speech on the debts of the Nabob of the Carnatic, i. 225, 376, 446; his impeachment of Warren Hastings, ii. 44.
——, Michael, iii. 215.
——, William, Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, i. 463, 464, 465; ii. 174.
BURLINGTON House, iii. 34.
BURNEY, Miss, i. 470.
BURRAMAAL, supplies of food from, ii. 107; district, Tippoo's cession of, 158, 160.
BURRAMUND Din, ii. 152.
BURRARD, General Sir Harry, iii. 123.
BURROUGHES, Sir W., i. 463.
BURROWES, Peter, iii. 170; violence of, 183, 240.
BUSHE, Chief-Justice, ii. 356; iii. 18, 161, 162, 164.
BUTE, 3rd Earl of, i. 12.
BUTLER, Sir R., iii. 182, 183.
BYRD, Captain, i. 173.
——, Mrs., and her son, American loyalists, compensation to, i. 467, 468.
BYRNE, Garrett, rebellion and banishment of, ii. 368, 374.
——, W. M., executed for treason, ii. 372, 373, 376, 377.
BYRON, Admiral, i. 37.

C.

CADDY, Lieut.-Colonel R. E., ii. 443; widow and children of, 443; iii. 15.

CADETS, supply of, ii. 577.
CADIZ, French expedition to, iii. 73, 77, 96, 100; English blockade of, 103.
CADOGAN, Lord, iii. 501; Lady Emily, ii. 329.
CAHIR, Baron, iii. 286.
CANNING, Viscountess, ii. 291.
CAIRNES, Mrs., i. 414.
CALEDON, Earl of, iii. 140, 319, 323.
CALCUTTA, inundations and hurricane at, i. 315; town-duties of, 540; ii. 497; courts of circuit for, 550, 562, 563.
CALICOES, Irish, iii. 207, 217.
CALICUT, Rajah of, ii. 479.
CALL, Sir John, Bart., iii. 439.
CALLAGHAN, Richard, pension to, iii. 321.
CALLAN, disfranchised, iii. 322.
——, Lord, iii. 217, 286, 322.
CALONNE, M. de, financial schemes of, i. 328.
CALVERT, General Sir H., Bart., iii. 516.
CAMBRIDGE, Duke of, iii. 513, 514.
—— University, system of education in, ii. 105.
CAMDEN, battle of, i. 55, 108, 506; ii. 387.
——, Earl, i. 274; appoints Lord Castlereagh Chief Secretary, iii. 44; proclaims martial law, 61, 62, 75, 90; Mr. Pitt conciliates, 277; his resignation, 343.
——, Lady, flies from Ireland, ii. 349.
CAMINO, island of, iii. 424, 426.
CAMP equipage, ii. 501, 580.
CAMPBELL, Sir Archibald, K.B., i. 35; governor of Madras, 181; civil and military character of, 225, 281, 284, 319, 322, 324; his remarks on raising cavalry, 295; not appreciated by the Court of Directors, 406; army reform suggested by, 532; eulogised by Lord Cornwallis, 546.
——, Admiral Sir George, his answer to the Téméraire mutineers, iii. 414.
——, Rear-Admiral Samuel, iii. 165.
——, Captain, i. 508.
——, A. Montgomery, ii. 567.
CAMPERDOWN, battle of, ii. 344.
CAMPO, Marquis del, ii. 4.
CAMPO d' Alange, Count, Spanish minister, iii. 405.
CANADA, i. 20; iii. 78; reinforcements sent to, i. 41; union with, desired by Vermont, 116.
CANANORE, ii. 160.
CANAPLES, M. de, ii. 505.
CANARA, ii. 191; iii. 530.
CANKANELLY, ii. 514.
CANIAMBADDY, ii. 71, 511, 515.
CANICE, St., iii. 323.
CANONGOES, responsibilities of, ii. 471.
CANTON, market for Indian articles, i. 399; treasury at, ii. 477; iii. 539.
CAPE Fear, i. 77.
CAPE Fear River, General Leslie's operations on, i. 64.
CAPE of Good Hope, right of sovereignty in,

iii. 443, 445, 474, 507; right of Spain to navigate to, 449, 471.
CAPITULATION of York Town, i. 523-528.
CAPOOL, surrender of, ii. 73.
CARBERY, Lord, iii. 215.
CARHAMPTON, Earl of, retirement of, ii. 328; his opinions of the Union, iii. 35, 80; vineyard at Pains Hill, 112.
CARLETON, Colonel T., his government in Nova Scotia, i. 291.
——, Sir Guy; *see* Dorchester.
——, Viscount, ii. 373; judicial firmness of, 374, 375; his views of the Union, iii. 4, 31, 41; Duke of Portland's opinion of, 260; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, 265, 274.
——, Mr. F., iii. 109.
CARLINGFORD, disfranchisement of, iii. 43, 322.
CARLISLE, Earl of, describes Lord Cornwallis's departure for America, i. 13; children of, ii. 144.
CARLOW, state of the county of, iii. 20, 21, 282; borough of, iii. 234.
CARMARTHEN, Marquis of, i. 200; succeeds to a large fortune, 274.
—— militia, in Ireland, iii. 117, 299.
CARNATIC, Nabob of; *see* Arcot.
—— the, critical state of, i. 485; ii. 124; danger from Tippoo in, i. 323, 467, 478; ii. 8; defensive army in, i. 310; ii. 34, 490-494, 539; pecuniary resources of, i. 491; ii. 496, 510; Lord Macartney's administration in, ii. 3; disputes with the Nabob, 140, 319; management of, 308, 545; supply of food from, 107, 501; ryots of, 506; Company's strength in, 536; Lord Wellesley's annexation of, iii. 289, 492, 530.
CAROLINA, defeat of loyalists in, i. 22; British prospects in, 102, 103; Lord Cornwallis's operations in, 499-520.
——, North, its protection to Georgia, i. 47; aspect of affairs in, 51; justifiable invasion of, 54; military importance of, 55; loyal professions from, 58; difficulty of penetrating, 64, 88; indecision of the loyalists in, 69.
——, South, the King's troops occupy, i. 78; perilous state of, 94, 105; weakness and treachery in, 99.
CARPENTER, General B., i. 375.
CARRIAGE-CATTLE, ii. 501; of grain, 502.
CARRICK, Earl of, compensation to, iii. 322.
CARRICKFERGUS, borough of, iii. 324.
CARTERET, Lord, Postmaster-General thirteen years, i. 274; Mr. Grey's attack on, 303, 304.
CARTY, Patrick, executed, iii. 112.
CARYSFORT, Earl of, supports the Union, iii. 184; his claims to an English peerage, 244, 259, 264, 272, 281; jointly Master of the Rolls, 302; created an English peer, 318;

his borough disfranchised, 322; Minister at Berlin, 391.
CASH payments, Minute of Council suspending, ii. 325.
CASHEL, Archbishop of, ii. 440; iii. 287; his views on the Union, iii. 135; readiness to support Union, 113, 184; his claims to the Irish Primacy, 160, 169, 210, 218; his suggestions as to the Irish Church, 172, 176, 199; and the Irish Spiritual Peers, 209; political influence, 217; promotion in peerage, 319; made Archbishop of Dublin, 438.
CASHEL, borough of, iii. 234; proposed fortress at, 297.
CASTE, education according to, i. 554; law of adoption, whether modified by, ii. 568.
CASTIGLIONE, battle of, ii. 310.
CASTLEBAR, affair at, ii. 394, 398, 411; the French at, iii. 67; disfranchisement of, 322.
CASTLE COOTE, Lord, iii. 318.
CASTLEMARTYR, disfranchised, iii. 322.
CASTLEREAGH, Viscount, an Irish Delegate, ii. 360; popularity and patriotism of, 430; Mr. Pitt's appreciation of, 433; Chief Secretary of Ireland, 441; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, iii. 7, 8, 223, 224, 250, 274, 506; Lord Longueville's enmity to, 17; attempt to compel him to vacate his seat, 44; his SPEECHES on the Irish Union, 47, 49, 64, 69, 195, 197, 199, 203, 213; threatens martial law, 62; speeches on the Regency Bill, 86, 87; his Bill for Maynooth, 91; speeches on the Munster Escheatorship, 98; his difficult position in Ireland, 161, 269; oratorical powers of, 162, 235; conciliatory policy of, 217; his replies to Grattan, 240, 242; his differences with the Duke of Portland, 266; Duke of Portland's estimation of, 273; Colonial Secretary, 509; visits Walmer, 519; and Coombe, 524; his conversation as to Mr. Pitt and Lord Wellesley, 523; moves for the Cornwallis statue in St. Paul's, 563.
——, Viscountess, iii. 119.
CASTLESTEWART, Lord and Lady, iii. 289.
CASWALL, General, i. 54.
CATAWBA ford, i. 55; action at, 84.
CATHCART, Hon. Colonel, concludes the Mauritius Convention, i. 294; selected for the China embassy, 327; ii. 1; political views of, 330, 331; death of, 388, 478.
CATHCART, Earl, iii. 506.
CATHERINE, Empress of Russia, anecdote of, i. 373; declines English mediation, ii. 110.
"CATHOLICISM," Lord Cornwallis's objection to the party-word, ii. 357.
CATHOLIC disabilities, views of government on, iii. 325-330; of the King, 333, 335; removal of, 343-349.
CATHOLICS, conduct of, on Union, iii. 52.

CATMANDU.

CATMANDU, ii. 207, 569.
CATTLE in India, army carriage of, ii. 501, 502; food for, 511, 514, 519.
——, destruction of, by rebels, iii. 61; boughing of, in Ireland, 169; agistment tithe on, 221.
CAUBUL, Zemaun Shah, sovereign of, iii. 131.
CAULFIELD, St. George, iii. 323.
CAVALRY, want of Indian, i. 295; chief importance of, ii. 86, 504, 507; state of the Nizam's, 508, 509; mode of foraging for, 511; Lord Cornwallis's proposed changes in, 576.
CAVAN, county of, political feeling of, on the Union, iii. 140, 173, 251; disfranchisement of the borough of, 322.
CAVENDISH, Lord John, his motion for vote of censure rejected, i. 138; opposes a coalition between Pitt and Fox, 164.
——, Sir Henry, iii. 239.
——, W., elected for Aylesbury, iii. 512.
CAVERI, the fording of, i. 480; ii. 528, 533, 514; periodical swelling of, ii. 105, 509, 513; navigation of, 501, 503; difficult passage of, 515, 538.
CAVERIPATAM, junction of English generals at, i. 481.
CAVERIPORAM Pass, difficulty of the, ii. 539.
CAWDOR, Lord, captures French invaders, ii. 338; fine regiment of, iii. 296.
CAWNPORE brigade, expense of, i. 257; Sir Robert Abercromby commands, ii. 294; triumph of the moderate party at Cawnpore, 307.
CEYLON, the Dutch Governor of, i. 497; its aid against Tippoo, ii. 483; excepted from the treaty with France, iii. 386; cession of, by Holland and Spain, 395; Dutch possessions in, 404, 421-423, 433, 454, 471.
CHALMERS, General Sir J., his defence of Coimbatore, ii. 74, 101; eulogised by Lord Cornwallis, 109; released by Tippoo, 150, 534.
CHANDERNAGORE, French settlement in, i. 352; French revolutionists in, 478, ii. 55; Lord Cornwallis's humane interference in, 56, 504; English seizure of, 226.
CHAPLAINS, Indian army, ii. 577.
CHAPMAN, Colonel Sir Thomas, at Castlebar, ii. 411, 412.
CHAPTAL, Jean Antoine, the French Minister, iii. 410.
CHARITABLE institutions of India, for officers' children, ii. 581.
CHARLEMONT, Earl of, ii. 339; iii. 51; Anti-Union meetings at his house, 166, 215; circular from, 171, 173; speeches of, 184, 186.
——, borough disfranchised, iii. 322.
CHARLES, Archduke, ii. 257, 259; his efforts crippled, iii. 24.

CIVIL.

CHARLESTOWN, seizure of arms at, i. 19; failure of Clinton's attack on, 22; besieged and taken, 43, 78; character of the rebels at, 57.
CHARLEROI, fall of, ii. 232.
CHARLEVILLE, Viscount, iii. 319.
——, borough disfranchised, iii. 322.
CHARTER; *see* East India Company.
CHATHAM, 1st Earl of; *see* Pitt.
——, 2nd Earl, resigns his commission, i. 13; appointed to the Admiralty, 406; Master-General, ii. 281; rumoured appointment for India, 406; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, 501, 508.
CHATHAM, Countess, i. 153; illness of, 181, 182.
—— Lines, Dundas repairs, iii. 500.
CHELMSFORD, inutility of fortifying, iii. 501.
CHERAW Hill, bad climate of, i. 505.
CHERIKA, Rajah of, his insult to Tellicherry, i. 365.
CHERNICHEFF, Comte, a Russian spy, ii. 378.
CHERRY, George F., ii. 236; his death, iii. 114.
CHESAPEAK, diversion on the, i. 57, 59, 66, 88, 94, 115; fortification of a post on the, 136.
CHESTERFIELD, Philip, (fifth) Earl of, i. 447.
CHEWTON, Lord, i. 142; release of, 146.
CHICHESTER, second Earl of, ii. 352.
CHINA, trade of, i. 246; mission to, 327, 330; ii. 1; East India Company's profits from, i. 410; British and Bengal exports to, 558; ii. 1, 2; iii. 540; investment for, stopped by Lord Cornwallis, ii. 72; Emperor of, 191; war with, 569; detention of treasure destined for, iii. 538, 542.
CHINNAH Murdah, i. 416.
CHINNAMUNGULUM River, ii. 498.
CHINTOMENY-PET, ii. 528.
CHITTAGONG, Mussulman marines from, ii. 302.
CHITTELDROOG, ii. 521; unproductive, 540.
CHOCZIM, taken by the Prince of Coburg, i. 402.
CHOKIES, exactions by, ii. 475.
CHONDRIES, rent payable by, ii. 470.
CHOUANS, the, iii. 157.
CHOUT, payment of, ii. 543.
CHRISTIAN, Admiral, driven back by bad weather, ii. 298, 299.
CHURCH Establishment of Ireland, ii. 437.
CIRCARS, the Guntoo, i. 355, 357; surrender of, 393; misery of the northern, ii. 178; Tippoo's, 479.
CIRCUIT, Committee of (India), ii. 473; Courts of, 549, 550, 562.
CISALPINE Republic, recognition of, iii. 407, 413, 442-457.
CITY Courts of India, ii. 562, 563.
CIVIL servants of India, conduct of, i. 243, 250; allowances to, 536.
CIVIL law, its collision with military law

CIVIL.

in Ireland, iii. 62; closing courts of, 63; Bill relating to, 74.
CIVIL List of Ireland, iii. 308.
CLAIRFAIT, Comte de, ii. 230, 233; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 264; English and Austrian opinions of, 273, 274.
CLANCARTY, Earl of, iii. 319.
CLANMORRIS, Lord, iii. 255.
CLANRICARDE, (thirteenth) Earl of, promotion of, iii. 258, 262; elected Irish Representative Peer, 286; his patent of Peerage, 307; favoured by the Duke of York, 352, 356; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 353, 357.
CLARE, Earl of, ii. 355; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 416; anecdote of, iii. 48, 51; Vice-Chancellor of Dublin University, 68, 71; created a British Peer, 113; his feelings on the Roman Catholic question, 147; his speech on the Union, 184-186; his opinions as to Maynooth College, 91, 310, 367-375.
CLARENCE, Duke of, ii. 32, 110.
CLARENDON, Earl of, quits the Duchy of Lancaster, i. 274, 303.
CLARINA, Lord, iii. 301, 318.
CLARKE, Sir Alured, i. 50.
——, Colonel G. R., an American rebel, i. 71.
CLARY, Marie Julie, wife of M. Joseph Buonaparte, iii. 436.
CLEAVER, Euseby; *see* Dublin, Archbishop of.
CLEMENTS, T., compensated for his borough, iii. 322.
CLERGY, Protestant, compulsory residence of, ii. 442, 443; provision for the Irish Roman Catholic, 407, 442, 447; iii. 64; of France, temper and liberality of, i. 329.
CLERMONT, Earl of, supports the Union, iii. 183, 265, 288; compensation for disfranchisement, 323.
——, Countess of, iii. 265, 288.
CLEVES, Duchy of, taken by the French, iii. 384.
CLIFDEN, Viscount, iii. 124; Irish boroughs of, 322-324.
CLINTON, Sir Henry, arrives at Boston, i. 20; unsuccessful attack on Charlestown, 22; inflicts loss on the enemy, 31; succeeds Sir W. Howe, 31; evacuates Philadelphia, 33; communication to Congress, 36; wishes to resign, 41, 42; besieges Charlestown, 43; his successful expedition against Springfield, 78; his differences with Lord Cornwallis, 107-112; sails to relieve Lord Cornwallis, 138; succeeded by Sir G. Carleton, 139; publishes pamphlets, 151, 177; quarrels with the Duke of Newcastle, 173.
CLIVE, Robert Lord, character of, i. 218; ii. 193; the "Fund" of, i. 550; ii. 572.
CLOGHER, disfranchised, iii. 323.
CLOGHNAKILTY, disfranchised, iii. 322.

COLLECTORS.

CLONBROCK, Lord, iii. 323.
CLONFERT, Bishop of, ii. 420; pension to his widow and family, iii. 332, 340.
CLONMINES, borough of, iii. 43; disfranchised, 322.
CLOSE, General Sir Barry, his knowledge of India, ii. 311; iii. 544.
CLOTHIERS, Yorkshire, deputation from, iii. 225.
CLOWDESLEY, naïveté of, iii. 157.
COAST-HOSPITALS in India, ii. 501.
COBURG, Prince of, takes Choczim, i. 402; ceases to command the army in Flanders, ii. 257, 259, 272.
COCHRANE, Major Charles, death of, i. 125.
COCHIN, Rajah of, i. 467; his position in reference to the Dutch, 491-493, 497; questionable authority of, ii. 479, 488; Tippoo's designs against, 483, 489.
COCKERELL, Colonel, i. 478, 495; abilities of, 537; sent against Tippoo, ii. 8, 62, 490; before Seringapatam, 146; presides at a Court-Martial, 167; defends the Carnatic, 492; his night-attack on Tippoo, 531.
CODDINGTON, H., compensation for his disfranchised borough, iii. 322.
COIMBATORE, defence of, i. 480; ii. 101, 109; besieged and taken, 74, 130; revenues of, 160; General Medows' operations against, 488; roads in, 502; Tippoo's designs against, 522; capitulation of, 534.
COIN of Hindostan, i. 316; Mahometan, 407; Indian silver, 456, 554.
COJA Cacheek Arakeel, loyalty and generosity of, i. 434.
COKE, T. W. (afterwards Earl of Leicester), i. 178.
COLCHESTER, Lord, iii. 365; his views respecting Maynooth, 368-371; diary of, 499.
——, defensive garrison at, iii. 379, 515.
COLCLOUGH, J. H., execution of, ii. 348; his nephew killed in a duel, iii. 124.
COLE, General Sir Lowry, iii. 97-99.
——, Lord, his opposition to the Union, iii. 50, 162.
——, Hon. Arthur, his decision in the Madras mutiny, iii. 333.
COLEBROOKE, Mr., improperly sent to India, i. 458; his return, 469.
COLEMAN, Mr., recommended by the Prince of Wales to Lord Cornwallis, ii. 163.
COLENBERG, Duchy of, George III.'s statement respecting, iii. 385.
COLERAINE, 4th Lord; *see* Hanger.
——, iii. 139, 234.
COLEROON, passage of the, ii. 539.
COLLECTORS, Company's, pay of, i. 278; described by Lord Cornwallis, 283; reformation of, 290; recall of Europeans, ii. 194; of internal duties, ii. 463, 470; reports from, 467; opinion, 472, 562; in Behar,

COLLECTORS.

473, 474, 548; interruptions to, 474; instructions to, 478; of Sayer duties, 497; services of, in war, 502; in Bengal, 546.

COLLECTORS, of Dublin excise, and port, and Wexford, patronage of, iii. 108.

COLLINS, Colonel, ii. 311.

COLONELS, rank of, in India, i. 534.

——, dissatisfaction of militia, iii. 134.

COLONIES, conference at Amiens respecting English, iii. 386, 450.

COLOONY, action at, ii. 402, 404.

COTTER, Sir James, supports the Union, iii. 49.

COLUMBO, ii. 483, 488, 489.

COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF in India, i. 174; patronage of, 215; salary, 216; duties, 415.

COMMERCE, treaty with France respecting, i. 268, 271; Irish privileges of, iii. 33; of India, i. 313, 314; of Indian provinces, 552; decline of Indian, 554; want of system in, ii. 228; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on Indian, 560.

COMMISSIONS, brevet, i. 428, 457, 461; field-officers', ii. 143.

COMMISSIONERS, legislation aided by, iii. 46; of compensation, 49, 62; of accounts, 108; of revenue, 108.

COMMITTEE of the Commons, on American war, i. 39; secret, on India, ii. 2; of circuit, 449.

COMMONS, House of (English), vote of thanks to Lord Cornwallis, i. 89; threaten the ministry, 164; business in, 178, 381, ii. 42; Indian influence in, i. 220; duration of sessions, 268; approbation of Lord Cornwallis, ii. 112, 124; projected reform in, 185; rights of Irish members reserved at the Union, iii. 33; longest debates in, 44; approve of the Union, 82; popular basis of, 121; largest division in, 181; Mr. Grey's motion for securing the independence of, 230; practice of, 249.

—— (Irish), address to Lord Cornwallis from, ii. 356; Lord Cornwallis, opinion of, 360; debates on the Union, iii. 40-50; 64, 68, 101, 161-165, 181-187, 190-204, 207-219, 233-243, 249, 250; debate on the state of the nation, 64-66; the Rebellion Bill, 68-70; on the Regency Bill, 86-88; on Maynooth, 90-92; on escheatorship of Munster, 97-99; conduct of the Opposition, 101, 183, 187, 190, 201, 207, 211, 220, 247; formidable influence of boroughmongers in, 110; cause of its dissimilarity from the English House of Commons, 121; debate on tithe agistment, 221; landed income of the members opposing and supporting the Union, 224; Union Bill passed, 249.

COMMUTATION (Tea) Bill, i. 178.

COMPENSATION to American loyalists, i. 193; for Irish boroughs disfranchised, iii. 49, 62, 81, 82, 321.

CORNWALL.

COMPETITION in the silk-trade of India, i. 250.

CONGLETON, Lord, ii. 356.

CONGRESS at Philadelphia, i. 19, 23, 35; refuse exchange of prisoners, 81.

—— of military chiefs in India, ii. 102, 513.

—— of Radstadt, iii. 419.

CONNAUGHT, cattle-maiming in, iii. 60; military defence of, 81; "fire-eaters" of, 256; famine in, 283.

CONOLLY, Right Hon. Thomas, ii. 453; favourable to the Union, iii. 43; Duke of Portland's opinion of, 280.

CONQUESTS, partition of Indian, ii. 22.

CONSTABLESHIP of the Tower; *see* Tower.

"CONSULAR EDICT" of Lord Downshire, &c, iii. 170.

CONSULAR French Government, iii. 148.

CONTI, Prince of, emigration and arrest of, ii. 40.

CONTINGENT charges, control of, ii. 580.

CONTRACTS, or agencies, question of, i. 434, ii. 501; suspicions of Lord Cornwallis respecting, i. 238, 469; for silk, fraudulent, 250; Lord Cornwallis puts down jobbing, 318; abolition of "riding," 458; interest of Directors in, ii. 18.

CONTRACTORS for silk, sued in equity, i. 253; for bullocks, in India, iii. 23.

CONVENTION of Saratoga, i. 36; of Mauritius, 226, 338, 350; English and Prussian, 361; with the Marathas, ii. 72; French "National," 249; in Dublin, 340.

CONWAY, Right Hon. H., i. 138, 321; ii. 175.

——, Comte Thomas de, career of, i. 317; ii. 55.

——, Mr., a spy, iii. 85.

CONYNGHAM, Earl, supports the Union, iii. 140; representative peer, 286; his borough disfranchised, 322.

COOKE, Edward, Under-Secretary of State, ii. 371; Lord Longueville's attack on, iii. 17; Lord Cornwallis's character of, 310, 313, 315, 381.

COORG, Raja and Princess of, ii. 73, 139.

COORGA country, cession of, ii. 158; value of, 160, 537, 540.

COOTE, Sir E., sepoys' attachment to, i. 215.

——, Right Hon. C., iii. 253, 323.

COOTINGBERRY, Raja of, ii. 479.

COPE, Mr. W., pension to, ii. 375.

CORBETT, arrested in Hamburgh, iii. 142, 284.

CORK, Edward, Earl of, iii. 35, 322.

—— (county), agitation in the, iii. 61; feelings respecting the Union, 210, 328; (city), Lord Longueville's influence in, 3, 324; embarkation of troops from, 231, 236; military position of, 488, 489.

CORN, high price of, in 1796, ii. 304; iii. 144.

CORN-LAW Bill of 1772, iii. 249.

CORNWALL, Right Hon. C. W., Speaker of the House of Commons, i. 89.

CORNWALL, R., political influence of, iii. 170, 322.

CORNWALLIS, Marquis, education, i. 3; enters the army, 4; academical life at Turin, 5; serves in Germany, 7; enters Parliament, succeeds to the Earldom, 9; aide-de-camp to George III., 9; marries, 9; opposes American taxation, 11; attacked by Junius, 12; sails for America, 21; subdues Jersey, 24; pursuit of the enemy, 27; his impetuous attack, 29; forces Washington's left wing, 30; leaves America, 31; returns with dormant commission as General, 33; distinguishes himself in retreating from Philadelphia, 34; illness of Lady Cornwallis, and Lord Cornwallis's return, 37; death of his wife, 38; resumes command in America, 40; effectively intercepts the enemy's communications, 43; civil and military command devolves on, 48; his want of troops, 50; critical position of, 55; his victory at Camden, 55; his foresight in providing for winter, 58; retires to South Carolina, 60; winters at Wynnesborough, 64; fords the Catawba under a severe fire, 84; wounded at the battle of Guilford, 87; receives a vote of thanks from Parliament, 89; his care of the wounded, 92; retires to Wilmington, 92; his affair with La Fayette, 106; differences with Sir H. Clinton, 107-112, 136; receives the approbation of Government, 110; arrives at Yorktown and Gloucester, 112, 113; requires reinforcements, 113; compelled to capitulate, 125, 127; his controversy with Sir H. Clinton, 136–138; difficulties about his exchange for an American prisoner, 141, 146-150; tenders his resignation of the Constableship of the Tower, 143; his resignation not accepted, 143; again tenders his resignation, 160, 161; his generosity to the American loyalists, 163; offered appointments in India, 175; successfully mediates between Lord Rawdon and Mr. Pitt, 177; offered office by Government and by the East India Company, 180; his conversation with George III., 182, 186; again accepts the Tower, 188; his views on Indian affairs, 190; declines Mr. Pitt's offer of the Governor-Generalship of India, 191; his mission to Frederick the Great, 200-211; inspects the Prussian troops, 212; appointed Governor-General and Commander-in-Chief of India, 216; his opinion of the India Acts of 1773, 1782, and 1784, 220; abolishes the payment of chouth, 223; improves the revenue, 225; offers assistance to the Peshwa, 228-231; his daily life in India, 237; checks abuses in recruiting, 241, elected Knight of the Garter, 247; effects economy in tent allowances, 248; his views

relating to the Indian armies, 250, 251; his interviews with Hyder Beg Khan, 256-258; decides the question as to the Tanjore succession, 262; prohibits the Company's collectors from commercial pursuits, 283; regulates the revenue from salt, 285; his knowledge of Indian affairs, 298; a witness for Warren Hastings, 299; ii. 237; his tour of observation, i. 316; plans of reform, 317-319; his comments on the conduct of a court-martial, 324; his kindness to Warren Hastings' domestics, ii. 41; reported marriage of, i. 384; approbation of the Government, 424; his policy towards Tippoo, 437; proceeds to Madras, 481; his domestic affairs, 494; despatches from America, 499-528; attacked by fever, 509; his measures of reform, 539; his revenue arrangements, 552; his views on suppressing slavery, 555; his plan of a permanent settlement, 560-565; his remarks on the French Revolution, ii. 9; criticizes the conduct of the Madras Government, 10-13; his views on the renewal of the Company's charter, 13-20; his reforms in the Indian courts, 34; his advice to his son, 53; rescues Colonel de Montigny and others from French rebels, 56; embarks for Madras, 58; commences the Mysore war, 59; besieges Bangalore, 70; destroys Tippoo's battering-train, 71; arrests money destined for China, to secure the Maratha alliance, 72; rejects Tippoo's terms, 73; receives votes of approbation from Parliament, 111; his success against Tippoo, 75; represses plunder and marauding, 87; reprimands cavalry officers, 88; succours the native sick, 95; his plan of education for his son, 98, 99, 105; waives his claim to prize-money, 130, 167; captures Severndroog, 132; marches to Seringapatam, 135; commences the siege, 136, 154, 513-524; defeats Tippoo, 137, 148; Tippoo attempts to assassinate, 137; baffles intrigues, 139; his kindness to Tippoo's sons, 139, 152, 224; declines Mr. Pitt's offer of the Secretaryship of State, 145; censures a court-martial for undue lenity, 167; created Marquis, 175; sends rice to the distressed Circars, 179; generosity to a distressed officer, 181; his reform of the civil administration of India, 191, 202, 203, 487; proceeds to Madras, 191; his plans for improving the revenue, 196-200, 463; improves the Calcutta police, 201; abolishes the office of Naib Nazim, 202; receives a vote of thanks from the Corporation of London, 220; quits India, 229; proceeds to the seat of war in Flanders, 241; his audience with the Emperor, 247; his interview with Marshal Mullendorf, 251,

253, 255; returns home, 256; urged to take the command in Holland, 259; consulted on the state of the Indian army, 265, 301, 311; accepts the Ordnance, with a seat in the cabinet, 283; encamps at Warley, 291; mediates between Lord Hobart, Sir J. Shore, and Mr. Dundas, 310; sworn in as Governor-General of India, 318; resigns, 319; offered the command of the army and the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland, 327, 339; enters on these offices, 349; addresses voted by the Irish Parliament to, 356; his treatment of the rebels, 357, 363, 367; his message to Parliament, 365; difficulties of his position, 415; his views respecting Roman Catholics, 417; censures a court-martial, 421; his plan for regulating salt sales in India, 505; his views on the amalgamation of the Indian armies, 572-582; accused of undue lenity in Ireland, iii. 13, 73-89; his Irish tours of observation, 119, 123, 287; narrowly escapes being shot, 121; his engagements to supporters of the Union, 245, 251, 256; receives a present from the Indian army, 275; his plans for the defence of Ireland, 297, 489-491; a dukedom, 331; leaves Ireland, 364; commands the Eastern district, 378; his mission to Amiens, 383-387; his instructions, 388-394; proposes to leave Paris, 395; his reception, and conversation with M. Joseph Buonaparte, 397; his private interview with Napoleon, 400-404; his conferences at Amiens, 404-484; tenders his services to the country, 502; his prospect of again visiting India, 520; a third time Governor-General of India, 525; general approbation of his appointment, 530; Sir John Malcolm's eulogium on, 530; arrives at Calcutta, 530; sworn in, 533; detention of treasure destined for China, 538-540; his instructions to Lord Lake, 547; his explanation to Lord Lake, 557; his last illness, 557, 558; his death, 559; marks of public esteem, 562, 563.

CORNWALLIS, Lady Mary; *see* Singleton.

——, Charles (4th) Lord, i. 2; serves in Flanders, 2.

——, Charles (5th) Lord, appointed Constable of the Tower, i. 2.

——, James, last Earl of, ii. 420; M.P. for Eye, iii. 492.

——, Countess, her marriage, i. 9; her death, 14; anecdote of, 14.

——, Countess Dowager of, i. 166.

——, Hon. Edward, General, i. 12.

——, Frederick, Archbp. of Canterbury, i. 12.

——, Mrs. (widow of the Archbishop), i. 153; ii. 121.

——, Hon. and Rev. James, Bishop of Lichfield, i. 151, 161.

——, Hon. William, i. 50; his engagements

with the French, 50, 171; ii. 132, 227; his censure of Rodney, i. 139; celebrated retreat of, ii. 293; court-martial on, 303; watches the French in India, 484; election for Eye, iii. 492.

CORNWALLIS, Thomas, Sheriff of London, i. 1.

——, Sir Thomas, Treasurer of the Household, i. 1.

——, Sir Frederick, supports Charles I., i. 1, 2; created a peer, 2.

——, Sir William, serves against the Irish rebels, i. 2.

——, Horace, character of, ii. 370; 419; death of, iii. 78, 93.

COROMANDEL, Coast of, i. 308; military establishment on the, 356; ii. 289, 491, 573; French commerce on, iii. 441.

CORRUPTION, of civil servants of India, i. 244, 250; charges of, 297; in the native courts of India, 555; in Ireland at the Union, iii. 16, 267.

CORRY, Lord, his opposition to the Union, iii. 64, 200, 247, 250.

——, Right Hon. Isaac, ii. 340; appointed Chancellor of Exchequer, iii. 39; favours the Union, 42, 49; admirably answers Grattan, 163, 164; his reply to Grattan, 195; his duel with Grattan, 196.

CORSICANS, their jealousy of the French, ii. 291.

COSSIMBUSAR, factory secured to France, i. 352.

COTTER, Sir James, iii. 49.

COTTONS, of Ireland, iii. 207, 208; dissatisfaction of the northern manufacturers respecting, 215, 216; Lord Castlereagh's concessions, 226, 227; exports to China from India, 540.

COUNCIL, nominations to the Indian Supreme, i. 389; timidity of the Aulic, iii. 24.

COUNCILS, provincial, in India, ii. 473.

COURIER newspaper, ii. 399.

COURTLAND Manor, encampment of the American army at, i. 29.

COURT-MARTIAL on Col. Debbieg, i. 189; conduct of, 265; proceedings and practice of, 306; improper decision of, 324, 451; ii. 438; Lord Cornwallis's censure on, ii. 168, 421; on Admiral Cornwallis, 303; in Ireland, iii. 63; Bill for defining powers of, 74; in Limerick, 291.

COURTS, Indian, European influence at, i. 398; jurisdiction of, ii. 35, 315; of requests, 315; criminal, 549, 550; of appeal, 563.

COUTTS, Mr., the banker, anecdote of, i. 273.

COVENTRY, Earl and Countess of, i. 447.

COWLEY, Lord; *see* Wellesley.

COWPENS, English defeated at, i. 84.

CRADOCK, second in Grattan's duel, iii. 195.

CRAIG, Colonel Sir James, ii. 248.

——, Lieut.-General Peter, ii. 421.

CRANGANORE, bought from the Dutch, i.

467, 491, 492; ii. 479, 483, 486; history of, ii. 106; its defensive position, 114; independence of, 126, 488.
CRAUFORD, General Sir Charles, character of, ii. 125.
CRAWFORD, Major-General, ii. 396; harasses the French, 404; acts under General Lake, iii. 11.
CRAWFURD, Sir James, Bart., captures Napper Tandy, iii. 142, 242.
CREDIT, British, in India, i. 319, 556, ii. 560.
CREDITORS of the Nabob, Committee of, i. 355.
CREMORNE, Lord, attacks Lord Castlereagh, iii. 97.
CREWE, Major-General, i. 300.
CRIMEA, death of four great-grandsons of Lord Cornwallis in, i. 16.
CRIMINAL law of India, i. 555; ii. 202; Lord Cornwallis's improvements in, 203, 204; system of administration, 487; suggested improvements in, 506, 561.
CROSBIE, W. A., pensioned, iii. 363.
CROSS Creek, i. 92.
CRUGER, Colonel J. H., his property confiscated, i. 56; commands at "Ninety-Six," 63.
CUFFE, Colonel J., peerage solicited for, iii. 246, 257, 319.
CULFORD, Lord Cornwallis's country-seat, i. 14, 469.
CULTIVATION, taxes on lands in (India), ii. 468, 477; of waste lands, 558, 559.
CUMBERLAND, William, Duke of, i. 4.
——, Henry Frederick, Duke of, i. 301.
CUMMUR-UD-DEEN, ii. 150.
CUNNINGHAM, General R., captured and rescued, i. 74.
CUPPAGE, Colonel J., his gallantry at Coimbatore, ii. 74, 109.
CURRAN, Right Hon. J. P., iii. 32; efforts to secure his election, 174; Lord Cornwallis's character of, 247.
CURRENCY, Indian, ii. 478.
CUSTOMS, consolidation of the, i. 293; Indian internal, 321; ii. 497; abolition of Government, i. 351, 353; endless and contradictory, ii. 467; exactions in the collection, 555.
CUTTACK, its importance, i. 366, 410, 437, 452; proposed exchange for Salsette, 400, 429, ii. 48; negotiation as to, i. 410; Lord Wellesley takes a part of, iii. 529.
CYDER and Perry Bill, opposed by Lord Cornwallis, i. 10.

D.

DACCA, factory of, secured to France, i. 352; famine in the district of, ii. 16; police of the town of, 205; state of cultivation in the district of, 469; appeal court at, 562.

DAGGER of Tippoo presented to Lord Cornwallis, iii. 275.
DALKEITH, Earl of, marriage of, ii. 285.
DALLAS, General Sir Thomas, ii. 91.
DALLING, General Sir John, i. 41; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 191; illness and recall of, 225.
DALRYMPLE, Viscount, minister at Berlin, i. 199.
DALY, Right Hon. Denis Bowes, Lord Castlereagh complains of, iii. 48; an active Anti-Unionist, 60, 173.
——, Mr. Justice St. George, supports the Union, iii. 18, 42, 49.
——, Captain Peter, promotion of, i. 170.
DAMAS, Comte de, anecdote of, ii. 279.
DAMER, Lady Caroline, i. 168.
——, Hon. G.; *see* Dorchester, Earl of.
DAN river, i. 85.
DANTON, George Jaques, ii. 238.
DARAPOORAM, surrender of, i. 480.
DARBY, Verney, charge against, iii. 190.
DARDANELLES, M. Joseph Buonaparte's jealousy of Russia in, iii. 398.
D'ARGENTEAU; *see* Mercy.
DARMAPATAM Island, taken by Tippoo, i. 387.
DARNLEY, Earl of, iii. 150; indecision of, 153; Lord Cornwallis's reconciliation with, 157; supports the Union, 163, 168; his borough disfranchised, 321.
DAROGAH, appointed by Lord Cornwallis, ii. 205.
DARRAH, Mr., pension and murder of, iii. 320.
DARRELL, Sir Lionel, Bart., iii. 285.
DARWAR, siege and surrender of, ii. 73.
DAVERS, Sir Charles, Bart., iii. 501.
DAVIDSON, General, death of, i. 84.
DAVIES, Mr., Advocate-General in India, i. 249; character of, 264.
DAWSON, R., attacks Lord Castlereagh, iii. 97, 98; opposes the Union, 210, 222; acquiesces in, 251.
DEBATES on the Irish Union, iii. 40-50, 64-70, 161-165, 182-187, 193-200, 202-204, 207-223, 230, 232, 236-241, 247-249; in English Parliament, 57.
DEBBIEG, General, court-martial on, i. 183; iii. 377.
DE BLAQUIERE, Lord; *see* Blaquiere, Sir John.
DEBT of India, i. 489.
—— of the Nabob of the Carnatic, i. 224, 353, 394; ii. 493, 545.
—— of Ireland, at, and after, the Union, iii. 33, 160.
DECCAN, merchants of, i. 553; Maratha demand of chout in, ii. 544; duties on exports from, 551; the Soubah of, iii. 544; Lord Cornwallis's policy towards, 548.
DECENNIAL settlement; *see* Settlement.
DECIES, Lord, Archbishop of Tuam, iii. 160.
DECLARATORY Bill, i. 11; passed, 17; re-

DE CLIFFORD.
lating to sending troops to India, 321, 362; Mr. Dundas's remarks on, 366, 371, 374; opposition to, 372.
De Clifford, (17th) Lord, ii. 41.
——, (18th) Lord, Irish influence of, iii. 43; opposes the Union, 151, 163; removal of his friend Mr. Rowley from office, 176; parliamentary influence, 203.
Deeg, fortress of, iii. 555.
Deep Chund, pensioned, i. 289, 313.
Deep River, i. 53.
Defence of the country, iii. 378-382, 504-510, 515.
—— of Ireland, Duke of Wellington and Lord Cornwallis's plans, iii. 297; Colonel Hope's report on, 488.
De Freyne, Lord, iii. 50.
De Lancey, General Oliver, promotion of, ii. 290.
Delaware, passage of the, i. 27.
Deleel Deel Khan, ii. 108, 119.
Delegates, American, i. 19; from Irish volunteers, ii. 340.
Delhi, revolutions and barbarities at, i. 543, 547; Lord Wellesley's proposal to occupy, iii. 530; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of the possession of, 542.
Denmark, alliance with Russia, i. 210, 450; consents to an armistice, iii. 356; West Indian settlements of, taken, 362.
Deringh, Raje of, ii. 189.
Derry, Bishop of, character of, ii. 340.
——, city of, iii. 29; county of, 141, 161.
Desandrouin, M., negotiates for a loan to Belgium, ii. 257.
Desart, Earl of, elected Irish representative peer, iii. 286.
Descent, Indian law of, ii. 558, 581; of persons in the European service in India, 581.
Desertion, punishment for, i. 56, 61; causes of, among the sepoys, ii. 95.
Despard, Colonel E. M., iii. 498.
D'Estaing, Comte; *see* Estaing, Comte d'.
Destouches, Chevalier, repulsed by Admiral Arbuthnot, i. 88.
Deuxponts, Duke and Duchy of, i. 208.
Devil's Bridge, Suwarrow's attack on, iii. 143.
Devonshire, Duke of, disfranchisement of his borough, iii. 323; Irish parliamentary influence of, 324.
——, Georgiana, Duchess of, canvasses for Fox, i. 173.
Dewanny Sudder Adawlut, Court of, ii. 201, 562, 563.
De Winter, Admiral; *see* Winter, Admiral de.
Dholepoor, iii. 534; its transfer to Sindia, 549, 550.
Dick, Dr. William, iii. 526.
Digby, Admiral R., in America, i. 120, 121, 135; writes to Washington, 147.
——, Colonel Stephen, i. 158; his account
DOVER.
of George III., 470-474; illness and death of, iii. 199, 250.
Dildeleer Khan pensioned, i. 289, 313.
Dillon, Charles, Viscount, opposes the Union, iii. 185.
——, Arthur, "Le Beau," guillotined, iii. 185.
Dindigul, fortress of, surrenders, i. 479; ii. 48; military strength of, 160, 539.
Dingle Icouch, disfranchised, iii. 322.
Disaffection, spirit of Irish, iii. 61, 67, 94.
Discipline, Lord Cornwallis's remark on, ii. 275; enforcement of, 525; how improved, 580.
Discontent of Bengal officers, ii. 311; causes and remedies, 572.
Dissenters, activity of, ii. 32, 185; parliamentary defeat of, 42; indifferent to the Irish Union, iii. 52; proposed payment of their ministers, 64, 294.
Districts, Indian, Ceded, ii. 539; Courts of, 562.
Dobbs, Francis, eccentric arguments of, ii. 376; iii. 250, 285.
Dolben, Sir W., his Bill regulating slave-ships, ii. 32.
Domingo, St., French armament for, iii. 391.
Doncaster, Earldom of, attainder and reversal of, i. 2.
Donegal, 2nd Marquis of, iii. 139.
——, county of, supports the Union, iii. 140, 141, 161; borough of, disfranchised, 322.
——, Bay of, its defensive position, iii. 287.
Donegaile, borough of, disfranchised, iii. 322.
Donop, Count, killed in America, i. 24, 30.
Donoughmore, Viscount, patronage of, iii. 108; services of, 125, 184, 225; created an Earl, 245, 319; elected representative peer, 286, 343.
Doolies, allowance to, ii. 96.
Dorchester, Guy Carleton, Lord, i. 13; succeeds Sir H. Clinton, 133, 146, 147, 148; Lord Sydney praises, 183; his pension and peerage, 271; power of granting commissions refused to, 280.
——, George Damer, Earl of, family anecdote of, i. 168; iii. 4, 231.
Dormer, (10th) Lord, ii. 333.
——, Lady Elizabeth, ii. 333.
Dorset, John Frederick, Duke of, i. 334; obtains the Blue Riband, 374; his application to the French Minister of Marine, 459.
Dorsetshire militia desire to leave Ireland, iii. 126, 130.
Douglas, Archibald, Lord, his claim in the House of Lords, ii. 44.
——, Captain Sir Andrew Snape, ii. 292.
Dover, Joseph, Lord, i. 425.
—— Castle, a suggested depôt for recruits, i. 406; military position of, ii. 336; iii. 508.
—— House Club, account of, i. 375.

DOWLAT BAUG, ford at, ii. 531.
DOWLING, Matthew, Wolfe Tone's attorney, outlawed, ii. 350.
DOWLUT ROW SINDIA, adjustment of differences with, iii. 547-555; his detention of English gentlemen, 536.
DOWN, Bishop of (Dr. W. Dickson), iii. 139.
——, county of, state of crime in, iii. 19, 21; capture of suspected persons in, 73; Anti-Unionist meetings in, 166, 167, 173; loyalty of middle classes in, 176, 229.
DOWNES, Lord, Chief Justice of King's Bench, Ireland, complains of detention of prisoners by military, iii. 14.
——, Ulysses Burgh, (2nd) Lord, iii. 14.
DOWNPATRICK, Lord de Clifford's influence in, iii. 43; becomes independent, 324.
DOWNSHIRE, Marquis of, i. 217; opposes the Union, iii. 34, 46, 80, 152; parliamentary influence of, 43, 322, 324; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 104, 105, 110, 141, 184; speech of, 129, 185; Mr. Pitt's interview with, 147; his reserve, 151; open hostility of, 163-167, 171, 173; subscription for the opposition, 174; unsupported by the middle classes, 176; promotes an Anti-Union petition from the militia, 178; dismissed from the militia and Privy Council, 179, 188, 191, 192; Duke of Portland's opinion of, 197; patronizes Mr. Saurin, 204, 212; Lord Castlereagh opposes, 228; defeated at the county election, 231; his interview with George III., 232.
DOWNSHIRE Militia, excellence of, ii. 396.
DOYLE, General Sir John, i. 49.
D'OYLEY, Sir John, Baronet, Agent for Indian Princes, i. 254.
DRAGOONS, 5th (Royal Irish), officers of, on a court-martial, ii. 422; disbanded, 423, 424, iii. 265.
——, 19th, employed against Tippoo, ii. 514, 516.
DROGHEDA, Marquis of, correspondence respecting his promotion, iii. 244, 259, 264, 272-274, 305; his character, 269; made an English Peer, 318; his borough disfranchised, 322.
——, representation of, iii. 324.
DROUGHTS, Indian, their effect on the revenue, ii. 465, 546, 547; resource against, 559.
DRUGS, intoxicating, levying of duties on, ii. 580.
DRUNKENNESS in the army, punishment for, i. 266; how checked in India, ii. 548.
DUAB, the, Lord Wellesley's wish to occupy, iii. 530; Lord Cornwallis's protection of, 550, 554.
DUBASH, the office of, ii. 67; Paupiah, 67.
DUBLIN, Archbishop of, high character of Cleaver, iii. 160, 169, 210.
——, ——, Agar, translated from Cashel, iii. 438.

DUBLIN, city of, its opposition to the Union, ii. 454; iii. 16, 168, 194, 206; agitation in, iii. 20-29, 111, 161, 173; Duke of Wellington's opinion of its military position, 297; freedom of, conferred on Lord Cornwallis, 562; garrison of, 132, 189; guilds of, 168; lodges, 29; neutrality of Roman Catholics in, 128; representation of, 7, 26, 324; riots in, 51; scarcity in, 110, 144; tranquillized, 110, 229, 247, 250, 285, 288.
——, county of, disturbed state of, iii. 21, 24; Anti-Union meetings in, 32, 35.
—— University, proposed changes in, iii. 68, 71; representation of, 234, 324.
DU BUY, Major, commands a Hessian regiment, i. 523.
DUCIE, Lord, i. 212.
DUCKWORTH, Admiral, takes the Danish settlements, iii. 362.
DUELS, between Mr. Pitt and Mr. Tierney, ii. 338; in Mayo county, iii. 256.
DUFF, Colonel, called "Tiger Duff," ii. 63; his tent attacked by Tippoo, 137; moves from Bangalore, 141; at the night-attack on Tippoo, 516.
——, General Sir James, his conflict with the Irish, ii. 347; his duties in Limerick, iii. 358.
——, J. Grant, his History of the Mahrattas, i. 227.
DUFFERIN, Lord, iii. 215; Baroness, the title conferred, 318.
DUIGENAN, Right Hon. Patrick, his conversion from Rome, iii. 62; his observations on Lord Cornwallis, 70, 90; urges security for the Irish Church, 197, 198; ably answers Mr. Saurin, 212; appointed Commissioner of Compensation, 321.
DULEEK, disfranchised, iii. 322.
DUNALLEY, Lord, supports the Union, iii. 256; obtains a peerage, 318.
DUNCAN, Lord, mutineers in his ships, ii. 326.
——, Lieut.-Col. William, ii. 322.
——, Lady Mary, i. 201.
——, Jonathan, his knowledge of India, i. 283; his administration at Benares, 314, 460, 537; Lord Cornwallis's admiration of, 424, 429, 430, 462, 552, ii. 81; not appreciated by the Court of Directors, i. 476, 559, ii. 216; his reforms and negotiations, ii. 204, 205; his character, 221; his appointment as Governor of Bombay, 237, 266, iii. 508, 510; assists the Malabar Commissioners, ii. 311, iii. 201; aids in settling the Nepaul Treaty, ii. 551; nominated for the Bengal Council, iii. 496, 497.
DUNCOMBE, Henry, M.P. for Yorkshire, i. 172; ii. 282.
DUNDALK, Lord Cornwallis visits, iii. 138, 140, 234.
DUNDAS, Thomas, Lord, votes against the Test Act, ii. 42.
——, Lady Eleanor, visits America, i. 292.

DUNDAS.

DUNDAS, Major-General Thomas, i. 134; capacity of, 389.
——, Sir David, military system of, i. 202, ii. 336; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, 333, iii. 500, 505, 515.
——, Right Hon. Henry, Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, i. 190; letter to Lord Cornwallis, 254; in Parliament, 374; ii. 110; proposes Mr. J. Duncan Governor of Bombay, 266; plan respecting the Indian army, 304; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 309; iii. 174, 201; presented with horses by the Nabob, ii. 310; his firmness, 319; Mr. Robinson's criticism of his plan, 323; his kindness, iii. 514, 516, 517, 519.
DUNGANNON Borough, iii. 234; Lord Abercorn's influence in, 324.
DUNGARVAN Borough, iii. 234; Duke of Devonshire's influence in, 324.
DUNKIRK, French gunboats at, ii. 313; proposed by Talleyrand for seat of negotiations, iii. 158.
DUNLEER Borough disfranchised, iii. 322; compensation for, 322.
DUNN, James, the assassin, executed, iii. 112.
DUNRAVEN, Earl of, iii. 254, 318.
DUNSANY, Randal, Lord, iii. 220.
DU PUY, André Julien, Comte, ii. 55, iii. 445.
DURBARS, intriguing spirit of, ii. 102.
DURWAR, fortress of, ii. 513.
DUTIES, Indian, collection of bazar, ii. 580; on boats, 475; Custom-house, i. 540; reform of internal, ii. 470, 474, 475-477, 546-571; Sayer, 496, 497, 547.
——, Irish, proposed at the Union, iii. 33.
DWYER, Michael, the Wicklow bandit, iii. 283.
D'YVERNOIS, Sir F., Lord Cornwallis's criticism on his pamphlet, ii. 296.

E.

EAD-GAH, Tippoo's defensive position at, ii. 530-532.
EAST INDIA BILL, Mr. Fox's, i. 14, 157, 175, 220; Mr. Pitt's, 220.
EAST INDIA COMPANY, their differences with Government, i. 178; Lord Cornwallis's services desired by, 179; elections by, 219; original territories of, 221; peculation of servants of, 221; capacity of the directors, 221; feudatorial character of, 223; misconduct of their supercargoes, 246; pay of their servants, 278, 286, 321, 379; collectorships of, 283; salt monopoly, 285; economy of, 290, 318; conduct to Sir A. Campbell, 319, 322, 407; justice for Madras and Bombay, 324; renewal of charter, 332; their patronage, 333, 433, 476, 535, 559, 561; military establishments of, 341-345; differences with Board of Control, 348; object to the raising of four regiments, 349, 362; oppose the Declaratory Bill, 366; proprietors and directors, 367; alleged illiberality of, 378; conciliation of, 385, 391; Duke of York's opinion respecting Company's troops, 402; financial position of, 409, 478; object to the Chinese embassy, ii. 1; proposed charter, 13-20, 229; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 14, 15, 113, 155, 213; appointments by, complained of, 155, 156; their past administration, 172, 568; capacity of the servants of, 173; made Dewan of the Nabob of Bengal, 192; Lord Clive's treatment by European officers of, 193; nominate supervisors of the revenue, 193; Mr. Dundas's plans defeated by, 266, 284; committees in London and India respecting the amalgamation of the armies of, 285; reject Lord Cornwallis's plans for the army, 288, 300, 301; zemindar payments to, 460, 463; policy of moderation in demands of, 467; Tippoo's treaty with, 532; their power over the army, 570, 574; supplies of ordnance by, 576; authority over contingent charges, 576, 577; importance of the Cape of Good Hope to, iii. 443; their differences with Lord Wellesley, 495, 524, 531, 543; their vote of 40,000*l.* to Lord Cornwallis's family, 564.
ECONOMY, Lord Cornwallis's remarks on public, i. 276, 290, 318, 541; in the Bengal and Bombay establishments, 560.
EDEN, Sir Morton, his peerage, iii. 109.
EDGECOMBE, Lord; *see* Mount-Edgecombe.
EDGEWORTH, R. L., iii. 183.
EDUCATION in India, i. 398, 554.
EFFINGHAM, Lord, resigns his commission, i. 18; his motion on the navy, 32; his motions in favour of Government, 164.
EGAN, John, iii. 164, 248; sobriquet of, 215.
EGERTON, the family of, iii. 175.
EGLINTON, Archibald, Earl of, i. 170.
EGYPT, French invasion of, ii. 415, iii. 357; Lord Cornwallis's anxiety as to, 359, 360, 378; British success in, 362, 490; the Turks and English in, 439.
ELDON, Earl of, i. 270.
ELECTIONS, English (1784), i. 172; ii. 42; Irish, iii. 111; of Irish Representative Peers, 272, 278, 280, 286.
ELEPHANTS useful in artillery movements, ii. 86; present of, to George III., 557.
ELGIN, Thomas, Earl of, at Maestricht, ii. 242.
ELIOT, Edward, Lord, i. 16.
——, Hon. G. C. Cornwallis, killed at Inkerman, i. 16.
ELLIOT, Sir George A.; *see* Heathfield.
——, Andrew, Lieutenant-Governor of New York, i. 148.
——, Right Hon. William, ii. 420, 421.
——, Hugh, Minister at Copenhagen, bold conduct of, i. 450.
ELPHINSTONE, Lieut.-Colonel John, i. 385; Field-officer's commission of, ii. 143.

ELWES.

ELWES, the miser, important vote of, i. 171.
ELY, Marquis of, promises to support the Union, ii. 452; adverse to the measure, iii. 34, 36; hesitates, 41, 43, 47; again promises support, 80, 149; conduct of, 108, 113, 258; marquisate of, 259, 262, 264, 281, 319; English peerage conferred, 318; his boroughs disfranchised, 322.
EMMETT, T. A., rebellion and banishment of, ii. 378, 428; ingratitude of, 392; separate imprisonment of, 438; conspiracy of, iii. 283, 499, 508.
ENGINEERS, officers of, ii. 576; the corps of, deserve encouragement, iii. 219, 225; improvement of, 229, 317.
ENGLAND, war with America, i. 13, 17; maritime power of, 32; policy of, 48, 346, iii. 495; her power after the American war, i. 204, 208; Frederick the Great's friendly professions to, 209; finances of, 210, 275; her prosperity, 264, 403, 557; commercial treaty of France with, 271, 276; general state of affairs in 1787, 272-274, 298; in 1788, 375-379; in 1789, 441; in 1790, 482, ii. 5-7, 32, 44-46; in 1791, 104, 144, 170; in 1792, 185; French jealousy of the guard-ships of, i. 335; friendship of Holland with, 334-337; Prussian convention with, 361; Indian saying respecting, 372; gloomy aspect of, 417, ii. 309, 311, iii. 317; party-feeling in, i. 444; European importance of, ii. 9; her conduct to Spain, 109; withdraws her troops from Flanders, 281; threatened French invasion of, 285, 313, 335, 337, iii. 296, 489, 504, 516; suspends cash payments, ii. 325; deserted by her allies, 333; danger and defences of, 334, 336, iii. 490; her alliance with Russia, iii. 24; Irish jealousy of, 60; proposed armistice between France and, 293; eastern district of, 378; treaty of Amiens between France and, 383-487; Newfoundland fisheries of, 399, 430, 444; her rights in Malta, 393, 411, 425; alliance of Naples with, 455; her privileges in the Bay of Honduras, 459; French uneasiness at her naval preparations, 465; militia and yeomanry of, 490, 491.
ENGLISH bishops promoted to the Irish primacy, iii. 160, 169.
—— Church incorporated with the Irish, iii. 176, 198, 209.
ENNIS, borough of, iii. 234.
ENNISCORTHY, Irish rebels defeated at, ii. 354; patrons of, iii. 170; disfranchised, 322.
ENNISKILLEN, Earl of, his difference with Lord Cornwallis, ii. 421; opposes the Union, iii. 51; reconciliation of, 193, 198; his son patronised by Lord Cornwallis, 333; Grand Master of Orange Lodges, 507.
——, borough of, iii. 234, 287.
ENNOREE river, i. 53.

FAMINE.

ERATORE Ford, ii. 529.
ERNE, Earl, elected Representative Peer, iii. 286.
EROAD, reduction of, i. 479; conveyance of food to, 467.
ERSKINE, Henry, Lord, defeated at Portsmouth election, i. 172; a witness for O'Connor, ii. 381.
ESCHEATORSHIP of Munster, debate on, iii. 97-100.
ESMONDE, John, M.D., execution of, ii. 347, iii. 284.
ESSEX, expected French descent in, ii. 313; defence of, 334-336.
ESTAING, Comte d', evades Admiral Byron, i. 37; repulsed at Savannah, 41.
ESTEN, Mrs., verses upon, i. 376.
ETRURIA, King of, iii. 407; recognition of, pressed on England, 435, 444, 449.
EUROPE, critical state of (1785), i. 198; in 1794, ii. 231-235, 258; Frederick the Great's opinion of, i. 208; affairs of, in 1788, 328-340; in 1791, ii. 9, 110; in 1792, 164; negotiations in, 341; politics of, 361-368, 391, 392; hostile aspect of, iii. 316, 317, 437; French preponderance in, 408, 439; Buonaparte menaces, 457; alarming state of, in 1802, 498; in 1804, 513.
EUROPEAN hostilities, their influence on India, i. 368; influence at Native Courts, 398.
EUSTACE, Lieut.-General Charles, iii. 116.
EUSTON, Earl of, marriage of, i. 182.
EVANS, Hamden, Irish state-prisoner, ii. 377.
EVIDENCE in the Indian Criminal Courts, ii. 549, 550.
EWART, Joseph, Minister at Berlin, i. 201.
EXCHANGE of American prisoners, i. 141, 146-150.
——, rate of, in India, i. 464, 465.
——, from Indian regiments, ii. 578.
EXCHEQUER of Ireland, iii. 33.
EXPEDITIONS intended against France, iii. 154, 158, 231, 236, 285, 294.
EXMOUTH, Viscount, iii. 534, 539.
EXPORT Indian duties, ii. 560.
EXSHAW, John, Mayor of Dublin, iii. 295.
EXTORTIONS in India, i. 256, 318, ii. 496; over the ryots, 549, 554.
EYE, Lord Cornwallis's influence in, i. 181, 469; iii. 491; election of Admiral Cornwallis, 492; election in, ii. 104, 165.
EYRE, Chief Justice, refuses the Rolls, i. 271.

F.

FACTORIES in India, belonging to the French, i. 352.
FAGNANI, Mademoiselle Maria, becomes Marchioness of Hertford, ii. 144.
FAIRFORD, Lord; *see* Downshire, Marquis of.
FALKLAND ISLANDS, iii. 427, 430.
FAMINE, anticipated in England, ii. 304.

FARMERS, Indian, severe to ryots, ii. 548, 554.
FARMING in India, i. 549; evils of, ii. 472.
FARNBOROUGH, Lord, iii. 309.
FARNHAM, (1st) Earl of, iii. 51; his opinions of Maynooth, 90, 372; opposes the Union, 185, 200, 220, 222.
——, (2nd) Earl of, iii. 50.
FAWCETT, General Sir William, Governor of Chelsea Hospital, i. 151, 419.
FAYETTE, Marquis de la; *see* La Fayette.
FELLOWS of Trinity College; *see* Trinity College.
FENCIBLES in Ireland, ii. 389; the Suffolk, 396; Lord Roden's, 412; disbanding of a regiment of, 439; Scotch and English, iii. 19, 60, 78, 79, 277, 332; strange address of a colonel to, 94.
FERDINAND IV., King of Naples, iii. 392.
FERGUSON, Major Patrick, i. 56, 59; surprised by the rebels, 59; cruel treatment of his men, 67, 316; orders to, 500; his death, 510, 511.
FERMANAGH, hostile to the Union, iii. 140.
FERMOY, military defences at, iii. 361.
FERRARD, Viscount, iii. 45.
FETHARD, disfranchised, iii. 322.
FETHERSTONE, Sir T., iii. 176, 182; changes his opinion on the Union, 183.
FETHERSTONHAUGH, Sir H., i. 172.
FIELD-OFFICERS, Indian, ii. 572, 576; allowances to, 580.
FIFE, (2nd) Earl of, ii. 44.
FINANCES of England and France, i. 210; of India, 239, 240; of the East India Company, ii. 493, 523.
FINANCIAL opinions of Lord Cornwallis, i. 321; arrangements consequent on the Irish Union, iii. 159.
FINCKENSTEIN, Comte de, i. 205.
FINGALL, Earl, supports the Union, iii. 8; Roman Catholic meetings at his house, 22, 28, 40, 58, 127, 146; his activity respecting Maynooth, 366, 369, 373; Lord Cornwallis communicates with, 521.
FINNERTY, Peter, libel by, ii. 344.
FISH-DAM, action at, i. 66.
FISHERIES, rents from Indian, ii. 496; at Newfoundland, iii. 399, 407, 419, 427, 454.
FITZGERALD, Lord Edward, rebellion of, ii. 341, 346, 363, 367; attainder and flight of, 384, 385, 389.
——, Lady Edward, ii. 384, 389.
——, Right Hon. James, ii. 372.
——, Right Hon. Maurice, iii. 42, 45.
——, Edward, self-banishment of, ii. 348, 368.
——, R. U., iii. 41.
FITZGIBBON, Lord; *see* Clare.
FITZHERBERT, Mrs., i. 301.
FITZPATRICK, Colonel, i. 419.
FITZROY, General Lord Charles, ii. 424; iii. 513.

FITZWILLIAM, Earl, i. 419; ii. 365; iii. 9; his speech on Irish education, iii. 371.
FLANDERS, disturbances in, ii. 31; campaign in, 230-235, 272; Lord Cornwallis ordered to, 239; its value to Austria, 246; its government, 261.
FLEMING, Dr. J., iii. 526.
FLESSELLES, Jaques de, murdered, ii. 6.
FLEURUS, battle of, ii. 232.
FLOGGING, Lord Cornwallis suppresses illegal, iii. 89.
FLOOD, Right Hon. Henry, ii. 340.
——, Sir Frederick, anecdote of, iii. 26.
FLORIDA, invaded by Spain, i. 41; loyalists of, 272.
FLOYD, General Sir John, reduces Sattimungul, i. 479, 480; his gallantry, ii. 48, 62; his conduct at Bangalore, 70, 163; joins Abercromby, 138; his corps of observation, 224; pursues Tippoo, 518, 528.
——, Lady, her marriage, ii. 80.
——, Colonel, forms a militia, i. 53.
FOMBELLE, John, Judge of the Sudder Adawlut, i. 371.
FORAGE for Indian cavalry, ii. 507, 520; distressing want of, 508, 511; Tippoo's orders to destroy, 514, 519.
FORBES, Major-General John, ii. 307.
FORDE, Colonel, his two marriages, iii. 162.
FORDS in India, ii. 515, 530.
FORE, disfranchised, iii. 322.
FOREST lands in India, ii. 559.
FORSTER, George, i. 252.
FORTESCUE, W. C., iii. 49.
——, Chichester, iii. 183.
FORTIFICATIONS of Portsmouth and Plymouth, i. 195-198; in Ireland, iii. 296-301, 515; of captured places in India, 417.
FORWARD, Right Hon. W., iii. 109.
FOSTER, Hon. Colonel T. H., iii. 45.
——, Right Hon. John, Speaker of the Irish Commons, ii. 362; anti-Unionists' champion, iii. 33, 34; hostility to the Government, 44, 46; proposed subscription for, 60; attacks Mr. Pitt, 86, 87; violent opposition of, 89, 183, 187, 195, 199, 212; questionable law of, 249; compensation to, 322.
"FOUDROYANT" captured by Admiral Osborne, i. 7.
FOUJDARRY Department, maladministration of justice in, i. 476; ii. 504; reforms in, 548; ii. 201.
FOX, General, the Right Hon. Henry, military talents of, i. 171; iii. 501, 502; his qualifications for Governor-General, i. 389, 392, 461; Mr. Dundas's opinion of, 559; iii. 501, 502, 508.
——, Right Hon. Charles James, eulogizes Lord Cornwallis, i. 14; ii. 111; his notice respecting India, i. 156; India Bill of, 157, 220, 236; attempted coalition with Mr. Pitt's friends, 164; his seat for West-

minster in jeopardy, 172; Duchess of Devonshire canvasses for, 173; Lord J. Russell's memoirs of, 199; his despatch to Berlin, 199; opposes the Declaratory Bill, 374; Secretary of State, 419; illness of, 420; his views of a Regency, 445; his alleged secret mission to Russia, ii. 110; disapproves of the Indian war, 112, 237; supports Russia against Turkey, 176; renews his parliamentary opposition, 330; a witness at O'Connor's trial, 381.

FOX, Luke, Justice of the Irish Common Pleas, iii. 164, 204.

——, Mrs. C. J., i. 420.

——, Hon. Caroline, ii. 7.

FRANCE, assists America against England, i. 32, 127; Washington seeks the aid of, 116; fleet and troops of, in America, 118, 130, 139; Rodney's victory over the fleet of, 139; her policy towards Russia and Germany, 198; alliance of Holland with, 199; her influence at Berlin, 207; unites with Austria, 208, 211, 275; improves her marine, 208; betrays Bavaria, 208, 209; her policy towards Holland, 209, 267, 334, 335, 341; her conduct in India, 210, 462, 558; ii. 484; foments Irish disturbances, i. 210; ii. 389, 391; iii. 130; comparative finances of England and, i. 210; her real policy towards Prussia, 213, 327; commercial treaty with, 256, 268, 271, 276; combines with Russia, 275; negotiations with, as to right of search, 283, 287; treaties between Tippoo and, 289; Mauritius convention with, 294, 330, 338, 349; intrigues of the Nizam with, 312; assists Tippoo, 317; ii. 533; iii. 529; settlements of, in India, i. 317, 337, 352, 478; ii. 54; iii. 417, 429; her designs on China, i. 327; revenues of, 328; Anglo-Indian policy towards, 331; disordered finances of, 334, 340, 349, 361; jealous of English armament, 335; prospect of war with, 346; iii. 495, 503, 504, 517; value of her Turkish commerce, i. 350; pacific professions of, 371, 372, 387; internal dissensions in, 403, 405, 450, 483; Tippoo's embassy to, 403, 461; her restless spirit, 406, 419; refugees from, ii. 7, 31; abstains from interference in India, 24, 495; Revolution in, 31, 186, 238, 266; iii. 148; Lord Lansdowne's views respecting, ii. 39, 124, 164; imprisonment and execution of financiers in, 110; confusion of affairs in, 144, 170, 176; makes war with Hungary, 185; her claims at Mahé, 209, 491; makes war with England and Holland, 225, 226; Pondicherry taken from, 226; Austria claims indemnity from, 333; decree of the convention of, 249; insubordination of the army of, 258; English military operations in, 261, 269, 276, 283; refuses Dutch terms of capitulation, 283; expected invasion by,

285, 313, 332, 333, 335, 337; iii. 287, 381; comparative resources of America and- ii. 296; capture of English vessels by, 297; makes peace with Naples, 312; the continental fear of, 329; defence of Essex against, 334, 335; Toulon armament from, 337; landing and surrender of troops and arms from, 338, 403, 404; information by Irish traitors to, 341, 347, 366; vessels reach Bantry Bay from, 342; dispersion of fleet of, 342; slaughter, in Ireland, of troops from, 390; another armament from, 419; landing in Ireland of troops from, 396, 401; iii. 13, 21; invasion by, ii. 412; iii. 2, 67, 70; Sir J. B. Warren's capture of a squadron from, ii. 414; her power of invasion, 416, 419; armament from, in Killala Bay, 428; frigates of, chased, 431; narrow escape of the armies of, iii. 24; meditates attacking Ireland, 56, 60, 73; her preparations at Brest, 77; army of, crosses the Rhine, 77; her naval expedition to Cadiz, 77; sailing of the fleet of, 93, 96, 100, 102, 110; army of, under Scherer, defeated, 102; defeated in the Grisons, 103; compelled to quit part of Italy, 114; joins Spain against England, 132; remonstrates with Hamburgh, 143; secret English expedition against, 152; offers negotiations with England, 155; Sir C. Grey's prejudices against, 157; Talleyrand communicates with Lord Grenville from, 158; convention with, in Egypt, 225; conferences and treaty at Amiens between England and, 383-487; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on society in, 406, 410; undue preponderance of, 408; East India trade of, 441.

FRANCIS, Sir Philip, i. 409; his resolutions on India, ii. 111; violent speech of, 186, 187.

FRANKFORT, Viscount, solicits rank and office, ii. 364, 365; created a peer, iii. 318.

FRANKLIN, Benjamin, his conduct respecting the Stamp Act, i. 17; anecdote of his velvet coat, 18; obtains Mr. Whateley's letters, 18; attacked by Wedderburn, 18; his conduct as to Lord Cornwallis's exchange, 142; refuses to release Lord Cornwallis's aides-de-camp, 142, 146; his conduct as to loyalists' property, 193.

——, William, Loyalist Governor of New Jersey, i. 144.

FRASER'S regiment, gallantry at Castlebar, ii. 395, 396.

FREDERICK THE GREAT, Lord Cornwallis's mission to, i. 199-202; his real policy towards England, 203; his experience in political intrigue, 204; declines an English alliance, 205; his wishes as to Russia, Austria, and Holland, 205, 206; his anger with his minister Lusi, 206; probable French influence with, 207; illness of, 207; Lord Cornwallis's interviews with, 208-211;

his opinions of France, 209; his views on European affairs, 209; invites Lord Cornwallis to inspect his troops, 211; his constitution, 212.
FREDERICK, Colonel Charles, ii. 76.
FRENCH, troops, defeat of, i. 8; surprise and retreat of, 9; Freehold Court House, action at, 34; fleet, Lord Howe's unsuccessful attempt to bring it to action, 34; fleet, after twenty-four hours' fight, decline renewing the battle, 50; squadron, compelled to return to port, 88; fleet, joined by their Rhode Island squadron, 122; fleet, number of, near Yorktown, 124; the English, when defeated, treated with civility by the, 126, 130; fleet, peril of, after Rodney's victory, 139; intercession with Tippoo, in favour of English prisoners, 459; prisoners, ii. 408, 425.
FRENCH, Arthur, refuses an Earldom, iii. 50.
FURLOUGHS, Lord Cornwallis's views as to, i. 251; of Indian officers, ii. 573; prevention of the abuse of, 579.
FURNAVESE, Nana, i. 553; ii. 553.
FURRUCKABAD, Nabob of, i. 222; arrangement with, 289, 313; surrender of, ii. 62.
FUSSILY district, revenue of, ii. 546, 547.
FUTTEH SING, i. 228.
FUTTYGHUR detachments, i. 256, 257; brigade, recall of, 288; ii. 294.
FYNALLET KHAN, ii. 295.
FYZULLAH KHAN, prudence and economy of, ii. 295.

G.

GAEKWARS, family of, i. 228.
GAGE, Hon. General T., dissolves the Massachusetts assembly, i. 19.
GALWAY, Robert, (4th) Viscount, Yorkshire estate of, i. 273.
—— county, disaffection of, iii. 61, 169; placed under martial law, 66; friendly to the Union, 98, 129.
——, borough, iii. 7; Duke of Wellington's plan of fortifying, 297; independence of, 324.
—— volunteers, ii. 395.
GAMING in the army, in Philadelphia, i. 31.
GANGES, Lord Cornwallis's voyage up the, i. 276.
GANTHEAUME, Admiral, his naval operations, iii. 391, 516.
GARDINER, Lieut.-General W., proposed for command, iii. 77, 81; Lord Cornwallis eulogizes, 353, 356, 357, 359.
GARDNER, Admiral, Lord, cruises off Brest, iii. 230; created a peer, 318.
GARTER, commoners receiving the order of the, ii. 361.
GASPEE man-of-war, burnt by the Americans, i. 18.

GATES, General, advance of, i. 53; defeated by Lord Cornwallis, 55, 506.
GAURINATH, dethroned, ii. 188; reinstated by Lord Cornwallis, 188.
GENEREUX, Lord Nelson captures the, iii. 223.
GENOA in the power of France, iii. 114; Austrians advance to, 223; surrenders, 238.
GENT, General, his character, iii. 275, 276.
GEORGE III., his conversation with Lord North, i. 155; his message to Lord Temple, 159; his conversation with Lord Cornwallis, 187; his illness in 1788, 416-425, 444, 450, 470-474; his recovery, 425, 441, 445-448, 482, 557; ii. 40, 46; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, i. 427; ii. 9; congratulations to, i. 430; ii. 30; celebrations at Calcutta on recovery of, i. 435; returns thanks at St. Paul's Cathedral, 442; his approbation of Lord Cornwallis, ii. 30, 111; Mr. Dundas's account of, 216; promises to confer rank on Lieut.-Colonel Ross, 235; presents from the Nabob to, 557; his views as to the Duke of York's command in Flanders, 263; his illness in 1801, iii. 341, 349.
GEORGETOWN taken by the Americans, i. 63.
GEORGIA subdued, i. 41; tranquillized, 78, 116; accounts and payments for, 502.
GERMAIN, Lord George, i. 21, 28; sends a dormant commission to Lord Cornwallis, 33, 38; his approbation of Lord Cornwallis's conduct, 80, 100, 110, 112; receives news of the fall of Yorktown, 135.
GERMANIC association, i. 204.
GERMAN troops, expense of, i. 244, 332; English employment of, iii. 138.
GERMANY, Emperor of, i. 198.
——, state of, i. 198; alliances with, ii. 125; allied army, commanded by the Emperor of, 230; Irish rebels' desire to be sent to, 428; conduct of courts of, iii. 24; Moreau's success in, 238; submits to Napoleon, 408; enlistment in, 451.
GHAUTS, passage of the, ii. 8, 539; state of roads near, 502.
GHAZEPORE, death of Lord Cornwallis at, i. 16; iii. 531, 559; Lord Cornwallis's tomb at, iii. 561.
GHEE, supply of, from waste lands, ii. 558.
GHOLAM ALI KHAN, Tippoo's vakeel, ii. 139, 534; disgraced, 211.
GHOLAM KADIR KHAN, cruelties of, i. 243, 364, 543, 547.
GHOLAM MAHOMMED, kills his brother, ii. 293-295.
GIBRALTAR, British force at, iii. 294.
GILBERTSTOWN, cruelties to the British at, i. 71.
GINJERA, Maratha claims upon, i. 386, 547, 565.
GISBORNE, Thomas, M.D., attends George III., iii. 341.

GLANDORE.

GLANDORE, Earl of, supports the Union, iii. 40, 184, 220; Master of the Rolls, 302.
GLASTONBURY, Lord, Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, iii. 513.
GLENTWORTH, Lord, supports the Union, iii. 125, 184; elected Irish representative peer, 286; promoted in peerage, 319.
GLOUCESTER (America), military defensive post at, i. 104, 109, 110.
GLOUCESTER, Duke of (George III.'s brother), marriage of, i. 214; Chancellor of Dublin University, iii. 68.
GOA, government of, ii. 210.
GODOLPHIN, Francis, Earl, death of, i. 274.
GODOY, Prince of Peace, iii. 403.
GOHUD, conquered by Sindia, iii. 533; the Rana of, 535, 548, 553-555; cession of, 549-554.
GOLDING, George, ii. 305.
GOLDSWORTHY, Lieut.-General, in household of George III., i. 375, 472.
GOOLD, T., Irish master in Chancery, iii. 174.
GOORKHA, Nepaulese dynasty of, ii. 191.
GOOTY, Fort, Tippoo's cession of, ii. 158.
GOPAUL, Fortress, besieged, ii. 513.
GORDON, 5th Duke of; *see* Huntley.
——, Lord George, enlisting men for the Dutch service, i. 189.
——, Duchess of, fashionable influence of, i. 268, 305; extraordinary ball of, iii. 377.
——, Lady Louisa, marries Lord Brome, i. 15.
——, Hon. Lockhart, Judge-Advocate General, i. 306.
GORE, Colonel J., i. 184.
——, Colonel W., appointed to the Barrack Board, iii. 108, 109.
——, Admiral Sir John, his kindness, iii. 526, 535.
GORT, Viscount, his gallantry at Coloony, ii. 401.
GOSFORD, Earl of, supports the Union, iii. 50, 319.
GOULD, Colonel Paston, i. 105.
GOURAN, disfranchised, iii. 322.
GOVERNMENT of India, Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, i. 238, 282; Lord Cornwallis's principles of, 276; weakness of, ii. 312; impolicy of a mixed, 496.
GOVERNOR-GENERALSHIP of India, offered by Lord Shelburne to Lord Cornwallis, i. 14; by Mr. Pitt, 191; accepted by Lord Cornwallis, 215, 216; salary of, 216; powers of, 218; qualifications for, ii. 165; expenses of, 181; appointed a second time, 321; a third time, iii. 524.
GOVERNORS, Mogul, character of, i. 564.
GOVERNORS of Presidencies, i. 391.
GOVIND RAO, i. 228.
GOWDIE, Major, Ryacotta garrison surrenders to, ii. 100.
GOZO, island of, iii. 424-426.
GRACE, act of, ii. 361.

GRENVILLE.

GRADY, H. D., ii. 459.
GRAFTON, Duke of, i. 10; his scheme of taxation, 17; opinion of, on political affairs, ii. 275.
GRAIN, Lord Cornwallis's inquiries as to supplies of, ii. 501, 502; mode of procuring, 511; scarcity of, 520.
GRANARD, Earl of, his gallantry, ii. 395, 396, 399; his boroughs disfranchised, iii. 323, 324.
——, borough disfranchised, iii. 322.
GRANBY, Marquis of, i. 6.
GRAND-MASTER of the Order of St. John, at Malta, iii. 424, 425; Napoleon's proposed powers to, 451, 478; sells Malta to France, 451; Emperor of Russia's proposal as to, 464, 469, 474.
GRAND, G. F., judge of Adawlet, ii. 182.
——, Madame, marries Talleyrand, iii. 387.
GRANDISON, Earl of, iii. 261; not nominated as representative peer, 265, 268.
GRANT, General James, i. 24, 25, 42; letters to Lord Cornwallis, 257, 286, 360, 431; iii. 41, 110; claims compensation, 272.
——, Lieut.-Colonel Ludowick, popularity of, ii. 302, 303.
——, Charles, purity of his character, i. 318; quits India, 430; unappreciated by the Court of Directors, 476; Lord Cornwallis's admiration of, 389, 488; iii. 378; his knowledge of India, i. 493, 559; consulted by Mr. Pitt and Mr. Dundas, ii. 184, 215.
——, James, his talent and experience, ii. 197.
GRANTLEY, Lord, ii. 5.
GRASSE, Comte de, his action with Admiral Graves, i. 116; captured, with his ship, 119; article of capitulation, as to, 527.
GRATTAN, Right Hon. Henry, witness for O'Connor, ii. 381; character of, 397, 398; removed from the Privy Council, 417; takes his seat, iii. 161; inflammatory speech of, 163; his influence, 167; opinion of, entertained by Lord Cornwallis, his duel with Mr. Corry, 196; violent speech on the Union, and attack on Lord Castlereagh, 239-243; supposed author of an address, 247.
GRAVES, Admiral Lord, replaces Admiral Arbuthnot, i. 78; reluctant to sail for the Chesapeak, 122.
GREENE, Major-General, character of, i. 75; defeated by Lord Rawdon, 98; succeeds in the south, 116.
GREGORY, Right Hon. W., iii. 278.
GRENVILLE, Lord, quits the India Board, i. 255; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, ii. 329; iii. 359; replies to Buonaparte's overtures, 158, 175; his character as minister, 270, 277; desires to resign, 343; disapproves of peace, 383, 393; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of a Grenville party, 512, 513.

GRENVILLE, Lord George, iii. 314.
——, General Richard, his friendship for Lord Cornwallis, i. 152; intimate with George III. iii. 330.
——, Right Hon. George, i. 11.
——, Right Hon. Thomas, his mission to Vienna, ii. 232, 256, 273; recalled, 235; offered the Irish Secretaryship, iii. 8, 9; electioneering movements of, 513.
GREY (1st), Earl, action at Taapan, i. 35; Lord Cornwallis's old acquaintance with, ii. 286; iii. 154, 157, 284.
——, Charles (2nd), Earl, his attack on Mr. Pitt, i. 303; his motion respecting the Post-office, 303.
GRISDALE, Rev. B., i. 154; presented by Mrs. Cornwallis to Withington, 405; ii. 121; Lord Cornwallis's esteem for, iii. 25, 228.
GROGAN, Cornelius, executed, ii. 347; attainted, 381; attainder reversed, 382.
GROUCHY, Comte de, attempted invasion of Ireland, ii. 342.
GUARDS, the, gallantry of, in America, i. 84, 522.
GUERNSEY, service of Irish militia in, iii. 76, 78, 86, 88; opinion of George III. as to, 80; King's County Militia in, 110; proposed quarters for Russians at, 137.
GUIANA (Portuguese), part of, ceded to France, iii. 398; Amiens treaty respecting, 466, 474.
GUIBERT, Comte de, his work on 'War,' i. 132.
GUICOWAR family, British interference sought for the, ii. 228.
GUILFORD, battle of, i. 86, 110, 520-523.
GUILDS of Dublin, described, iii. 168.
GUJELHUTTY, pass of, i. 480.
GUJRAJ MISSER, pension to, ii. 551.
GUNGES, management of, i. 460, 564, 565; separation of land-revenue from, 466; their withdrawal from the Zemindars, 553; duties payable in, ii. 475, 478; collections in, 497.
GUNNING, Sir Robert, ii. 291.
——, Miss Isabella, i. 470.
GUNTOOR CIRCAR, demand of the cession of, i. 251, 281, 320; Lord Cornwallis's opinions respecting, 263, 355, Lord Cornwallis's instructions as to, 537-539; surrender of, 542-545, 557; inquiry as to carriage cattle at, ii. 501.
GUSTAVUS III. makes war with Russia, i. 450.
GUZERAT, importance of, i. 459; ii. 113; Lord Wellesley acquires parts of, iii. 530.
GUZZLEHUTTY pass, difficulty of, ii. 539.
GWALIOR, fortress of, iii. 534; ceded to Sindia, 548-552, 549.
GYA, pilgrimages to, i. 411; duties payable at, ii. 497.

H.

HABEAS Corpus Act suspended, ii. 342; iii. 345; its conflict with martial law, iii. 11, 14.
HACKETT, the Irish rebel, ii. 369.
HAFIZ JEE, capture and death of, ii. 133.
HALDANE, Lieut.-Colonel H., i. 92, 146; his map of the march, 175; Lord Cornwallis's esteem for, 197; distinguished at Camden, 508.
HALDIMAND, General Sir F., i. 271.
HALHED, Nathaniel B., Agent for Oude, i. 254.
HALIFAX, i. 108.
HALL, Lieut.-Colonel, killed, i. 518.
HALLIDAY, Alexander H., M.D., iii. 139.
HAMBURGH, Napper Tandy arrested in, iii. 143, 189.
HAMILTON, Lord George, the earldom of Orkney conferred on, iii. 245.
——, Right Hon. Sackville, iii. 278; commissioner of compensation, 321.
——, Lieut.-Colonel John, character of, i. 49, 192; his operations in Carolina, 501.
——, Hon. Arthur C., opposes the Union, iii. 45.
——, Alexander, opposes the Union, iii. 46.
HANGER, Hon. George, i. 173.
HANNAY, Sir Samuel, Bart., i. 394, 448.
HANOVER, troops in India, ii. 64; neutrality of the Elector of, 289; Prussian evacuation of, iii. 389, 391, 395.
HARCOURT, Earl, captures General Lee, i. 26; accompanies George III. to Kew, 472; repulses the French, ii. 283.
——, Countess, her advice in George III.'s illness, i. 446.
HARDING, Thomas, official appointment of, iii. 17.
HARDWICKE, Earl of, Irish policy of, iii. 340, 349, 378; Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, 351-364; supported by Mr. Addington, 418.
HARPUR, Colonel Gabriel, i. 252, 443.
——, Richard, pensioned, iii. 521.
HARRIS, Sir James; *see* Malmesbury.
——, Lord, his views on the Indian army, ii. 300; attacks Tippoo, 517.
HARRISON, James, iii. 17.
——, Rev. Mr., joins the British, i. 131.
HARRISTOWN, disfranchised, iii. 322.
HARROWBY, Lord, second in Mr. Pitt and Mr. Tierney's duel, ii. 338.
HARTLAND, Lord, iii. 182; family of, 256; peerage conferred, 318.
HARTLEY, Major-General James, ii. 61; brilliant action of, 62; consulted by Lord Cornwallis, 311.
HARVEY, B. Beauchamp, execution of, ii. 347; bill of attainder against, 381, 382.
HASTINGS, Right Hon. Warren, talents of,

i. 218, 219; impeachment of, 293, 299, 302; conduct of Directors to, 318; Lord Cornwallis's esteem for, 322; Lord Lansdowne's opinion of, 328; Mr. Dundas on the arrangements of, 333; his praise of Lord Cornwallis's administration, 363; trial of, 371, 376, 380; Mr. Sheridan's speech against, 404; his trial resumed, 442; his judgment of character, 448; Lord Cornwallis's kindness to, ii. 42; tediousness of his trial, 44; Lord Lansdowne's remarks on the trial of, 122, 123; his administration considered, 193, 194, 201; reinforces Suja-ul-Dowla, 293.

HAUGWITZ, Comte de, character of, ii. 240; communicates with Lord Cornwallis, 241, 243.

HAW river, i. 85.

HAWKE, Lord, joins the opposition, i. 300.

HAWKESBURY, Lord, presides at the Board of Trade, i. 255; rumoured official promotion of, 274; preliminary treaty with France, iii. 386, 398, 409; his instructions as to the Amiens treaty, 388-482.

HAY, Lieut.-Colonel, brevet rank of, iii. 126; widow and family of, 128, 130.

——, Edward, Esq., President of the Board of Trade, i. 295.

HAYES, Charles, i. 225.

HEADFORT, Marquis of, his political influence, iii. 31, 32; promotion of, 264, 286, 319.

HEARTH-MONEY, in Ireland, iii. 233.

HEATHFIELD, Lord, returns to England, i. 299, 300; his marriage, ii. 44, 45.

HEATLY, Mr., opium contractor, i. 554.

HEBERT, Jacques Rene, character of, ii. 238.

HEIRS of murderers, Indian law respecting, ii. 549, 550.

HELDER, the British land at the, iii. 128.

HELVETIC Republic, recognition of, iii. 396.

HENLEY, Lord, diplomatic services of, iii. 109; peerage conferred, 318.

——, Lady Bridget, fortune of, i. 300.

HENNIKER, Lord, M.P. for Eye, ii. 129; his family, and influence, iii. 246, 254; peerage of, 318.

——, General B. T., supports the Union, iii. 246.

HERTFORD, Marquis of, ii. 244; his influence with the militia, 451.

HERTZBERG, Comte de, Prussian minister, i. 204.

HESSE, Landgrave of, his treatment of General Schleiffen, ii. 7.

HESSIAN regiment, Lord Cornwallis's praise of, i. 523.

HEWITT, Right Hon. Sir George, Bart., commands in India, ii. 431; serves in Ireland, iii. 119 123.

HIGGINS, Francis, Irish services of, iii. 320.

HIGHLANDERS, form a corps in America, i. 54; settlement of, 64.

HILDESHEIM, bishopric of, iii. 384, 385.

HILL, Right Hon. Sir G. F., compensated, iii. 279.

——, Sir Richard, Bart, votes for peace, ii. 282.

HILLSBOROUGH, disfranchised, iii. 322.

——, in America, i. 57, 85.

HINCHINBROOK; *see* Sandwich.

HINDOOS, pilgrimages of, i. 411; dislike sea-voyages, 551; laws of, ii. 192, 566, 568; character of, 204; high caste in the army, 302; evidence of, 549; Indian infantry generally, 573.

HINDOSTAN, European ignorance of, i. 252; corruption of the natives, 282; British policy in, 313; weakness of, 316; Sindia's aim respecting, 323; submissiveness of, 341; tranquillity of, 399; iii. 529; Hindoo pilgrims of, i. 411; difficulties of a campaign in, 479; military establishment in, 557; uncultivated lands in, 562; land-tenure in, ii. 181; duties levied in, 497; Sindia's possessions in, iii. 554; Lord Cornwallis's policy towards, 554.

HIPPESLEY, Sir John, Bart., Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, ii. 98, 106; debate on the motion of, 112.

HOARE, Sir J., compensated, iii. 321.

HOBART, Lord, his appointment at Madras, ii. 229, 237; Lord Cornwallis praises, 236; his expedition to Malacca, 302, his conduct to the Nabob, 304; his dissatisfaction, 309; countermands the Manilla expedition, 333; alleged promise of, iii. 17; Lord Cornwallis's political apprehensions of, 313; rumoured Lord-Lieutenancy of, 334, 337; Home Secretary, 360.

HOBKIRK's Hill, i. 98.

HOCHE, General, sails from Brest, ii. 342.

HOHENLINDEN, battle of, iii. 317.

HOLKAR, TOOKAJEE, account of, i. 222; Sindia's success against, ii. 187.

HOLKAR, JESWUNT RAO, Lord Wellesley's attack of, iii. 523, 533; policy of war with, 536, 541, 545; Sindia's separation from, 549, 552; Lord Cornwallis's policy towards, 551.

HOLLAND, Lord, maiden speech of, ii. 330.

HOLLAND, French alliance with, i. 199; tendency of its government, 206; Frederick the Great's anxiety for, 209; its affairs in 1786, 267; critical state of, 275; democratic discomfiture in, 320; political struggle in, 328; French influence against, 333, 336, 341; English support of, 334; refuses reparation, 339; internal affairs of, 348; rescued from France, 361; alliance with England, 369, 371, 388; English and Prussian defensive treaty with, 402; sale of Craiganore and Jacottah by, 467, 491; dissensions in, 545; tenure of Craiganore and Jacottah by, ii. 10, 11, 115; transfer of the forts of, 126;

English and German protection of, 279, 281; capitulates to France, 283; negotiations with, 479, 480, 483, 488; Cochin settlement of, 489; surrenders her fleet to England, iii. 28; treaty with, 141; evacuation of, by English, 136; English withdraw from, 136, 145; conduct of English troops in, 141; armistice in, 141, 142; proposed reinforcements from, 298, 305, 311; cession of Ceylon by, 395, 404, 422, 454, 471; ambassador from, at Amiens, 436, 443; restitution of sequestered property to, 435, 445, 449, 479, 481; conciliatory disposition of, 460; port charges to, 471; Prince of Orange's losses in, 479.

HOLLOND, E. J., his misgovernment, ii. 10, 11; suspended from office, 12, 482; ordered into custody, 65; evidence against, 66, 112, 493-495, 499; sent to England, 80.

——, John, conduct of, i. 416, 429, 475; peculations by, 476; corrupt government of, 480; disobedience and neglect of orders, ii 9-13, 20; proceedings against him in England, 65, 66, 82, 112; quits India, 481, 485, 486; evidence against, 493-495, 499.

HOLMES, Peter, supports the Union, iii. 239.

HOLT, Joseph, the rebel, transported, ii. 369; iii. 283.

HOLYHEAD Harbour, state of, iii. 24.

HOMAN, Sir W., ii. 456.

HOMPESCH, Baron, sells Malta to France, iii. 451; England distrusts, 478.

HONDURAS, British privileges in, iii. 459.

HONINGHAM, Lord Bayning's seat, i. 153.

HOOD, Admiral, Lord, anxious to relieve Lord Cornwallis, i. 123; elected for Westminster, 173, 465.

HOPE, General Sir Alexander, his plans for the defence of Ireland, iii. 297, 488, 490; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 378, 500, 508.

HOPPNER, John, R.A., iii. 499.

HORNE, Brigadier-General, promoted, i. 412; Lord Cornwallis's remarks upon, 415, 416.

HORSE Artillery, iii. 382.

HOSPITALS, inquiry as to regulations of coast, ii. 501.

HOSSEIN REZA KHAN, Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, ii. 179, 555, 556.

HOTHAM, General George, leaves the Prince of Wales, i. 273.

HOTZE, General, killed, iii. 142.

HOWARD DE WALDEN, Lord, presides at a court-martial, i. 183.

HOWDEN, Lord; *see* Cradock.

HOWE, Earl, joins Sir W. Howe, i. 23; attempts to bring the French fleet to action, 34; obtains a committee on the American War, 39; quits the Admiralty, 406; stops the Portsmouth mutiny, ii. 326.

HOWE, Viscount, his operations in America, i. 20, 23, 29; his want of energy, 28; resigns and returns to England, 31; Lord Cornwallis a witness for, 39, 177; rumoured reappointment of, ii. 111; Lieut.-General of the Ordnance, 284.

HUDDY, the American rebel, i. 144.

HUGHES, John, the Irish spy, ii. 397, 398.

——, James, the Wicklow bandit, iii. 85, 86.

HULSE, Right Hon. Sir Samuel, services and appointments of, i. 273.

HUMBERT, General, lands in Ireland, ii. 390, 391; captured, 397.

HUNGARY, French war with, its effect on England, ii. 185.

HUNT, Sir Vere, compensated, iii. 321.

HUNTLEY, George, Marquis of, military services of, i. 269; his regiment of Fencibles, ii. 455; iii. 78.

HURRY PUNT, the Maratha commander, ii. 71, 76; takes the field, 82; tardiness of, 92; negotiates, 99, 100, 103; his arguments with Lord Cornwallis, 107; artfulness and ability of, 119; marches against Tippoo, 135, 520, 521; his exorbitant demand, 138; takes leave of Lord Cornwallis, 161, 540, 542, 544; advances against Sindia, 187; supports Lord Cornwallis's views, 524, 534, 535; joins in the treaty with Tippoo, 537.

HUSKISSON, Right Hon. William, iii. 234.

HUTCHINSON, Lord, commands at Castlebar, ii. 394; offers to resign, 410, 411; Lord Cornwallis's criticism and praise of, 414; supports the Union, iii. 43; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 360; Alexandria surrenders to, 386.

——, Hon. Francis H., official appointment of, iii. 108.

——, T., Governor of Massachusetts, i. 18.

HYDERABAD, Tippoo's embassy at, ii. 488, 513; British influence at, iii. 544.

HYDER BEG KHAN, ministerial abilities of, i. 240, 248, 313, 552; ii. 565; Lord Cornwallis's interviews with, i. 256, 258, 287; dies, ii. 178.

I.

IMPEY, Sir Elijah, Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, i. 249, 322; Mr. J. Grant's remarks on, i. 377, ii. 43; judge of the Sudder Dewanny, ii. 201; frames judicial and police regulations, 204.

INCHIQUIN, Earl of, solicits a Marquisate, iii. 245; obtains it, 253, 319; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, 264.

INCOME TAX, Mr. Pitt's plan of an, ii. 457; iii. 122.

INDEMNITY Bill, Ireland, iii. 12.

INDIA, Mr. Fox's bill, i. 156, 190, 191,

220; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on the government of, 157, 178; ii. 172; official life in, i. 174, 175; French influence and possessions in, 210, 287, 336; iii. 417, 427, 429, 441; Mr. Dundas's bill for, i. 215; first Supreme Council of, 219; Mr. Pitt's bill, 220; former statutes relating to, 220; native princes of, 222, 346, 347; intestine quarrels in, 223; climate of, 235; ii. 86, 573; former misgovernment of, i. 222, 238; finances of, 239, 409, 410; iii. 545; European forces essential for, i. 242; corruption in, 250; pacific system of government recommended, 252, 257; iii. 542, 546; weak measure of the Government, i. 263; its improvement under Lord Cornwallis, 276, 292, 461; ii. 207; remuneration to public servants in, i. 286; its state in 1788, 321; European jealousy of English power in, 330; Police Bill for, 340; Mr. Dundas's views of English policy in, 342-344, 369, 557; influence of European politics upon, 369; nominations to the Supreme Council of, 389; necessity of private frugality in, 372; missionary obstacles in, 398; abuses dangerous to, 458; its coinage, 456, 554; its affairs in 1789, 462; conduct of the Madras Government, 486; ii. 10-13, 228; military governors best for, i. 536; the farming system of, 549; mildness and regularity of the British government in, 553; China trade with, 558; iii. 530; question of a permanent settlement in, i. 560-565; ii. 195-200, 463-475; maladministration by Mogul governors in, i. 564; administration of the Carnatic, ii. 2-4; difficulties of a campaign in, 8, 9, 98; discussions on renewal of Company's Charter in, 14-20, 229; partition of conquests in, 21; administration of justice in, 35, 183; powers of a Governor-General of, 50; necessity for the Mysore war, 113-115; political situation of, 118-121; Lord Lansdowne's opinion of, 122-124; results of the war with Tippoo, 155, 166; territorial acquisitions in, 160; ministerial responsibilities for, 164; Supreme Government of, 173; low price of Indian Stock, 184; Mr. Francis's violent speech on, 186; land tenure in, 191; judicial regulations in, 201-203, 314, 315; police regulations in, 204, 205; military establishment in, 221, 237, 265; character of contests in, 222, 294; employment of militia and sepoys in, 302; Mr. Dundas proposes reforms in the army of, 304; inconsistencies in the government of, 312; military regulations for, 323; Lord Cornwallis's character of the people of, 332; free commerce in, 474; Lord Cornwallis's political estimation of, 477; European ignorance of, 514; colonization by Europeans not to be encouraged in, 574; military expenses of, 578; destruction of fortifications

in, iii. 417; importance of Cape of Good Hope to, 443; Spanish trade with, 449; military arrangements for, 493; Lord Wellesley's administration in, 529; Lord Cornwallis's administration in, 531, 563; its state, on Lord Cornwallis's third appointment, 533, 534; increased exports from, 539.

INISTIOGUE, disfranchised, iii. 322.

INFANTRY, for national defences, ii. 333, 336; officers in India, 578; the "Lawyers' Corps of," iii. 5.

INKERMAN, two great-grandsons of Lord Cornwallis killed at, i. 16.

INLAND rahdarry duties, ii. 475.

INNES, Lieut.-Colonel Alexander, i. 47, 500.

INSURRECTION Act, ii. 341.

INTEMPERANCE in India, ii. 573.

INTESTACY of Zemindars, ii. 558.

INTOXICATING drugs, duties leviable on, ii. 580.

INUNDATIONS, Indian revenue how affected by, ii. 465, 546.

INVASION by France, expected, ii. 285, 313; iii. 517; defence of England against, ii. 333, 335, 337; iii. 379-382, 503, 509, 510; of Wales, ii. 338; by whom encouraged, 340; of Ireland, iii. 73, 117; defences of Ireland against, 297-302, 305, 364.

IRELAND, office of Vice-Treasurer of, i. 10, 184; state of, 15, 182, 190; Mr. Pitt's commercial plan for, 192; French interference with, 210; Parliamentary abuses in, ii. 40; expected invasion of, 327; Lord Cornwallis Lord-Lieutenant and Commander-in-Chief of, 327, 329; imminent danger of, 336, 338-419; causes of disaffection in, 339; "United Irishmen" of, 340; disloyal volunteers in, 340; armed rebels in, 342; rebel press of, 343; vigorous measures of Government, 346, 347, 357; extent of the insurrection, 349; consequent desolation in, 349, 350; Parliamentary proceedings in, 355; character of the militia of, 359; pardon proclaimed in, 359, 361; compensation voted for losses in, 361; decline of the rebellion, 363, 379; proposals of rebel leaders, 367, 369, 381; conduct of the military in, 371; propositions of the state-prisoners, 372, 373, 377; special commission directed to, 374, 375; examination of state-prisoners in, 383; the Cabinet of, 387; military arrangements in, 389, 415; iii. 79, 115-118; General Humbert's expedition, ii. 390, 391; disaffection in the militia of, 393, 394; excesses of the troops in, 397; surrender of the French invaders of, 403; disposal of state-prisoners in, 405, 425, 427; conciliation of Roman Catholics in, 407; iii. 63; disaffection in, ii. 415, 416, 419, 458; Sir R. Abercromby's saying of, 415; folly of former Governments of, 416, 443, 444; religious parties in, 420;

expected opposition to the Union, 429; Treaty of Union with, 437, 456; iii. 33; Lord Castlereagh Chief Secretary of, ii. 441; Mr. Pitt's views as to, 442, 443; Lord Cornwallis's definition of "principal persons" in, 445; representation of, iii. 6, 7; election of peers, 26; office of Chief Secretary of, 9; its state in 1798, 12, 19-22; popular feeling as to the Union, 31, 40; debates on the Union, 40-50, 65, 69, 184-187, 193-199, 202, 203, 215; riots in Dublin, 51; Mr. Pitt's speech respecting, 53; Roman Catholic sentiments as to the Union, 51-56; tactics and treatment of Anti-Unionists, 54, 55, 56; its disaffection in 1799, 60, 61, 67; French invasion of, 73, 225, 300; Rebellion Bill for, 75; change of feeling in, respecting the Union, 81; postponement of Union question in, 83; conduct of the military in, 95; improved transit between England and, 100; Government appointments in, 107-109; satisfactory state of the South of, 121, 124; proposed income-tax in, 122; state of feeling in the North, of as to Union, 138, 141, 145; threatened scarcity in, 144; Roman Catholic peers of, 146, 204, 227; expectations of the Roman Catholics in, 147-149; financial arrangements for, 159; agitations renewed in, 167, 169; creation of peers for, 171, 208, 213, 214, 244, 272; incorporation of the Churches of England and, 176, 198; largest division in the House of Commons of, 181; cotton manufacturers of, 208, 215, 216, 226; limitation of number of peers of, 208, 209, 219, 226, 277-280; Primacy of, 209; agistment-tithe in, 221; survey of boroughs in, 223; political weight of property in, 224; limited effect of the Union with, 228; wool-manufacturers of, 230; Mr. Grey's motion as to members for, 230; Lord Cornwallis's administration in, 235, 237; civil offices in, 243; representative peers of, 245, 252; future government of, 249; passing of the Union Bill in, 252; George III.'s opinions respecting peerages of, 257-264; state of, in 1800, 282, 283, 295; Royal Assent to the Union with, 285; Ordnance establishment of, 294, 315; Duke of Wellington's plan for defending, 297, 300; military preparations in, 299, 305, 347; legal arrangements in, 303; the Roman Catholics of, 306, 307, 316, 327-330, 343; effects of the Union with, 313; prospects of, 317; disfranchised boroughs in, 321; Lord Hardwicke Lord-Lieutenant of, 351-354, 364, 493; inadequacy of wages in, 358; Sir William Medows Commander-in-Chief of, 361; education of Roman Catholic priests in, 365-375; law as to schools in, 374; Roman Catholic alarm as to the Amiens Treaty, 458; Colonel Hope's plan for defending,

488-491; plan of paying Roman Catholic clergy of, 494.
IRISH Club, the, i. 374.
IRISH settlers in America, i. 514.
ISMAIL captured by Suwarroff, ii. 110.
ITALY, success of the Allies' armies in, iii. 114; doubtful aspect of, 116; disasters in, 270; independence of Northern, 389; Buonaparte's encroachments in, 413, 457; new republics of, 435.
IVES, E. O., resident at Lucknow, i. 286; ii. 556.

J.

JACKSON, Rev. W., trial and suicide of, ii. 398.
JACOTTAH bought from the Dutch, i. 467, 491, 492; ii. 126, 479, 486; its history, ii. 106; independence of, 488.
JAEEDAD lands in India, iii. 536, 540, 541.
JAHANDER SHAH, Prince, his widows and children, i. 364; his character, 547.
JAMAICA, expected attack on, i. 41.
JAMAUL BEG, death of, ii. 480.
JAMES river, i. 101, 105.
JAMES, W., mayor of Dublin, ii. 447.
JAMESTOWN, disfranchised, iii. 322.
JEHANGIR, marriage and coins of, i. 407.
JENKINS, Sir R., Sindia's detention of, iii. 534, 536, 552, 558.
JERSEY, Irish militia regiments in, iii. 76, 80; quartering of Russian soldiers in, 137.
—— (America), Lord Cornwallis's operations in, i. 25; conduct of Loyalists in, 28, 77.
JERVIS, Sir John; *see* St. Vincent.
JESSORE, Sayer-duties in, ii. 497.
JEWS in the Indian infantry, ii. 573.
JOBBING in India, i. 318, 400; in Ireland, iii. 100, 102.
JOHNSTON, General Sir H., iii. 116.
——, Mr. Justice (Ireland), iii. 18; convicted of libel and resigns, 164.
JOHNSTONE, Captain George, R.N., gallant action by, iii. 532.
JONES, Sir William, his compilation, i. 321; his qualifications, 542.
——, Lieut.-Colonel, i. 10.
——, Right Hon. Theophilus, superannuation of, iii. 108, 109; compensation to, 323.
JOSEPH II., Emperor of Germany, encourages Russia, i. 198; quarrels with Holland, 199, 373.
JOW SAUL, Rajah, ii. 556.
JUDGE-ADVOCATE, his duties, i. 306.
JUDGES, station and pay of Indian, ii. 35.
—— of Adaulet, influence of, i. 283.
JUDICIAL reforms in India, ii. 204, 218, 487.
—— regulations by Lord Cornwallis, ii. 201-204, 315.
JUGGERNAUT, pilgrims to, i. 411.

JUGGETT SING, Raja, his character, iii. 535, 540, 547.
JUMMA, equity of a, ii. 196; a decennial, 559.
JUNIUS attacks Lord Cornwallis, i. 12; his inaccuracies, 12, 13.
JURISDICTION in the French Indian factories, i. 352; in the Indian Courts, ii. 315.
JUSTICE, Courts of, state of, in Oude, i. 240.
JYNUGUR tribute, restoration of, iii. 550.

K.

KALBE, Baron de, an American General, i. 51.
KALKREUTH, Comte de, employed in secret negotiations with France, ii. 230.
KANNAMBADDY Ford; *see* Caniambaddy.
KARICAL, French factory, seized, ii. 226.
KARIGAUT Ford, Lord Cornwallis's passage of, ii. 518, 531, 532; pagoda of, attacked, 517, 531, 532.
KAUNITZ, Comte de, defeated, ii. 230.
KAVIL NYNE, Sindia's Moonshee, iii. 549, 552.
KAWAY River, ii. 538.
KEARNEY, Dr. John, Provost of Dublin University, iii. 107, 108.
KEITH, Viscount, ii. 317; able conduct of, iii. 103; pursues the enemy, 123.
KEKVICH SING, Rana of Gohud, iii. 534; provision for, 549, 551, 553.
KELLS, disfranchised, iii. 322.
KENMARE, Earl of, moderation of, iii. 8, 52; offended with the Irish Chancellor, 92; his Earldom, 109, 246, 319.
KENT, Duke of, returns from Geneva, ii. 32; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, iii. 310.
——, Sir Charles, his estate, Fornham St. Geneviève, i. 409.
——, defence of, against invasion, iii. 515, 516.
KENNAWAY, Sir John, i. 355; family of, 371; sent to Hyderabad, 386, 542, 546; Lord Cornwallis's instructions to, 537; ii. 481; negotiates with Tippoo, ii. 138, 162, 487; Lord Cornwallis's esteem for, 322, 536; negotiates with the Nizam, 490.
KENYON, Lord, Attorney-General, i. 166; succeeds Lord Mansfield, 269, 404.
KERR, Lord Charles, iii. 519.
——, Lady Caroline, iii. 519.
KERRY, Knight of; *see* (Maurice) Fitzgerald.
KHALSA, the, removed to Calcutta, ii. 193.
KHISTNAGERRY Fort, ii. 537.
KHRISTNA, the, i. 310; passage of the, ii. 492.
KHURUKPOOR, Zemindary of, ii. 192.
KILBEGGAN borough, iii. 170; disfranchised, 322.
KILCONNELL, Viscount, ii. 355.
KILDARE county, state of, ii. 358; iii. 20, 21.
—— borough, disfranchised, iii. 322.

KILKENNY county, disaffection of the militia, ii. 393, 396; militia fly from the French, 395, 399; state of, iii. 21.
—— borough, iii. 234.
KILLALA Bay, French landing at, ii. 390-392.
KILLYBEGS, disfranchised, iii. 322.
KILLMALLOCK, disfranchised, iii. 322.
KILMAINHAM, "Directory of," ii. 438.
KILMOREY, Earl of, ii. 348.
KILWARDEN, Viscount, Chief Justice, ii. 373; consulted by Lord Cornwallis, 376; supports the Union, 453; iii. 31, 184; speech of, iii. 186; his opinion in Tandy's case, 189; Duke of Portland's remark on, 258; his communication as to the Roman Catholics, 316; his promotions, 318, 319; visits Maynooth, 365, 366; minutes of his conversation, 368-371.
KING, Right Hon. Colonel Henry, iii. 65.
——, John, Under-Secretary of State, iii. 156, 206.
——, John and Gilbert, compensated for Jamestown, iii. 322.
——, Colonel Hon. R., iii. 65.
——, Rufus, American Minister, applies for arms, ii. 408-410; friendly assurance of, 427.
KING'S COUNTY, agitation of, iii. 21; its militia in Guernsey, 110; conduct of its sheriff approved, 190.
KING'S Mountain, i. 59, 71.
KINGSTON, Earl of, his borough disfranchised, iii. 322.
——, Duchess of, ii. 398.
KINKEL, Baron, Vice-Admiral, ii. 253.
KINSALE borough, iii. 234.
KIPPAX, C. B., iii. 2, 10.
KIRKLAND, Colonel Moses, i. 68.
KIRKPATRICK, General W., i. 261; his mission to Nepaul, ii. 190, 568-570; invited by the Rajah, 205, 206; his reception, 221.
KISHNAGERRY, surrender of, ii. 96.
KISTNARAIN, ii. 189.
KISTRAVERA, ii. 189.
KLENAU, General, Austrian advance under, iii. 223.
KNOCKTOPHER, disfranchised, iii. 322.
KNOX, General, Washington's War Secretary, i. 148.
——, Lieut.-Colonel, attacks Seringapatam, ii. 146; opposes Tippoo, 480; his night attack of Tippoo, 531.
——, Alex., Lord Castlereagh's private secretary, iii. 109, 366.
——, Hon. C., iii. 49.
——, Right Hon. George, opposes the Union, iii. 31; resigns office, 45, 46; declines dividing with the Opposition, 203.
KNYPHAUSEN, Lieut.-General, commands the German troops in America, i. 35.
KOOKULPOUR, distressed renters of, ii. 471.
KORAN, the law of the, ii. 203, 542.
KORSAKOW, defeated by Massena, iii. 142.

KURNOOL.

KURNOOL, payment of peshcush from, ii. 563-565.
KYD, Captain A., services of, ii. 537.

L.

LA CROSSE, Raimond de, Contre-Amiral, iii. 432.
LA FAYETTE, Marquis de, joins the Americans, i. 99; at Wiltown, 100; his troops, 105; defeated, 106; at Wilmington, 118; urges Lord Cornwallis's exchange, 135, 150; Lord Cornwallis's feelings towards, 202; Frederick the Great's partiality for, 212; his conduct, ii. 6.
LAKE, Gerard, Viscount, equerry to the Prince of Wales, i. 273; employed in Ireland, ii. 342, 354; commands against the rebels, 391-403; at Castlebar, 412, 413; resigns the Mastership of Kilmainham, iii. 352; opposed to Lord Cornwallis's Indian policy, 531; instructions to, 545-555; Lord Cornwallis's explanation to, 556, 557.
LAKSHMI, king of Assam, ii. 188.
LALL BAUGH, the gardens of, ii. 138.
LAMBART, Gustavus, his borough disfranchised, iii. 322.
LA MOTTE PICQUET, Comte de, defeated by Admiral Cornwallis, i. 50.
LANDHOLDERS, Indian, profits of, ii. 471; improvidence of, 472; coerce the ryots, 548; their resources, 559; their agreements with ryots, 560.
LAND in India, resumption of, where fraudulently alienated, i. 543; circumstances affecting its value, 562, 563; ii. 467; assessment on, 561.
LANDOWNERS, Indian, grievances of, ii. 195; Lord Cornwallis's enquiries respecting, 195; policy towards, 477; poverty of, 478.
LAND-REVENUE of India, Bahar, i. 456, general settlement of, 460, 462; separation of the gunges from, 466; fixed assessment of, 489; history of the settlement of, ii. 191-199; farming of, 200; Lord Cornwallis's minutes on, 463-478, 546-548, 556-560.
LANDS, waste, Lord Cornwallis's plan for improving, i. 543; ii. 558-560.
LANESBOROUGH, disfranchised, iii. 323.
——, Earl of, compensated, iii. 323.
LANGFORD, Lord, family of, iii. 253; peerage of, 318.
LANGRISHE, Sir Hercules, supports Government, iii. 32; compensated, 322.
LANSDOWNE, Marquis of, i. 10, 142; offers Lord Cornwallis the Governor-Generalship of India, 14, 150, 186; his resignation, 159; illness of, 171; opposes the Declaratory Bill, 367, 374; his wife's death, ii. 6; supports Lord Cornwallis, 114, 123; his prediction respecting France, 124; supports the war, 237.

LEITRIM.

LARKINS, W., Accountant-General in India, i. 287; character of, 319, 390, 536.
LASCARS, enquiry respecting gun-, ii. 502; regulations for, 575, 577, 580.
LASCY, Comte de, ii. 272.
LASWARREE, battle of, iii. 511.
LATOUCHE, Right Hon. D., speech of, iii. 162; addressed by the City of Dublin, 194; his borough disfranchised, 323.
——, John, his borough disfranchised, iii. 322.
LAUDERDALE, (8th) Earl of, his motion for peace, ii. 290, 291.
LAURENS, Henry, captured and sent to the Tower, i. 134; communications as to his release, 146, 147.
——, Lieut.-Colonel John, i. 134.
LAURISTON, Marquis de, iii. 391, 395.
LAVOISIER, imprisonment and death of, ii. 110.
LAW, Thomas, supports Lord Cornwallis, i. 460, 466.
——, English promotions in the, i. 269; of Indian Courts-martial, 277; separation of judicial duties from fiscal, 476; ii. 229; establishment of regular Indian courts of, i. 437; Lord Cornwallis's minute on criminal, ii. 51; abrogation and modification of Mahommedan, 202, 203; its administration in Bengal, 218; of nations, as to the transport of criminals, 432; of property, in India, 561; of succession and adoption among Hindoos, 566, 568; conflict of civil and martial, iii. 14, 15.
LAWYERS' Corps, in Dublin, proceedings of, ii. 457; iii. 4, 5, 16.
LAWYERS in India, Lord Cornwallis's remark on, i. 264.
LAY education at Maynooth, iii. 373, 375.
"LEADENHALL-STREET economy," ii. 67.
LEASES in India, i. 562, 564; ii. 478.
LECALE, Lord, peerage of, iii. 303, 318.
LE CLERC, General, iii. 391.
LEE, General Charles, captured, i. 26.
——, John, i. 299.
LEEDS, 5th Duke of; *see* Carmarthen.
LEES, Sir John, iii. 3.
LEESON, Hon. R., opposes the Union, iii. 32.
LEICESTER militia, in Ireland, iii. 4, 30, 76, 78.
——, George, Earl of; *see* Townshend, 5th Marquis.
LEIGH, R., collector of Dublin excise, iii. 108.
LEINSTER, (2nd) Duke of, made Master of the Rolls, i. 404; writes about Lord E. Fitzgerald, ii. 384; hesitates about the Union, 453; compensated, iii. 321; his statement as to Maynooth, 366.
—— county, outrages in, ii. 345; scarcity in, iii. 283.
LEITRIM, Robert, Earl of, his patronage, iii. 109; Irish representative peer, 286; compensated, 322.

LENNOX.

LENNOX, Lord G., Constable of the Tower, i. 164, 165; question as to vacating his seat, 167, 169; gazetted for Plymouth, 183.
——, Charles, at Waterloo, i. 198; Lord Cornwallis's character of, 198; his duel with the Duke of York, 482; Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, ii. 460.
LEOPOLD, Duke of Tuscany, his moderation and success, ii. 32; Emperor of Austria, 41, 46.
LESLIE, Hon. Alexander, General, i. 27; his operations on Cape Fear River, 64, 69; at Charlestown, 75; his difficulties, 81; recalled from Virginia, 100; goes to South Carolina, 110; gallantry of, 521, 523.
——, C. P., iii. 288.
LEITH, General Sir G. A., i. 495.
L'ESTRANGE, Colonel P., iii. 88.
LETTERS of marque, power of granting, by the Governor-General, ii. 315.
LEWINS, Edward J., treason and death of, ii. 342, 362.
LEXINGTON, skirmish and loss of troops at, i. 19.
LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY, Bishop of; *see* Hon. James Cornwallis.
LIFFORD, Lord Cornwallis's popularity at, iii. 140; disfranchised, 323.
LIGURIAN Republic, European recognition of, iii. 396, 407, 443, 465, 476; projected union with the Cisalpine, 413.
LILFORD, Lord, conduct in 1784, i. 163; illness of, iii. 170.
LIMERICK, Earl of; *see* Glentworth.
——, city of, iii. 7; supports the Union, 29; political independence of, 324.
——, county, state of, iii. 290, 358.
—— militia regiment, its gallantry at Colooney, ii. 401, 404.
LINCOLN, General B., repulsed at Savannah, i. 41; surrenders, 44.
——, South, militia, in Ireland, iii. 4, 30.
LINDSAY, General Sir David, i. 197.
LINEN, Irish, export of, ii. 437.
LIPPENCOT, Captain, Washington's demand of, refused, i. 144.
LISBURN, political dependence of, iii. 234.
LISLE, siege of, ii. 244.
LISLE, Lieut.-Colonel, breaks his parole, i. 53.
LISMORE, Lord, subscribes against the Union, iii. 174; compensated, 322.
——, borough, disfranchised, 323.
LISTOWEL, Earl of, family and property of, iii. 255; peerage conferred on, 318; compensated for Athy, 321.
LITTLE, Captain, his services in India, ii. 529, 540, 544.
LITTLEHALES, Lieut.-Colonel, high character of, ii. 455; iii. 9; Lord Cornwallis's estimation of, iii. 40, 270; objects to the aid of Russian troops, 138; his opinion of the strength of the army in Ireland, 298; Lord

LOTHIAN.

Hardwicke's confidence in, 378, 409; makes a tour with Lord Hardwicke, 493.
LIVERPOOL, Earl of, his objection to Fox's India Bill, i. 157; complains of French offers of peace, iii. 353.
LLANDAFF, Earl of, supports the Union, iii. 125; freehold tenants of, 230; elected Representative Peer, 286.
LOCKHART, Sir John, takes the name and estates of the Ross family, iii. 178.
LOFTUS, Lord; *see* Ely.
——, General W., marriage of, ii. 45; rumoured retirement of, iii. 150.
LONDON, corporation of, votes its freedom to Lord Cornwallis, ii. 220; iii. 562; its defence against invasion, ii. 333.
——, Corresponding Society of, treasonable proceedings of, ii. 345.
LONDONDERRY, 1st Marquis, meritorious conduct of, ii. 424; correspondence respecting his promotion, iii. 259, 260, 262, 264, 273, 305; elected Representative Peer, 286; his borough disfranchised, 323.
——, 2nd Marquis; *see* Castlereagh.
——, 3rd Marquis; *see* Stewart, Hon. Colonel.
LONDONDERRY, city of, proposed representation of, iii. 7; Lord Cornwallis's reception at, 140; political independence of, 324.
LONGFIELD, Colonel Mountiford, iii. 108.
LONGFORD, 2nd Earl of, supports the Union, iii. 184; elected Representative Peer, 286.
—— county, adverse to the Union, iii. 176.
—— militia, misconduct of, at Castlebar, ii. 395, 404.
——, borough, disfranchised, iii. 323.
LONGUEVILLE, Viscount, political influence of, iii. 2, 17, 125, 289, 324; elected Representative Peer, 286; promoted, 289, 319.
LORDS, House of, first instance of dividing against a money-bill, i. 10; law relating to Scotch peers, 268; discourages the trial of Hastings, 302; Scotch peers in, ii. 44; debate on India in, 122; oratory requisite in, 145; creations and promotions in, iii. 267, 272, 304, 318, 319.
—— (Irish), treaty of Union, ii. 437, iii. 33; representative peers, 26, 171, 233, 244, 268, 273, 277; election of, 286; English peerages conferred, 113, 260-262, 267; elective franchise of Roman Catholic peers, 146, 148, 149, 204, 222, 227; creations and promotions of peers, 171, 213, 251, 257, 263, 272, 280, 281, 283, 287, 289, 301, 303, 304, 307, 311, 312, 313, 318, 319; number of creations of, 208, 209, 214, 219, 226; spiritual, 209, 270, 271, 287; absentee, 245; precedence of, 252; usage as to patents, 252, 279, 284; inquiry as to Maynooth, 373.
LORTON, Viscount, iii. 66; his peerage, 311, 318.
LOTHIAN, (5th) Marquis of, i. 214; George III.'s kindness to, 420; ceases to be Gold

LOTHIAN.

Stick, 425; his regiment changed, 441; the Prince of Wales's regard for, ii. 29, 47; Lord Cornwallis's sympathy with, iii. 495, 518.
LOTHIAN, 6th Marquis of; *see* Ancram.
LOUGHBOROUGH, Lord, opposes the Declaratory Bill, i. 368; his doctrine as to the Regency, 445; his opposition to Catholic emancipation, iii. 316, 317.
LOUGHREA, military defences at, iii. 489.
LOUGH SWILLY, defencelessness of, iii. 488.
LOUIS XVI., misfortunes of, ii. 4; his want of resources, 7; anecdote of his indecision, 279.
LOUTH, county, meeting of Anti-Unionists in, iii. 24.
—— militia, excellence of, ii. 393; iii. 111.
LOVAINE, 2nd Lord, i. 376.
LOW COUNTRIES, rebellion in the, i. 373.
LOWTHER, Gorges, his borough disfranchised, iii. 323.
LOYALISTS, American, discouragement of, i. 22, 28, 59, 63; patience and fortitude of, 54; compensation to, 60; persecutions of, 70, 85, 116, 520; Lord Cornwallis's attempts to protect, 126; their position and conduct considered, 139; appeal to Lord Cornwallis in England, 163, 177; final compensation to, 193; their number in Nova Scotia, 291.
——, Irish, loan for relieving, ii. 356; violence of, iii. 134, 145.
LUBY, George, the Irish rebel, ii. 369.
LUCAN, Earl of, elected Representative Peer, iii. 286; his borough disfranchised, 322.
LUCCHESSINI, Marquis Jerome de, character of, ii. 234, 235.
LUCKNOW, the "Augean stable" of, i. 244; corruption at, 248, 250, 318; Lord Cornwallis visits, 312; Shah Zada at, 232; residency expenses at, ii. 553; maladministration at, 554.
LUCKIPORE, trade in coarse cloths at, i. 435.
LUDLOW, Earl of, compensated, iii. 323.
LUSHINGTON, Sir Stephen, ii. 83.
LUSI, Comte, Frederick the Great's Minister, i. 199, 202; offends Frederick, 206.
LUTTRELL, Henry, opinions and connexions of, iii. 35, 80.
LUTTRELLSTOWN, Lord Carhampton's sale of, iii. 112.
LUXEMBURG, its probable annexation to France, i. 209; its position in 1790, ii. 31.
LUZERNE, Comte de la, interferes for English prisoners, i. 459.
LYNCH'S Creek, i. 53, 65.
LYTE, Henry, privy purse to the Prince of Wales, i. 273.
LYTTELTON, Lord, compensated, iii. 322.

M.

MAAL ADAWLUTS abolished, ii. 562.
M'ARTHUR, Lieut.-Colonel, his services in America, i. 51, 53, 500, 503.

MACPHERSON.

MACARTNEY, Earl, pensioned, i. 287; goes to China, 331, 479; Sir J. Macpherson's remark on, 443; his Carnatic administration, ii. 3, 4.
——, Sir John, Bart., opposes the Union, iii. 215; his speech on tithes, 216, 220.
MACAULEY, Alexander, i. 305.
MACBRIDE, Admiral John, i. 197.
MACCAN, Anthony, the rebel "Exile of Erin," ii. 362.
M'CANN, John, executed for treason, ii. 375.
M'CLELLAND, James, supports the Union, iii. 43.
M'CORMICK, Richard, rebellion and flight of, ii. 369.
MACDONALD, Right Hon. Sir A., Chief Baron, i. 270.
——, Marshal, movement and defeat of, iii. 114, 116.
MACDONELL, James Joseph, treason and flight of, iii. 67.
MACDOWAL, General Hay, his regimental discipline, i. 311.
M'GUICHEN, James, the Irish rebel and spy, iii. 85.
MACHERRY, Rajah of, relinquishment of alliance with, iii. 548, 554, 555.
MACK, General, Duke of York's conference with, ii. 245; proposed command, 257, 259.
MACKAY, Major-General A., promotion of, i. 176.
——, Lieut.-General Hon. A., Lord Cornwallis's friendship with, i. 156, 178, 274.
MACKENZIE, Colonel, his opinions criticised by Lord Cornwallis, ii. 525, 526.
MACLEOD, General Sir John, serves in America, i. 91, 508, 523; in India, ii. 146; desires promotion, 290, 299; iii. 128; wishes to accompany Lord Cornwallis to Ireland, ii. 353.
——, Lieut.-General Norman, praised by Lord Cornwallis, i. 311, 317.
——, A., consulted on the Tanjore succession, ii. 567.
M'MAHON, Colonel, Lord Moira's letter to, ii. 331.
M'NALLY, Leonard, account of, iii. 320.
M'NAUGHTEN, E. A., supports the Union, iii. 43.
M'NIVEN, William James, M.D., treason of, ii. 343, 374, 437; his 'Memoir,' 366, 378; examination of, 383; banishment of, 428.
MACPHERSON, Sir John, Bart., agent for the Carnatic, i. 219; General Grant's description of, 268, 448; resigns his seat in council, 287, 442, 559; salary withheld, 305; Mr. Dundas's remarks on, 337; compensation and pension to, 369; convicted and fined for bribery at Cricklade, 377; Lord Cornwallis's complaints of, 383, 430, 453, 458, 463, 469; his intimacy with the Prince of Wales, 423; statement of his own case, 242.

MACPHERSON, James, agent for the Nabob of Arcot, i. 412, 556, ii. 174.
MADAJEE SINDIA, his ambition, i. 222, 242; ii. 542; confers with Major Palmer, i. 322, 323; his differences with other chiefs, 453; English alliance with, 566; ii. 480.
MADAN, Colonel Charles, Lord Cornwallis's aide-de-camp, ii. 86; serves in the Carnatic, 154, 537.
MADHO RAO, i. 228.
MADHO RAO RASTIA, Tippoo's friend, ii. 76, 82.
MADGETT, —, ii. 391.
MADRAS, qualification and power of governors of, i. 324; iii. 174; officers' claims, i. 395; military arrangements at, 412; treasury of, 459; mutiny at, 466; misgovernment of, 485-487, 492; ii. 8, 11, 13, 114, 332, 481, 484, 485, 495; charter of justice for, 314; Lord Hobart appointed governor of, 229, 237; inquiries as to ordnance, &c., at, 501.
MADRID, treaty of, Buonaparte's, iii. 398; annulled, 407; secret article in, 412; De Souza refuses to sign, 415; Portugal secured against, 419.
MAGAN, Francis, pensioned, iii. 106.
MAGAZINES, Lord Cornwallis's inquiries as to, at Madras, ii. 502.
MAGRI, Tippoo encamps near, il. 514.
MAHDOO RAO NARAIN, Peshwa at Poona, i. 222, 228; sagacity of, ii. 187.
MAHEPUT NARRYAN, Zemindar of Benares, i. 400.
MAHOMMED AMEEN, Rajah, character of, ii. 508, 509, 512.
—— REZA KHAN, Judge in Bengal, i. 240.
—— ULLEE KHAN, deposed, ii. 293, 295.
MAHOMMEDAN laws, ii. 203; law of evidence, 549, 550; law of descent, 558.
MAHOMMEDANS in the Madras and Bengal cavalry, ii. 573.
MAHON, Lieut.-Colonel, supports the Union, iii. 256.
MAITLAND, Right Hon. General Sir T., i. 495; ii. 175; commands an expedition against France, 455; iii. 152; describes Lord Cornwallis's Irish policy, iii. 236.
MALABAR Coast, transport of troops to, i. 308; English possessions near, 429, 459, 462; security of, ii. 159; iii. 533-535, 541; Commissioners' report as to, ii. 221, 311; operations against Tippoo at, 481; military cantonments at, 519; government of, 539; distraction of the, 540; Jews in the infantry at, 573; Lord Wellesley's policy towards, iii. 174, 201, 530.
MALACCA, Lord Hobart's expedition against, ii. 302.
MALCOLM, General Sir John, his eulogium on Lord Cornwallis, iii. 530, 531; his zealous exertions, 547.
MALDA, silk manufacture at, i. 433.

MALET, Sir Charles W., his services under Lord Cornwallis, i. 224, 323, 410; ii. 162, 179, 542, 552; Lord Cornwallis's instructions to, i. 345-348, 410; ii. 480, 481, 487.
MALMESBURY, Earl of, i. 200; maintains the power of the Prince of Orange, 328; English Minister at the Hague, 334; created a Baron, 373; vacillates on the Regency question, 420; meets Möllendorf, ii. 253; his unsuccessful negotiations with France, 314; iii. 385.
MALTA taken by Buonaparte, ii. 363; besieged by England and surrenders, iii. 294; treaty for evacuating, 386; proposed Russian garrison in, 392, 401; Lord Hawkesbury's instructions as to, 393-395, 407; Lord Cornwallis and Buonaparte's conversation as to, 402; number, rank, and eligibility of the Knights of, 407-409, 411, 412, 425, 426, 447, 478; Lord Cornwallis's opinions respecting, 408, 409; Amiens negotiations respecting, 411, 412, 452, 464, 465; proposed guarantee for, 420-423, 453, 454; proposed demolition of fortifications, 424; proposed articles of treaty as to, 425, 426, 430; its neutrality in war, 431; proposed Neapolitan garrison for, 431, 440, 446, 447, 455, 481; sold to France by the Grand Master, 451; protection of the Knights of, 446, 455, 475; treaty respecting, 468, 469, 486; Lord Hawkesbury's remarks on, 474, 475; election of Grand Master, 478, 479.
MALTA, Knights of, Amiens conferences as to, iii. 393, 402, 408, 409, 411, 412, 421, 424-426, 446, 447, 451; Emperor of Russia proposed as protector of, 452, 453, 469; treachery of Grand Master of, 478.
MANGALORE, treaty of, ii. 114.
MANILLA, expedition to, ii. 333; communication between British India and, ii. 333.
MANNINGHAM, Major-General, his rifle corps, iii. 277, 296.
MANOGI, i. 228.
MANSFIELD, Earl, his age and tenacity for office, i. 267, 268, 299, 377; Duke of Rutland's executor, 348; resigns, 404.
MANTUA invested, ii. 310.
MANUFACTURES of India, i. 318, 541; ii. 560; effect of the Union on Irish cotton, iii. 207, 208, 215, 216; Northern cotton, 215, 226.
MARATHAS, the, Chiefs of, i. 222, 453; ii. 107; iii. 519; treaties with, 224, 346; evil consequences of aiding, i. 226, 230; confederacy of, 227, 332; the Nizam's hostilities with, 243, 245; Tippoo's wars with, 248; communications with the princes of, 251; negotiations with, 261, 358, 359, 365; weakness of provoking, 263; hostile influence of, 282; Sir A. Campbell's plan of raising cavalry from, 295; British alliance with, 297, 323,

406, 496, 546; ii. 481, 509; their doubtful policy, i. 309, 310, 312, 322; court an English alliance, 324, 341, 386; co-operation with, 345, 347, 356; relations of the Nizam with, 357; cession of Cuttack by, 410, 429; pilgrimages of, 411; interference with Sindia's management of, 439, 440; their jealousy of the British, 453; British policy towards, 544, 545, 546, 557; conferences with, 565-568; favourable communications with, ii. 8, 11, 21-24; their skilful foraging, 72; description of a bazaar of, 72; receive 150,000*l.* for their aid, 72; begin the siege of Darwar, 73; jealousies among, 80; supposed want of earnestness, 82, 521; supplies to, 97; treaty with, 114-117; avaricious interference of, 120; vigilance and clearsightedness of, 121, 523; unsatisfactory termination of negotiations with, 140; misconduct of some of, 179, 180; co-operation of, 487, 520; frankness of, 488; collections from, 497; their character as allies, 524, 541; claim chout, 543, 544; their expected application for fire-arms, 553; "convenient neighbours," iii. 509; Duke of Wellington's remarks on, 542; power of, 550.

MARAUDERS in Ireland repressed, iii. 85.

MARCOFF, Comte, Russian Minister, iii. 389.

MARENGO, battle of, iii. 24, 270.

MARINE, Bombay, battalion, ii. 577.

MARION, Francis, pursued by Tarleton, i. 65, 72.

MARRIAGES of Fellows of Dublin University, iii. 68, 71.

MARSDEN, Alexander, ii. 460, iii. 2; Lord Hardwicke's confidence in, 378, 381.

MARSHALL, R., Inspector-General of Exports, iii. 109.

MARTIAL law, its conflict with the civil courts, ii. 434; iii. 12, 13, 74; proclaimed in Ireland, 61; Irish Act continuing, 210, 213.

MARTIN, Governor Josiah, commands the Highlanders in Carolina, i. 54; character of, 503, 508; illness of, 523.

——, Richard, iii. 49.

MARYBOROUGH, disfranchised, iii. 323.

MASSACHUSETTS Bill, i. 11, 19; disturbances in, 292.

MASSAREENE, Earl of, compensated, iii. 321.

MASSENA, his victory near Zurich, iii. 142.

MASSEY, Hon. E., compensated, iii. 321.

MASTER of the Rolls (Ireland), the office of, iii. 302, 303.

MASULIPATAM, inquiry as to draught-cattle at, ii. 501.

MATSON, George Selwyn's residence, ii. 144.

MATTHEWS, General, taken by Tippoo, i. 158; uncertainty of his fate, 158.

——, Major George, Sir C. Ross's inquiry respecting, iii. 179; dismissed the militia, 192.

MAXWELL, Lord, supports the Union, iii. 251.

——, Right Hon. Colonel John; *see* Barry.

——, Lieut.-Colonel Hamilton, marches from Calcutta, i. 480; at Seringapatam, ii. 136, 146, 148; attacks Tippoo, 517, 518, 531.

——, Captain, at Dacca, Lord Cornwallis's censure of, ii. 525, 526.

MAURITIUS Convention, i. 330; Mr. Dundas's remarks on, 338.

MAWHOOD, Colonel Charles, i. 27.

MAY, Sir Edward, supports the Union, iii. 139.

MAYENCE capitulates, ii. 230.

MAYNOOTH College, Bill for supporting, thrown out by Lord Clare, iii. 91, 365-375; pupils at, 458.

MAYO county, rebellion in, ii. 416; iii. 21; cattle-maiming in, iii. 61, 66.

MEASURE, standard Indian land, ii. 467.

MEATH, disturbed state of, ii. 358; iii. 21.

——, (O'Beirne) Bishop of, converted from Romanism, ii. 419; his education, iii. 367.

MEDICAL officers in India, ii. 577.

MEDOWS, General Sir William, i. 178; his Indian appointment, 324, 341; his precipitation, 388, 391, 427, 558; his good sense and devotedness, 408; highly estimated by the Government, 397; his popularity, 429; opens the Bengal campaign, 478; his plans, 479, 480; Governor of Fort St. George, 487, 488, 494; ii. 13; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, i. 489, 490, 494; ii. 49, 52, 67, 86, 481, 503; attacks Seringapatam, 8, 531; Tippoo writes to, 33; Tippoo retreats before, 37; military movements of, 60; before Seringapatam, 136, 146, 148; character of, 143, 154, 156; waives his claim to prize-money, 167, 536; Red Ribbon bestowed on, 216; arrives at Madras, 490; his operations on the Coromandel coast, 491, 492; Lord Cornwallis's instructions to, 501; Commander-in-Chief in Ireland, iii. 359, 361.

MEER ABUL KASSIM, i. 426; ii. 308; his authority, ii. 103, 523; his sagacity, 120.

MEER MIJUNAL DEEN, ii. 78.

METGE, Mr., second in the duel between Mr. Corry and Mr. Grattan, iii. 196.

MELVILLE, Viscount; *see* Dundas.

MENDIP, Lord, ii. 43.

——, (2nd) Lord, supports the Union, iii. 124.

MERCHANTS, Dublin Guild of, iii. 168.

MERCY D'ARGENTEAU, Comte, Austrian ambassador, ii. 232, 245; his proposals as to the command of the allied armies, 233, 235, 274; Lord Cornwallis expostulates with, 247; his dislike of the sea, 258; his fever, 260; death of, 263.

MERRY, Antony, English Minister at Paris, iii. 384; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 418, 469, 484.

MICHEL, —, treachery and execution of, ii. 378.

MIDDLETON.

MIDDLETON, George, 4th Viscount, i. 166; his borough disfranchised, iii. 323.
——, Albinia, Lady, i. 166; ii. 5.
MIDNAPORE, collectorship in, ii. 464, 471, 474, 478; disappointment in, 472.
MIGOT DE LA COMBE, M., gallantry of, ii. 74.
MIGUELON, French projêt respecting, iii. 429.
MILAN, capture of the citadel of, iii. 103.
MILFORD, Richard, Lord, ii. 338.
MILITIA (American), infidelity of, i. 53, 55, 61, 68, 71; desertion in, punished, 56; alacrity and numbers of the Virginian, 85; formation and regulation of, 499, 503; the rebel, 499; mutiny of the Cheraw, 505.
—— (English), Lord Cornwallis conciliates the colonels of, ii. 292; courage and fidelity of, 333; offer to serve against the Irish rebels, 355; their conduct in Ireland, 449-451, 455; steadiness of the Leicestershire, 451; caprice of the Buckinghamshire, 451; Warwickshire and South Lincoln, contemplate returning, 451; conduct of the colonels of, 451; ill-drawn statutes relating to, 451; steadiness of the Bedfordshire, iii. 4; bad accommodation of Suffolk and Worcestershire, 4; Sir John Blaquiere's success with the Leicestershire and South Lincoln, 4, 30; required in Ireland, 19, 30; Lord Cornwallis's encomium on, 126; their return from Ireland, 135; recruits from, 154, 165, 169, 178; Mr. Dundas's circular to the colonels of, ii. 458, 459.
MILITIA (Irish), inspection of, ii. 389; character of, 390, 393; iii. 117; Kilkenny and Longford, disaffection of, ii. 395; habits of, 408, 416, 417; proposal to send them to Guernsey, iii. 76, 78, 86, 88; the Mayo, 78; the Wicklow, 78; proposal to recruit from, 79, 133, 154, 165, 169, 178; their services in England discouraged, 112; augmentation of, 134, 135; solicitation of signatures from the Downshire, 178; recruiting from, 296.
MILLS, Colonel, his character, i. 47, 53, 67; escapes from the Americans, 54; captured and hung in cold blood, 47, 67.
MILTON, George, Lord, proposed as Irish Secretary, ii. 278.
MILTOWN, Earl of, iii. 32.
MINEEHOURAH, distressed renters at, ii. 471.
MINISTERS, change of, in 1783, i. 160; visits of native, 240; real responsibility of, ii. 164.
MINORCA, England threatens to keep, iii. 415.
MINSTER, Lord; *see* Conyngham.
MINT established at Patna, i. 457.
MINTO, Earl of, ii. 43.
MIRABEAU, his 'Histoire Secrète du Cabinet de Berlin,' ii. 39.
MIRZA ALI, fraud, murders, and death of, ii. 236.
MIRZAPORE, prosperous mart of, i. 553.
MISCHIANZA, fête in honour of Sir W. Howe, i. 31.

MOORE.

MISSIONS, obstacles to Indian, i. 398.
MITCHELL, Admiral Sir A., commands in India, i. 181; the Dutch fleet surrender to, iii. 28; presides at the trial of the Téméraire mutineers, 414.
MOBARICK UD DOWLAH, i. 241; extravagant ideas of, 286, 529; congratulates George III. on his recovery, 431; character of, 529.
MOGUL Government, practice as to zemindarries under, ii. 469, 470, 474.
MOHAMMED ALI, Nabob of Arcot, i. 222.
MOIRA, Earl of, i. 49; Americans advance upon, 55; defends the American war, 62; commands a division at Camden, 65, 507; Lord Cornwallis's estimation of, 68, 107, 427; his extensive command in South Carolina, 82, 500; routs Gen. Greene, 98; returns ill to England, 105; captured by the French, 118; Comte de Grasse's civilities to, 119; speaks against the India Bill (1784), 162; supposed misunderstanding between Mr. Pitt and, 177, 190, 300; sides with the Prince of Wales, 300; his opinion concerning George III., 421; Duke of York's second in a duel, 482; his operations in America, 505; explanation by, 514; punishes desertion, 515; defensive operations of, 516; his parliamentary defence of Lord Cornwallis, ii. 114; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 269; curious letter from, 331; attacks the Government, 356; marriage of, iii. 513.
MÖLLENDORF, Marshal, Lord Cornwallis confers with, ii. 231, 251-255; his proposed march into Flanders, 243, 247, 250.
MONAGHAN, loyalty of the corporation of, iii. 140; disfranchisement of, 234, 323.
MONCK, Viscount, his elevation, iii. 319.
MONCRIEFFE, Colonel, R. E., i. 197.
MONEY, application for, for Ireland, iii. 27, 34, 151, 156, 201, 202, 226, 278, 308, 358.
MONEY-BILL, first instance of the Peers dividing against, i. 10.
MONOPOLIES in Oude, i. 458.
MONSEL, W. T., quits the Opposition, iii. 66.
MONSON, Colonel the Hon. W., i. 226; iii. 519.
MONSOON, South-Western, i. 479; the Carnatic, ii. 502, 519.
MONTAGU, Right Hon. Frederick, i. 156.
MONTIGNY, Chevalier de, rescued from the French Revolutionists, ii. 55, 56, 504.
MONTGOMERY, Colonel Richard, death of, i. 20.
——, Alexander, M.P. for Donegal, iii. 140, 141.
MONTMORIN, Comte de, signs French treaty of peace, i. 338.
MOODAJEE BHONSLA, i. 222; proposed alliance with, 308-311.
MOORE, Mr. Justice Arthur, his Parliamentary conduct, iii. 67; introduces Grattan, 164.
——, Lieut.-General Sir John, captures Wex

MOORE.

ford, ii. 349; rumoured appointment of, iii. 123.
MOORE, Colonel Francis, Lord Cornwallis's praise of, iii. 131.
——, Francis, accompanies Lord Cornwallis to Amiens, iii. 383.
——, R. B., compensated, iii. 322.
——, Stephen, supports the Union, iii. 43.
——, John, treason of, iii. 2, 11.
MOORHOUSE, Colonel, death and character of, ii. 70; proposed mark of respect to, 90, 91.
MOORSHEDABAD, police of, ii. 205; appeal court at, 563.
MOPLAS, feuds of the, ii. 540.
MOREAU, J. V., famous retreat of, ii. 312; reinforced at Genoa, iii. 114; his success in Germany, 238.
MORGAN, Major-General Daniel, his military operations, i. 77, 82.
MORNINGTON, 3rd Earl of; *see* Wellesley.
MORRES, Right Hon. Lodge, family and estates of, iii. 254.
——, Harvey, rebellion of, iii. 284.
MORRIS, Robert, refused permission to practise at Calcutta, ii. 182.
MORSE, General Robert, Lord Cornwallis's recommendation of, iii. 147.
MORTGAGES, facilitating Indian, ii. 473.
MOSLAY, Comte de; *see* Otto.
MOTTEUX, J., Chairman of the East India Company, i. 317.
MOUNT EDGECOMBE, Earl, offered the Constableship of the Tower, i. 185.
MOUNTJOY, Viscount, killed at New Ross, ii. 348; his politics, 372.
MOUNTSANDFORD, Henry, Lord, family and services of, iii. 255; peerage of, 318.
MOUNTSTUART, John, Lord, family and services of, ii. 43.
MOZUFFER JUNG, Nabob of Furruckabad, i. 222; dissatisfied with the British, 289.
MUDGHERI, hill-fort of, ii. 522.
MUD-ISLAND fort captured, i. 30.
MULLINGAR, iii. 234; disfranchised, 333.
MUNRO, Sir Thomas, introduces the ryotwar system, ii. 200.
MUNSTER, bishopric of, Prussian interference with the, iii. 384, 385.
—— (Ireland), political feeling of, ii. 447, 454.
MUR ABUL COSSIM, ability of, ii. 512.
MURDER, law of India as to, ii. 549.
MURPHY, Father John, character of, ii. 347.
MURRAY, Colonel Alexander M'Gregor, i. 384.
——, Colonel Sir John M., Bart., serves against Tippoo, i. 383; his seat in Council, 385, 453, 455.
——, Lieut.-Colonel Peter, killed, i. 384; iii. 503.
——, Dr. Richard, Provost of Dublin University, iii. 106.
——, Right Hon. Lieut.-General Sir Robert Keith, i. 214.

NATIVE.

MUSGRAVE, General Sir T., i. 202; commands in the Carnatic, 461; his plan against Tippoo, 478; ii. 8, 51; Lord Cornwallis's notice of his services, i. 485-490; ii. 52; Lord Cornwallis's instructions to, ii. 84.
——, Sir Richard, Bart., iii. 143, 150.
MUSSULMANS, projected marine corps of, ii. 302.
MUTILATION, punishment by, i. 555.
MUTINY Bill of 1784, i. 171; for Ireland in 1798, ii. 339.
—— at Madras, i. 466; of the Cheraw militia, 505; in the Bengal army, predicted by Lord Cornwallis, ii. 284; symptoms of, 312; at the Nore and Portsmouth, 326; Bantry Bay, iii. 414.
MYERS, General Sir W., ii. 368; Lord Cornwallis praises, iii. 360.
MYSORE, difficulties of a campaign in, i. 479; plan of attacking, and peculiarities of the country of, ii. 8, 9, 23, 47, 59-61, 69, 70-76, 540; instructions to General Musgrave, 83; to Captain Kennaway, 84; account of campaign, 98; capture of Ryacotta, 100; necessity for the war in, 114; general order for attack on Seringapatam, 146; results of the war in, 156; sickness in the army, 162; inquiries as to the passes into, 500; operations against Tippoo, 515, 516; soil of, 519; promotion of officers who served in, 578; political superiority, iii. 131, 152; Mr. H. Wellesley appointed to settle affairs in, 493.
MYSORE, Queen of, ii. 78.

N.

NAAS, disfranchised, iii. 323.
NAIB, effects of maladministration by a, ii. 470.
NAIRS, the, ii. 540.
NAMCOOL, fort of, ii. 539.
NAMUR, rumoured annexation to France of, i. 209.
NANA FURNAVESE, character of, i. 229; ii. 187; Mr. Malet's conference with, i. 249, 289, 323, 347; his friendly policy, 324, 477; his apologies and explanations, 565; his fall, ii. 187; instance of his sagacity, 542.
NANA SAHIB, adopted by Bajee Rao, i. 228.
NAPLES, peace between France and, ii. 312; French evacuation of the states of, iii. 386.
——, king of (Ferdinand IV.), suzerain of Malta, iii. 393, 398, 426; French and English negotiations respecting his custody of Malta, 407-484; French dislike of, 450.
NAPPER; *see* Tandy.
NARAIN RAO murdered, i. 228.
NASH, Lieutenant, Tippoo's capture of, ii. 534.
NATIVE Indian princes, alliance with, i. 345-348.

NATIVE.

NATIVE Indian troops, conduct of, i. 242; good condition of, 311; character of, 317, 551; religious prejudices of, 552; qualifications of, ii. 19; relief-guard of, 302.
NAVAN, disfranchised, iii. 323.
NAVY, the, Lord Effingham's motion respecting, i. 32; harbours in America for, 109; Comte de Grasse cripples the British, 116; rapid manning of, against Spain, ii. 109, 110; Admiral Cornwallis's retreat from the French, 293; the scurvy in, 296; dispersion of the West India squadron, 298; mutiny in, at Portsmouth and the Nore, 326; its preparations against invasion, iii. 103, 465, 518.
NAWAB SAADEL ALLI KHAN, stipend of, ii. 553.
NEAL, Colonel, American rebel, flight of, i. 53.
NEEDHAM, General the Hon. F., ii. 348.
NEGAPATNAM, its restoration to Holland, i. 369.
NEILSON, Samuel, treason of, ii. 372, 376, 398; evidence against, 425; Roger O'Connor's charge against, 460.
NELSON, Lord, pursuit of and victory over the French, ii. 386; captures the Généreux, iii. 223.
——, Thomas, Governor of Virginia, i. 126.
NEPAUL, Captain Kirkpatrick's mission to, i. 261; ii. 183, 568-570; peace between China and, 183, 190; its history, 190, 191; invitation from the Rajah of, 205-208; trade of, 206; treaty with, 551.
NESBITT, Lieut.-Colonel, attacks Tippoo, ii. 146, 531.
——, Thomas, compensated, iii. 322.
NETHERLANDS, state of the, ii. 31, 45.
NEUTRALITY, the armed, of 1780, i. 373; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, ii. 484.
NEUTRALS, American, Lord Cornwallis's toleration of, i. 75.
NEVILLE, Hon. Grey, dies at Scutari, i. 16.
——, Hon. Captain Henry A., killed at Inkerman, i. 16.
——, Hon. Captain R. Cornwallis, i. 16.
——, R., his votes on the Union question, iii. 45.
NEWBOROUGH disfranchised, iii. 323.
NEWCASTLE, 2nd Duke of, i. 173.
——, Irish borough, disfranchised, iii. 323.
NEWCOME, Dr. W.; *see* Armagh.
NEWCOMEN, Viscountess, elevation of, iii. 254, 318.
——, Sir W. G., Bart., family and services of, iii. 186, 254; address of the City of Dublin to, 194.
NEWELL, the spy, assassinated, ii. 397.
NEWFOUNDLAND fisheries, conference at Amiens as to, iii. 407, 419, 427, 429, 441; French demands respecting, 454.
NEWRY, representation of, iii. 7; supports the Union, 29; independence of, 324.
NEW ROSS, representation of, iii. 234.

NUZZERS.

NEWSPAPERS, Irish seditious, ii. 343, 344.
NEWTOWN ARDS disfranchised, iii. 323.
—— LIMAVADY disfranchised, iii. 323.
—— STEWART, military position of the pass of, iii. 287.
NEW YORK defended by Washington, i. 23; British capture of, 23, 116; state of affairs at, 122.
NIGHTINGALL, Lieut.-General Sir Miles, ii. 298; Lord Cornwallis's estimation of, 417; accompanies Colonel Maitland on an expedition, 455; ordered to attack Quiberon, iii. 231, 236; marries, 285; appointed A.Q.M.G., 379; accompanies Lord Cornwallis to Amiens, 384, 418.
NIMEGUEN, gallantry of the British at, ii. 276.
NINETY-SIX, taken by the British, i. 44, 500; state of affairs at, 68, 70, 71.
NIZAM, the, disordered state of his government, i. 222, 357; proposals from, 426; his diamond present, 431; complains of insult, 431; negotiations with, 485, 537-539; 542-546; his conduct, ii. 82, 88, 120; Lord Cornwallis's present of field-pieces to, 93; Duke of Wellington's note on the Maratha claims against, iii. 542; the Peshwa and, 544.
NIZAM, the, treaty with, ii. 114; viceroy of the Deccan, 480; alacrity of, 490; troops of, 507.
NIZAMUT ADAWLUT, ii. 201, 563.
NOAILLES, Vicomte de, his present to Lord Cornwallis, i. 132.
NOOR MAHL (Light of the Seraglio), i. 407.
NOOTKA SOUND, Spanish seizure of, ii. 109.
NORBURY, Earl of, ii. 373; his peerage, iii. 318; visits Maynooth, 365.
NORE, mutiny at the, ii. 326.
NORMANTON, Earl of; *see* Cashel, Archbishop of.
NORTH, Lord, i. 12; his bill for conciliating America, 32; resigns, 138; Lord Sydney's censure of, 420; his coalition with Fox, iii. 511.
'NORTHERN STAR,' seditious language of the, ii. 343, 460.
NORTHLAND, Viscount, elected Irish Representative Peer, iii. 286.
NORTHUMBERLAND, 2nd Duke of, i. 183; political differences of, 374; heads the "armed neutrality," 420; character of, 431; General Grant's remarks on, ii. 44; Anti-Jacobin verses on, 332.
NORTON, Sir Fletcher, his conduct with reference to the Corn Bill, iii. 249.
NOVA SCOTIA, settlements in, i. 291.
NUGENT, Admiral Sir Charles Edmund, iii. 21.
——, Field Marshal Sir George, iii. 21, 115, 124.
——, Baroness, title conferred, iii. 314, 318.
NUNDYDROOG ROCK, storming and capture of, ii. 74.
NUZZERS, prohibition of, ii. 194.

O.

OAKELEY, Sir Charles, ii. 3, 509; character of, 84, 172, 228, 539; Lord Cornwallis visits, iii. 364.

OATES, Captain, killed by the Americans, i. 67.

O'BEIRNE, Dr.; *see* Meath, Bishop of.

OCCUPATION-TENURE in Hindustan, ii. 192.

O'COIGLEY, Rev. James, treason of, ii. 345, 350.

O'CONNOR, Arthur, treason of, ii. 341, 344, 345, 378, 381; trial of, 381; examined before a secret committee, 383; proceedings against, 392; protest of, 393; emigration of, 428; custody of, 437; answer to his complaints, iii. 59.

O'CONNOR, Roger, criminal proceedings against, ii. 459; his claims, 460, 461; character of, 462.

O'DONNELL, Mr., moves that the Union Bill should be burnt, iii. 248.

OFFICERS, Indian, discontent of, ii. 288, 298, 301.

OGLE, Right Hon. George, his remarkable duel, ii. 372; opposes the Union, iii. 70, 162.

O'HARA, Brigadier-General, commands the Guards in America, i. 66; quits England, 162; Lord Cornwallis's eulogies on, 130, 190, 517, 522.

——, Charles, opposes the Union, iii. 199; objects to a statue to Lord Cornwallis, 563.

OLDHAM, Colonel, reduces Eroad, i. 479.

OLD LEIGHLIN, Bishop of Ferns' political influence in, iii. 323.

OLD POINT COMFORT, i. 110.

OLIVENZA, its cession to Portugal, iii. 407, 449.

OLIVER, Richard, compensated, iii. 323.

OMAGH, proposed fortress at, iii. 489.

OMDAT UL OMRA, i. 254; Lord Cornwallis's advice to, ii. 236; his character, 308; his remonstrance, 324; death of, iii. 493.

O'NEIL, Viscount, his claims for elevation, iii. 245; his earldom, 319; his borough disfranchised, 323.

ONGOLE, inquiry as to draught-cattle at, ii. 501.

OOSSORE, British attack of, ii. 100, 522.

OOTRADROOG, capture of, ii. 76.

OPIUM, contracts for, i. 238, 554, 555; of Bengal, 558.

OPPOSITION, bad effect of the language of, ii. 186; character of the, 266; conduct of the Irish, prospects of, iii. 30, 101, 200, 206, 207, 217; exertions of the Irish, 182, 191, 201.

ORAM, Lieut.-Colonel James, ii. 96.

ORANGE, Prince of, success of, i. 339; his claims, iii. 386; indemnity sought for, 387, 389, 407; English support of, 388; Buonaparte's remarks upon, 401; Amiens conferences respecting, 419, 427, 428, 431, 435; French offer respecting, 442, 444; treaty for indemnifying, 449, 454, 460, 461, 466; title of, 467; Lord Hawkesbury's objections to French treaty respecting, 475, 476; French objections to treaty, 479, 481; definitive treaty respecting, 485.

ORANGE, Princess of, i. 199; detention of, on her way to the Hague, 335; the King of Prussia demands reparation for the insult to, 339.

—— yeomanry of Ireland, iii. 167; Government, danger of, 325; societies, opposition of, 327; lodges of Ireland, their respect for Lord Cornwallis, 507.

ORANGEMEN (Northern), their neutrality as to the Union, iii. 29.

ORDE, Right Hon. T., family and appointments, i. 164, 167, 255.

ORDNANCE, office of solicitor to the, ii. 379, 380; consolidation of the English and Irish, 386; iii. 228, 294, 296; supply of, to America, ii. 409, 410; pay of staff, iii. 15; General Ross surveyor of the, 315; Lord Cornwallis's resignation of, 337, 339, 350; compensation to officers of, 350.

ORIEL, Lord; *see* Foster.

ORISSA, revenue of, ii. 192, 197, 473, 547.

ORLEANS, Duke of (Egalité), his English reception, ii. 31.

ORMONDE, Marquis of, his character, ii. 393, 396, 399; kills two runaways, 395; political activity of, iii. 124; his reserve, 149; his claims to an English peerage, 259, 264; elevation of, 319.

ORMSBY, Sir C. M., Bart., iii. 129.

——, James, Lord Cornwallis patronizes, iii. 129.

ORPHEE, the, captured by Admiral Osborne, i. 7.

OSBORNE, Admiral, captures French vessels, i. 7.

——, C., supports the Union, iii. 43.

——, Sir Henry, Bart., iii. 183.

OSNABURG, bishopric of, iii. 384.

OSSORY, Bishop of, borough influence of, iii. 323.

OSTEND, English expedition to, ii. 337.

OSWALD, Richard, i. 142.

OTRANTO, French troops at, iii. 465-467, 470, 476.

OTT, General, Austrians advance under, iii. 223.

OTTO, Louis Guillam, iii. 385.

OTTOOR, fort of, ii. 539.

OUDE, Nabob of, i. 222; buys Allahabad, 238; Lord Cornwallis's arrangements with, 250; English agents of, 253; extravagance of, 258.

——, contracts for cloths and indigo of, i. 238; bad state of, 240, 256; ii. 319;

necessary force in, i. 257, 288; commerce with, 288; British defence of, 333; Sir J. Macpherson's conduct in, 383; monopolies in, 458; treaty with, 539; manufactures of, 541; British interference with, ii. 308; Lord Wellesley takes a part of, iii. 530, 534.
OUTRADROOG, capture of, ii. 131.
OXMANTOWN, Viscount, elected Irish Representative Peer, iii. 286; elevation of, 319.

P.

PACKET-SERVICE of India, i. 543.
PAINE, infidel writings of, ii. 186.
PAINSHILL, Lord Carhampton's vineyard at, iii. 112.
PAKENHAM, Admiral Sir Thomas, character of, iii. 112, 114, 340, 381.
PALACATCHERRY, fortress of, ii. 37, 48, 160; military position of, 538.
PALICODE, the pass of, i. 480; ii. 552.
PALK, Sir Robert, i. 371.
PALMER, Lieut.-General William, i. 296; ii. 179.
PAPER-MONEY of America, i. 19, 116; of the East India Company, 464, 465.
PARDON, proclamation of, ii. 359; bills of, 361.
PARKER, Vice-Admiral Sir Peter, i. 21.
——, the Nore mutineer, executed, ii. 326.
PARLIAMENT; *see* Lords and Commons.
PARNELL, Right Hon. Sir John, ii. 355; his doubtful feeling on the Union, iii. 6; dismissed from office, 36, 38; opposes the Union, 41, 45, 46, 207, 210, 212, 233, 240; parliamentary conduct of, 69, 87; Lord Castlereagh answers, 195, 241; Mr. Corry answers, 199; compensated for Maryborough, 323.
——, Henry, ii. 356.
PARSONS, Sir Lawrence, opposes the Union, iii. 47, 69, 239; his speeches, 162, 163, 215, 232; active opposition of, 173; succeeds to the earldom of Rosse, 176; unfounded complaint by, 187, 190; Memoir in favour of the Union, 197; his loyalty, 283.
PARTIES, attempted union of, i. 164; state of Irish, iii. 175.
PARTITION of conquests in Mysore, ii. 22.
PARTY-SPIRIT, excessive in England, i. 168, 419, 444.
PASSAGE-MONEY of Indian officers, ii. 580.
PATERSON, Mr., his dispute with Captain Maxwell, ii. 525.
PATNA FACTORY, i. 352; mint established at, 457; police regulations of, ii. 205; appeal court at, 563.
PATTAHS, grant of, to ryots, ii. 560.
PATTISON, Brigadier-General James, commandant at Charlestown, i. 46, 500, 502.
PATRONAGE, military, Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, i. 280; iii. 25; of a Commander-in-Chief in India, ii. 574.
PAUL, Emperor, murdered, iii. 356.
PAUPIAH, alleged peculations of, ii. 65, 67, 497-499, 503.
PAY of the Company's servants, i. 278; of the Indian army, 395; ii. 573, 576; of Indian chaplains, 577; of Ordnance staff, iii. 15.
PAYMASTERS in India, exorbitancy of, ii. 53; nomination of, 577.
PAYNE, Rear-Admiral, i. 375.
PEARCE, Colonel T. D., ii. 62.
PEDEE river, i. 54, 65.
PEEL, Sir Robert, largest parliamentary division on motion by, iii. 181; curious demand by an Irish M.P. upon, 340.
PEERS, Catholic, claim to vote for representative peers, iii. 146, 148, 204, 221; objected to by Duke of Portland, 227.
PELHAM, Right Hon. T., Secretary for Ireland, illness and resignation of, ii. 430, Lord Longueville attacks, iii. 3, 4; made Keeper of the Signet, 293; opinion of Lord Cornwallis respecting, 498.
PELLEW, Sir Edward, commands a naval expedition against France, iii. 152.
PELTIER, Jean Gabriel, his libel upon Buonaparte, iii. 447, 457, 458.
PENDLETON, Judge, escapes from parole, i. 502.
PENSACOLA, i. 50.
PEPYS, Sir Lucas, physician to George III., i. 474.
PERCEVAL, Hon. Spencer, Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, ii. 379; solicitor to the Ordnance, 386; resignation of, iii. 285.
PERCY, Earl of; *see* Northumberland, Duke of.
PERDITA; *see* Robinson.
PERQUISITES in India, abolition of, i. 556.
PERRON, M., surrender of Ismael Beg to, ii. 116; serves Sindia, iii. 529.
PERRY, John, rebellion and execution of, ii. 368.
PERSIAN translations of French revolutionary phrases, iii. 530.
PERY, Viscount, family of, ii. 453; opposes the Union, 453; iii. 4.
PESHCUSH, arrears of, ii. 484; payment of, 495; from Kurnool, 563-565.
PESHWA, the, etymology of the word, i. 227; negotiations with, 229; relations with, 289; proposes to join the British against Tippoo, 359, 546; his conduct, ii. 116; unscrupulous government of, 119; political state of his country, 187, 222; iii. 544.
PETRIE, S., convicted of bribery, i. 377.
PHILADELPHIA, congress at, i. 19; British army at, 31; Sir H. Clinton prepares to abandon, 33; the British evacuate, 34; Lord Cornwallis's opinion as to taking, 102-104.

PHILIPSTOWN.

PHILIPSTOWN disfranchised, iii. 323.
PHILLIPS, Major-General, captured at Saratoga, i. 76; attempts a junction with Lord Cornwallis, 94, 95; penetrates into Virginia, 97; his death, 97, 99.
PHILLIPSON, General, R. B., i. 12; returned for Eye, 162, 171.
PICHEGRU defeated by the Duke of York, ii. 230; refuses Dutch terms of capitulation, 283.
PIEDMONT, its restoration to Sardinia, iii. 389; Buonaparte's remarks on, 401.
PIERREPOINT, Hon. Evelyn, H. F., ii. 281.
PIGOT, Sir Arthur, i. 157.
——, Admiral, wins largely at cards of the Prince of Wales, i. 375.
PILGRIMS, Hindoo, encouragement to, i. 411; duties on their places of resort, ii. 497.
PILNITZ, proceedings at, ii. 164.
PITT, Right. Hon. William (1st Earl of Chatham), his opinion of the Declaratory Bill, i. 11; fails to conciliate America, 19.
——, Lord; *see* Chatham.
——, Right Hon. William, offers the Governor-Generalship of India to Lord Cornwallis, i. 14; his speech in 1783 criticised by Lord Cornwallis, 156; his rumoured appointment to the Treasury, 160; unwilling to join the Duke of Portland, 163; George III. wishes the Duke of Portland to meet, 167; his extraordinary abilities, 168, 420, 429, ii. 114; supposed misunderstanding between Lord Rawdon and, i. 177; Lord Cornwallis's letter to, about the Tower, 186; Lord Cornwallis's interviews with, 188, ii. 264; his regard for Lord Cornwallis, i. 188, ii. 351; renews his offer of the Governor-Generalship to Lord Cornwallis, i. 191; his Irish commercial policy, 192; his plan of seaport fortifications, 195; India Bill of, 220; his conduct on Mr. Hastings' impeachment, 293; proposes a vote for paying the Prince of Wales's debts, 301; attacked by Fox, Grey, and Sheridan, 303; his activity at the India Board, 333; his views of European policy, 333-337, 339; his successful policy against France, 361; his opinion respecting Sir J. Macpherson's claims, 370, 443; parliamentary tact of, 374; his vigorous government, 406, ii. 14; his conduct on the Regency question, i. 417; sees George III., when recovering, 421, 471; mutual dislike of Lord Thurlow and, 422, ii. 185; proposes a Regency Bill, i. 423; the Prince of Wales's hostility to, 445, ii. 28, 38, 47, 52; his judicious conduct during the illness of George III., i. 441; Mr. Dundas's consultations with, on Indian matters, 533-536; opponents of, dismissed from the King's bed-chamber, ii. 29; popularity of, 32, 38, 45; his approbation of Lord Cornwallis, 112, 114, 176; prosecutes

PLYMOUTH.

the war, 125, 280; offers to mediate between Russia and Turkey, 110; offers Lord Cornwallis the secretaryship of state, 145; proposes to pay off the Four per cents, 185; his election triumphs in 1784, i. 172; favours a permanent assessment of Indian land-revenue, ii. 198; official diligence of, 215; presses the recall of the Duke of York, 234, 267; his opinion of Austrian policy, 234; the Portland and Whig parties join, 259; insists on the recall of the Duke of York, 273, 276; Mr. Wilberforce's defection from, 281; illness of, 282, iii. 498; removes the Duke of Richmond from the Ordnance, ii. 283; financial prospects of, 304; the Nabob of Arcot's present to, 310; his duel with Mr. Tierney, 338; his memorandum on the Duke of Portland's and Lord Cornwallis's correspondence, 433; appreciates Lord Castlereagh, 433; his promise as to the Catholic question, 436; his views as to Irish policy, 442; his plan of an income-tax, 457, iii. 122; desires to appoint Mr. T. Grenville Irish Secretary, 9; his speech on the Irish Union, 53; his views on Irish government, 57; the Irish Speaker's invectives against, 86, 87; his conduct on the expected scarcity of 1799, 144; attempts to conciliate Lord Downshire, 147; his remarks on Buonaparte's overtures, 155; his kindness to Lord Camden, 189, 277; approves of Lord Castlereagh's measures, 226; his firmness respecting the Union, 232; consulted by Lord Castlereagh as to Irish peerages, 277; resigns on the Catholic question, 325, 334; independence of, 326; his position, 332; his views on the Catholic question, 335, 346, 348; approves of peace, 382, 383; his connexion with Mr. Addington, 507, 508; his suggestion as to volunteers, 509, 510; Lord Cornwallis's remarks upon, 512, 516; dislikes Lord Cornwallis's support of Mr. Addington's government, 517, 518; his opinion of Lord Wellesley's policy, 523; his reconciliation with Mr. Addington, 524.
PITT, Right Hon. General Sir W. A., commands in Ireland, i. 166.
PIUS VII., his submissiveness to the French Republic, iii. 408.
PLOWDEN, Mr., communicates with Lord Cornwallis as to the Catholic claims, iii. 348.
PLUNKETT, W. C., opposes the government, iii. 18, 67, 69, 97, 200; political agitation of, 161; his motion respecting the King's County Sheriff, 191; Lord Castlereagh's replies to, 240, 241; strong language of, 250.
PLYMOUTH, Governorship of, i. 183; conversation between Lord Cornwallis and Lord Sydney as to, 183; Lord G. Lenox gazetted for, 183.

POLAND, Frederick the Great's hint respecting, i. 210.
POLICE, Bill for Indian, i. 340; Lord Cornwallis's improvements in Bengal, ii. 205; regulations in the Indian, 550.
POLYGARS, military movement against, i. 416; Lord Cornwallis's humane interference for, ii. 27, 225; restoration of, 495; conciliation of, 496; tribute of, 545.
PONDICHERRUM PASS, ii. 538.
PONDICHERRY besieged, ii. 224, 225, 571; surrenders, 226, 227; insubordination of its defenders, 227; Buonaparte's wish respecting, iii. 403; fortifications at, 417, 418.
PONSONBY, Right Hon. W. B., iii. 124; introduces Mr. Grattan to Parliament, 164; signs the "Consular Edict," 171, 173.
——, Right Hon. George, opposes the Union, iii. 42, 199, 210-212; moves to vacate Lord Castlereagh's seat, 43; Lord Castlereagh's animadversions on, 48; parliamentary conduct of, 49, 69; attacks Lord Castlereagh, 98; his chagrin, 162; unfounded complaint of, 187, 193; his speech and defeat, 202, 204; opposes the Irish Representative Peers' Bill, 233, 238; his borough disfranchised, 322.
—— family, Curran patronized by the, iii. 247; parliamentary influence of, 324.
POPHAM, Lieut.-General William, ii. 307.
——, Sir Home, commands the fleet, ii. 337.
PORCHER, Josias Du Pré, i. 414.
PORTARLINGTON, representation of, iii. 234.
PORCHESTER, Lord, unsuccessful motions of, ii. 114; attacks the Board of Control, 118; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, 129.
PORTLAND, 3rd Duke of, his administration, i. 159; suggested union with Mr. Pitt, 167; rumoured appointment as premier, 419; Lord Rawdon's alliance with, 422; his party supports the war, ii. 237; joins Mr. Pitt, 259; his explanation with Lord Cornwallis as to state prisoners, 433; suggests a new Militia Bill, 451; adopts Lord Castlereagh's plan for the Union, iii. 26; firmness of, 58, 188; his objections to the creation of peers, 259-262; feelings of Lords Cornwallis and Castlereagh against, 266; explanation of, 271-274; tone of his letters, 189, 277; his account of the illness of George III., 342; President of Council, 360; his correspondence with Lord Camden, 189, 499.
PORTSMOUTH, i. 107, 113.
PORTUGAL, her slave-traffic in India, i. 555; peace with, ii. 329; Indian forts conquered from, 479; war between Spain and, iii. 398; Amiens conferences as to, 407; French policy to, 416; security of, 419-421, 423, 427, 428; Buonaparte's secret article against, 473; territories of, 449, 466, 474; Amiens treaty respecting, 486.

POST-OFFICE, Mr. Grey's motion respecting the, i. 303.
POTATO crop in Ireland in 1800, iii. 289, 295.
POTEMKIN, Gregoire Alexander, Frederick the Great's hints for gaining, i. 209, 210.
POWERSCOURT, 4th Viscount, courage and loyalty of, ii. 370; opposes the Union, iii. 40, 185, 220; attacked by the Dublin mob, 51.
POWNEY, Mr., Resident at Travancore, i. 492; ii. 489, 490.
PRAGA stormed, ii. 280.
PRESBYTERIANS, Irish, disloyalty of some of their clergy, ii. 340; their hatred of the Roman Catholics, 344; provision for their clergy, iii. 55, 64.
PRESENTS from native princes discouraged, i. 399; orders against, 410; from the Nabob to George III. and his ministers, ii. 557.
PRESIDENCIES in India, i. 221; governors for the, 391.
PRESTON, John, supports the Union, iii. 256.
PRIMACY, Irish, appointments to the, iii. 160, 169, 209.
PRIESTLEY, Dr. Joseph, his followers malcontents, ii. 185.
PRIME Serjeant of Ireland, precedence of, iii. 51.
PRIMOGENITURE, Indian law of, ii. 558.
PRINCE Abdul Khalie, Tippoo's second son, ii. 152.
—— Moaz Addeen, Tippoo's third son, ii. 152.
—— of Brunswick, the hereditary, i. 8.
PRINCES, native Indian, i. 222; employment under, 226; communications with, 251; alliance with, 345-348.
PRISONS in India, jail-deliveries of, i. 556; discharge of offenders from, ii. 550.
PRISONERS, state, disposal of, ii. 405, 438, papers of, 382, 392; examination of, 383, 386, 401, 405; conviction of, iii. 13; removal from Ireland, 27; conduct of, 85.
—— of war, employment of, i. 81; exchange of American, 57, 135, 147; Tippoo's detention of English, ii. 211, 223; Lord Hawkesbury's treaty respecting, iii. 386; discussions at Amiens as to expenses of, 396, 403, 405, 407, 416, 421, 423, 427, 435, 440, 442, 473, 477, 479, 485; France refuses to pay charges for, 433.
PRIVILEGE of Parliament in cases of libel, i. 10.
PRIZE-MONEY, Lord Cornwallis and General Medows waive their claim to, ii. 167, 536.
PROCLAMATION to the American loyalists, i. 92; to the Irish rebels, ii. 359.
PROMOTION, system of, army, for India, i. 530; ii. 572, 575, 577, 578.
PROPERTY, its security in India, i. 553, 554.
——, preponderating influence of, favourable to the Union, iii. 224.

PROSECUTIONS in India, i. 318.
PROTESTANTS, Irish, Wexford insurgents murder, ii. 349; strength of, 418; not unfavourable to the Union, iii. 52, 55; prejudices of, 148; government of Ireland by, 307; their opinions on the Union and the Catholic question, 327, 329.
PROVINCIAL Indian courts, ii. 202; councils of revenue, 473.
PROVOSTSHIP of Dublin University, iii. 106, 107.
PRUSSIA, Lord Cornwallis's mission to, i. 14; views of, 198, 199; her policy towards England, 204; communication with the minister of, 204, 206; conversation of Lord Cornwallis with the king, 208; reviews of the army, 212; invasion of Holland, 361, 442, 450; her predilection for England, 266, 275, 402; supports Holland, 267; vacillation of, 335; demands reparation of the Dutch for insult to the Princess of Orange, 335, 339; complains of English tardiness, ii. 39; Turkish alliance with, 45; policy of, 46; offers to mediate between Russia and Turkey, 110; Austrian alliance with, 164; inactivity of, 231; Lord Malmesbury's remark on, 231; camp of, at Wola, 235; destination of the forces of, 239, 240, 241; Austrian jealousy of, 246, 248, 270, 272; subsidy for, 261; English employment of the troops of, 287; her political reserve, iii. 24; employment of Irish rebels to serve in, 71; her aid desirable in English national defence, 135; unjustly possesses the English Electoral dominions, 384, 385; evasive character of the cabinet of, 388, 389; evacuates Hanover, 391; jointly guarantees the independence of Malta, 425.
PRUSSIA, Prince of, attached to England, i. 212.
——, Frederick Henry Louis, Prince of, i. 327.
——, Frederica Charlotte, Princess of (Duchess of York), ii. 161.
PULASKI, Comte Casimir, i. 34.
PULTENEY, Mr., ii. 43, 44.
——, Sir James, ii. 331, iii. 123.
PUNISHMENT of deserters, i. 56, 60, 61; by way of retaliation, 75; by mutilation checked by Lord Cornwallis, 555, ii. 203; military order respecting, ii. 355; effect of leniency in Irish rebellion, iii. 73, 74.
PURLING, Mr., i. 463.
PURSERAM BHOW joins Lord Cornwallis, ii. 71, 520, 521; his supineness, 92, 135; breaks his engagements, 141; victory of, 142; joins General Abercrombie, 158; routed, 522; misconduct of, 528, 529, 544; recrosses the Caveri, 538; returns to his own country, 540.

Q.

QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL, Lord Cornwallis's remarks on the office, i. 536.
QUARTERS, frequent change of, recommended, ii. 580.
QUEENSBERRY, 4th Duke of, Lord Sydney's account of, i. 419; the Prince of Wales's interest in, ii. 29; residuary legatee of George Selwyn, 144.
QUIBERON BAY, proposed landing of the British at, iii. 152; Colonel Nightingall ordered to attack, 231.
QUIGLEY; *see* O'Coigley.
QUIN, Sir R., his family and services, iii. 254.
QUINETTE, M., Colonel Nightingall's description of, iii. 436.

R.

RADNOR, 2nd Earl of, ii. 292.
RADSTÄDT, Congress of, iii. 77, 419.
RADSTOCK, Lord, iii. 318.
RAGONATH, ambition of, i. 228.
RAGOJEE, flattered, i. 410, 411.
RAGGOGIE BOOSLA, ii. 542.
RAHDARRY duties, ii. 475.
RAIN, its effect in Hindustan, i. 479; periodical Indian, ii. 8, 9, 28, 90, 523.
RAINER, Rear-Admiral, ii. 333.
RAINSFORD, General Charles, i. 375.
RAJAHS, status of, ii. 160.
RAJAH RUNJEET SING, iii. 548, 554, 555.
—— SOONDER SING, the Nabob's Dewan, i. 286.
—— TEIJEWUNT, ii. 85.
—— TICKET ROY, finance minister at Oude, i. 252; ii. 179.
RAJESHAHY, opinion of collector in, as to revenue, ii. 467; inundation and suspension of revenue in, 546.
RAJKERREE, transfer of, to Sindia, iii. 549, 550.
RAM, Mr., resident at Tanjore, ii. 527.
——, Mr., contests Wexford with Mr. Sheridan, iii. 124.
——, Stephen, compensated, iii. 323.
RAMGHERI, capture of, ii. 131.
RAMPORE, capture of, ii. 295.
RAM RAJI BEHAUDER, Rajah of Travancore, i. 222.
RAM RAJAH of Sattarah, i. 227, 245.
RAMSAY, Captain, ii. 294.
RAN BEHAUDER SHAH, ii. 191.
RANDALSTOWN disfranchised, iii. 323.
RANK, comparative, of Company's and King's officers, i. 367; abolition of local, 381, 428; its importance in India, 554; military, ii. 298; iii. 127.
RAO RAJA BUCKLIAR SING, iii. 548, 554, 555.

RATHCORMACK.

RATHCORMACK disfranchised, iii. 323.
RATOATH disfranchised, iii. 323.
RAWDON, Francis, Lord (afterwards Marquis of Hastings); *see* Moira, Earl of.
READ, Colonel Alexander, ii. 96; at Bangalore, 510.
READING, military, Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, i. 156.
REAY, 6th and 7th Lords, i. 178.
REBELLION Act (Ireland), iii. 62, 75, 77.
——, Irish, ii. 339-348, 350, 354; decline of, 363, 379; one cause of, iii. 520.
REBELS, American, their flight at Waxhaws, i. 45; Lord Cornwallis's opinion as to the treatment of, 48; character and policy of the Charlestown, 57; their severe government, 58; surprise Major Ferguson, 59; cruelties of, 61; their precarious state, 116.
——, Irish, ii. 339-343; treatment of, 357; proclamation of pardon to, 359, 369; conduct of the, 358; submission of the republican, 363; their proposals, 369, 381; surrender of the Kildare, 370; examination of, 383, 401; plunder by, 404; disposal of convicted, 425, 427, 428, iii. 71, 72, 74.
RECRUITS, character of American, i. 116; for India, 311, 317; abuses in obtaining, 241; system of procuring, 258; Lord Cornwallis's character of Indian, 279; best mode of supplying, 322; East India Company's powers as to, 332, 368; English depôt for, 406; European, 531; from the Irish and British militias, iii. 154.
REFORM, Parliamentary, Mr. Pitt's scheme (1785), i. 192; projected in 1792, ii. 185; its real meaning, with the United Irishmen, ii. 340, 345.
——, Indian, in the Company's collectorships, i. 283; Lord Cornwallis's measures of, 290, 541, 554; ii. 470; Lord Cornwallis's views upon, i. 318, 321; ii. 195; judicial, ii. 487.
REGENCY, discussion as to the, i. 418, 419; Mr. Pitt's Bill, 423; postponement of the Bill, 445; Lord Cornwallis's opinion respecting the, ii. 36.
——, debate on the Irish Bill, iii. 86, 87.
REILLY, John, threatened removal from office, iii. 176.
RELIGION, danger of interfering with the Hindoo, or Mahometan, i. 398; vigilance of the Netherland Clergy as to, ii. 31.
RELIGIOUS pilgrimages in India, i. 411; Indian prejudices, 552; ii. 84; tenets of witnesses, ii. 550; ceremonies, questions as to, 568; animosities, the misery of Ireland, iii. 306.
RENTS, Lord Cornwallis's remarks on the ryots, ii. 466, 468-470, 497.
REPUBLIC of the Seven Islands, Amiens treaty respecting, iii. 474.
REVENUE, Indian regulations respecting, i. 283; from salt, 285; demand upon the

RODNEY.

Bengal, 452; acquisition of, by negotiation, 462; collection of, 475; ii. 183, 218, 219, 229; from spirits, 476; from land, 489, 490; ii. 546-548; Board of, i. 541; cautions as to the, 543; arrangements respecting, 553, 554; question of a permanent settlement of land, 561; ii. 191-199, 463-478; want of system, ii. 228; improvement in the, 504; in Arcot and Tanjore, 527; of Tippoo, 536, 537; of the Benares' Zemindarry, 551; abolition of courts of, 562.
REVIEWS, Prussian, i. 152.
REVOLUTION, French, effects of, on England, ii. 185; iii. 148.
REYNOLDS, Henry R., M.D., attends George III., iii. 341.
——, Thomas, gives evidence against the rebels, ii. 375; iii. 106.
RHADARY duty, abolished, i. 314.
RHALLE, Colonel, commands the Hessians in America, i. 24, 26.
RHODE Island, occupied by the French, i. 67.
RICE, import of, ii. 304; supplied to the army, 510, 511; scarcity of, 520.
RICHMOND, 3rd Duke of, his motion respecting troops in America, i. 32; an active reformer, 154; presides over the Board for sea-port fortifications, 195, 197; his plan for fortifying Portsmouth and Plymouth, iii. 301.
RICHMOND, 4th Duke of; *see* Lennox.
RIFLE CORPS, Duke of York's plan for, iii. 168, 177.
RIGBY, Right Hon. R., his debts, i. 165; his description of Mr. Pitt, 303; illness of, 377.
RITSO, Mr., i. 285, 322.
RIVERSDALE, Lord, compensated, iii. 323.
RIZA ALI, defeat of, ii. 529.
ROBERTSON, Lieut.-General James, i. 123.
ROBESPIERRE, Lord Cornwallis's remarks on, ii. 238, 261; guillotined, 258.
ROBINSON, Sir G. A., Bart., eulogized by Lord Cornwallis, i. 384, 455; orders to, ii. 500; mutual friendship between Lord Cornwallis and, iii. 525, 526, 557, 558, 560, 561.
——, Mrs. (Perdita), her intimacies, i. 44; canvasses for Mr. Fox, 173.
ROCHAMBEAU, Comte de, i. 135.
ROCHE, discovered among the French prisoners, ii. 405.
——, Sir Boyle, iii. 40; anecdotes of, 97, 363.
ROCHUM VIHAN, his character, ii. 512.
ROCKINGHAM, Marquis of, i. 11.
RODEN, 2nd Earl of, gallantry of his soldiers, ii. 395, 396, 399, 412; his influence in Dundalk, iii. 138, 141; elected Irish Representative Peer, 286.
RODNEY, Admiral Lord, his victory, i. 139; his election contest, 139.

ROEBUCK.

ROEBUCK, Benjamin, ii. 34.
ROGUIN, M. de, his description of Turin academical life, i. 4; ii. 182.
ROGERS, Major, attack on, by Sir Lawrence Parsons, iii. 190.
ROHILCUND, defenceless state of, i. 252.
ROHILLAS, cruelties of, i. 543, 547; Sir R. Abercrombie pursues, ii. 294; pensions of, 553.
ROLLIN, General, ii. 245.
ROMAN CATHOLICS, Presbyterian hatred of, ii. 344; revolutionary, 347; fanaticism of some rebel, 363; policy of conciliating, 407; their admission into Parliament, 416, 418, 421, 437; conduct respecting the Union, 436, 437, 446; Mr. Pitt's remarks on, 442; oaths of, 437; views on the Union, iii. 8, 16, 19, 28, 52, 128, 143, 307; disclaimers of titles of honour by their prelates, 20; meet at Lord Fingall's, 22, 28; conduct of their Bishops on the Union, 40; Lord Cornwallis's views as to provision for their clergy, 54, 55, 56, 58; Duke of Portland's views on concessions to, 59, 63, 64; views on the Regency Bill, 87; address to Lord Cornwallis, 138, 139, 141; power of voting for Representative Peers, 146, 148, 149; names and numbers of Peers, 146, 148; expectations of, 147, 149; feelings of those in Dublin, 167; join the opposition, 175; alleged grievances of the Peers, 205; Lord Cornwallis urges concessions to, 306, 313, 316; discussions respecting, 325-330, 335, 336, 344; papers circulated among, 343; Mr. Pitt's advice respecting, 346; memoranda as to, 347-350; College at Maynooth for, 365-375; proposed payment of their clergy, 494; Lord Cornwallis's opinions on the Catholic question, 499; Lord Cornwallis's advice to Lord Fingall respecting, 521, 522.
ROMAN STATES, French evacuation of, iii. 386.
ROMANZOFF, Comte de, i. 403.
ROSCOMMON, borough disfranchised, iii. 323.
ROSE, Right Hon. George, iii. 309.
ROSENBERG, Prince de, ii. 271.
ROSS, General Alexander, i. 76; brings home the news of the Camden victory, 80, 509; ii. 387; rank of Major conferred on, i. 91; his mission to Paris, 142; Franklin refuses to release, 142; regains his liberty, 146; appointed Lieut.-Colonel and Deputy Adjutant-General in Scotland, 151; advises General Medows, 397, 408; marries, 470; ii. 299; accompanies Earl Spencer and Mr. Grenville to Vienna, ii. 232, 256, 273, 274, 279; George III. promises to confer rank on, 235; returns from Vienna, 271; accompanies Lord Cornwallis to Warley Camp, 291; Surveyor-General of the Ordnance, 292, 410; iii. 315; wishes to resign office, iii. 351; his Irish tour, 493; sent to arrange with Birmingham gun-manufacturers, 506.
ROSS, General Sir Charles, investigates a charge of tampering with the militia, iii. 178, 179.
——, Lieut.-General John, C.B., iii. 135.
——, Right Hon. Robert, Revenue Commissioner, iii. 108.
——, Captain Charles Cornwallis, killed before Sebastopol, i. 16.
ROSSE, Earl of, iii. 176.
ROSSLYN, Lord, his anecdote of Elwes, i. 171.
ROSSMORE, Lord, position and character of, iii. 260, 265; elected Irish Representative Peer, 286; compensated, 323.
ROUS, Sir John, moves a vote of censure, i. 138; his election for Suffolk, 172; ii. 58.
ROWAN, Hamilton, treason of, ii. 341; Lord Cornwallis intercedes for his wife, 382; his contrition, 382.
ROWLEY, Admiral Sir Josias, iii. 165.
——, Rear-Admiral Samuel, iii. 165.
——, Clotworthy, his marriage, iii. 164.
——, William, threatened removal from office, iii. 176.
RUGELEY, Colonel, i. 60; cowardly surrender of, 72, 514.
RUGELEY Mills, i. 55.
RUMBOLD, Sir Thomas, bribery and alleged peculations of, ii. 81, 126.
RUNMUST KHAN, disputes between Tippoo and, ii. 563, 565.
RUPEES, improved coinage of, i. 456.
RUSSIA, Catherine, Empress of, i. 198; declines English mediation, ii. 110, 124; the Whig party support, 176.
——, Paul, Emperor of, murdered, iii. 356.
——, Alexander I., Emperor of, iii. 392; proposed as guarantee for Malta, 394, 398, 420, 423-425, 430, 431; objections to, 453, 454; his declaration as to the Maltese Knights, 469, 474.
——, flattered by Austria, i. 209; English policy towards, 210; probable alliance of Denmark with, 210; combination of France and Austria with, 275; policy of, 373; fleet of, 373, 380; plague, famine, and war with Turkey in, 402; Swedish war with, 450; aggression of, ii. 39; Prussian and Turkish alliance against, 45; succeeds against Turkey, 110; supposed mission from Mr. Fox to, 110; negotiations with, 144; makes peace with Turkey, 176; English alliance with, iii. 24; defeats the French, 102; proposed employment of troops from, 137, 138, 298; soldiers from, employed at Jersey, 199; English convention with, 357, 392; proposed garrison from, in Malta, 392, 401.
RUTHERFORD, General, taken prisoner, i. 58.
RUTLAND, 4th Duke of, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, i. 164; character of, 167, 182, 348.

RUTLAND.

RUTLAND, 5th Duke of, endeavours to retain his regiment in Ireland, ii. 451, iii. 76.
——, Isabella, Duchess of, i. 348.
RUXTON, Mr., opposes the Rebellion Bill, iii. 69.
RYACOTTA, fort of, ii. 100, 539.
RYAN, Captain, killed by Lord Edward Fitzgerald, ii. 346; pension to his widow, iii. 106.
RYOTS, conflicting rights of, i. 251; protection of native, 554, 562, 563; ii. 546, 548, 561; their position, ii. 192; undefined demands of Zemindars upon, 464, 466, 467, 471; alleged privileges of, 468, 469; Tippoo's cruelties to, 506; oppressions of, 554; grant of pattahs to, 560.
RYOTWAR system, introduction of, and defects in, ii. 200.

S.

SACKVILLE, Viscount; *see* Germain.
SADUT ALI KHAN, Nabob of Oude, i. 240.
SAHEB ZADA, march of, ii. 133.
ST. AUGUSTINE, i. 50.
ST. CROIX, taken by the English, iii. 362.
ST. DOMINGO, French fleet sent to, iii. 391, 400.
ST. FELIX, French commodore, interferes with right of search, ii. 132.
ST. GEORGE, Sir R. Bligh, iii. 183.
ST. HELENA, troops at, ii. 581.
ST. HELENS, Lord, his mission to Russia, iii. 357, 408.
ST. JOHN, General the Hon. F., iii. 111.
——, Colonel the Hon. G., lost at sea, ii. 129.
ST. JOHNSTOWN (Donegal) disfranchised, iii. 323.
—— (Longford) disfranchised, iii. 323.
ST. JULIAN, Comte de, the Emperor of Austria's plenipotentiary, iii. 287.
ST. LAWRENCE, French right of fishery in the Gulph of, iii. 429.
ST. LEGER, Lieut.-Colonel, ii. 125.
ST. LUCIE, engagement with the French off, i. 50.
ST. VINCENT, Earl, M.P. for Yarmouth, i. 172, 181; his kindness to Lieut. Broke, ii. 449; recommends Admiral Cornwallis as his successor, iii. 340.
SALARIES of the Company's servants, i. 278, 290, 321, 541; of judicial superintendents, 556.
SALEM country, supplies of food from, ii. 107; Tippoo cedes, 157, 160; manufactures of, 186; its military position, 539.
SALSETTE, its questionable value, i. 312; suggested restoration of, 321, 546, 557; exchange of, 345; compared with Cuttack, 366, 387, 452; ii. 47, 48.
SALT, supply of, i. 284; revenue from, 285;

SCHOOLS.

Irish provisions, ii. 437; sales, 505; Lord Cornwallis's plan to reduce the price of, 505.
SALUTE at sea, proposed abolition of the, iii. 427; English adherence to, 430.
SAMOGA, Captain Little's victory near, ii. 529.
SAMPSON, William, banished, ii. 377, 381.
SANDAL-WOOD, commerce in, ii. 538.
SANDWICH, 4th Earl of, Lord Bristol's motion against, i. 39.
——, 5th Earl of, i. 155; influence in Huntingdonshire, iii. 309.
SANKERYDROOG, fort of, ii. 539.
SANTEE river, i. 54, 72.
SARATOGA, convention of, i. 36.
SARDINIA, King of (Emanuel III.), Lord Cornwallis presented to, i. 4.
—— (Emanuel IV.), re-establishment of, iii. 388; restoration of Piedmont to, 389, 435; Buonaparte's objections to, 401; proposed indemnity to, 407; suggested provision for, 443.
SATTARA, Raja of, i. 227.
SATTIMUNGUL, Colonel Floyd reduces, i. 479.
SAUMAREZ, Admiral Lord de, pursues French frigates, ii. 431; his victory over the French and Spanish, iii. 380; offered an army commission by Lord Cornwallis, 380.
SAURIN, Right Hon. W., ii. 447; captain of the "Lawyers' Corps," 457; iii. 5; the Irish Yeomanry, 29; his opposition to the Union, 38, 39, 204, 212, 248.
SAVAGE, Francis, iii. 162; opposes the Union, 163.
SAVANNAH taken, i. 41, 51.
SAVARY conveys the French to Killala, ii. 431.
SAVENDROOG, capture of fort, ii. 75.
SAXE-COBURG, Prince Frederick, his victory, ii. 230; his retreat, 233.
SAXE-TESCHIN, Albert, Duke of, ii. 247, 253.
SAXE, Prince Zavier de, i. 9.
SAXHAM estate, i. 409.
SAYE AND SELE, 10th Lord, joins the opposition, i. 300.
SAYER duties, abolition of, i. 475; ii. 229; collection of, i. 565; ii. 496, 546; amount of, ii. 547.
SCARCITY in Lord Cornwallis's army, ii. 514; in England and Ireland, iii. 295.
SCAWEN, John, Military Auditor General, i. 455.
SCHELDT, navigation of the, i. 199; recovery of, ii. 268.
SCHERER, defeat of the French under, iii. 102.
SCHIMMELPENNINCK, M. de, Dutch minister, iii. 404, 434-436; negotiates at Amiens, 444, 471, 480, 481, 485, 487; frankness of, 445.
SCHLEIFFEN, Comte de, ii. 7, 39.
SCHOOLS, licence of Irish, iii. 374.

SCHWARTZ.

SCHWARTZ, Rev. C. F., i. 251; his suggestions as to the Tanjore succession, ii. 207, 208, 212, 221, 566, 567; his humanity to Serfojee, 209, 552.
SCOTCH fencibles in Ireland, iii. 19, 76, 78; volunteers from, 285.
SCOTT, David, ii. 16; his queries as to the army, 297; information and opinions of, 312, 330; iii. 378.
——, Major, Warren Hastings's friend, i. 376.
——, Matthias, iii. 108.
——, Colonel W., ii. 296.
SEAPORTS, fortification of, i. 195-197.
SEARCH, right of, resisted by France, i. 287; in Bengal, 353; of ships under convoy, 373.
SECRET-SERVICE money, iii. 308; amount voted, 359.
SECUNDER JAH, supports Lord Cornwallis, ii. 135, 523, 528, 543.
SEDITIOUS meetings in Ireland, iii. 19, 21.
SEEDEE family, i. 386.
SEIKS, Lord Cornwallis's pacific policy to the, i. 252; their power, 257.
SELWYN, George Augustus, death and bequest of, ii. 144.
SEPOYS, their attachment to Sir Eyre Coote, i. 215; character of, 235, 316, 345, 468; officers of, 238; ii. 580; improvement of, i. 276; number and employment of, 288; desertion of, ii. 95; murder by some Patan, 180; the militia relieve, 302.
SEQUESTRATION of property in France, iii. 414, 442.
SERA communication, ii. 509, 521.
SERFOGEE, his claim to the Tanjore succession, ii. 207-209, 212; removed from Tanjore, 552; his title, 564, 567.
SERINGAPATAM, siege of, ii. 72, 138, 139, 155, 530-532, 542; Lord Cornwallis's plan of attack, 105, 133, 135, 506-509; night-attack on, 136, 148; the march from, 166; soil of, 519; British possession of, iii. 152, 530.
SETON, Archibald, i. 460; ii. 266.
SETTLEMENT of Benares, i. 456, 460; the ten-years', 549, 561; question of a permanent, 560-565; of land revenue, ii. 191-200, 464-478, 546-548; confirmed by English Government, 214.
SETTLEMENTS in Nova Scotia, i. 291; the best class of settlers in, 291.
SEVEN ISLANDS, republic of, iii. 474.
SEVERNDROOG, fortress captured, ii. 132, 135.
SHAHABAD, collectorship and revenue of, ii. 464, 548.
SHAH ALEM, income of, i. 221; solicits British aid, 307; misery of, 316, 364; cruelties to, 543, 547; English custody of, iii. 541.
—— ZADA, Prince, i. 241; Lord Cornwallis's interview with, 295.

SINGLETON.

SHANNON, 2nd Earl of, ii. 452; Lord Longueville's complaints of, iii. 3, 4, 17, 18; his political influence, 124, 324; compensated, 322.
——, 3rd Earl; *see* Boyle.
—— River, defensive fortifications near, iii. 489, 515.
SHAW, Bernard, iii. 3.
——, Sir Robert, Bart., iii. 80.
SHEARES, Henry and John, trial and execution of, ii. 346, 375.
SHEE, Sir George, compensated, iii. 32, 322; Secretary to the Treasury, 108; takes office under Lord Pelham, 381.
SHEER JUNG, rapacity of, i. 297.
SHEFFIELD, 1st Earl of, i. 158; the Duke of Portland and Mr. Pitt's recommendation of, iii. 261; Lord Cornwallis's remark on, 265.
SHELBURNE, 3rd Earl of; *see* Lansdowne.
SHERIDAN, Right Hon. R. B., attacks Mr. Pitt, i. 303; opposes the Declaratory Bill, 374; his Begum speech, 376, 404; his rumoured appointment to office, 419; Lord Sydney's censure of, 420; ii. 40; the Prince of Wales's intimacy with, i. 423; returned for Stafford without contest, ii. 43; a witness for O'Connor, 381; contests Wexford, iii. 124.
SHIAS, sect of, ii. 203.
SHOOTER'S HILL, military defence of, ridiculed, iii. 508.
SHORE, Sir John; *see* Teignmouth.
SHROFFS, class of, i. 554.
SIBBENDIES, ii. 527.
SIBTHORPE, Colonel Humphrey, Irish services of, iii. 30.
SICILIES, King of the Two, proposed as guarantee for Malta, iii. 421, 423, 425, 426.
SIDMOUTH, Viscount, Prime Minister, iii. 334; his opinion of the illness of George III., 341; his remarks on the Amiens conferences, 418, 431, 438, 463, 482; his esteem for Lord Cornwallis, 498, 501; coolness between Mr. Pitt and, 507, 508; defeat and resignation of, 511; Lord Cornwallis's support of, 517; reconciliation of Mr. Pitt and, 524.
SILESIA, military manœuvres in, i. 212.
SILK, contracts for, i. 250, 253; trade at Beauliah, 434; failure of, at Dacca, ii. 16.
SILVER coinage in India, i. 456; fluctuating value of Indian, ii. 464, 465.
SIMCOE, Lieut.-General, in America, i. 35; refuses to deliver up an American, 131; character of, 461; ii. 455.
SINCLAIR, Mr., committed for contempt, iii. 211.
SINECURES, Lord Cornwallis abolishes Indian, i. 318.
SINGLETON, Mark, the Prince of Wales praises, ii. 163; Ordnance Storekeeper, 289.
——, Lady Mary, i. 10.

SINDIA, MADAJEE, origin and family of, i. 222; Lord Cornwallis's policy towards, 231, 243, 25 2, 261; ii. 23; ambition of, i. 242; strength of, 257; friendliness of, 324, 347, 394; his sagacity, 358; ii. 187, 222; his selfishness, i. 438, 439; quarrels with the Vizier, 439; Lord Cornwallis's firmness towards, ii. 180; his insincerity, 206; death of, 265.
SINDIA DOWLUT ROW, defeated, iii. 511; Lord Wellesley's policy towards, 529, 533; liberates Mr. Jenkins, 536, 540, 558, 559; Lord Cornwallis's policy towards, 537, 540, 545; instructions to Lord Lake respecting, 547-555.
SIRR, Major, services of, iii. 180, 320.
SIVAGI founds the Maratha state, i. 228.
SKELLY, Colonel Francis, gallantry of, i. 279; ii. 90.
SKELTON, Lieutenant W., R.N., iii. 514.
SKYNNER, Chief Baron, resigns, i. 270.
SLAVES, American demand for payment for fugitive, i. 193; Portuguese traffic in, 555; Sir W. Dolben's Bill for freedom of, ii. 32.
SLIGO, Marquis of, iii. 244, 264, 286; created a Marquis, 244, 319.
——, borough, iii. 234.
SLOPER, General Sir Robert, commands in India, i. 166, 174, 181; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 191, 239, 244, 258, 259, 281, 383; illness and recall of, 225, 226, 349.
SMALLWOOD, General, Lord Cornwallis remonstrates with, i. 67.
SMITH, Major-General, wins largely of the Prince of Wales, i. 375.
——, James, Ordnance Solicitor, ii. 379.
——, Sir W., Baron of Irish Exchequer, iii. 18; supports the Union, 43.
——, Right Hon. Sir Michael, Master of the Rolls, iii. 302, 303.
——, Nathaniel, i. 429.
——, Admiral Sir Sydney, iii. 131.
——, M. (son of Mr. Baron Smith), his speech, iii. 48.
SMUGGLING Bill, i. 178.
SOONIES, sect of, ii. 203.
SOONDOOR, district of, ii. 179.
SORBONNE, its strictness, iii. 369.
SOUBISE, Prince de, i. 8.
SOUILLAC, Vicomte de, his letter on the right of search, i. 283, 287, 294.
SOUTHAMPTON, 1st Lord, i. 168.
——, 2nd Lord, i. 168.
SOUTH SEAS, Spanish concessions in the, ii. 109.
SOUZA, Chevalier de, French exclusion of, at Amiens, iii. 415, 473.
SPAIN invades Florida, i. 41; her policy, 372; iii. 444, 458, 459; her rumoured opposition to Russia, i. 380; treaty prohibiting her from Indian commerce, 388; her claims and concessions in the South Seas, ii. 109; declares war, 312; combined squadrons of France and, iii. 132; her plenipotentiary at Amiens, 387, 407; war between Portugal and, 398; dilatoriness of, 405, 406, 415, 438; her cession of Trinidad and Olivenza, 406, 407; her submissiveness to the French republic, 408; guarantees Maltese independence, 425; her connexion with France, 448; her rights of navigation, 449, 471; conciliatory to England, 460; frontier between Portugal and, 466, 467, 474.
SPEAKER of the Irish House of Commons (1799-1800); *see* Foster.
SPEKE, Peter, character of, i. 429; iii. 517; Court of Directors support, i. 559.
SPENCER, 2nd Earl, i. 419; his mission to Vienna, ii. 232, 256, 257, 273; solicits his recall, 235; connection with Mr. Pitt, 283; his friendship with Lord Cornwallis, 336, 449; iii. 337; resignation of, 343; supposed unfavourable to peace, 383.
——, Countess, iii. 103, 413.
——, Joshua, opposes the Union, iii. 32.
SPIRITS, tax on, in India, ii. 229, 547, 580.
SPRANGER, John, i. 272.
STABLES, John, i. 260, 332.
STAFFORD, 1st Marquis of, his great election contest, i. 302.
STAHREMBURG, Comte de, ii. 233, 259, 263.
STAIR, Earl of; *see* Dalrymple.
STAMP Act, repealed, i. 11, 17.
STATUTES, interpretation of 24 George III., i. 399; ill-drawn militia, ii. 451.
STAUNTON, Sir George L., i. 349.
STEELE, Thomas, his motion respecting the Constable of the Tower, i. 167.
STEPNEY, Sir John, i. 201.
STEUART, General Sir James, ii. 355.
STEUBEN, Baron, repudiation of his contract by the Americans, i. 105.
STEWART, Hon. Col., ii. 424.
——, Right Hon. Sir John, ii. 373.
——, Henry, iii. 66.
STOCK, value of Indian, i. 277.
STOPFORD, General the Hon. E., i. 185.
STOREY, Admiral, surrenders the Dutch fleet, iii. 28; in the Texel, 77.
STORMONT, 7th Viscount, minister in Poland, i. 270; violent member of opposition, 274; opposes the Declaratory Bill, 368; rumoured appointment of, 419; Lord Sydney remarks on, 420; ii. 117, 126.
STRABANE, Lord Cornwallis's reception at, iii. 140; disfranchised, 323.
STRACHAN, Admiral Sir R., his action with a French frigate, ii. 132.
STRATFORD, Colonel the Hon. John, iii. 46.
STRETTLE, Robert, iii. 3.
STUART, Sir Charles, appointed to command an expedition, iii. 236.
——, Hon. Charles, Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, i. 238; ii. 58, 81, 142, 207.

STUART, General James, i. 385; extensive command of, 415, 416; sent against the Mundahs, 429; embarrassed by the rains, 479, 480; carries Outradroog, ii. 131; at Seringapatam, 136, 138, 146; attacks Tippoo, 517, 531; investigates the Tanjore succession question, 567.
SUBAH of the Deccan, iii. 544.
SUBSIDIARY treaties, Lord Wellesley's, iii. 523.
SUDASEOGHUR, fort of, ii. 210.
SUDDER DEWANNY ADAWLUT, court of, ii. 563.
SUFFOLK militia, iii. 4.
SUFFREIN, repulse of, iii. 532.
SULLIVAN, treason of, ii. 391.
SULLIVAN'S Island, failure of attack on, i. 22.
SUMATRA, protection of, i. 468.
SUMPTER, General, advance of, i. 51; repulsed by Lord Rawdon, 55; pursued by Tarleton, 56; his indefatigable character, 58; repulses Tarleton, but is wounded, 70; defeated, 513; his gang of plunderers, 517.
SUNDERBUNDS, ii. 558, 559.
SUNDERLIN, Lord, iii. 185.
SUPERVISORS, appointment of, ii. 473.
SURAN, revenue of, ii. 548.
SURAT, court-martial at, i. 325.
—— Nabob of, ii. 23.
SURAJPORE, ii. 107.
SURREY, Earl of, moves a vote of censure, i. 138.
SUTHERLAND fencibles, ii. 455; iii. 19.
SUWARROW, Count P. A., captures Ismail, ii. 110; defeats the French, iii. 102; Lord Cornwallis criticises, 114; defeats Macdonald, 116; twice nearly defeated, 130; retreats and returns to Russia, 143.
SWAMMY, Rajah, claims of, ii. 567.
SWEDEN, peace between Russia and, i. 450.
SWERGA DEVA, Rajah of Assam, ii. 189.
SWEETMAN, John, treason of, ii. 398.
SWIFT, Dean, his lines on Irish corruption, iii. 102.
SWITZERLAND, King of Naples' corps from, iii. 475, 478; emancipation of, 494; conduct of the French to, 507.
SWORDS of Tippoo and Mararirow presented to Lord Cornwallis, iii. 275.
——, borough of, compensation for, invested for benefit of, iii. 323.
SYAGI, the Gaekwar, i. 228.
SYDNEY, 1st Viscount, i. 7; Secretary of State, 160; consults Lord Cornwallis as to India, 174; Lord Cornwallis seeks an explanation with, 183, 184, 185, 187; resigns, ii. 5; marriage of his son, 45; marriage of his daughter, 285.
SYMES, Lieut.-Colonel, i. 202.
SYMONDS, Captain, zealous activity of, i. 131.

T.

TAAPAN, Sir C. Grey's affair at, i. 35.
TAGHMON disfranchised, iii. 323.
TALLAGH disfranchised, iii. 323.
TALLEYRAND, Prince de, marriage, iii. 387; Lord Cornwallis meets, 390; Lord Hawkesbury's character of, 392; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 395, 420; his mistress, 410.
TALOOKDARS, advantages of a permanent settlement to, i. 563; doubtful legal character of, ii. 192, 473; undefined demands on, 464, 466; capacity of the smaller, 466; independence of, 470, 471, 547.
TALOOKS, Lord Cornwallis's opinion concerning, ii. 210, 558.
TAMBERCHERRY PASS, ii. 538.
TAMBURETTIES, princesses of Travancore, i. 222.
TANDY, Napper, rashness of, ii. 391; arrested at Hamburgh, iii. 142, 143; tried, 189; convicted, 355; Lord Cornwallis's humanity to, 338, 353.
TANJORE, the rajah of, i. 222; Ameer Sing decided to be successor, 251; question of the succession, 262, 556; Mr. Schwartz's information respecting, ii. 207, 208, 212; 552, 566-568; uncertain payments from, i. 390; character of, 568; ii. 493, 495; treaty with, ii. 209, 551; mismanagement of, 308; difficulties as to property in, 319; enormous debt of the rajah, 484, 486; affairs of the rajah, 526; revenues of, 527; defensive position of, 539; cattle in, 501, 503.
TANKERVILLE, 4th Earl of, quits the Post-office, i. 303; anecdote of, 304.
TARA, Lord, peerage of, iii. 217, 318; compensated, 323.
TARENTE, Duc de, iii. 114.
TARLETON, General Sir B., i. 44; his rapid march and victory, 45, 55; pursues Sumpter, 56; his remissness and its effects, 59, 85; checks the enemy's incursions, 70; rashly attacks Sumpter, 70; pursues Marion, 72; repulses Washington, 83; his unequal force, 83; defeated at the Liverpool election, 173; his 'History,' 272; attacks Lord Cornwallis, 315; blackballed at Brookes's, 375; military reputation of, 502, 513, 518, 519, 520, 523; forced marches of, 508; defeats the rebels at Yadkin, 518.
TAXATION of American colonies, i. 11; Mr. Townshend's scheme of, 17; Lord Cornwallis's remarks on Indian, ii. 476.
TAX on Indian land, ii. 196-200; on spirits in India, 497, 547, 548.
TAXES in India, i. 553, 564; bill for trebling the English assessed, ii. 330; difficulty of

deciding on exemption from, in India, 466, 472; upon ryots by zemindars, 468, 469; unjust principle of Indian, 472; regulation of, at the Irish Union, 437.
TAYLOR, Lieut.-General Sir Herbert, services of, ii. 353; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 430, 431, 436, 446, 455; iii. 89; private secretary to the Duke of York, iii. 40.
——, Major-General Hon. Robert, ii. 391, 396.
——, Michael Angelo, ii. 112.
TEA, duty on, i. 17; destruction of, at Boston, 18; smuggling of, 178.
TEAK, commerce in, ii. 538.
TEELING, Bartholomew, treason and execution of, ii. 391; confession of, 404, 405.
TEHSEELDARRY establishments, ii. 547.
TEHSEEN ALLY KHAN, irregularities of, ii. 555.
TEIGE WUNT, character of, ii. 70, 87, 91, 128, 508, 510; orders to, 506; Lord Cornwallis removes, 512, 513.
TEIGNMOUTH, Lord, i. 224; his financial talents, 224, 238, 283, 293; his abilities and experience, 260, 392, 466, 488; vote for his expenses, 331; illness of, 389; his Bahar administration, 466; his valuable exertions, 553, 560, 561, 563; ii. 196; Mr. Pitt appoints him Governor-General, 215, 217, 218, 220, 224; Lord Cornwallis's esteem for, 228; disapproves of terms made with Gholam Khan, 294; his policy in India, 296, 302; iii. 529; his proposal as to revenue, ii. 304; coolness between Lord Hobart and, 309, 310; investigates the complaints of Bengal officers, 316; censured for want of firmness, 318; liberality and candour of, 324; orders the Manilla expedition, 333; Lord Cornwallis's comments on the revenue minutes of, 463-478; his views of English policy in India, 472.
TEJWUNT SING, Raja, character of, ii. 70.
TELLICHERRY, military importance of, i. 262, 557; ii. 160; insulted by Tippoo, i. 365; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 387, 437, 438; Tippoo's designs against, 467; Tippoo's tributaries at, ii. 491.
TEMERAIRE mutineers, iii. 414.
TEMPERATURE of India, ii. 86.
TEMPLE, 2nd Earl, protects Wilkes, i. 10.
——, 3rd Earl; *see* Buckingham.
TEMPLETOWN, 2nd Baron, desires promotion, iii. 288; created Viscount, 318.
TENANCY in India, ii. 199.
TENANTS, Irish, neglect of, by landlords, ii. 388.
TENT allowance, Lord Cornwallis restores, i. 248.
TENURES of land in Bahar, i. 456, 462; in India, 561, 562; variations of, ii. 467; duration of, 472.
TERRITORY, acquisitions of Indian, ii. 160;

uncertain definition of British Indian, iii. 545.
TEST ACTS, divisions on motions for repealing, ii. 32; proposed alterations in, iii. 58, 64.
TEXEL, French fleet in the, iii. 77.
THANET, Earl of, a witness for O'Connor, ii. 381.
THELUSSON, Peter J., i. 449.
THIBET, jealousy of the Lama of, ii. 190; trade of, 569.
THOMASTOWN disfranchised, iii. 323.
THOMOND, Marquis of; *see* Inchiquin.
THOMPSON, Charles, secretary to Congress, i. 36.
THORNTON family, connected with Russian trade, i. 373; join Wilberforce in his defection from Mr. Pitt, ii. 281.
THUGUT, Baron de, ii. 233; ascendency of, 235, 245, 246, 247; Lord Spencer and Mr. Grenville confer with, 257, 271.
THURLOW, Lord Chancellor, anecdote of his kindness, i. 269; called "The Tiger," 299; removal of, ii. 185; illness of, iii. 498.
——, Thomas, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 299.
TICKET ROY, Rajah, ii. 555, 556.
TIERNEY, Right Hon. G., his duel with Mr. Pitt, ii. 338.
"TIGER DUFF," anecdote of, ii. 63.
TIGHE, William, iii. 65; his conduct on the Union question, 97-99, 216; compensated, 323; influence of, 324.
TIPPERARY, agitation of the county, iii. 20, 21, 130, 132, 141; its feelings as to the Union, 120, 125; vacillation of freeholders in, 180.
TIPPOO SULTAUN captures General Matthews, i. 223; peace with, 180; hates the English, 223, 436; ii. 162; quarrels with the Marathas, i. 243, 248, 251, 322; his threatened invasion of the Guntoor Circar, 263; 282, 289, 316, 320, 323, 461, 478, 497; ii. 488, 491; i. 297, 321, 356, 462, 544; possible war with, 346, 347; his intended invasion, 341; alliance with the Marathas against, 310, 312; warlike preparations of, 316, 319, 438, 461, 466; discontent in his army, 356; insults Tellicherry, 365, 387, 545; Lord Cornwallis remonstrates with, 365; his embassy to France, 403; bigotry of, 436; moves to Palacatcherry, 466; attacks the Raja of Travancore, 475, 488, 490, 492, 493, 496; ii. 20-24; not discouraged by the Madras Government, i. 477, 488, 494; ii. 11, 12; action with Colonel Floyd, i. 480; abandons his enterprise, 481; violates the treaty of peace, 483; reparation from, 490-491; insolence and violence of, ii. 483; unprovoked attack of, i. 494, 496, 497; Lord Cornwallis's policy towards, 546, 568; ii. 145; preparations for invading, 8; attacked by General Medows, 33, 37; gains in repu-

tation, 51, 52; Lord Cornwallis marches against, 60, 68; driven from all his positions, 71; cuts off Lord Cornwallis's communications, 71, 72; attempts negotiation, 73, 74, 534; besieges Coimbatore, 74; character of, 78, 79, 105, 118, 157, 179, 494, 505, 506, 522; defeated near Seringapatam, 92; desires peace, 93, 99, 102, 103; present from, declined, 95; negotiations with, 107, 108, 508; his English friends, 112; early warnings to, 114, 115; object of negotiating with, 115, 117; attempts to corrupt the Allies, 118, 120; Marquis of Lansdowne's remarks on, 122; unfounded claims of, 126, 127; attacked at Seringapatam, 136, 152, 154; his loss, 137; attempts to assassinate Lord Cornwallis, 137; consents to peace, 138, 139, 150; his two sons given as hostages, 139, 152, 535; description and career of his sons, 152, 158, 224; preliminaries of peace with, 151; discourages European markets, 187; complains, 211; payments by, 206, 221, 222; wounded, 480; his violation of treaties, 487; aggressions of, 488, 489, 491; banditti of, 490; operations against, 509, 513-524; encamps near Magri, 514; elder sons of, 527; night-attack on, 530-532; treaty with, 535, 541; territory, revenue, and power of 536, 537; demands tribute, 563-565; sword and turban of, presented to Lord Cornwallis by the army, iii. 151, 275; urged to war by the French, 529.

TIRHOOT, revenue of, ii. 548.

TITCHFIELD, Marquis of, marriage of, ii. 291.

TITHE, agitation in Ireland, ii. 343, 418; iii. 55, 56, 61, 291, 292; modification of, ii. 407, 447; Mr. Pitt's opinion on, 442; iii. 227; of agistment, iii. 220, 221.

TOBACCO, Virginian, i. 43; debates on the duties on, ii. 40.

TOBAGO, conferences at Amiens respecting, iii. 395, 396, 399, 402, 403; cession of, 405, 419, 427, 429, 431.

TODD, Antony, Post-office Secretary, i. 304.

TOLER, Mr., recommended for a peerage, iii. 303.

TOMLINE, Bishop of Lincoln, iii. 309.

TONE, Matthew, treason and execution of, ii. 391.

——, Theobald Wolfe, treason of, ii. 341; 362; taken on board a French ship, 415; defence, and suicide of, 434, 435.

TORRENS, Mr. Justice, iii. 18.

TOTTENHAM, the family of, ii. 452; iii. 35.

TOULOUSE, Archbishop of; *see* Brienne.

TOURNAY, siege of, raised, ii. 230.

TOUSSAINT L'OUVERTURE, Buonaparte's remarks on, iii. 400.

TOWER, CONSTABLESHIP OF THE, i. 143; deemed a civil office, 161; Lord Cornwallis resigns, 161; voted by the Commons to be a military office, 167, 169; Lord George Lennox appointed to, 184; Lord Cornwallis accepts, from Mr. Pitt, 188, 189.

TOWER HAMLETS, iii. 500, 504; volunteers of the, 514.

TOWNSHEND, 4th Marquis, i. 154, 184.

——, 5th Marquis, i. 349.

——, Lieut.-Colonel Henry, at Cherbourg, i. 7, 8.

——, Right Hon. Charles, his scheme of taxation, i. 17.

——, Right Hon. Charles, commonly called Spanish Charles, i. 156; loses his seat for Yarmouth, 172.

——, Charles, commonly called Exchequer Charles, i. 166; life at Chiselhurst, ii. 5.

——, John, iii. 108.

——, Hon. J. T., ii. 5; marriage of, 41.

——, R. B. Esq., compensated, iii. 322.

——, Thomas, Viscount Sydney, i. 7; *see* 1st Lord Sydney.

——, Hon. Thomas, i. 8.

——, Marchioness, beauty of, ii. 5.

——, Lady Elizabeth, ii. 45.

——, Mary, her portrait by Reynolds, i. 166.

TRACY, Francis Grenville, pensioned, iii. 321.

TRADE with China, i. 246; of India, ii. 560.

TRALEE, borough of, iii. 234.

TRANSFER of land in India, tax on, ii. 469.

TRANSPORT, delays from want of transport, i. 59; iii. 115.

TRAUTSMANDORFF, Count, violence of, i. 373.

TRAVANCORE, Tippoo's designs on, i. 387, 491, 497; ii. 488; defence of, i. 558; ii. 490; Tippoo attacks, i. 475, 494, 496; ii. 20, 479-483, 486, 488; relief of, ii. 24; Mr. Francis's resolutions as to, 111; discussion in the House of Lords respecting, 122; the French propose a resident in, iii. 441.

——, Rajah of, i. 222; alliance with, 307, 496, 497; his alarm and conduct, 438, 466, 467; neglected by the Madras Government, 492; ii. 106; dispute between Tippoo and, 479; his right to Jycottah and Cranganore, 488.

TREASON, international treaties as to persons guilty of, iii. 427, 429.

TREATIES, Indian, illegal and prejudicial, i. 224; of Lord Wellesley, iii. 523, 534.

TREATY, Commercial, with France (1786), i. 268, 271, 278; of Versailles (1783), 330, 331, 351; with Prussia (1788), 450; of Prussia with Turkey (1790), ii. 45; with Tippoo signed, 160; of guarantee, with Indian Allies (1792), 176; with the Rajah of Tanjore (1793), 209; of Irish Union (1798), 437; with Tippoo (1792), 535, 536; with the Rajah of

Nepaul (1792), 551; Lord Hawkesbury's, iii. 386; of Amiens (1801), 397-487; of Badajoz (1801), between Spain and Portugal, iii. 407; of Madrid (1801), by Napoleon, 407.
TREBBIA, battles of, iii. 116.
TRENCH, Hon. Richard, iii. 129.
TRENTON, Lord Cornwallis takes, i. 24; the Americans reoccupy, 27; Lord Cornwallis's evidence as to, 39.
TREVES, the money-lender, anecdote of, i. 451.
——, Pellegrine, patronized by the Prince of Wales, ii. 29, 35, 36; his appointment at Benares, 238.
TRICHINOPOLY, military preparations at, ii. 495; Lord Cornwallis's enquiries as to, 501, 503; frontier fort of, 539.
TRIGGE, Lieut.-General, West Indian success of, iii. 362.
TRIM, disfranchised, iii. 323.
TRINCOMALE, Mr. Pitt suggests a seizure of, i. 337; its important harbour, 369.
TRINIDAD, Lord Hawkesbury's treaty as to, iii. 386; Spanish cession of, 395, 399, 404, 406, 421, 423.
TRINITY COLLEGE, Dublin, statute as to marriage of provost and fellows, iii. 68, 71; Roman Catholics admitted to, 368, 371.
TROWBRIDGE, Rear-Admiral Sir Thomas, iii. 538.
TROY, Dr., ii. 447; opinions of, iii. 8; papers given to, 343, 349; confers with Lord Kilwarden, 368; Lord Hardwicke's message to, 370; solicits Lord Cornwallis's aid, at Amiens, iii. 458.
TRYON county, affair of, i. 49.
TUAM, disfranchised, iii. 323.
TUCCOJEE HOLKAR, delegated authority to, i. 440; his position, 453; ii. 480.
TULJAJEE, rajah, succession to, ii. 566-568.
TULLAMORE, proposed fortress near, iii. 489.
TULSK, disfranchised, iii. 323.
TUMBUDDRA, the, i. 298; ii. 521.
TURGOT, M., theories of, i. 329.
TURIN, academical life at, i. 5; surrender of, iii. 116.
TURKEY, Russian designs upon, i. 210; French policy towards, 350, 371; English policy towards, 381; Prussian treaty with, ii. 45; defeated by Russia, 110; refusal of English mediation, 124; makes peace with Russia, 176; representation of, at Amiens, iii. 462, 468, 470, 473, 479, 481.
TURKS in Egypt, cruelty of, iii. 439.
TURNBULL, Lieut.-Colonel, i. 56; disperses American rebels, 500; gallantry of, 505.
TURNER, Samuel, pensioned, iii. 321.
——, General Sir T. H., Duke of Cambridge's appointment of, iii. 514.
TUSCANY, King of, recognition of, iii. 449, 458, 459.

TWISS, General William, ii. 313; goes to Holland, iii. 128, 131, 134, 141, 489, 492.
TYBEE, i. 43.
TYRAWLEY, Lord, supports Government, iii. 220; recommended for promotion, 246, 263; Duke of Portland's remarks on, 257; Irish Representative Peer, 286.
TYRONE, Earl of, moves address in support of the Union, iii. 41.

U.

ULSTER, state of, ii. 343, 345; iii. 61.
UNIACKE, Lieut.-Colonel, iii. 108, 382.
UNION with Ireland, expected hostility to, ii. 429; treaty of, 436, 437; disposition towards, 445, 453; scheme of, 456; iii. 33; opinions on, iii. 29-32; outline of, 33; opposition to, 35, 55; debates on, 41-50, 65, 69, 161-165; Mr. Pitt's speech on, 53; change of feeling respecting, 81; postponement of the question of, 83; conduct of the opposition to, 101, 183, 207, 211; favourable prospects of, in House of Commons, 104, 151; opposition to, by guild of merchants, 168, 169-172, 184, 194-199, 203, 214, 239-242; popular indifference to, 111; support of, 125; state of feeling in the North respecting, 138; expectations of the Roman Catholics from, 147-149; divisions on, 181, 217; determination to carry, 191; resolutions for, carried, 219; progress of, 223, 231; property of supporters, 224; conduct of Roman Catholic Peers as to, 226; engagements to supporters of, 245, 251-256, 267, 269; Bill passes the Commons, 249; Royal assent to, 285; effects of the, 313; promotion and creation of Peers on the, 318; boroughs disfranchised at, 319-323.
"UNITED IRISHMEN," Society of, ii. 340; conspire with France, 341; dishonour and inhumanity of, 341; iii. 60, 66; in London, 73; organisation of, 81; ii. 424.
UPTON, Hon. Fulke Greville, iii. 288.
UXBRIDGE, 4th Earl of, iii. 123, 522.

V.

VALENCIENNES, besieged by the French, ii. 233; surrenders, 235.
VANDELEUR, Right Hon. J. O. iii. 108.
VANNECK, Miss Gertrude, ii. 280.
VATTEL, M. Joseph Buonaparte's contempt for, iii. 442.
VAUGHAN, Hon. Lieut. General, i. 25.
VELLA MURDAH, i. 416.
VELLORE, massacre of, ii. 152; inquiries as to grain in, 501; a depôt for stores, 509.
VENCATAGHERRY, ii. 510, 511.

VENTRY.

VENTRY, 1st Lord, family and services of, iii. 255; Peerage of, 318.
VEREKER, colonel; *see* Gort.
VERGENNES, Comte de, saves Captain Asgill's life, i. 145; his opinion of the policy of England and France, 271; his death, 293, 334.
VERIA BUDDERDERGAM, attack of the fort of, ii. 100.
VERMONT, seeks union with Canada, i. 116.
VERSAILLES, treaty of, interpretation of, i. 330, 331.
VILLAGE system in India, ii. 200, 205.
VILLARET JOYEUSE, Admiral, commands the French fleet, iii. 391.
VINEGAR HILL, General Lake's defeat of the rebels at, ii. 354.
VIOMENIL, Baron de, i. 145.
VIRA RAJINDRA; *see* Beer.
VIRGINIA, tobacco of, i. 43; its militia, 51, 85; military importance of, 102, 115; its men and riches, 103; policy of the march into, discussed, 136.
VIZIER, the, Nabob of Oude at Lucknow, i. 222; his character, 258, 252; his debts, 394, 395.
VOLUNTEERS, augmentation of, voted, i. 166; Mr. Bruen and the, 166; formation of the Irish, ii. 339; from the militia, iii. 165, 169, 178; Dublin garrisoned by the Lancashire, 189; Exemption Bill, 509; Consolidation Bill, 512; Tower Hamlets, 514.

W.

WADDINGTON, S. F., tried for forestalling, iii. 295.
WAGENHEIM, Major-General, anecdote of, ii. 64; in India, 510.
WALAJABAD, Ordnance at, i. 492.
WALDECK, Prince de, resigns command, ii. 233, 257, 259, 272; his conversation with the Duke of York, 245, 246.
WALDEGRAVE, 3rd Earl of, his death, i. 176.
WALES, Prince of (afterwards George IV.), a violent Foxite, i. 168; his retrenchment, 272; Mr. Pitt's motion to pay off his debts, 301; his conduct, 360, 374; patronizes Mr. Treves, 363; his influence over the Duke of York, 417, 419; conduct of, 423; Sir J. McPherson's intimacy with, 423, 443; his claim to the Regency, 445; patronizes Mr. Colebrooke, 458; complains of Mr. Pitt's conduct, ii. 28; feelings of King towards, 38; communicates with Lord Cornwallis, 46; forms a party, 32; letters to and from Lord Cornwallis, i. 350; ii. 28, 35, 46, 163; General Grenville's remarks on, 110.
WALLACE, Captain, releases Serfojee, ii. 552.
WALLAUJAH BEHAUDER, Nabob, ii. 557.

WELLESLEY.

WALLSCOURT, Lord, Peerage of, iii. 255, 318.
WALMODEN, Comte, commands the Hanoverians, ii. 283.
WALPOLE, Hon. G.; ii. 338.
——, Colonel L. T., death of, ii. 348.
WALSINGHAM, 2nd Lord, ambassador to Spain, i. 255.
WARD, Right Hon. Robert, iii. 215; compensated, 322.
——, Hon. Edward, compensated, iii. 322.
WARE, Hugh, an Irish rebel, ii. 369.
WARREN, Sir J., captures French frigates, ii. 414, 419.
——, Dr. Richard, i. 155; attends George III., 422, 474; his medical opinion, 445.
WARSAW surrenders, ii. 280.
WASHINGTON, General George, takes the command of the American army, i. 23; difficulties of, 26; attacks Sir W. Howe, 30; his left wing driven in by Lord Cornwallis, 30; his weak position, 31; unable to get recruits, 52; complains of British severity, 62; complaints of, 72, 514, 515; his conduct towards Major André, 78; orders terms to be refused to Arnold, 88; protected by the French fleet, 119; his treatment of the Loyalists, 126; determines to avenge Huddy's execution, 144; unjustifiable conduct in Asgill's case, 145; orders Lord Cornwallis's return to America, 147; military movements of, 514; gives an entertainment on the recovery of George III., ii. 6.
——, Colonel William, i. 77.
WATERFORD, Marquis of, ii. 356.
—— City, favourable to the Union, iii. 29; independence of, 324; its freedom conferred on Lord Cornwallis, 561.
—— county, representation of, iii. 7; conflict of laws at the Assizes, 14; disturbed state of, 130, 132, 141.
WATSON, General J. W. T., in America, i. 98.
——, Sir Brook, ii. 244.
WATTS, W. Henry, patronized by the Prince of Wales, ii. 47.
WAXHAW, rebels defeated at, i. 45, 51, 56.
WAYNE, Major-General A., i. 99.
WEAVERS, Indian, regulations for, i. 424.
WEBSTER, Lieut.-Colonel, i. 500; defeats the American rebels, 507, 508; gallantry of, 523; killed, 93.
——, Alexander, D.D., i. 93.
WEDDERBURN, Mr. (afterwards Lord Loughborough), his personal attack on Franklin, i. 18.
WEDDELL, Mr., i. 172.
WELLESLEY, Marquis, i. 15; favours the permanent assessment, ii. 198; his Malabar plan, iii. 174; takes the Carnatic, 289; obtains a Marquisate, 319; his borough disfranchised, 323; Lord Cornwallis's approval of, 356, 492, 493, 509; conduct

of the Directors to, 493, 523, 525; declares war against Holkar, 519; Lord Cornwallis disapproves of his policy, 519; succeeded by Lord Cornwallis, 523; subsidiary treaties of, 523; policy of, 529, 530; his views adopted by Lord Lake, 531; guarantees the Rana of Gohud, 534; meets Lord Cornwallis at Calcutta, 535; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 541; explains to the Rajah of Jaypoor, 547.
WELLESLEY, Hon. Henry, Lord Wellesley's appointment of, iii. 493; marriage of, 501.
WELLINGTON, Duke of, Col. Tarleton's unfortunate criticisms on, i. 44; aide-de-camp to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, 404; exchanges regiments with Colonel Yorke, 173; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, in 1796, 307; commands the Manilla expedition, 333; his plan for defending Ireland, iii. 297; his memorandum on the Bassein Treaty, 542.
WELSH, Colonel T., takes Ramgheri, ii. 131; Lord Cornwallis eulogizes, 188; expels the Berkendosses, 207; negotiates at Assam, 221.
WELTZIE, of the Dover House Club, anecdote of, i. 375.
WEMYSS, Lieut.-Colonel, sickness of his men, i. 54; defeats the rebels, 58; attacks Sumpter, 66, 68, 512; wounded and left, 66, 513.
WESLEY (Wellesley), Lady Anne, Duke of Wellington's sister, i. 404.
——, Lieut.-Colonel; *see* Duke of Wellington.
WESTENRA, Colonel W. W., iii., 288.
——, Henry, compensated, iii. 323.
WEST INDIES, rebellion in, ii. 170; dispersion of the fleet of, 298, 299; French proposals respecting, iii. 450, 452.
WESTMEATH, Earl of, elected Irish Representative Peer, iii. 286.
—— County, improved state of, iii. 21.
WESTMINSTER scrutiny (1785), i. 191.
WESTMORELAND, 10th Earl of, ii. 387.
WEXFORD County, rebellion in, ii. 349, 358, 416; suspension of trials in, iii. 12; disaffection of, 20, 21, 61; militia of, 110, 111.
—— borough retaken from the rebels, ii. 354; favourable to the Union, iii. 29; dependence of, 234.
WEYMOUTH, Viscount, ii. 44.
WHALEY, T. (Jerusalem), anecdotes of, iii. 182, 184.
WHATELEY, T., abstraction of his letters, i. 18.
WHIGS, their ministry defeated, i. 160; Mr. Pitt's plan of sea-fortifications opposed by, 195; support the Empress Catherine against, ii. 176; divided on the Irish Union, iii. 82.
WHITBREAD, Samuel, ii. 104.

WHITBREAD, a witness for O'Connor, ii. 381.
WHITBY, Captain John, Admiral Cornwallis's friendship for, ii. 299; iii. 516.
WHITE, Mr., loan-contractor, subscription of, iii. 174.
WHITE'S CLUB support Mr. Pitt, i. 446; ball on regency, 447.
WHITELOCKE, Lieut.-General, court-martial on, iii. 514.
WHITEMARSH, i. 30.
WHITWELL, Mr., malversation of, i. 284.
WHITWORTH, Colonel Sir F., R.A., sent to Ireland, iii. 310, 315.
——, Earl, peerage of, iii. 318; his kindness to Lord Brome, 354.
WHOLLAGHAN, Hugh, court-martial on, ii. 421, 422; iii. 193.
WICKHAM, Right Hon. W., ii. 371; his plan respecting the Roman Catholic clergy, iii. 494.
WICKLOW, 2nd Earl of, iii. 109; Irish representative peer, 286.
——, 3rd Earl of, iii. 109.
—— county, rebellion in, ii. 358, 387, 416; iii. 12, 20, 21, 61; predatory system in, ii. 363; banditti in, iii. 282, 283.
——, borough disfranchised, iii. 323.
——, Countess of, her borough disfranchised, iii. 323.
WILBERFORCE, William, his defection from Mr. Pitt, ii. 281.
WILFORD, General, his conduct with the Irish rebels, ii. 367, 368.
WILKS, Colonel, his opinion on Indian land-revenue, ii. 191.
WILLIS, Francis, M.D., attends George III., i. 416, 446; the Nabob of Bengal's present to, 431; his opinions and treatment of George III., 472, 473; firmness of, 474.
——, John, jun., M.D., attends George III., iii. 341; the King's aversion to, 510.
WILLIAMSBURGH, military position of, i. 109.
WILLIAMSON, General, submission of, i. 500.
WILMINGTON, i. 86 et seq., 108.
WILTON, Earl of, Lancashire volunteers of, iii. 175.
WINCHELSEA, Earl of, i. 482.
WINDHAM, Right Hon. W., sent to Holland, ii. 264; George III. approves of, 263; his views of affairs in Holland, 267; his opinion of the Duke of York's retirement, 267, 274; his information as to Corsica, 291; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 293; iii. 498; resigns office, 343; disapproves of peace, 383; speeches about volunteers, 509; opposes the vote for Lord Cornwallis's statue, 563.
WINIPILLY, ii. 87.
WINTER, Admiral de, released, iii. 141.
WOLA, Prussian camp at, ii. 235.
WOLFE, Colonel John, opposed to the Union, iii. 30, 31.
WOODHOUSE, John, i. 433.

WOOL.

WOOL-MANUFACTURERS, English and Irish, iii. 230; Mr. Pitt's opinion of their jealousy, 231.
WOOLWICH Academy, augmentation of, iii. 317.
WORCESTERSHIRE Militia, iii. 4.
WORMB, Colonel, his mode of arming his Yaghers, iii. 177.
WORONZOW, Comte S., iii. 389.
WORTHINGTON, Sir W., changes the Yeomanry colours, iii. 29.
WRAXALL, Sir N., misstatement by, i. 135.
WRAY, Sir Cecil, i. 172.
WRITTLE, military defences at, iii. 501.
WYCOMBE, Earl of, i. 372.
WYNNE, Robert, iii. 382.
WYNNESBOROUGH, healthy site of, i. 64 et seq., 511.
WYVILL, Rev. Christopher, Walpole's criticism of, i. 154.

Y.

YADKIN, river, i. 51, 82, 84.
YANAM French factory seized, ii. 226.
YARMOUTH, Earl of, ii. 244.
YELVERTON, Lord, supports the Union, iii. 41; speech by, 220; Duke of Portland's remarks respecting, 258.
——, Hon. W., compensation to, iii. 323.
YEOMANRY, Irish formation of, ii. 342; violence of, 371, 388, 389, 422, 423; Mr. Saurin's conduct to, iii. 29; discipline of, 74, 94; chiefly Orangemen, 167; rebels appeal to, 168.
YONGE, Right Hon. Sir G., i. 165; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, 169; his papers on the Indian army, 341; Mr. Dundas's interview with, 534.
YORK, Frederick, Duke of, military talent of, i. 15; his esteem for Lord Cornwallis, 152, 443; ii. 176; Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, i. 211; ii. 36; his opinion of Frederick the Great, i. 266; buys Lord Galway's estate, 373; wishes to join the Russian army, 361; amusements of, 374, 448; the Prince of Wales's influence over, 417, 419; ii. 32; habits of, 441; joins the Opposition, 446; purchases Oatlands, 449; his duel with Colonel Lennox, 482; projected loan on the security of, ii. 110; visits the Prussian army, 125; marriage of, 170; commands in Flanders, 230, 231; bad feeling between the Austrian generals and, 232, 233; suggested retirement of, 234; resignation of, 263, 264, 267, 268, 276; Lord Cornwallis's explanation to, 273;

ZURICH.

recall of, 276, 277; exculpates Lord Cornwallis, 278; appointed Field-Marshal, 286; Lord Cornwallis's interview with, 313; his kindness, 330; his scheme for the Ordnance, 386; rumoured appointment of, iii. 123; his army evacuates Holland, 136, 137; favourable to Lord Clanricarde, 352, 356; his plan for national defence, 508; consults Lord Cornwallis, 510.
YORK, Duchess of, ii. 161; marriage portion of, 170.
YORKE, Right Hon. Charles P., Lord Cornwallis's opinion of, iii. 500.
——, Colonel, exchanges regiments with Colonel Wesley, afterwards Duke of Wellington, i. 173.
YORKSHIRE, election of Mr. Wilberforce, i. 172; clothiers oppose the Union, iii. 225.
YORKTOWN, i. 102, 104; Lord Cornwallis arrives at, 112; besieged by the enemy, 124; capitulates, 127, 135, 139.
YOUGHAL borough, iii. 234.
YOUNG, Bishop of Clonfert, death of, iii. 314.
——, Mrs., pension to, iii. 332, 340.
——, Rev. J., D.D., declines preferment, i. 259.
YPRES, fall of, ii. 232, 249, 250.
YUCATAN, privileges in, iii. 448.

Z.

ZADA, the Shah, i. 232.
ZAIN-UL-ABU-DIN, veracity of, i. 356, 358.
ZEALAND, province of, ii. 258.
ZEMAUN SHAH, character of, iii. 131.
ZEMINDAR settlement; *see* Assessment.
ZEMINDARS, conflicting rights of, i. 251; abuses by, 460; ii. 546; the chief, i. 549; character of, 554; ii. 466, 473, 478; their territorial right, i. 561-564; ii. 474, 497; tribute from, restored, 25; of Bengal, 160; rights and privileges of, 195-198; liabilities of, 199, 200; form the police, 205; proposed allowances to, 463; the Company's receipts from, 464; their demands, 464; Lord Cornwallis's plan for improving, 466; their relative rights and duties discussed, 467-472; poverty of, 478; restoration of displaced, 495; usurious loans to, 580.
ZEMINDARIES, extent of, ii. 192; Nizam's exactions from, 193; descent of, 558.
ZEMINDARY of Benares, administration of justice in, ii. 204; land revenue of, 551.
ZETLAND, Earl of, ii. 43.
ZILLAH Courts, ii. 202, 203, 562.
ZURICH, Massena's victory near, iii. 142.

THE END.

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET, AND CHARING CROSS.