

The Workhouse Issue at Manchester
Selected Documents, 1729-35
Part One

Kazuhiko Kondo

Preface

- A. Parliamentary Proceedings
- B. Broadsides
- C. Lists
- D. Diaries
- E. Poems of John Byrom
- F. Various Correspondence
- G. Legal Documents

P R E F A C E

On Saturday, 23 January 1731, 'a petition of the several inhabitants, traders, and proprietors of land, within the town of Manchester' was presented to the House of Commons at Westminster, and read. It alleged that they had 'agreed to contribute and give two thousand pounds towards the erecting a publick workhouse, for better maintenance and employment of their poor'. And they asked 'that leave may be given to bring in a bill for the erecting a publick workhouse in the said town¹⁾'.

The petition was immediately referred to a committee chaired by Sir Henry Hoghton, MP for Preston, to examine the case and report to the House. This is one of the commonest types of entry in the *Journals of the House of Commons* in the eighteenth century. Apparently there was nothing extraordinary about the petition, for after the Bristol Workhouse Act of 1696,²⁾ and especially after Knatchbull's Act of 1723,³⁾

1) *Commons Journals*, XXI, 594. See A.1. below.

2) 7 & 8 William III, cap. 32: An act for erecting hospitals and workhouses within the city of Bristol, for the better employing and maintaining the poor thereof.

3) 9 George I, cap. 7: An act for amending the laws relating to the settlement, employment and relief of the poor.

a wave of workhouse building had followed. A book of 118 pages, *An Account of Several Work-houses for Employing and Maintaining the Poor* (London, 1725) listed 127 establishments, most of which had been 'lately set up'. The second 'very much enlarged' edition (London, 1732) listed 109.⁴⁾

In Manchester and its environs trade was thriving, the population growing. William Stukeley, who visited Manchester in 1713, described the town as

the largest, most rich, populous, and busy village in England. There are about 2400 families.... Their trade which is incredibly large, consists much in fustians, girthwebb, tickings, tapes, &c. which is dispers'd all over the kingdom and to foreign parts.⁵⁾

Much impressed by 'one of the greatest, if not really the greatest meer village in England', Daniel Defoe wrote in 1726, that

including the suburb... it is said to contain above fifty thousand people.... The Manchester trade we all know; and all that are concerned in it know that it is... very much encreased within these thirty or forty years beyond what it was before; and as the manufacture is encreased, the people must be encreased of course.⁶⁾

The people attracted to Manchester included not only tradesmen and itinerant writers, but also the poor. The parliamentary petition of January 1731 mentioned above stated that Manchester was 'very large and populous, and the poor thereof very numerous and burthensome'. A broadside published in the same winter in relation to the bill for erecting a workhouse in Manchester complained of 'the rates to the poor which are increasing and burthensome'.⁷⁾ The workhouse was intended as a means to reduce the poor rates, either by keeping the poor industrious or by keeping the idle and invalid out of the parish. Such neighbouring towns as Ashton-under-Lyne, Knutsford, Stockport, and Warrington saw the establishment of their workhouses in 1729 and 1730.⁸⁾

4) [Anon.,] *An Account of Several Work-houses for Employing and Maintaining the Poor... As also of Several Charity-Schools for Promoting Work and Labour* (1725); The Second Edition, very much enlarged (1732); The Third Edition (1786).

5) William Stukeley, *Itinerarium Curiosum* (1724), 55. Internal evidence indicates that Stukeley was writing about the Manchester of 1713 (St. Ann's Church, 'finish'd last year').

6) Daniel Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, III (1727), actually published in August 1726. New Edition (1927), 670.

7) See B.1. below.

8) *An Account of Several Work-houses*, 2nd ed., 98, 143-44.

Therefore, the petitioners and the MPs who led the parliamentary committee would have been quite confident of the eventual success of the legislation and the incorporated workhouse. Yet, in spite of the well-organized subscription of £2,219 and the nomination of twenty-four trustees since October 1729, and though a four-storeyed building meant for the workhouse had been half completed by the end of 1730⁹⁾, the scheme was doomed to failure. High Churchmen in and around Manchester feared the alliance of Low Churchmen and Dissenters which might dominate the incorporated trust. Disputes and petitions followed one after another, and thus the workhouse bill became a party issue both at Manchester and Westminster. The parliamentary proceedings reveal an ominous outlook. Additions were twice made of the committee members from late January, and on 10 February the Commons ordered with some significance, but without any explication, 'that all that come to the committee . . . have voices'. Finally on 7 April 1731, the Commons committee deferred further consideration of the matter for six weeks, which meant 'the end of all'. John Byrom, a High Churchman, poet, diarist, and stenographer, was one of the most vigorous opponents of the scheme. He was instrumental, together with tory lawyers, Thomas Pigot and George Kenyon, in defeating the whiggish scheme in Manchester and London. Byrom's return to Manchester on the evening of 10 June (the Pretender's birthday) was greeted with the ringing of bells at the Collegiate Church (now the Cathedral).

Here I compile the scattered documents relating to the workhouse scheme. This will contribute not only to sort out the often misrepresented facts and chronology of the issue, but also to analyse the factious alignments among the Mancunians of the period. I am more interested in the social alignments of the people, which were superimposed on their political and religious allegiances, than in the identification of the site and building of the workhouse, or in the charity institutions themselves¹⁰⁾. The long-contested workhouse issue provides a fine occasion for exposing the otherwise hidden social conflicts in and around the town. The period was preceded by the Jacobite disturbances in 1715¹¹⁾ and the lingering clerical quarrels within the Collegiate Church during the 1720s.

9) See D. 2. below.

10) G. B. Hindle, *Provision for the Relief of the Poor in Manchester 1754-1826* (1975), has been extremely informative, but its interest is more institutional and centred on charity provisions.

11) I have published an article "The dreadful mob" at Manchester, 1715', in H. Hasegawa (ed.), *Europe* (Nagoya University Press, 1985).

The relevant documents are so dispersed and voluminous that, though I have tried to be selective, they must be divided into two parts: the first comprising various documents before 1732, the second those drawn up during the lawsuits afterwards. The last piece in Part One (G. 1.) predicts what was to follow. A chronological table of events will be placed at the end of Part Two.

Textual abbreviations are extended and punctuation marks added where necessary, but otherwise original spelling has been preserved often without adding *sic*. Italicized proper names in printed materials have been romanized. Dates in documents are in the Old Style, but in my captions and notes the year is taken to begin on 1 January instead of 25 March. Square brackets [] are employed either for editorial additions or to indicate *lacunae*. Brackets < > indicate original insertions in the text. An ellipsis... is used for an omission.

Notes are based on various local sources, which include, to mention only a few, Jeremiah Smith, *The Admission Register of the Manchester School* (1866-74); Thomas Baker, *Memorials of a Dissenting Chapel* (1884); F. R. Raines, *The Fellows and Chaplains of the Collegiate Church* (1891), as well as the informative biographical index at the Local History Library, Manchester Central Library. They are too numerous to reiterate here. All have been introduced with comments in my 'Social history of eighteenth-century Manchester: How and where to look for sources', *Shigaku Zasshi*, vol. 91, No. 12 (December 1982). All references to the Members of Parliament are based on that indispensable tool of English political history: *The History of Parliament Trust, The House of Commons 1660-1690*, 3 vols. (1983); *The House of Commons 1715-1754*, 2 vols. (1970); *The House of Commons 1754-1790*, 3 vols. (1964), and they are referred to without so specifying.

Acknowledgements are due to the record offices and libraries designated below. I am able to reproduce some essential materials here by the kind permission of the British Library, Lord Kenyon of Gredington, Lancashire Record Office, and City of Manchester Leisure Services Committee. Dr Douglas Farnie of the University of Manchester, Anthony Jenkins of Lancashire Record Office, and James Raven of Pembroke College, Cambridge, have extended their unsparing and critical comments on my earlier drafts. I am most grateful for their help, though in a few points I have been so obstinate as to set aside their thoughtful suggestions.

ABBREVIATIONS

Baskerville	Stephen W. Baskerville, 'The management of the tory interest in Lancashire and Cheshire 1714-1747' (unpublished Oxford D. Phil. thesis, 1976)
BL	The British Library
CaUL	Cambridge University Library
Colley	Linda Colley, <i>In Defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party 1714-60</i> (1982)
<i>Commons Journals</i>	<i>The Journals of the House of Commons</i>
LaRO	Lancashire Record Office (Preston)
Lillywhite	Bryant Lillywhite, <i>London Coffee Houses</i> (1963)
<i>Lords Journals</i>	<i>The Journals of the House of Lords</i>
MaCL	Manchester Central Library
<i>Palatine Note-book</i>	<i>The Palatine Note-book, for the Intercommunication of Antiquaries, Bibliophiles, and other Investigators...</i>
<i>Poems</i>	<i>The Poems of John Byrom</i> , edited by A. W. Ward, 3 vols., in 5 parts (1894-1912)
PRO	The Public Record Office (Chancery Lane, London)
<i>Remains</i>	<i>The Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byrom</i> , edited by Richard Parkinson, 2 vols., in 4 parts (1855-57)
Rocque	<i>The A to Z of Georgian London</i> , based upon John Rocque's <i>Plan of the Cities of London and Westminster and Borough of Southwark</i> , and its Alphabetical Index [1739-47], published by Harry Margary (1981)
VCH	<i>The Victoria History of the Counties of England</i>
WaRO	Warwick County Record Office (Warwick)

A. PALIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS FROM JANUARY TO APRIL 1731

Four petitions for and against the Manchester workhouse were presented to the House of Commons between 23 January and 25 March. They were referred to a committee chaired by Sir Henry Hoghton, MP for Preston, a presbyterian and Walpolian.¹⁾ There are minor corrections in the revised edition of the *Commons Journals* (1803), but they only relate to spellings and punctuation, and I follow the text of the first edition where any difference occurs.

A. 1. Sat., 23 January 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 594

A Petition [I] of the several Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land within the Town of Manchester, in the County of Lancaster, whose Names are thereunto subscribed, on behalf of themselves, and others, the Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, within the same Town, was presented to the House,²⁾ and read; alleging, that the said Town is very large and populous, and the Poor thereof very numerous and burthensome; and that the chief Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, there, have agreed to contribute and give Two thousand Pounds towards the erecting a publick Workhouse, for better Maintenance and Employment of their Poor; which will very much tend to the lessening the Poor Rates within the said Town, and to the making the Labour of the Poor more beneficial to the Trade thereof: And therefore praying, that Leave may be given to bring in a Bill, for the erecting a publick Workhouse in the said Town, for the Purposes aforesaid, with such Provisions, Powers, and Authorities, as to the House shall seem meet.

Ordered, That the said Petition be referred to the Consideration of a Committee; and that they do examine the Matter thereof, and report the same, with their Opinion thereupon, to the House.

And it is referred to Sir Henry Hoghton, Mr. Baron Birch, Mr. Sandys,³⁾ Mr. Burton, Sir Charles Turner, Mr. Bromley, Mr. Bacon, Sir James Campbell, Mr. Geers, Mr. Longueville, Sir John Williams, Sir Thomas Read, Mr. Chetwynd, Major

1) Sir Henry Hoghton (?1679-1768), 5th bart., son of Sir Charles (?1644-1710), of Hoghton Tower, MP for Lancashire. Sir Henry, or Harry, a resolute presbyterian and whig, involved himself vigorously against the Jacobites in 1715 and 1745. MP for Preston 1710-13, 1715-22, for East Looe 1727-27, and again for Preston 1724-41. See E. 1. and F. 15. (page 88).

2) By Sir Henry Hoghton. *Remains*, I, ii, 454. See D. 4. (page 48).

3) Samuel Sandys, opposition whig. See A. 12.

Compton, Mr. Butler, Mr. Scrope, Mr. Cunnigham, Mr. Williams,⁴⁾ Mr. Hucks, Mr. Guidott, Mr. Gould, Mr. Finch, Mr. Potenger, Colonel Onslow, Mr. Vincent, Mr. Lowther, Mr. Dockminique, Mr. Harley, Sir Robert Austen, Mr. Lyddell, Mr. Middleton,⁵⁾ Mr. Plumptre, Mr. Jenison, Mr. Andrews, Sir John Rushout, Mr. Daniel Pulteney,⁶⁾ Mr. Gape, Mr. Plummer, Mr. Tower, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Waller, Mr. Boone, Master of the Rolls,⁷⁾ Mr. Owen, Sir Justinian Isham, Sir Richard Lane, Mr. Brooksbank,⁸⁾ Lord Malpas,⁹⁾ Mr. Offley, Mr. Moor, Mr. Attorney-general,¹⁰⁾ Mr. Solicitor-general¹¹⁾ [*sic*], Sir Tho. Frankland, Mr. Rolle; and all the Members, that serve for the Counties of Lancaster, Chester, and York: And they are to meet this Afternoon, at Five of the Clock, in the Speaker's Chamber; and have Power to send for Persons, Papers, and Records.

A. 2. Fri., 29 January 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 602

Ordered, That Sir Edmund Bacon, Mr. Bladen, Mr. Clavering, Mr. Conduit, Mr. Crispe, Mr. Earle, Sir Wm. Yonge, Mr. Laroche, Sir Robert Monroe, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Alderman Perry, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Pringle, Colonel Read, Mr. Scawen, Mr. Selwyn, Sir John Shaw, Mr. Trelawny, Mr. White, Mr. Whitworth, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Polhill, be added to the Committee to whom the Petition [I] of several Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, within the Town of Manchester... is referred.¹²⁾

A. 3. Tues., 2 February 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 604

A Petition [II] of the principal Inhabitants, Traders, and Land-owners, within the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, whose Names are thereunto

4) Hugh Williams, government whig. See A. 13.

5) John Plumptre, government whig. See A. 6. note 8.

6) Daniel Pulteney, opposition whig. See D. 4. note 9.

7) Sir Joseph Jekyll (?1662-1738), MP for Reigate 1722-38, Master of the Rolls from 1717. 'Odd old whig, who never changed his principles or wig': Pope.

8) Stamp Brooksbank, government whig. See A. 6. note 10.

9) George Cholmondeley, Viscount Malpas, government whig. See A. 6. note 9.

10) Sir Philip Yorke (1690-1764), MP for Seaford 1722-33, Attorney General 1724-33, Lord Chancellor 1737-56. He was created Baron Hardwicke in 1733, Earl of Hardwicke in 1754.

11) Charles Talbot (1685-1737), MP for Durham 1722-33, Solicitor General 1726-33, Lord Chancellor 1733-37. He was created Baron Talbot in 1733.

12) An addition made by Sir Henry Hoghton. See D. 4 (30 January).

subscribed, on behalf of themselves, and others, the greatest Part of the Inhabitants, Traders, and Land-owners, within the said Town, was presented to the House, and read; setting forth, that the Petitioners are informed, there is a Petition depending in the House, praying Leave to bring in a Bill for erecting a publick Workhouse in the said Town, for the better Maintenance and Employment of their Poor: That there is already a convenient Workhouse hired for that Purpose by the common Consent, at a publick Meeting of the said Town, and therefore, they apprehend, there is no Occasion for any other, which will prejudice their Trade, and render their Rights and Properties very precarious: And praying, that they may be heard by themselves, or Counsel, before such Bill be brought into the House.

Ordered, That the said Petition be referred to the Consideration of the Committee, to whom the Petition of the several Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, within the Town of Manchester, in the County of Lancaster, whose Names are thereunto subscribed, on behalf of themselves, and others, the Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, within the same Town (presented to the House the Twenty-third Day of January last) is referred; and that the Petitioners be heard by themselves, or Counsel, if they think fit, before the said Committee, against the said last-mentioned Petition.

A Petition [III] of the several Inhabitants, Land-owners, and Traders, within the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, whose Names are thereunto subscribed, in behalf of themselves, and others of the principal Inhabitants, Land-owners, and Traders, within the said Town, was presented to the House, and read; setting forth, that the Petitioners find by the Votes of the House, that there is a Petition, praying Leave to bring in a Bill for erecting a publick Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, for the better Maintenance and Employment of their Poor: That there is already a convenient Workhouse hired for the Maintenance and Employment of the Poor, in pursuance of the present Laws, by common Consent, at a publick Town Meeting, and there is no Occasion for any other; and that a Workhouse, as intended by the Petition depending in this House (praying a Bill for that Purpose) will prejudice the Trade and Interest

1) By Sir Edward Stanley (1689-1776), 5th bart., sheriff of Lancashire 1722, MP for Lancashire 1727-36, mayor of Preston 1731, opposition whig ('country party'). He succeeded his cousin in 1736 as 11th Earl of Derby. See D. 4. notes 4 and 30.

2) By Richard Shuttleworth (1683-1749), of Gawthorpe Hall, MP for Lancashire 1705-49. He was 'reputed one of the strongest Jacobites in England'.

3) Printed proceedings of Parliament supervised by the Speaker. cf. pages 24 and 53 (note 41).

of the said Town, and render the Rights and Properties of the Inhabitants, Traders, and Land-owners, therein, precarious and uncertain; and that the Terms, proposed for building the Workhouse, petitioned for, are disagreeable to the Town in general, and have been rejected at a public Meeting: The Petitioners therefore pray the House to take the Premises into Consideration, and that they may be heard by themselves, or Counsel, before such Bill be brought in.

Ordered, That the said Petition be referred to the Consideration of the Committee, to whom the Petition of the several Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, within the Town of Manchester, in the County of Lancaster, whose Names are thereunto subscribed, on behalf of themselves, and others, the Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, within the same Town (presented to the House the Twenty-third Day of January last) is referred; and that the Petitioners be heard by themselves, or Counsel, if they think fit, before the said Committee, against the said last-mentioned Petition.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the said Committee, that they do admit Counsel to be heard, at the same Time, upon the said Petition, presented to the House the Twenty-third Day of January last.

A. 4. Tues., 2 February 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 610

Ordered, That Mr. Wrighte, Sir Clobery Noell, Mr. Booth, Mr. Lawson, Sir Geo. Beaumont, Mr. Keymys, Mr. Lyddell, Sir Edmund Bacon, Mr. Cartwright, Lord Gage, Mr. Vyner, Mr. Oglethorpe, Mr. Vernon, Mr. Charlton, Sir Wm. Morice, Mr. Annesley, Mr. Peytoe, Mr. Fuller, Mr. Bacon,⁴⁾ be added to the Committee to whom the Petition [I] of several Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land within the Town of Manchester...⁵⁾ is referred.

A. 5. Wed., 10 February 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 620

Ordered, That all, that come to the Committee, to whom the Petition [I] of the several Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, within the Town of Manchester... is referred, have Voices.

4) Some additional MPs are twice named. See A. 1. and 2.

5) An addition made by Samuel Sandys. See D. 4. (30 January).

A. 6. Wed., 24 February 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 643-44

Sir Henry Hoghton reported from the Committee, to whom the Petition [I] of the several Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, within the Town of Manchester, in the County of Lancaster, whose Names are thereunto subscribed, on behalf of themselves, and others, the Inhabitants, Traders, and Proprietors of Land, in the said Town, and also the Petition [II] of the principal Inhabitants, Traders, and Land-owners, within the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, whose Names are thereunto subscribed, in behalf of themselves, and others, the greatest Part of the Inhabitants, Traders, and Land-owners, within the said Town, and also the Petition [III] of the several Inhabitants, Land-owners, and Traders, within the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, whose Names are thereunto subscribed, in behalf of themselves, and others, the principal Inhabitants, Land-owners, and Traders, within the said Town, were referred; that the Committee had examined the Matter of the said Petitioners, and had directed him to report the same, as it appeared to them, together with the Resolutions of the Committee thereupon, to the House: And he read the Report in his Place, and afterwards delivered it in at the Clerk's Table; where the Report was read, and is as followeth; *viz.*

That the Committee (pursuant to the Order of the House, of the Twenty-third Day of January last) had examined the Matter of the said Petitions; and, to prove the Allegations of the First Petition, Witnesses were called; *viz.*

Mr. Christopher Byron,¹⁾ being examined, said, that the Town of Manchester is very large and populous, and the Poor numerous; and that within these Five Years the Inhabitants have paid double of what they paid formerly, towards the Maintenance of the Poor: That he applied to the proper Officer, who kept the Poor's Books, to inspect, and to take a Copy, or Extract, from them, and was denied so to do; but the Overseers of the Poor acknowledged to him, that the Poor's Rates were very much increased from what they used to be.

He further said, that, if a Workhouse was built, the Poor might be employed, and kept from rambling up and down; it would be an Ease to the Inhabitants in the Poor's Rates, paid towards their Maintenance, and be of great Advantage to the Trade of the Town.

1) Christopher Byron, whig attorney. Intimate with the Chethams, he prepared the subscription deed in October 1729. See D. 4. note 38.

And he further gave Evidence, that about October 1729, he was sent for to be at a Meeting of several of the chief and substantial Inhabitants of the Town, at which Meeting the Churchwardens, and other Officers of the Town, were present, and then received Instruction, in Writing, from one of the Churchwardens, to prepare a Draught of a Subscription Deed: Pursuant thereunto, he prepared one accordingly, and attended them at another Meeting with it; when it was read, and unanimously agreed to by all, that were then present, and ordered to be ingrossed; and, after it was ingrossed, he saw Fourteen of them sign it, which were all, that were present at that Meeting: Which Subscription Deed he delivered to the Committee; which was read; whereby it appeared, that Two thousand Pounds, and upwards, is subscribed, the Subscribers whereof are the chief Inhabitants of the Town.²⁾

And he said further, that he was at a Meeting of some of the Inhabitants in June last,³⁾ about Eight Months after the Subscription Deed was signed; when it was unanimously agreed, that a Workhouse should be hired for a Year only, for employing the Poor, until one could be built, pursuant to the Subscription Deed; and it was then agreed by the Churchwardens to apply to Parliament for an Act, for erecting a Workhouse:

That he was at the Workhouse, so hired, in December last, wherein were only Forty-five People taken in, and saw only One Person employed at Work.

Mr. John Kay,⁴⁾ being called, and examined, said, that he hath known the Town of Manchester about Four Years; and most of the Subscribers acknowledged to him, that their Names to the Subscription Deed was of their own Hand-writing; and he knew them to be Men of Substance.

Then the Committee proceeded to examine the Matter of the Two Petitions [II, III], presented to the House the Second Instant; and, to prove the Allegations thereof, Witnesses were called; viz.

Mr. Bowker,⁵⁾ who laid before the Committee a Book of Assessments, made for a Poor's Rate in the Town of Manchester, which was signed by the Justices of the Peace

2) See C.

3) 16 June 1730. See B. 2. and B. 3.

4) John Kay (1709-1768), attorney of Salford, was employed to prepare the petition and to present it to Parliament (A. 1.). See D. 3. note 32, and G. He was a cousin of Richard Kay (1716-1751) of Bury, diarist, and a relative of John Kay (1704-1767), inventor of the fly shuttle.

5) Robert Bowker, constable 1732, and boroughreeve of Manchester 1733. He subscribed £10 to the workhouse scheme. See F. 7. and 8., and D. 6. for the evidences of Bowker, Banks, Hart and Byrom on February 9 and 17, as well as April 7.

in June last, which is the usual Time of making the said Assessments.

He is Overseer of the Poor, and hath been so for Ten Years past, for which he receives a Salary of Thirty Pounds *per Annum*: And said, that a Book was produced at a Meeting of several of the Inhabitants of the Town, and subscribed by great Numbers of them; but confessed, he never saw, or heard of, any such Book kept there, or of any such Meeting, before.

Mr. Jeffery Hart⁶⁾ said, that he had taken an Abstract of the Poor's Rate; and that it amounted to about 1,333£. That the Inhabitants, who have signed the Subscription Deed, and petitioned for a Bill, for erecting a Workhouse, pay to the Poor's Rate 229£ 1s. 9d. That the Petitioners against such Bill, who have subscribed the Deed, pay 236£ 14s. 2d. and the rest of the Petitioners against the same pay 306£ 14s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. And he added, that at a Meeting, after the Subscription Deed was signed, it was then proposed to hire a Workhouse for a Year; and at another Meeting, the 22d of December last, a Paper was read, said to be a Subscription, which was rejected by those, that were then present.

Mr. John Byrom⁷⁾, being called, confirmed the Evidence, given by Mr. Hart, of a Proposal of hiring a Workhouse for a Year; and added, that he was at the Meeting on the 22d of December last, where about 190 of the Inhabitants of the Town were present; when it was proposed to them to agree to the Subscription Deed, which had been signed by several of the Inhabitants, for erecting a Workhouse, a Copy of which, he said, was read at that Meeting; and they all declared against it: But, being asked, if he had examined that Paper, which was read to them, with the original Subscription Deed, he said, he never saw it: He hath a Family at Manchester, but could not say, whether or no he paid Scot or Lot.

That the Committee came to the following Resolutions; *viz.*

Resolved, That it is the Opinion of this Committee, That the Petitioners for a Bill for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, have fully proved the Allegations of their said Petition.

Resolved, That it is the Opinion of this Committee, That the House be moved for Leave to bring in a Bill, for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, in the

6) Jeffrey Hart of Salford, married Margaret, daughter of Robert Assheton (?1651-1731), Jacobite fellow of the Collegiate Church of Manchester. He was one of the nine defendants in the Manchester School Mills case in 1730.

7) As for John Byrom and his family, see pages 33-34 (D).

County Palatine of Lancaster, for the better maintaining and employing the Poor of the said Town.

And the House being moved, That Leave be given to bring in a Bill, pursuant to the last Resolution of the Committee;

Ordered, That Leave be given to bring in a Bill, upon the Debate of the House, for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, for the better maintaining and employing the Poor of the said Town; and that Sir Henry Hoghton, Mr. Plumptre, the Lord Malpas, and Mr. Brooksbank, do prepare, and bring in, the same.

A. 7. Thurs., 11 March 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 663

Sir Henry Hoghton presented to the House (according to Order) a Bill for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, for the better maintaining and employing the Poor of the said Town; and the same was received.

A. 8. Wed., 17 March 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 677

A Bill, for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, for the better maintaining and employing the Poor of the said Town, was read the First time.

And a Motion being made, and the Question being put, That the Bill be read a Second time;

The House divided:

The Yeas go forth:

-
- 8) John Plumptre (1679-1751), MP for Nottingham and Bishop's Castle, Treasurer of the Ordnance. One of Newcastle's staunchest adherents. See D. 6. (page 59) and E. 1.
- 9) George Cholmondeley (1703-1770), MP for New Windsor 1727-33, Viscount Malpas [Irish] 1725, Earl Malpas 1733, married Mary, daughter of Sir Robert Walpole in 1723. 'A vain, empty man, shoved up too high by his father-in-law': H. Walpole. See F. 9. (page 80).
- 10) Stamp Brooksbank (1694-1756), MP for Colchester 1727-34, director of the Bank of England 1728-40 and 1743-55, presbyterian and eminent Turkey merchant. The four MPs, Hoghton, Plumptre, Lord Malpas and Brooksbank, were all government whigs.

Tellers for the Yeas,	{ Mr. Clutterbuck, ¹⁾ Mr. Crispe: ²⁾	} 121.
Tellers for the Noes,	{ Mr. York, ³⁾ Mr. Legh Master: ⁴⁾	} 94.

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.⁵⁾

Ordered, That the Bill be read a Second time upon this Day Sevensnight.

A. 9. Wed., 24 March 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 696

[The bill, read a second time.]

Resolved, That this House will, upon Friday Sevensnight, resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, upon the said Bill.

A. 10. Thurs., 25 March 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 697-98

A Petition [IV] of the principal Inhabitants, Traders, and Land-owners, within the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, whose Names are thereunto subscribed, on behalf of themselves, and others, the greatest Part of the Inhabitants, Traders, and Land-owners, within the said Town, was presented to the House, and read; praying, that they may be heard by themselves, or Counsel, against the Bill, depending in this House, for erecting a publick Workhouse in the said Town, for better Maintenance and Employment of the Poor thereof, in regard there are many Clauses in the said Bill, which will prejudice the Trade and Interest of the said Town, and also render the Rights and Properties of the Inhabitants and Land-owners therein precarious and uncertain.

Ordered, That the said Petition be referred to the Consideration of the Committee

-
- 1) Thomas Clutterbuck (1697-1742), MP for Liskeard and Plympton, government whig.
 - 2) Thomas Crisp (?1690-1758), MP for Ilchester, government whig till 1733, added to the Manchester workhouse committee on 29 January (A. 2.). Sheriff of Lancashire 1716.
 - 3) John Yorke (1685-1757), MP for Richmond, independent whig.
 - 4) Legh Master (?1694-1750), MP for Newton, 1727-47, tory. His father, Sir Streynsham Master was governor of Madras and director of the East India Company; his mother, Elizabeth, daughter of Richard Legh of Lyme, Cheshire (cf. D. 2. note 23). He visited Manchester on 4 November 1730 with Peter Bold. See D. 2.
 - 5) F. 14. (18 March 1731).

of the whole House, to whom the Bill, for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, for the better maintaining and employing the Poor of the said Town, is committed; and that the Petitioners be heard by themselves, or Counsel, if they think fit, before the Committee, upon their said Petition.

A. 11. Fri., 26 March 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 700

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee of the whole House, to whom the Bill, for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester... is committed, that, when they hear Counsel upon the Petition [IV]... against the said Bill, in regard that there are many Clauses therein, which will prejudice the Trade and Interest of the said Town, they do admit Counsel to be heard in favour of the said Bill, against the said Petition.

A. 12. Thurs., 1 April 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 709

Ordered, That Mr. Sandys have Leave to make a Motion, it being past Six of the Clock.

And he moved the House accordingly:

Ordered, That the Order, of the 24th of March last, for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House To-morrow, upon the Bill, for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester... be discharged.

Resolved, That this House will, upon Wednesday Morning next, resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, upon the said Bill.

Ordered, That the Petitioners [IV], the principal Inhabitants, Traders, and Landowners, within the Town of Manchester... be heard by themselves, or Counsel, if they think fit, before the said Committee, upon their said Petition, on Wednesday Morning next.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the said Committee, that, when they hear Counsel upon the said Petition, they do admit Counsel to be heard in favour of the said Bill, against the said Petition.

1) Samuel Sandys (1695-1770), MP for Worcester, opposition whig. He was created Baron Sandys in 1743. See A. 4. note 5, and D. 4. note 10 (25 January 1731).

A. 13. Wed., 7 April 1731

Commons Journals, XXI, 720

The Orders of the Day being read ;

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole House upon the Bill, for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, for the better maintaining and employing the Poor of the said Town.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hugh Williams took the Chair of the Committee.²⁾

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Hugh Williams reported from the Committee, that they had heard Counsel upon the Petition, presented to the House, against the said Bill, in respect of several Clauses contained therein, and had also heard Counsel in favour of the Bill, against the said Petition; that the Counsel on both Sides examined several Witnesses, and went through their Evidence, and the Counsel for the Petitioners were heard, by way of Reply; and that the Committee had made some Progress in the Bill, and had directed him to move, that they may have Leave to sit again.

Resolved, That this House will, upon this Day Six Weeks, resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, to consider further of the Bill,³⁾ for erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, for the better maintaining and employing the Poor of the said Town.

B. BROADSIDES FOR AND AGAINST THE WORKHOUSE SCHEME

The three broadsides included here are without dates, but most probably printed around the turn of the year, between December 1730 and February 1731.¹⁾

B. 1. *A Case in relation to an Act of Parliament, humbly desired for the erecting a Work-house, in the Town of Manchester in the County Palatine of Lancaster, for the better employing and maintaining the Poor there*

BL, 516. m. 17. (13)

2) Hugh Williams (?1694-1742), MP for Anglesey, government whig. He contested Chester unsuccessfully in 1722 and 1734. See D. 4. note 11 (25 January), and D. 6. (7 & 16 April). Sir Henry Hoghton (see A. 1.) took to a bed of illness.

3) 'And so this same affair was ended'. See D. 6. (7 April).

1) John Byrom and Thomas Pigot were shown *The Case for the Workhouse at Manchester* on 23 January 1731. See D. 4. (23 January), F. 6. (6 February), and D. 5. (1 April).

That in or about October 1729, a general Desire appeared amongst all the Substantial Inhabitants of the Town of Manchester, to erect a Work-house for the Purposes aforesaid, in order to lessen the Rates to the Poor, which are increasing and burdensome.

And as the building of a good Work-house and providing for the Poor, could not be done effectually, without the Aid of an Act of Parliament, (the Charge thereof being thought by every Body too much to be raised by Assessments) a Subscription was proposed to be made by the principal Inhabitants of the Town; And after several Meetings and diverse Consultations for that purpose, at last they all agreed, that if a Scheme could be thought on and settled [*sic*] so as to secure an equal Regard to the Poor, in general without favour to any Party amongst them, they wou'd readily Subscribe; Whereupon. [*sic*]

It was Agreed, that 24 Trustees should be elected, who should annually nominate their Successors, which was concluded, by all the Persons concerned, to be the most proper and only Expedient, to secure all their several Interests and for promoting and effecting so desirable [*sic*] a Work, and to prevent any Disputes touching the same, and to obtain a handsome Subscription; All which were the only Ends intended, and then declared to be so by the Gentlemen who met on that Occasion; Upon which Instructions were given for drawing up Articlès by one of the Gentlemen then present (now an Opposer²⁾ which Articles were settled and agreed to and ingrossed, and the Gentlemen (who 'tis said are now of another Opinion) most vehemently pressed the carrying on of the Subscription; Accordingly 24 Gentlemen were nominated as agreed on by the Subscription Deed; and the Affair went forward with great Peace and Unanimity, and above 2,000 Pound was charitably and chearfully [*sic*] subscribed, and near 600 Pound thereof has been laid out, towards erecting a Work-house.

And that an Act might be obtained, for erecting such Work-house, and for making a Provision for the Poor, a Petition was prepared and signed by a very great number of substantial Inhabitants, in order to have been presented to the Parliament the last

2) Sir Oswald Mosley (1674-1751) of Ancoats in Manchester and of Rolleston (Staffs.), sheriff of Staffordshire in 1714. He succeeded to the lordship of the manor of Manchester in 1734 after Lady Ann Bland (née Mosley, 1664-1734: page 37, note 22). He built the first exchange in Manchester 1729 (page 85, note 58), subscribed 100 guineas to the workhouse scheme, and was nominated at the head of the eight whig trustees. He appears as plaintiff against Hugh Parr, Sir John Bland, and others at the Duchy Court of Lancaster in 1735-36 *re* Manchester workhouse. Never a 'strong Jacobite' as Henri Talon describes in his *Selections from the Journals and Papers of John Byrom* (London, 1950), 124. See D. I. note 20, F. I. note 6, and G. I.

Session [1729-30], and which was sent accordingly, but it happen'd to come after the Day fixed by an Order of the House of Commons, for receiving Petitions for private Bills, So nothing could be done that Session.

Since that, some of the Gentlemen (who at the time of setting and signing of the Subscription Deed, were zealous to have this Matter compleated) have set themselves with all their might to oppose, the obtaining an Act on the Terms and for the Purposes mentioned in the Subscription Deed, Conceiving (as 'tis supposed) That they shall be deprived of that absolute Power, they have for many Years exercised over the Town; And to make their Opposition appear with a better face, suggest several things contrary to the Principles and Characters of the Trustees, and to the Intentions of the Subscribers and Petitioners (who pay near a Moiety of the whole Assessments of the Town), And such as by the desired Bill will be effectually guarded against; For their only Design is to administer Relief and Charity, in the most impartial manner, to the necessitous Poor by employing them, and also educating them in the true Notions of Religion, Loyalty and Liberty; This 'tis hoped will be done, if the proposed Act should take place, whatever may be insinuated by the Opposers to the contrary.

Therefore in regard Bills of this kind have met with great Encouragement and Success, It is humbly prayed, That the intended Bill may be promoted, on the Success whereof, it is apprehended, the Peace, good Order and Government, of the numerous Populace of this Town very much depend.

[blank verso]

<[Printed marginal note] The Subscription Deed for a Work-house³⁾>

Whereas a publick Work-house, or Hospital, is intended shortly to be erected in Manchester, for the [Habitation,] Maintenance and Employment of the Poor of the said Town.

Therefore, for the promoting and effecting so useful and desirable Work, we whose Hands are hereunto set, do hereby, severally for ourselves, and for our several and respective Executors and Administrators promise to pay, into the Hands of Mr. Thomas

3) Having compared the document with the MS copy of the subscription deed at MaCL (MSF 362. 51. M1), I designate some differences and additions in square brackets, but waive variant spellings and punctuation.

Butterworth and Mr. Jeremiah Bower⁵⁾, both of Manchester aforesaid, or to one of them, the respective Sums of Money, mentioned and set down in Words at length, over against our several Names by us hereunto Subscribed, at such times and in such manner, as the said Thomas Butterworth and Jeremiah Bower, by order or direction of the 24 Persons herein next after mentioned, or the major part of them, shall call for or require the same, for and towards the erecting the said Work-house or Hospital, and defraying all incidental Charges about the same, and we the Subscribers hereunto do consent and agree, that the Situation and Building of the said Work-house or Hospital, shall be order'd and directed by 24 Persons (or the major part of them) who shall be elected, for that and the other purposes herein after mentioned, in manner and by the Persons following, [Editor's para]

(to witt) Eight of the said 24 Persons, by James Chetham⁶⁾ of Smedley, Esq; Mr. James Bayley⁷⁾, Borough-reeve and Mr. Abraham Hawarth⁸⁾, Constable of Manchester aforesaid, the said eight Persons, to be of the Communion of the Church of England; other eight Persons of the same Communion, by the present Church Wardens of Manchester aforesaid; and other eight Persons by the said Thomas Butterworth, Mr. Richard Taylor⁹⁾, and Mr. Jonathan Lees¹⁰⁾, which said 24 Persons, shall be Governours, Trustees and Managers, of the said intended Work-house or Hospital, and the Poor Persons to

4) Thomas Butterworth (1683-1745), woollen draper of Manchester, trustee of Cross Street Chapel (presbyterian), son of Thomas, one of the founding trustees of the same chapel. He married Frances, sister of Robert Dukinfield, another trustee. Of his daughters, Susannah became third wife of Sir Henry Hoghton (see A.1. note 1), and Ann became second wife of Daniel Bayley (1699-1764), another trustee of the chapel. Himself nominated at the head of the eight presbyterian trustees of the workhouse, he subscribed £100 to the scheme.

5) Jeremiah Bower (-1755), haberdasher and hatter, churchwarden of Manchester 1724, constable 1733, boroughreeve 1743. Nominated one of the eight tory trustees of the workhouse, he subscribed £50 to the scheme. See D.2. note 15.

6) James Chetham/Cheetham (1682-1752) of Smedley, sheriff of Lancashire 1730, influential whig JP. Himself nominated one of the eight whig trustees of the workhouse, he subscribed to the scheme £150, the largest sum.

7) James Bayley (1674-1753), merchant of Manchester, boroughreeve 1729. Two of his sons, Daniel (1699-1764) and Samuel (1717-1778) became trustees of Cross Street Chapel, and a daughter, Sarah married another trustee of the chapel, John Touchet (1704-1767). His second son, James Bayley (1705-1769) became whig spheriff of Lancashire 1757. Nominated one of the eight whig trustees of the workhouse, he with his sons subscribed £75 to the scheme.

8) Abraham Haworth, constable 1729, boroughreeve 1746. Nominated one of the eight whig trustees of the workhouse, he subscribed £20 to the scheme. See G.1. note 10.

9) Richard Taylor (-1737), merchant of Manchester, one of the first trustees of Cross Street Chapel. Nominated one of the eight presbyterian trustees of the workhouse, he subscribed £100 to the scheme.

10) Jonathan Lees (1676-1746), chapman of Manchester, trustee of Cross Street Chapel, boroughreeve 1736. Nominated one of the eight presbyterian trustees of the workhouse, he subscribed 15 guineas to the scheme.

be maintained and employed therein, for the Term of three years next, after the 25th Day of December¹¹⁾ next, and at the end of the said three years, the Trustees then being, shall make an Election in manner following, of 24 other Persons to succeed them, in the said Trust, (that is to say) each and every [of] the said electing Trustees, shall and may nominate and elect his and their own Successor and Successors, as he and they shall respectively think fit, which said new elected Persons shall be and continue Trustees, for the Purposes aforesaid; for and during one year only next after such Election, and at the end of the said year, and of every successive year, for ever thereafter, a new Election shall be made, by the old Trustees of 24 other succeeding Trustees, in the way and form aforesaid; Provided, nevertheless and it is agreed, that when or as often as any of the Trustees, to be elected by any of the ways aforesaid, shall happen to dye, after their respective Elections and before the times herein appointed, for general Elections, the place of such Person or Persons so dying, shall be filled up and supplied by such Person or Persons, as the major part of the surviving Trustees shall by Writing under their Hands, within one month next after such Vacancy, nominate and appoint. [Editor's para]

And it is hereby further consented to and agreed, that the first Trustees to be chosen as aforesaid, shall as soon as conveniently may be after their Election, apply for and use their best endeavours to obtain an Act of Parliament, for the forwarding and establishing the Intents and Trusts aforesaid; with such Clauses, Powers, Priviledges, Provisoos and Limitations, to be contained in the same Act, as the same Trustees or the major part of them, shall with the advice of Council [*sic*] learned in the Law think necessary and convenient, Nevertheless not altering the manner or times of electing Trustees before herein laid down and appointed, the Charge of which said Act and other expences, in and about obtaining the same shall and may be defrayed, and paid out of the Moneys raised by the Subscriptions hereto, and in the mean time the same Trustees or the major part of them and their Successors, shall and may from time to time make and appoint any and such Rules, Orders, Officers, Assistants and Sallaries, for the managing the Trust in them reposed, as they shall find proper and necessary, Provided always and nevertheless that the Persons subscribing hereto, shall not be obliged to pay any of their Subscription Money, until the Subscriptions hereunto amount to the Sum

11) 'October' in the MS at MSF 362.51.M1.

of two thousand Pounds, any thing herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding,
 In witness whereof we have hereunto set our Hands the twenty second day of October¹²⁾
 tertio Anno Regni Georgii Secund' Magnae Britan' & Anno Dom' 1729.

This Deed was subscribed by 94 Persons, whose Subscriptions amount to 2,043
 Pounds,¹³⁾ and 24 Trustees were appointed accordingly and near 600 Pounds hath been
 actually laid out in erecting a Work-house. But now some Persons that promoted and
 subscribed the above Articles, and the last year signed Petition, for an Act of Parlia-
 ment pursuant to the said Articles, are now opposing the same, although the 24 Trustees
 appointed are Gentlemen of unexceptionable Characters, and of good Fortunes.

[Printed endorsement] A Case for obtaining an Act of Parliament for erecting a
 Work-house for the better maintenance and employment of the Poor of
 Manchester.

*B. 2. The Case of the Petitioners against bringing in a Bill for Erecting a New
 Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, and establishing a perpetual Succession of
 Guardians for ordering the Relief and Employment of the Poor*

MaCL, L1/55/5/13(409)

BL, SPR. 356. m. 2. (101) another copy, 816. m. 15. (57)

cf. a MS copy at MaCL, MSF 362. 51. M1(1-2)

The Town of Manchester being no Corporation, is free and open for all Persons
 whatsoever to set up and exercise any Trade there; and to this the Improvement of the
 Manufactory, and the flourishing Condition of that Town, is greatly owing.

The Maintenance of the Poor there chiefly concerns the Land-Owners, who pay the
 Poor Rates for all Houses and Lands, except in some very few Instances, where the
 Tenants have long and beneficial Leases.

12) The date has often been misrepresented as 22 August. Byrom and his contemporaries some-
 times wrote 7^r for September, 8^r for October, 9^r for November, 10^r for December, and the latter
 three could be misread for August, September and October (r and t being sometimes indistin-
 guishable). A.W. Ward in *Poems*, II, ii, 587, should be corrected accordingly. R. Parkinson's
 dates in *Remains*, I, ii, 440, represent the reverse case. cf. page 37, note 19.

13) In the lists of subscribers and trustees (C. below) can be found 97 names and some of their sons
 and brothers. The subscriptions amount to £2219 10s.

The Poor are under the Care of three Churchwardens, who are annually elected by the Parish, for that Division which consists of the Town of Manchester¹⁾; and four Overseers, who are also annually appointed for that Town, by the Justices of the Peace for the County of Lancaster, out of the most substantial Inhabitants of the Town; and these Officers have hitherto discharged that Trust without the least Imputation of Partiality.

The Variety of Manufactures carried on in the Town, affords a constant Supply of Work to the Poor of both Sexes, of what Age soever; and therefore a Workhouse has not been thought so necessary there, as in Towns where no Manufacture is carried on.

But in October 1729, some few of the Traders designing, under specious Pretences of Charity, to gain and establish in themselves and Families a Power of raising Contributions on the Land-Owners and Inhabitants, for the Relief of the Poor; and disposing thereof; and thereby to ingross the Labour of the Poor, and employ them in their own Work, and at their own Rates; set on foot a Subscription for erecting a Workhouse, and obtaining an Act of Parliament for that Purpose; and in consequence of erecting this Workhouse, constituting Guardians, and making them a Corporation, they aimed to gain the Power of levying Money at Pleasure on the Land-Owners and Inhabitants, for maintaining and employing the Poor, and applying it to such Persons, and in such Manner as they should think proper; and by the express and unalterable Terms and Conditions of the Subscription, to perpetuate these Powers in their own Families and Friends; for by the Articles of the said Subscription, the first Guardians are to be chosen by Persons named in the Subscription Paper; and those Guardians, at three Years end, to name their Successors; and afterwards, at the end of every Year, the Guardians for one Year to name others for the next, successively for ever. <[Printed marginal note] *Vide* The Articles of the Subscription, printed with the Case of the Petitioners for the Bill.²⁾>

To this Subscription, some Persons who objected to these Terms, were prevailed on to sign, upon Assurance that nothing should be done or attempted, without the general Concurrence of the Town; others by seeing the Hands of the former; many unwarily, without considering the Terms; and more without so much as reading the Preamble; and by these means the whole Subscription amounted to 2000£.

Soon after which, the Promoters of this Scheme, tho' but about one Third of the

1) i. e. the township of Manchester (1,646 acres=6.67km²), which was coextensive with the Manchester division, one of the six divisions in the parish of Manchester (35,152 acres=142.4km²). *VCH, Lancashire* IV (1911), 174, 222.

2) i. e. B. 1.

Land-Owners had signed the Subscription, and notwithstanding the Assurances to have the general Concurrence of the Town, privately handed about a Petition to Parliament for a Bill to establish their Scheme, which was sent up last Year, but coming too late in the Session [1729-30], was not presented.

These Proceedings being discovered, occasioned a stricter Inquiry into the Design of the Promoters of this Scheme; and as many industrious People employed in the Manufactory of the Place, through Sickness and Misfortunes, frequently become necessitous for a Time and want Relief, it was easy to foresee, that if these Projectors could accomplish their Designs, and secure *A perpetual Succession of Guardians of the Poor in their own Families and Friends*, no other Trader would be able to procure any other Hands to work for him, but such as the Guardians should refuse to employ.

A Towns Meeting was therefore immediately called; and most of the Land-Owners and principal Inhabitants being there present, there appear'd almost a general Dislike to the Terms of the Subscription.

Soon afterwards, it being discovered that the intended Trustees were contracting for Materials for the building a Workhouse, a second Towns Meeting was held on the 16th of June last [1730], and most of the Subscribers were then present: And in order to gratify such as thought a Workhouse necessary, it was unanimously agreed that the present Churchwardens and Overseers should hire a Workhouse, to be manag'd as the Laws in being direct; and many then present subscribed this Resolution, and others were going to set their Names; but one of the Trustees declaring, that it being Unanimous, there was no need of subscribing Names, the rest desisted. A Workhouse was actually hir'd, pursuant to this Resolution; and the Poor are now maintain'd and employ'd therein.

Notwithstanding this, and tho' Eight of the Twenty-four intended Trustees declared they would not act in their Trust, and above one Third in Value of the Subscribers declared against proceeding any farther upon the intended Scheme, and that they would not be bound thereby, the rest of the intended Trustees thought fit to proceed with all Expedition to build a Workhouse, in hopes to make that some Pretence to apply to Parliament for a Bill to establish their Designs.

Thereupon a third Towns Meeting was regularly called and had on the 22d of December last [1730], at which there was a very great Appearance, tho' the Promoters of the Scheme did not think fit to attend; and a Copy of the Terms of the Subscription being then read and considered, the same was unanimously rejected.

And tho' the Promoters of the Scheme were in Treaty for an Accommodation with the rest of the Town, yet they privately got signed a Petition for a Bill in Parliament, which was not known to the rest of the Inhabitants, 'till the same was presented to, and appeared in the Votes of the House of Commons, otherwise many more concerned in Interest would have subscribed the Petition against the bringing in the Bill.

The Petitioners for the Bill appear to be only one sixth Part in Number and Value of the Inhabitants, who contribute to the Relief of the Poor.

They have not had the Consent of, or consulted the Town upon any Step they have taken; and therefore it is apprehended they ought not to conclude the rest of the Town by what they have thought fit to agree upon among themselves, at their private Meetings; especially since they are not equally concerned in point of Interest, being much inferior to the rest in all Respects.

[Printed endorsement] The Case of the Petitioners against bringing in a Bill for Erecting a Workhouse in the Town of Manchester, and establishing a perpetual Succession of Trustees for ordering the Relief and Employment of the Poor.

B. 3. *An Answer to the Case of the Petitioners against bringing in a Bill for erecting a New Work-house, in the Town of Manchester*

MaCL, L1/55/5/13(413)

It is admitted that the Town of Manchester being no Corporation, is free and open for all Persons whatsoever to set up and exercise any Trade there; And that to this the Improvement of the Manufactory and the flourishing Condition of that Town, is greatly owing.

And also that the Maintenance of the Poor, there chiefly concerns the Land Owners and Traders, who pay the Poor Rates for all Houses, Lands and personal Estates, except in some very few Instances, where the Tenants have long and beneficial Leases.

The Poor are under the Care of three Church Wardens and four Overseers, the first elected annually by the whole Parish, whose Inhabitants are vastly more numerous than those of the Town; And the latter nominated by the Justices of the Peace.

The Variety of Manufactures carried on in the Town, affords a constant supply of

Work to the Poor of both Sexes, but the known Idleness of such, was generally allowed as an unanswerable Argument to prove the Necessity of a Work-house, and urged as such by the now Opposers of the Bill.

Nothing can be more false than the base Suggestion of some few of the Traders, designing under specious pretences of Charity to seek their own Interest to the detriment of the Publick; And any Power which the Trustees are represented to aim at, by levying Money and raising Contributions at their Pleasure is also false, and not intended by the Deed (to which the Opposers refer)[.] And all the Power they shall have they desire may be limited with such Restrictions as shall be most for the publick Benefit of the Town, without a Possibility of making any Advantage to themselves, their Families or Successors thereby.

Some of the Gentlemen who were voluntarily Subscribers to the Deed for no less than Seven Hundred Pounds (but now Opposers) very unwarily happen'd to sign their Names by seeing former Hands theirto [sic], and without so much as reading the Preamble, and others of them signed in Hopes and Expectations that a Towns Meeting would let them loose again, as they seem to admit by their own Case. How absurde and trifling these Pretences are from Gentlemen of Reputation, let every one that reads them determine.

The Petition for a Bill in Parliament was so far from being privately handed about, that it was signed by several of the Gentlemen now opposing it, as well as other principal Inhabitants, tho' it had the Misfortune to come too late for the last Session.

To ingross any part of Trade by confining the Labour of the Poor to the Trustees, was never designed by them; Nay they are willing to be excluded from having any of their Goods manufactured in the Work-house, nor is such a Scheme practicable, which may be easily thus demonstrated.

The largest Sum that can ever be expected to arise from the Labour of the Poor in the Work-house (where no Person capable of maintaining himself, will ever come, or can be compell'd) will scarce amount to 400 Pound [sic] in a Year.

Now what Monopoly can ¹⁾ 24 Gentlemen make from the Labour of the Poor amounting to that Sum in a Town, that returns near 10,000 Pound *per* Week; And where Numbers of private Traders pay above 3,000 Pound *per Annum* for Labour.

1) See Byrom's diary for 21 Nov. 1730 (D. 2.).

There was no Towns Meeting at all had concerning a Work-house from the time of the Subscription, which was in October 1729 till the 16th of June following; At which Meeting the Necessity of an immediate Work-house being agreed to by all then present; It was unanimously consented that the Church Wardens and Overseers shou'd hire one for one Year only; not with any Intention to defeat the Subscription but to employ some of the Poor till a Work-house on that Foundation could be finished, and such hired Work-house, tho' useful in part, is so far from being sufficient for the Reception and Employment of the whole Poor of the Town, that not above Fifty Persons lodge therein, tho' the Poor are no less than Five Hundred in Number, and above 150 Pound *per Annum* is now paid by the Town, for their Habitations elsewhere.

Seven of the Eight Trustees who are said to declare against Acting in the Trust, continued long after the Subscription to meet and consult the rest; And one of the principal Subscribers and now a violent Opposer of the Bill,²⁾ was the chief Promoter and Director in building the new Work-house, and not two Months ago was consenting and assisting to prepare Heads for an Act, to establish the Trust.

The Towns Metting said to be regularly call'd and had on the 22d of December last, was a concerted Design to oppose the Bill, by getting together all the People they could raise, (some of them of the meanest Rank) and amusing them by Stories most palpably false; And preparing (as we were then informed and now appears) Memorandum ready drawn before the Meeting for them to sign, and that in so clandestine a manner that they were ashamed to enter it in the Towns Books, where the Transactions of regular Towns Meetings are constantly inserted; So that with good reason the Petitioners absented themselves from such an Assembly.

The Opposers of the Bill were so far from being ignorant of the Design of the Petitioners presenting their Petition to the House, that their Agents were sent up to oppose it before the Petition came up; And some of them were attending at the Door of the House, when the same was presented.

By an Abstract taken from the Poor's Books, it appears the Inhabitants of Manchester, who signed the Subscription Deed, and thereby engaged to use their utmost Endeavours to obtain an Act of Parliament to establish the Trust, pay towards the Poor

}	£ s. d. 509 : 11 : 8
---	-------------------------

2) Sir Oswald Mosley. See B. 1. note 2, and G. 1.

3) cf. Jeffrey Hart's evidence in the Commons committee (A. 6.).

And all the Petitioners against the Bill (exclusive of Subscribers) pay }
no more than } 267 : 17 : 10

So untrue is it that the Town has not been consulted upon the Subscription, that on the contrary this Affair has from the beginning been managed in the most publick manner by one of each Party, (after it was agreed by the Burrough Reeve [*sic*], Constables, Church Wardens and principal Inhabitants of the Town) going about to obtain a general Subscription, which Method one of the now Opposers advised, and the other Opposers publickly approved; And they themselves first began to put in Execution, nor is the Formality of a Towns Meeting ever accounted necessary or proper to obtain a charitable Subscription.

Upon the whole it plainly appears that the Twenty Six Subscribers, who now oppose the Bill, prevailed upon the other Subscribers to contribute the far greatest part of the 2,200 Pound, all or most of them first subscribing the Deed and consenting to the Terms, and afterwards perswading others to subscribe; And when a large Sum of Money had been laid out in erecting the Work-house, and a Petition prepared to apply to Parliament to establish the Trusts; Then do they in the most unreasonable manner oppose the obtaining an Act, and get together under pretence of a Towns Meeting all they could possibly influence to joyn them in that Opposition.

C. LISTS OF SUBSCRIBERS AND TRUSTEES

A copy of the subscription deed dated 22 October 1729, for erecting a workhouse at Manchester, as in the latter half of the document B. 1., is followed by lists of subscribers and trustees. On the right-hand side are added my notes: **W** for whig (Low Church) trustees of the workhouse, **T** for tory (High Church) trustees, **P** for presbyterian trustees.

MaCL, MSF 362. 51. M1

	£	
Sam[ue]l Cestriens	30	Samuel Peploe, bishop of Chester ¹⁾
James Cheetham	100	Chetham. W
John Lees	50	T
Tho[mas] Butterworth	100	P
Jos[ep]h Byrom	50	T
Ja[me]s Bayley & Sons	50	W boroughreeve
Jere[mia]h Bower	50	T
John Dickenson	10-10	head churchwarden
Tho[mas] Touchett	15-15	P
Rob[er]t Bowker	10	overseer of the poor
Isaac Clegg	15-15	P
Ab[raha]m Howarth	20	Haworth. W constable
Jon[atha]n Lees	15-15	P
Josiah Nichols	10-10	
John Illingworth	10-10	
Jos[ep]h Yates	50	W
Rich[ard] Taylor	50	P
Hen[ry] Booth	30	
Fran[cis] Davenport	10	
James Marsden	30	
Jos[ep]h Bancroft	20	
Tho[mas] Bradshaw	30	
Darcey Lever	50	T
W[illia]m Diggles	30	
Lichf[or]d Flitcroft	40	P
Edw[ard] Holbrook	10-10	
Dan[iel] Walker	40	P

1) Samuel Peploe (1668-1752), staunch whig and latitudinarian, was vicar of Preston (nominated by Sir Charles Hoghton, father of Sir Henry) 1700-26, warden of the Collegiate Church of Manchester 1718-38, and bishop of Chester 1726-52. His second wife was Ann, sister of John Birch, MP for Weobley 1701-35 and constant government whig. Of Peploe's daughters, Mary became third wife of Francis Jodrell (1690-1757), whig sheriff of Cheshire, and Ann married James Bayley (1705-1769), son of James Bayley (1674-1753). See D.2. note 34.

Edm[un]d Hopwood	50	(sheriff of Lancashire 1726)
Edm[un]d Nield	10-10	
John Lees	5-5	cf. another John Lees above
Sam[ue]l Taylor	5-5	
John Aldcroft	5-5	
Jos[eph] Vigor	20	
Rich[ard] Rothwell	5-5	
John Oliver	10-10	
James Sedgwick	10-10	
J. Wood for John Rigby	10-10	
Sam[ue]l Mellor	8-8	
Hugh Parr	10-10	W
Oswald Moseley	105	Mosley. W
Ann Bland	52-10	lady of the manor of Manchester
Edw[ar]d Cheetham	50	Chetham. W
Cha[rle]s Worseley	50	P
John Smith	15-15	
Pet[er] Rosbotham	15-15	
John Widows	15-15	
Rich[ard] Bury	10-10	
Sam[ue]l Birch	21	
Geo[rge] Croxton	15-15	
Rich[ard] Taylor	more 50	see above for £50
John Leech	10-10	
Ja[me]s Hilton	10-10	
Dan[iel] Walker	10	cf. another Daniel Walker above
Tho[mas] Kenworthy	10-10	
Jos[ep]h Jolley	10	
John Stockport	5-5	
John Kenworthy	10	
W[illia]m Dawson	10	
Rog[er] Sedgwick	50	(boroughreeve 1740)
Egerton Leigh	50	

Rob[ert] Evans	10-10	
Geo[rge] Leigh	15	
Tho[mas] Birch	15-15	
Ralph Royle	10	
Jos[ep]h Herd	10-10	
John Gandy	10-10	
Peter Heywood	10-10	
Rob[er]t Hibbert	10-10	
Ja[me]s & John Green	10-10	
John & Dan[ie]l Walker	10-10	cf. another Daniel Walker above
John Greaves	10-10	
John Seddon	10	
John Arderne	7-7	
W[illia]m Latus	10-10	
Law[rence] Wilson	10-10	
Tho[mas] Bent	3-3	
John Harrison	10-10	
Sam[ue]l Worthington	10-10	
Tho[mas] Leigh	10-10	
Nath[aniel] Eaton	10-10	
Sam[ue]l Clowes, for self and four brothers	50	(boroughreeve 1739)
Rob[ert] Birch	10-10	
James Edge	12-12	
Jo[] Byrom	15-15	John Byrom was not a subscriber (F. 7.)
Rich[ard] Millington	10-10	W
John Gorton	5-5	
John Holland	5-5	
John Stock	10-10	
Mich[ae]l Angier	10	
John Schole	10	
Jos[] Birch	10	
Sam[ue]l Ridings	15	

James Walker	10	
Tho[mas] Deacon	10-10	
W[illia]m Boardman	10	
Tho[mas] Dickenson	10	
Tho[mas] Partington	10	
Henry Wilson	10-10	
James Chetham	50	see above for £100
Jos[ep]h Yates	50	see above for £50
James Bayley	25	see above for £50

The 8 persons elected by Ja[me]s Chetham Esq., Mr. Ja[me]s Bayley, and Mr. Ab[raha]m Haworth²⁾ for the purposes within ment[ione]d pursuant to the within written Agree[men]t are —

Sir Oswald Moseley Bar³⁾
 Edward Chetham⁴⁾ } Esq^{res}
 James Chetham }
 Joseph Yates⁵⁾ }
 James Bayley
 Ab[raha]m Haworth
 Hugh Parr,⁶⁾ and
 Rich[ard] Millington⁷⁾

2) Chetham, Bayley and Haworth were noted whig families. See B.1. notes 6, 7 and 8.
 3) Sir Oswald Mosley. See B.1. note 2.
 4) Edward Chetham/Cheetham (1689-1769) of Nuthurst, barrister. 'A man of strong mind... quick in his profession', Edward inherited by 1762 the properties of all the branches of the Chethams. He died unmarried in 1769, when the male line of the Chethams became extinct: E. Axon, *Chetham Genealogies* (Chetham Society, 1903), 63-64.
 5) Joseph Yates (1690-1773) of Peel, sheriff of Lancashire 1727. Plaintiff in the lawsuit against Gamaliel Lloyd, etc. *re* the Manchester School Mills in 1730: PRO, DL 4/139.
 6) Hugh Parr, gentleman, employed John Kay as attorney: A.6. note 4. Parr was at the head of the list of defendants sued by Sir Oswald Mosley at the Duchy Court of Lancaster in 1735-36. See G.
 7) Richard Millington, gentleman. Not much is known of him.

The 8 persons elected by the Churchwardens of Manches[ter] for the same purposes and pursuant to the same Agree[men]t

Sir John Bland Bar ⁸⁾ t	*
Darcy Lever ⁹⁾	} Esq ^{res}
Rob[er]t Booth ¹⁰⁾	
Miles Nield ¹¹⁾	*
Jos[ep]h Byrom ¹²⁾	
John Lees ¹³⁾	
Jere[mia]h Bower ¹⁴⁾	
Ja[me]s Lightboun ¹⁵⁾	*

The 8 persons elected by Mr. Tho[mas] Butterworth, Mr. Rich[ard] Taylor, and Mr. Jon[atha]n Lees¹⁶⁾ for the same purposes and pursuant to the same Agree[men]t are,

Tho[mas] Butterworth
 Rich[ard] Taylor
 Dan[ie]l Walker¹⁷⁾
 Charles Worsley¹⁸⁾

-
- 8) Sir John Bland (1691-1743), 5th bart., only surviving son of Ann Bland (1664-1734), whig lady of the manor of Manchester (D.1. note 22). He was a Jacobite MP for Lancashire 1713-27. Though nominated one of the trustees of the workhouse, he and three others among the High Churchmen named below did not subscribe to the scheme (as marked*). See D. 4. (23 January 1731), and F. 1. for his vehement censure of Sir Oswald Mosley, his relative.
- 9) Darcy Lever (-1743), LLD, sheriff of Lancashire 1736, knighted 1737. Nominated one of the eight tory trustees of the workhouse, he subscribed £50 to the scheme, but later wanted to revoke the subscription. He married Dorothy, daughter of the Rev. William Assheton, rector of Prestwich (the patron of which was Sir Ralph Assheton: D.1. note 7).
- 10) Robert Booth (-1758), JP and patron of Trinity Chapel, Salford. Hanoverian tory.
- 11) Miles Nield (1670-1738), merchant, churchwarden of Manchester. He attended the meeting at Hawkswell's on 8 September and 17 November 1730. See F.13. (page 86).
- 12) Joseph Byrom, John Byrom's father-in-law. See D. (pedigree).
- 13) John Lees, merchant, churchwarden of St. Ann's Church, was present at Hawkswell's on 8 September and 17 November. Not to be confused with Jonathan and John Lees, presbyterians (B.1. note 10, and C. note 18).
- 14) Jeremiah Bower, haberdasher. See B.1. note 5.
- 15) James Lightboun/Lightbowne (1686-1747), son of Samuel Lightbowne, woollen draper. He was present at Hawkswell's on 8 September and 17 November.
- 16) Butterworth, Taylor and Lees belonged to important presbyterian families. See B.1. notes 4, 9 and 10.
- 17) Daniel Walker of Stand, merchant, trustee of Cross Street Chapel from 1713.
- 18) Charles Worsley (1676-1753) of Platt, son of Ralph Worsley (1647-1728), nonconformist. A daughter Deborah married John Lees (1710-1799), merchant and trustee of Cross Street Chapel.

D. DIARIES OF JOHN BYROM

John Byrom (1692-1763), second son of Edward Byrom (1656-1711), merchant gentleman of Manchester, was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, Trinity College, Cambridge, and at Montpelier. He married Elizabeth, daughter of Joseph Byrom (1659-1733), silk merchant, at the Collegiate Church of Manchester on 14 February 1721. Edward and Joseph were brothers. The couple had six children, including Elizabeth, or Beppy (1722-1801), diarist, and Edward (1724-1773), boroughreeve and founder of St. John's Church, Manchester. John's wife, Elizabeth died in 1778 at the age of 78. FRS in 1724, John Byrom left shorthand diaries, correspondence and poems.

The following are carefully compiled from 1) the text of *The Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byrom*, edited by Richard Parkinson, especially vol. I, part ii (1855), 2) the shorthand MSS at Chetham's Library, 3) excerpts by J. E. Bailey (John Byrom's Journal, Letters, &c.) published in *The Palatine Note-Book*, II (1882), and 4) fuller excerpts by A. W. Ward (Extracts from John Byrom's Journal, Letters, &c., 1728-1732) included as Appendix V of *The Poems of John Byrom*, vol. II, part ii (1895). Some criticisms and corrections are suggested in my notes.

D. 1. Diary at Manchester, June to September 1730

Poems, II, ii, 587-89

Also *Palatine Note-book*, II (1882), 91

and *Remains*, I, ii, 439-41

Saturday, June 13th.

Mr. Illingworth²⁾ and Mr. John Lees³⁾, our shorthand brother, called on me this morning to show me the subscription-paper, which I took from his reading, as on the other

Art Gallery, *John Byrom and the Manchester Jacobites* (Exhibition catalogue, 1951); and W. H. Thomson, *Previously Unpublished Byromiana relating to John Byrom* (Private publication, 1954), are of some help.

2) Thomas Illingworth, son of Robert Illingworth, of Hunt's Bank, Manchester, esq. was present at the meeting at Hawkswell's on 8 September and 17 November 1730. cf. F. 13. (page 86).

3) John Lees, tory merchant. See C. note 13.

⁴⁾ side. He came again after dinner, and desired me to go with him to Mr. Pigot, which I did. There were Mr. Darcy Lever, ⁶⁾ Sir Ralph Assheton, ⁷⁾ Mr. Sidebottom of Middleton, ⁸⁾ Mr. Illingworth; and we talked the matter over. Darcy Lever was against the scheme of a subscription, but, because he had set his hand to it, seemed less willing to unsettle it, as it were; and we agreed that, if he had been unwarily led into it, or upon better consideration saw reason to alter his opinion, he need not stick to say so, or set his hand to better judgment to overthrow his former mistakes. I quoted the case of a man approving of inoculation, and upon further view disapproving of it. They had a meeting after at Hawkswell's in the Square, where I went; but came away, because they were not come (the rest of 'em, and Mr. Lloyd and Houghton were at my house drinking tea, it being my son Edward's birthday

Sunday, 14th.

Mr. Pigot's man came here about noon, and desired me to come to his house I dressed and went there, where were Mr. Illingworth and Dickenson, ¹²⁾ and they read me a paper which Mr. Pigot had drawn up, to be printed to disperse among the parishioners to-morrow, being reasons against the subscription project. All that I said to him as to these matters always, was to forbear personal reflexions as much as possible, and come

4) Not extant?

5) Thomas Pigot (1693-1770), barrister, steward of the Court Leet of Manchester, recorder of Clitheroe. He married Elizabeth, youngest sister of Sir Ralph Assheton (-1765). A friend of John Byrom and one of the most instrumental in procuring the failure of the intended workhouse bill. See F. 1, 3, 9, 11, and 13.

6) Darcy Lever, tory trustee of the workhouse. See C. note 9.

7) Sir Ralph Assheton (-1765), bart., of Middleton, sheriff of Lancashire 1739. He married Mary (-1737), daughter of Sir Holland Egerton of Heaton, tory country gentleman; and secondly Eleanor, daughter of the Rev. John Copley, High Churchman (D. 4. note 16).

8) The Rev. Samuel Sidebottom, rector of Middleton (the patron, Sir Ralph Assheton) 1714-52.

9) Not Hickswell or Hkswell [*sic*] as in *Poems*, II, ii, 588; or *Palatine Note-book*, II, 91. John Hawkeswell/Hawkswell was constable 1731, boroughreeve 1744. Byrom and his friends frequented the Hawkswell's in the square by St. Ann's Church, which was consecrated in 1712. See D. 1. note 22.

10) Gamaliel Lloyd (-1749), merchant. He was present at Hawkswell's on 8 September and 17 November 1730. One of the nine defendants in the Manchester School Mills case 1730. cf. F. 17.

11) John Houghton (-1794) of Baguley (Ches.), was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He married Mary' (1711-1756), daughter of Joseph Byrom (1659-1733), and sister of Elizabeth, John Byrom's wife. See D. 6. note 21.

12) John Dickenson (1689-1779), influential tory merchant and then head churchwarden of Manchester, subscribed 10 guineas to the workhouse scheme. Present at Hawkswell's on 8 September and 17 November 1730. Patron of Birch Chapel, boroughreeve 1749. Charles Stuart, the Young Pretender, stayed at his town house in 1745. cf. D. 3. (page 47) and D. 6. (page 60).

to the point. He wrote out the paper fair, and sent it in the afternoon by his man, for me to read. I mentioned to them, when they called here after church, to wit Messrs. Dickenson, Illingworth, Thomas Clowes and Pigot,¹³⁾ that I observed there was no provision for the trustees after 3 years being in the communion of the Church of England;¹⁴⁾ and Mr. Pigot made that another article in the second place....

July 1st.

... Sunday night, at Father Byrom's,¹⁵⁾ Mr. Dickenson and young Mr. J. Lees brought the following paper,¹⁶⁾ and Mr. Dickenson subscribed it, being to go up to town to-morrow morning. I was desired to draw up a shorter form; and Friday after I drew this: — 'Whereas the project of some particular persons for erecting a public building in the town of Manchester was rejected at a public meeting of the inhabitants of the said town,¹⁷⁾ without whose consent any undertaking of that nature would be injurious and of ill tendency; And whereas at the said public meeting it was carried, *nem[ine] con[tradiciente]*, that a proper house should be hired for the employment of the poor according to the laws in being (and the practice of other places), and a proper house has been hired accordingly: We, the underwritten subscribers to the said project, who know the ill use that may be made of it, would have nothing done in this matter in opposition to the unanimous wish of the said inhabitants (to which we adhere), do hereby revoke our several subscriptions, the reasons and obligations of which we conceive to be entirely ceased'. The faults you find in the paper on the side in the words 'some of us'; 'surprised into a subscription'; 'unknown powers'; 'for that purpose'; 'or at first we'll disown intention'.

[Early] July.

Mr. Salkeld here from Doncaster on Wednesday noon; Dr. D.,¹⁸⁾ Mrs. D., Mrs.

13) Thomas Clowes, gentleman, married Margaret, daughter of Miles Nield (C. note 11). Treasurer of Mrs. Catherine Richards' Charity 1728-34, constable 1747. He attended the meeting at Hawkswell's on 8 September 1730. J. E. Bailey in *Palatine Note-book*, II, 91, takes the name for Darcy Lever.

14) See the subscription deed in B.1. and F.1.

15) i.e. John Byrom's father-in-law, Joseph Byrom (1659-1733), a successful silk merchant and boroughreeve of Manchester 1703. John Byrom's own father, Edward, died in 1711. Joseph was nominated one of the eight tory trustees of the workhouse, and subscribed £50 to the scheme (C. note 12). He was present at Hawkswell's on 8 September and 17 November 1730.

16) Not extant?

17) A town meeting on 16 June 1730 is referred to in B.2., B.3. and A.6.

18) Dr. Thomas Deacon (1697-1753), nonjuror and physician, was sometimes addressed as 'grand seigneur'. Himself and three sons were active Jacobites during the rebellion of 1745.

B[yrorn], and I went with him to see the workhouse on Thursday.

September ¹⁹⁾ 8th.

At Ancoats last night with Mr. Booth, ²¹⁾ Lady Bland, ²²⁾ Jenny, ²³⁾ and Mrs. Lunt; ²⁴⁾ I came home with them in the coach after nine o'clock, and went then to Mr. Lees', where were Mr. Cranage and ²⁵⁾ Wilson from London. Sir Oswald lent me a pamphlet, *Hist. Egyptiens*, ²⁶⁾ part of Rollin's.

September 9th, Wednesday.

Last night at Hawkeswell's, Mr. Lloyd, ²⁷⁾ Lees, ²⁸⁾ Lightboun, ²⁹⁾ Nield, Walker, Pigot, Kenyons T. and G., ³⁰⁾ Dickenson, Illingworth, ³¹⁾ Clowes Tom, Jos[eph] Byrom, and Sir Oswald Mosley, where the workhouse matter was debated. But Sir Os[wald] much the same, *viz.* for opposing unreasonable powers, but for accommodating; I repeated, 'Ribs thirty-three this D—n had he', ³²⁾ &c.

D. 2. Manchester, November 1730

Poems, II, ii, 603-14

Also *Palatine Note-book*, II, 95

-
- 19) For reasons given in B. 1. note 12, 'November' in *Remains*, I, ii, 440, should read September.
- 20) i. e. Sir Oswald Mosley's seat in Manchester. See B. 1. note 2.
- 21) Robert Booth of Salford. See C. note 10.
- 22) Lady Ann Bland (1664-1734), daughter of Sir Edward Mosley (1618-1695), married Sir John Bland (-1715) in 1685. She was the lady of the manor of Manchester from 1695 to her death, and resided at Hulme Hall. Latitudinarian and whig, she founded in 1709 St. Ann's Church in Manchester (consecrated 1712), quarrelled with Francis Gastrell (1662-1725), High Church bishop of Chester from April 1714 to 1725. She subscribed 50 guineas to the workhouse scheme. Sir John Bland (C. note 8) was her son.
- 23) Jane, wife of George Leycester (D. 2. note 37), and elder sister of Sir Oswald Mosley.
- 24) Thomas Lunt was steward of the manor of Manchester.
- 25) Cranage and Wilson, unidentified.
- 26) Charles Rollin, *Histoire ancienne des Egyptiens . . . et des Grecs*, 13 tomes (Paris, 1730-38).
- 27) James Lightboun, tory trustee of the workhouse. See C. note 15.
- 28) Miles Nield, tory merchant. See C. note 11.
- 29) James Walker, gentleman of Manchester, boroureeve 1726, father of James Walker (1719-1789), MD, FRS. Not to be confused with Daniel Walker and his family: C. note 17.
- 30) The Kenyons were a legal family of Lancashire. Thomas Kenyon (1668-1731) of Salford, was grandfather of Lloyd, first Lord Kenyon (1732-1802), MP and chief justice of King's Bench. Thomas's nephew George Kenyon (1702-1780) of Peel, was son of George (1665-1728), tory MP for Wigan. The younger George was barrister and clerk of the peace for Lancashire from 1728. See D. 3. note 27, and F. 1.
- 31) i. e. Thomas Clowes, see note 13 above.
- 32) The verses are not extant. See *Poems*, II, ii, 578, and D. 2. note 34.

Thursday, November 5th.

Mr. Legh¹⁾ Master, and Mr. Bold²⁾ and his wife, came to town last night; I called at the Bull's Head³⁾, but did not go into his room....

Last night I was with Mr. [Darcy] Lever at Dr. Deacon's. Brother Josiah⁴⁾, Mr. J. Lees⁵⁾, Stringer, Nield, Dick[enson], here with the copy of the scheme for the workhouse act, about which he spoke to Mr. Master this morning.

Friday, November 13th.

... Mr. Pigot met me in the street, and told me that they had gained a point last night upon Sir Os[wald] Mosley, who had promised to oppose the workhouse. Messrs. Hunter⁶⁾, Vigor⁷⁾, Nield there. Messrs. Thomas and John Clowes⁸⁾ here this afternoon; ... I was at Dr. D[eaco]n's a little time. The grand seigneur's deposing Canterbury case⁹⁾. At Mr. Legh's, where Mr. Fielden¹⁰⁾ was and Mr. Shrigley¹¹⁾ came. Young Mr. Shrigley said Sir Oswald Mosley had promised to oppose¹²⁾ the act for the workhouse, and to come away. That old Mr. Reynolds had sent a silver font to Strangeways¹³⁾. Mr. Legh said, the words¹⁴⁾ of the Canterbury act that said the profits should go to the workhouse, were left out.

November 16th.

-
- 1) Legh Master, tory MP for Newton. See A.8. note 4.
 - 2) Peter Bold (?1705-1762), tory MP for Wigan 1727-34, and for Lancashire 1736-41 and 1750-61.
 - 3) Bull's Head Inn, in Market Place, Manchester.
 - 4) Josiah Byrom (1708-1740), the youngest brother of Elizabeth, John Byrom's wife.
 - 5) Thomas Stringer (?1701-), gentleman of Manchester, one of the deponents in the Duchy Court of Lancaster 1735. See G.
 - 6) William Hunter, one of the commissioners of St. Ann's Church 1719.
 - 7) Joseph Vigor, married Ann Allen, niece of Edward Byrom (1656-1711), and cousin of John Byrom.
 - 8) John Clowes appears in 1734 as treasurer of Mrs. Catherine Richards' charity. MaCL, M3/5/2A(5).
 - 9) 1 George II, st. 2, cap. 20 (1728): An act for erecting a workhouse in the city of Canterbury for employing and maintaining the poor there, and for better enlightning the streets of the said city.
 - 10) Henry Legh (1679-1757) of High Legh (Ches.), whig after 1714: Baskerville. His son George Legh (1703-1780) had considerable property in Manchester. See page 45 (9 January 1731).
 - 11) Robert Fielden/Feilden, constable of Manchester 1733.
 - 12) William Shrigley (-1739), prominent tory attorney and one of the first churchwardens of St. Ann's, Manchester. His son William (?1692-1756) was chaplain of the Collegiate Church.
 - 13) Wrongly transcribed as 'open' in *Poems*, II, ii, 607.
 - 14) Strangeways, to the north of Manchester, was a seat of Thomas Reynolds (-1741), director of the South Sea Company 1715-22. The charity of the late Mrs. Catherine Richards (of Strangeways) was founded in 1711, when Reynolds inherited the seat. MaCL, M1/10 & M3/5/2A; Hindle, 154-55, 169. See note 38 (page 43) below. His only son Francis (-1773) was MP for Lancaster 1745-73, 'thoroughly attached to the Pelhams'.

Good Madam, take care of this, and particular of the pitchfork; I would not pay 100 guineas for it. Mr. Pigot says he thinks that the agents for the bill have enough of it

Wednesday, November 18th.

Last night, Mr. Bower¹⁵⁾ called on me with regard to a house [Hawkswell's] in the Square. There were Messrs. Nield, Lightbowne, Pigot, Kenyon, Illingworth, Lloyd, Dickenson, Father Byrom, Lees, Bonner[?], &c., and I. They met to consult what measures to take in respect to the workhouse. Mr. Dickenson told us what Sir Edward Stanley¹⁶⁾ had said upon the journey that he had taken to see him: that he had thought there was no manner of occasion for any act of Parliament; that the Court had a pique against him; that he had wrote to Mr. Chetham¹⁷⁾ that it was not fit to give such powers to the trustees; that the Bishop had done what he could by representing the town as disaffected; that Mr. Shrigley's letter last year had puzzled them, wherein he had written, that only a few presbyterians had signed a petition that was signed by many Churchmen, that they were much in the wrong about the subscription, that is to say, for subscribing.

It was agreed that Mr. Parker¹⁹⁾ should retain Mr. Fazakerly²⁰⁾, and also [whom] Mr. Fazakerly would have with him. Pigot mentioned Sir John Darnal²¹⁾, and I said I knew him and many other Members [of Parliament]. They desired I would undertake to manage matters, for which I should be a proper person; but I said I looked upon this endeavour to procure an act to be of bad consequence to the town, if it succeeded, and therefore was ready to do anything to prevent if I could; that, when I was in London, I sometimes had an opportunity of talking about such things in private, which often went a great way. Uncle Parker was mentioned for solicitor. Lord Derby²²⁾, Mr. Legh²³⁾ of

15) Jeremiah Bower, a treasurer and tory trustee of the workhouse. See B. 1. note 5.

16) Sir Edward Stanley, opposition MP. See A. 3. note 1.

17) For James Chetham, see B. 1. note 6, and the lists(C). For Edward Chetham, see C. note 4.

18) Samuel Peploe, bishop of Chester 1726-52. See C. note 1.

19) John Parker, sheriff of Lancashire 1732. His uncle Thomas Parker (1666-1732) was first Earl of Macclesfield, and Lord Chancellor 1718-25.

20) Nicholas Fazakerley (?1685-1767), barrister and tory MP for Preston 1732-67, married Anne, daughter of Sir Thomas Lutwyche. See D. 6. note 11. He worked as counsel in defence of *The Craftsman* in 1731. See G. 1.

21) Sir John Darnall (1672-1735), serjeant-at-law, knighted 1724. In 1727 his daughter Mary married Robert Ord (1700-1778), barrister and MP, opposition whig. See D. 3. (8 Jan. 1731).

22) James Stanley (-1736), 10th Earl of Derby.

23) Peter Legh (1669-1744) of Lyme, Cheshire, nonjuror and Jacobite. Newton was a pocket borough of the Legh family. It has often been mislocated as on the foldout maps in E. Porritt, *Unreformed House of Commons*, I (1903); D. Horn & M. Ransome (eds), *English Historical Documents*, X (1957). See *VCH, Lancashire*, III (index map); IV, 132.

Lyme, Lord Galway, by Pigot, Warrington, &c. I had written by their direction at top of a paper, We whose names, &c. being named²⁴⁾ as trustees. After that, I said I did not know but it might be as well to write only the names of the gentlemen who are for having an act of Parliament, and the names of those who are not. They said that would do. I promised I would go to pay Sir Oswald Mosley a visit to-morrow, to try to get his hand.

At about 5 o'clock I went to go to Ancoats, but met Sir Oswald Mosley by Mr. Yates' house,²⁶⁾ and told him that I was going to pay him a visit. He asked me if I would see the workhouse; and so we went there, where we talked the matter over; and upon the whole, if it was referred to him, he would soon say, whether he was for an act or not. 'If it was referred to you', said I, 'you would say "no", would you not?' 'Yes, I would', said he. He showed me a scheme of an act of his drawing. I told him that the town were against an act at all; that it was in vain to think of moderating this matter at all. It was act or no act; that he seemed to be against any act at all, upon the whole, and therefore I would have him to be hearty on the matter, since his name would go a great way. He said, if two madmen should meet, must he take part, and be mad too? I said 'no', but he would let the madmen destroy each other, when we could take one side off by declaring his mind. I told him it was the Trojan [horse] . . .

We were together at the Merchants' Coffee-house,²⁷⁾ after he had been home with them on the other side, he and I and Will[iam] Shrigley, — and he was too much by one. He gave his hand to these words, that 'the trustees shall have nothing to do with the town money, but will act only as managers of a parish charity',²⁸⁾ under which he wrote, 'I think this is very reasonable. Oswald Mosley'.

Mr. Pigot and he drank a bottle of wine with me on Friday evening after, and he seemed to be more willing to oppose the act; but still, if they would alter it, he thought it better. Told us that he had told them that they could not succeed as it is; that if they pretended to meddle with the town money, or to set up a monopoly, he would

24) John Monckton (1695-1751), first Viscount Galway [Irish], MP for Clitheroe 1727-34, government whig.

25) George Booth (1675-1758), 2nd Earl of Warrington. See D. 4. note 32.

26) Joseph Yates, whig trustee of the workhouse. See C. note 5.

27) Merchants' Coffee House, Market Place, Manchester.

28) cf. MaCL, M1/18 (Deeds in the boroughreeve's chest) & M3/2/1 (An account of several charities given for the use of the poor of Manchester, 14 Dec. 1731).

oppose them heartily, and his brother Thornhaugh;²⁹⁾ and he mentioned Tom White,³⁰⁾ Sir G. Heather,³¹⁾ and he said he had hinted to them that they would make a monopoly business of it, if they were not opposed. . . . Mentioned Mr. Chetham the justice acting cunningly

Saturday morning, November 21st.

Sir Oswald Mosley and Mr. Pigot here last night, talking about the workhouse Mr. Dickenson and Dr. Deacon, who stayed till eleven, we till twelve. Mr. Dickenson said their side not so hearty as they should be.

Reading Virgil's story of the Trojan horse, *Aen[eid]*, II. 46-48:

Aut haec in nostros fabricata est machina muros,

Inspectura domos, venturaque desuper urbi,

Aut aliquis latet error.

'Either this machine is contrived against our liberties, to down our fences, to inspect our houses, to come over our town, or else there is some other mischief concealed in it'. So said the true-hearted Trojan Laocoon, when he saw 110 of his townsmen considering, whether they should admit and suffer the famous wooden horse, which the Greeks had brought to obtain their own ends, for their own destruction to come into Troy their town, or not. And so said accordingly this act of the projected building a workhouse, which I hear the inhabitants view the same with reference to the town of Manchester, disputing about whether there is some mischief or other at the bottom of it. 'At the bottom' say you? Yea, at the very top, and most visible on the surface of it. The mischief designed and intended by this wooden horse of ours, is written on the outside of it in characters one should think sufficiently legible and intelligible. Looking at the front of it, if your eyes are open and true, and see in gold letters the Greek word³²⁾ 'Monopoly'³³⁾! Look at the left side of it! Look at the face of it, where the Greeks

29) —Thornhaugh, son of John Thornhaugh (1648-1723) and brother of Elizabeth, who married Sir Oswald Mosley in 1703. cf. F. 4.

30) Possibly Thomas White (1696-1776), MD, son of Thomas White (-1702), attorney. His son Charles White (1728-1813), surgeon and FRS, was instrumental in founding the Infirmary (1752) and the Literary and Philosophical Society (1781) of Manchester.

31) Possibly Sir Gilbert Heathcote (1652-1733), merchant, repeatedly director and governor of the Bank of England, MP, lord mayor of London. Government whig and 'one of the richest commoners of his time'.

32) An allusion to the whigs (or the alliance of Low Churchmen and Dissenters).

33) See B. 2. (page 23) for 'a perpetual succession of guardians of the poor in their own families and friends'; B. 3. (page 25) and D. 3. (page 46) for 'monopoly'.

profess themselves to be the principal inhabitants and proprietors of Troy; under the heart of it I perceive in gold letters the Greek word 'Monopoly', under the second and third ribs, 'a Corporation of Greeks for ever'. For wise men of Greece should examine all Trojans upon oath — a Corporation of Greeks for ever.

The dissection of the dragon lately brought to Manchester College by the operator³⁴⁾. When the Committee dissected it, it was surprised with the sight of a shapeless monster, and could make neither head nor tail of it, there was so much stuff about it.

Tuesday, November 24th.

At the Library after dinner with Dr. Mainwaring to see the new books that were come in . . . Mr. Lever there. Went home from thence. Sir Oswald Mosley called at our house for me. I saw him hereafter at the Merchants' Coffee-house, and he took me upstairs, and gave me this copy of an act of Parliament for the workhouse of his own drawing, desiring me to consider it.

[A draft bill *re* Manchester workhouse?]

Wednesday, November 25th.

Morning, great parlour. Considering Sir Oswald Mosley's paper which he gave me November 24th, 1730.

Saturday, November 28th.

On Wednesday 3 o'clock Sir Oswald Mosley called on me, and we walked to Strangeways, where were Mrs. Mosley—My Lady, I should say—and her daughter and two Miss Leycesters.³⁷⁾ Sir Oswald and I drank a bottle together by ourselves, and talked about the act of Parliament and workhouse . . .

34) The 'operator', or Samuel Peploe, whig warden of Manchester and bishop of Chester, nominated Henry Brooke (1694-1757) as the only whig fellow of the Collegiate Church on 8 June 1728. The college, or the chapter, predominantly High Church, had been in a state of disobedience since Peploe became warden in 1718, and involved in active dispute after he was nominated bishop of Chester in 1726 while holding the wardenship *in commendam*. Byrom, a High Churchman, here regards Brooke, 'the lately brought dragon', as insignificant and 'shapeless'. cf. 'Ribs thirty-three this Dragon...' in D. 1. (page 37).

35) Chetham's Library, founded by the will and endowment of Humphrey Chetham (1580-1653), merchant of Manchester. For its Librarians, Francis Hooper and Robert Thyer, see D. 4. note 15, and F. 19. note 5.

36) Peter Mainwaring (1696-1785), MD, educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, later an influential whig gentleman of the town. Honorary physician to the Infirmary, first president of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester.

37) The two misses were daughters of George Leycester of Toft (Ches.), who married Jane, sister of Sir Oswald Mosley: D. 1. note 23. George's son Ralph Leycester (1699-1777) was a friend of John Byrom. See their correspondence in F. 5. and 16.

Yesterday Mrs. Malyn sent to me to desire I should go with them to Strangeways in their sister's coach. So, having forgot to mention Mrs. Banks the last time with them, I mentioned him this; and Mr. Reynolds gave me his word and honour that Mrs. Banks should have the second Poor Widow's place that was vacant, if she were qualified, the first being promised to a tenant's wife that had done the family great service, &c.

Being at the Merchants' Coffee-house, Sir Oswald Mosley sent for me up-stairs and talked with me about the act. Told me, he thought of communicating it to some of the gentlemen, that we should wait on him on Monday. I called at Mr. Lees', and afterwards supped there, and stayed till about eleven o'clock. They were examining at the Merchants' Coffee-house a letter to be sent to Hamer [?], threatening to fire his house, murder him, if he did not pay money. It is morning, Josiah here. He took Sir Oswald Mosley's act for his reading

D. 3. London, unless otherwise stated, December 1730 to 22 January 1731

Remains, I, ii, 441-53

Lichfield, December 27th.

This morning we came from Wolsley Bridge [Staffs.]. Mr. Dawson¹⁾ and Webb, who set out before us. (I met with Mr. Sandford²⁾ and gave him an act or bill about work-house.) Meriden [Warws.], 'What have I to do with the ship? I am only a passenger, &c.'³⁾

38) Mrs. Mary Banks appears from 1735 among the twenty widows to whom £1 5s each was distributed half-yearly from the Catherine Richards' (Strangeways) Charity in the churchwardens' account. MaCL, M3/5/2A(7)-. See note 14 (page 38) above.

1) William Dawson, corn merchant and tenant of the School Mills, Manchester.

2) Possibly John Stafford, attorney of Macclesfield, who was active in 1759 in relation to 'a bill for discharging the inhabitants of Manchester from the custom of grinding all their corn and grain at the School Mills'. LaRO, DDKe/9/109; WaRO, Diaries of Sir Roger Newdigate, February-March 1759, *passim*.

3) John Aikin quotes Byrom's 'first letter' from London, in his possession: . . . We are not of the man's humour, who being on board a ship at sea, and a storm arising, and being desired to work a little, for that the ship was in danger of being sunk, replied, "What have I to do with the ship? I am but a passenger". We look upon ourselves embarked in the *good ship Manchester*, and whenever we apprehend her in the least danger, are ready to work as hard as if we were never so considerable sharers in her cargo. We profess a love and service to the fellow inhabitants of our country, although we should not have a foot of land in it, not measuring our affection for our brethren by our's or their acres, but by justice, kindness, and liberty'. *A Description of the Country from Thirty to Forty Miles round Manchester* (1795), 215-16.

London, at Abingdon's,⁴⁾ December 31st.

Yesterday Capt. Campbell,⁵⁾ Mr. Dawson and I came to London from Manchester, having lain at Holmes Chapel [Ches.], Wolsley Bridge, Meriden, Towcester [Northants.], St. Albans [Herts.], we came to London about one o'clock to Blossoms Inn, the Captain and I ate a beefsteak there, and I gave him a copy of the bill for the workhouse, and he gave me direction to William Campbell Esq.⁷⁾ at Forrest's Coffee-house,⁸⁾ Charing Cross. He said he would introduce me to Lord Isla about my shorthand, I showed him Mrs. Mort's letter written in it, talked with him about the act, and desired his interest. I drank tea at cousin Chaddock's¹⁰⁾ and stayed a good while, Mrs. Foster there; called at Mrs. Rathbone's, George Lloyd¹¹⁾ not come to town, expected on Friday; thence to Dick's,¹²⁾ saw M. Folkes and Parkyns going out, Folkes said I looked cursed thin; Johnson there,¹³⁾ he and I supped at the King's Arms,¹⁴⁾ had a bottle of wine and a piece of cod, the bill was 5s. 1d. with cheese only, he would pay his half crown, did, and I told him of the ten guineas I had of his and which I would deliver upon demand, for I would not have them. He said he had been at the Duke of Montagu's,¹⁷⁾ with whom Lord Herbert, Char-

4) Until 1 June next Byrom stays at Abingdon's. 'Abington's, near Gray's Inn Gate, Holborn': Lillywhite. See D. 6. (13 May).

5) Unidentified.

6) Blossoms Inn in Lawrence Lane, near Cheapside: Rocque.

7) William Campbell, cousin of Archibald Campbell, Earl of Islay (note 9 below).

8) Forrest's Coffee House, opposite the Mews Gate, Charing Cross, 'used for masonic lodge meetings': Lillywhite, though earlier than his earliest date.

9) Archibald Campbell (1682-1761), first Earl of Islay 1705, third Duke of Argyll 1743. Walpole's chief adviser in Scotland.

10) N. Chaddock, a cousin of Byrom?

11) George Lloyd (?-1783) of Queens' College, Cambridge, eldest son of Gamaliel Lloyd. See D. 1. note 10.

12) Dick's or Richard's Coffee House, Fleet Street near Temple Bar. '... and popt my head into Dicks Coffee House, where I found a cluster of honest country gentlemen....' *The Craftsman*, 23 December 1727.

13) Martin Folkes (1690-1754), vice-president of the Royal Society 1723, president 1741, president of the Society of Antiquaries 1750.

14) Possibly Sir Thomas Parkyns (1664-1741) of Trinity College, Cambridge, JP in Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire.

15) Samuel Johnson (1691-1773), a native of Cheshire, produced *Hurlothrumbo* in 1729 at Haymarket, London. 'A wit, musician, player... a dancing master too': Epitaph at Gawsworth (Ches.), in J. P. Earwaker, *East Cheshire, Past and Present*, II (1880), 570-71.

16) King's Arms Inn, Holborn Bridge near Fleet Market: Rocque.

17) John Montagu (?1688-1749), 2nd Duke of Montagu.

18) Henry Herbert (?-1738), 2nd Baron Herbert of Cherbury, son of a zealous Whig peer.

¹⁹⁾ les Stanhope, Martin Folkes were, they had had much talk about me; I gave him an act to show to Charles Stanhope and told him that if he was for that, I would not see him, but otherwise, would wait upon him, for he was desirous to see me, Johnson said . . .

January 8th, 1731.

Friday, 2 o'clock, at Richard's.²⁰⁾ I have not writ daily, and now will recollect together, or backwards, as:

Rose at 12; went to Mr. Parker's to talk about the bill, but he had company, and not much information. The town he said had fee'd Fazakerly and Strange,²¹⁾ and the party Darnal, for which I was sorry because of Bob Ord.²²⁾ He thought they would begin in the House of Lords. Thence to Hanmer's,²³⁾ at home . . .

Thursday, 7th: Rose 11; went to Richard's . . . thence to the Royal Society. Hawksbee gave me a letter and £8 5s. arrears, the letter was that bonds would be put in suit; I shall enquire of Mr. Folkes how the matter is, and pay accordingly.²⁴⁾ Saw at the Society and spoke to Mr. Sloane, Graham, Hawksbee, Graham junior, Nesbit;²⁵⁾ a long lecture about Chinese chronology [characters] . . .

Saturday, 9th.

I passed by Kent's, and G. Legh spoke to me from the window and desired me to dine there, and I did so because I wanted to speak to Mr. Legh his father²⁶⁾ about the bill. I told Mr. Legh that I was desired to speak to him by the Manchester people; he said he had seen the printed copy of the bill, and did not see anything wrong in that. He

19) Charles Stanhope (1673-1760), whig MP 1717-41, was charged in the South Sea Bubble 1721. Secret enemy of Walpole since 1727.

20) i. e. Dick's Coffee House. See note 12 above.

21) John Strange (1696-1754), barrister, pupil of William Salkeld (1671-1715). Later Solicitor General, knighted 1740, MP and Master of the Rolls. cf. page 58.

22) Robert Ord (1700-1778), barrister and MP for Mitchell 1734-41, most intimate friend and legal adviser of Pulteney, the opposition leader. For Darnall, see D. 2. note 21.

23) Sir Thomas Hanmer (1677-1746), Speaker of the House of Commons 1714-15, Hanoverian tory.

24) Francis Hauksbee (1687-1763) was clerk and housekeeper of the Royal Society from 1723. Sir Hans Sloane (1660-1753), president of the Royal Society (1727-41), made a proposition in 1728 to sue fellows in arrear of their payments, and in consequence an act was obtained in 1731. C. R. Weld, *A History of the Royal Society* (1848), I, 458-62. John Byrom, FRS, had been in debt to the Society until 1741, when he wrote: 'I have the honour to be known that I am ready to discharge the bond which I gave to the Society': John Byrom (Manchester) to Francis Hauksbee (Fleet Street), 25 May 1741. BL, Add. MS. 6180, f. 138. Byrom's elder brother Edward died on 12 May 1740, unmarried, hence John inherited what his father had left, and was able to come out of financial stringency.

25) George Graham (1673-1751) and Robert Nesbitt (-1761) were fellows of the Royal Society.

26) Henry Legh of High Legh and his son George. See D. 2. note 10.

spoke to me after dinner, and I gave him a copy and commented thereupon, and he and George were against a monopoly, and he desired me to give his service to the Manchester gentlemen and tell them that he for his part should be out of town soon, that it must stand or fail by the justice of it. I argued much for a fair election, saying that if the present trustees were angels, their successors might be devils by the same reason. I wrote to Mr. [Gamaliel] Lloyd that I had been with Mr. Legh, and that I had learned to construe *salus populi* — ‘No Monopoly’. Mr. Ken²⁷⁾[yon] came to Richard’s to-night and spoke to me, and I gave him a bill and desired his opinion, which he promised . . .

Friday night, 15th.

. . . This morning a letter from Mr. Lloyd, says that Sir O[swald] Mosley was against a bill and had writ to Lord Warrington to oppose it, and that they had had another bill from London of worse tendency than the first.

Thursday, 14th.

Mr. Johnson called here to tell me that Charles Stanhope had desired me to come to his house to-night at 8 o’clock. Mr. Lloyd and Houghton met me in Chancery Lane, and we went to Mr. Booth’s, the Duke of Montagu’s steward, to dinner, had a venison pie and a hare, and we talked about the bill. And Mr. Harper was there, who was it seems a solicitor and maker of acts of Parliament. They said it would not do, that it was easy to give it a fillip . . . Harper sang a Lancashire song about ‘Naunt Grace Gilbert’s Mare’. Thence to Richard’s, thence with Johnson to Charles Stanhope’s, with whom I talked about the bill; he asked me the objections against it, and I told him; he said the Members for the County that were against it, should propose to them that were for it to have a reasonable bill, which if they refused, or to show it, would be a good objection in the House. Tom Hill³⁰⁾ was there, we had fish to supper and hashed rabbit I think, and very good wine, both claret and burgundy, and Johnson played and sang.

Sunday, 17th.

Rose late, went at 4 to Dr. Hoadly’s,³¹⁾ not within; to Jo[h]n Clowes’, where I ate

27) George Kenyon (1702-1780), barrister. See D. 1. note 30.

28) Probably the petition to be presented on 23 January (A. 1.), or either of the two broadsides for the workhouse (B. 1. or 3.).

29) Unidentified.

30) Thomas Hill (1661-1734), portrait painter.

31) Benjamin Hoadly (1706-1757), MD, of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, physician and friend of John Byrom. He was son of Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761), Erastian bishop successively of Bangor, Hereford, Salisbury, and Winchester.

some potted hare. Thence to Richard's... Mr. Lloyd came there... we met with John Kay,³²⁾ and we three to the King's Head³³⁾ and drank a bottle of wine and ate cold beef, 1 s. apiece....

Wednesday, 20th.

... Had a long account from Josiah of the quarrel between the Chethams and J. Dickenson at the Turk's Head³⁴⁾....

Friday night, 22nd.

Mr. Pigot came to town this day, I met with him at Richard's to-night. He went to the Beggar's Opera with Mr. Assheton,³⁵⁾ and I to the Baptist's Head,³⁶⁾ to Mr. Lloyd's too, Richardson, Rook, Heywood, where we drank good wine and talked about plays. I was against plays....

D. 4. London, 23 January to 4 February 1731

Remains, I, ii, 453-61

Poems, II, ii, 615-16

Also *Palatine Note-book*, II, 92

Saturday, 23rd.

Rose after 7, went to Mr. Pigot at Mr. Assheton's room, breakfast there, G. Lloyd came to us. We three took coach to Sir Roger Bradshaigh's,¹⁾ who showed us *The Case for the Workhouse at Manchester*,²⁾ which he let Mr. Pigot and me read but not copy. Sir Roger he would not engage on either side till he had full information of the case, said that he was written to that they would have made it up for giving them the money laid out (I think) and a covenant for no act of Parliament. We went thence to Mr.

32) John Kay (1709-1768), attorney of Manchester/Salford. See A. 6. note 4.

33) Possibly King's Head Inn (Tavern), Smithfield: Rocque & Lillywhite.

34) Possibly the Turk's Head Bagnio, Charing Cross. cf. William Hogarth's engravings. There James and Edward Chetham, whig magistrates (B. 1. note 6, and C. note 4), and John Dickenson, tory merchant (D. 1. note 12), seem to have met each other unexpectedly.

35) *The Beggar's Opera* by John Gay, first produced 1728. cf. D. 5. note 5.

36) Richard Assheton (-1758), younger brother of Sir Ralph Assheton of Middleton (D. 1. note 7). See D. 4. (24 January).

37) Either Baptist's Head Tavern, Milk Street, Aldermanbury, or Baptist's Head, Chancery Lane. The latter was used for masonic lodge meetings: Lillywhite.

1) Sir Roger Bradshaigh (?1675-1747) of Haigh, bart., MP for Wigan 1696-1747, government whig, but he was financially indebted to James, Earl of Barrymore (1667-1748), Jacobite MP for Wigan, 1715-47.

2) i.e. B. 1. above. Not 'The Case of the Whigs at Manchester', as in *Remains*, I, ii, 453.

[George]⁶⁾ Leycester, Sir J. Bland,³⁾ Sir Ed. Stanley,⁴⁾ Mr Shuttleworth,⁵⁾ first to Sir H. Hoghton, who was not within. We had the coach three hours, 4s. and discharged it at Westminster Hall. Mr. Leycester brought us word that the petition was presented by Sir H. Hoghton and a committee appointed to sit on Wednesday se'night, of which I have just now transcribed a copy in shorthand from Mr. Pigot's reading here at Abingdon's. We dined at Queen's Head⁷⁾ with Mr. Leycester, Master, and Dr. Morgan of Trinity College. We have been from one place to another all day; at Mr. Harmin's the clerk under Staples, who was engaged on the other side; at Richard's, where we met Mr. Ken[yo]n, and I introduced him to Mr. Pigot, and he wrote the form of a petition; to Fazakerly's, who was a little shyish we thought, but thought a general petition against a bill might do, and so I should think; to Parker; to Strange, who was more communicative; to Abingdon's, where we now are. Dr. Hopwood⁸⁾ told me of a box with a hat that had come to him from Blossoms Inn loose.

Sunday, 24th.

Breakfast at Mr. Richard Assheton's, sent for my hat box, 8d. Mr. Pigot and I took coach to Mr. Shuttleworth, Leycester, &c., but dined first with Lightboun; Mr. Lloyd and I at Abingdon's at night.

Monday, 25th.

Went about 9 to Mr. Pulteney's⁹⁾, enquired for Sir Ed. Stanley, and they were both very civil, and Pulteney advised us to petition against the bringing in the bill. Thence to Mr. Sandys¹⁰⁾, again out; to Mr. Leycester, he went with us to the House and called out Sandys, who spoke to us and seemed to be much for us. Ken[yo]n taken in for our solicitor. Hu[gh]¹¹⁾ Williams asked me to dinner, and lent me his case; thence I ran

3) Sir John Bland, Jacobite. See C. note 8.

4) Sir Edward Stanley, opposition MP for Lancashire. See A. 3. note 1.

5) Richard Shuttleworth, Jacobite MP for Lancashire. See A. 3. note 2.

6) Sir Henry Hoghton, Walpolian MP for Preston. See A. 1. note 1.

7) Queen's Head Inn, Gray's Inn Lane: Rocque. See F. 6. (6 February).

8) Robert Hopwood (1695-1762), MD, Byrom's friend in London.

9) Daniel Pulteney (?1674-September 1731), MP for Preston 1722-31, Lord of the Admiralty 1721-25, opposition whig and one of the directing triumvirate of *The Craftsman* since 1726, with his cousin William Pulteney (1684-1764), and Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751). He was a member of the committee to consider the bill for the Manchester workhouse. See A. 1. (23 January) and F. 7.

10) Samuel Sandys, opposition whig. He was in the committee on the Manchester workhouse, and made a motion on 1 April 1731. See A. 1., 4. and 12.

11) Hugh Williams, government whig. He chaired the parliamentary committee of 7 April 1731. See A. 13.

about 5 to Richard's, where we were to meet.

Tuesday, 26th.

We went and showed our petition to Pulteney, who put the last clause first; called on Sir John Bland, who was up; Sandys gone out at 9 o'clock, we saw him at the House, I met him in the Court of Requests and spoke to him, and he said he did not care to stand there and we went into the lobby where Mr. Pigot was. While Mr. Pigot was at Shuttleworth's, I went to the Cocoa Tree¹²⁾ and altered the petition according to Pulteney's direction; after Sandys had seen them we went to the coffeehouse, and Ken[yo]n's clerk copied them. Mr. Pigot, Lloyd, and I dined at an eatinghouse, but I did not like it; to Richard's, Mr. Legh of High Legh there and Mr. Stanley, I sat by them, Mr. Legh calling me. Mr. Fazakerly desired Pigot to retain John Ward;¹³⁾ we went to him about 6 and he did so, and he perused our petition, altered *part* for *many*; thence to Mr. Wilbraham's,¹⁴⁾ retain him; to Page's coffeehouse from Richard's with Dr. Hooper¹⁵⁾ and Mr. Lloyd, where we went upstairs and wrote letters and sent the engrossed petition. I wrote to Mr. Copley,¹⁶⁾ Lever, and Mrs. Byrom.¹⁷⁾

Wednesday, 27th.

I called upon Mr. Pigot at Legh Master's, where he lodged, and Mr. Master went with us to Mr. Shuttleworth, and thence to Westminster; got a copy of the committee, which was not so bad as we expected, saw Dr. Walker there who asked me to Lambeth,¹⁸⁾ I told him of our matter. Mr. Pigot and I dined at Lebec's Head, pease soup, sprats and beefsteak, 4s. 1d., reckoning reasonable. Thence to Richard's... saw Johnson¹⁹⁾ whom I desired to ask Sir W. Yonge that I might wait upon him. Went to Page's to

12) The Cocoa Tree Chocolate House, Pall Mall. Here from the 1720s to 1740s two tory clubs met regularly, the Loyal Brotherhood on Tuesdays, and Edward Harley's Board on Thursdays: Colley, 71-72.

13) John Ward (1670-1749), barrister and tory MP 1703-22, retired to pursue his legal career after 1722. 'Parliamentary agent': *Poems*, II, ii, 616. A friend of Sir Francis Leycester and Edward Digby (D. 5. note 17). cf. F. 11. and 13.

14) Randle Wilbraham (?1695-1770) of Cheshire, barrister and tory MP 1740-68.

15) Francis Hooper, son of John Hooper, merchant, was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, DD 1728, Chetham's Librarian.

16) John Copley (?1668-1732) was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, a strong High Churchman and fellow of the Collegiate Church of Manchester from 1706. His daughters married Sir Ralph Assheton (D. 1. note 7), Sir Thomas Egerton, MP, and Samuel Egerton, MP.

17) See F. 2. (26 January) below.

18) Unidentified, but see D. 1. note 29.

19) William Yonge (?1653-1755), MP for Honiton 1715-54, succeeded his father Sir Walter as 4th bart., 'stood by Walpole to the end'. See A. 2. and D. 5. note 9.

Mr. Pigot, where he was drawing up instructions for a case, we sat there till about 10 Had a letter from Mr. Lloyd that he was ordered by the managers to return me their hearty thanks and to give me £20 by Mr. Berry, that Mr. Pigot had £100 remittance. Dowgate.²⁰⁾

Thursday, 28th.

Copied out the petition from shorthand, called on Mr. Pigot at Mr. Master's who was writing over the instructions. I left him to go to Mr. Bromley's with Dr. Hooper,²¹⁾ but the Dr. not within. I turned back, called upon Dr. Hoadly; went into the City, saw Salkeld, who wanted to raise £2,000 upon land security, his father-in-law being dead some little time, and he had a letter from his wife; a gentleman coming in told him that he might have the money he thought; Mr. Deacon just called in; I called on Mr. Sidebottom, saw his brother, who just come from Manchester, said that Mr. Bayley offered to join the churchwardens and overseers in the management, that there might be equal numbers. I endeavoured to convince him that it was an unfair design I forgot to go to the Royal Society. Mr. [George] Lloyd and I went to Tom's, Dr. T. Bentley met us in the passage and came to Tom's after; Harper, Hoadly, Hatsel,²²⁾ Woolaston, Wray, two Whites, &c. at Tom's; Mr. Lloyd took leave of me to go to Cambridge to-morrow. I went to Page's and wrote from thence to Mr. Lloyd a copy of the case to Hugh Williams, and said at the end, if they sent me a million of money it should all go in the service, that I desired nothing but success in so just a cause; Mr. Pigot wrote also. I wrote to Mrs. Byrom for some more shirts, that I liked my hat very well.²³⁾

Friday, 29th.

Rose after 9 . . . thence to the Court of Requests, saw Captain Campbell who attends there, Dr. Hooper, Vernon, Morgan, Pigot, Shuttleworth, who asked me to dinner on

20) Dowgate Hill in the City, where stand three Livery Company halls: Tallow Chandlers, Skinners, and Dyers.

21) Henry Bromley (1705-1755), MP for Cambridgeshire 1727-41, government whig. He was among the committee members of 23 January 1731.

22) James Bayley, a principal whig merchant of Manchester. See B.1. note 7.

23) Tom's Coffee House, either in Russell Street, Covent Garden, or in Devereux Court near Temple Bar. The opposition paper *The Craftsman* was printed for Richard Francklin 'under Tom's Coffee-house in Covent Garden'.

24) Thomas Bentley (?1693-1742), classical scholar and fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. He was nephew of Richard Bentley (1662-1742), master of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1700-42, and FRS.

Sunday next Mr. Pigot called here just now and came to my chamber where I have got a fire made, and told me that he had had materials for stating the case from Geo[rge] Kenyon, that Sir Roger Bradshaigh and he had had high talk about it, from whom he learnt that it was now before Sir Robert [Walpole]²⁵⁾; he told Sir R[oger] that if it was a promised bill he would not ask him, which nettled him a little; Shuttleworth told me to-day that he believed it would be stopped in the other House if not in theirs,²⁶⁾ that he hoped they should do well.

Saturday, 30th.

Wrote Mr. Lloyd a list of their committee, and to Sir Os[wald] Mosley to come up [to London]; hurry worry from one place and body to another, I have not time to take down matters; Sir H. Hoghton added a new list of committee men, and Sandys was to offer another;^{*)} Pigot with Lord Bingley,²⁷⁾ received very graciously.

Sunday, 31st.

We dined with Shuttleworth, Mr. Lister there.²⁸⁾ I went to Bromley's, to Shepherd's, where we had the matter over, and I talked away, Greaves there; called on Williams by the way, was a little too warm with him I doubt.

Monday, February 1st.

Mr. Harte²⁹⁾ came to town post with the petition, I was not so well after yesterday's feasting.

Tuesday night, [February] 2nd.

Abingdon's, 11 o'clock. Just come from Page's, where Mr. Lightboun, Pigot, Illingworth, and Ken[yo]n have been. This morning I called upon Mr. Pigot after 8, he was in bed; we took coach to Sir Edward Stanley's and gave him the general petition, and to Shuttleworth and gave him the subscribers' petition to present to the House.³⁰⁾ Thence

25) Sir Robert Walpole (1676-1745), prime minister 1721-42. See E.1. and 3. Sir Roger Bradshaigh's letters to Walpole, 1730-37, are included in CaUL, Cholmondeley (Houghton) MSS.

26) i. e. the House of Lords.

*) See A. 2. (29 January) and A. 4. (2 February).

27) Robert Benson (1676-April 1731), Baron Bingley, Treasurer of the Household 1730. His wife Lady Elizabeth, was the eldest daughter of Heneage Finch, first Earl of Aylesford.

28) Thomas Lister (1688-1745), tory MP for Clitheroe 1713-45. He married Catherine, cousin of Sir Ralph Assheton (-1756: D.1. note 7).

29) Jeffrey Hart, a witness in the parliamentary committee against the workhouse bill in February 1731. See A. 6. note 6.

30) The petition [II] of the principal inhabitants, traders, and land-owners, and the petition [III] of the several inhabitants, land-owners, and traders, of Manchester, both presented to the House of Commons on 2 February (A. 3.).

to Sir Thomas Aston, he was in bed with headache; to Lord Warrington's, not within,³¹⁾ I left my service for Lady Mary; to Pigot's, drank coffee with him and his wife; to Westminster, the petitions presented, I was in the gallery after; Sandys moved for the pension bill to be printed, and Sir Edward Stanley seconded him; a call of the House;³²⁾ Lord Malpas³⁴⁾ being sat reading a pamphlet in one of the committee rooms, I spoke to him, and Mr. Pigot and I sat with him and talked the matter over; he was very civil, said he had been wrote to by his friends that the thing was right from those who knew the progress of the affair, that it was not easy to conceive how such a subscription could be got without general consent, that he had no interest there, that if it appeared to be against the inclination of the people We dined at the White Hart, I had two dishes³⁵⁾ of pease-soup, he a beefsteak; thence to Page's, having been at Gray's Inn, where Mr. Lightboun dined; went to his chambers and found him about 5. Mr. Illingworth, Bowker, and Banks³⁶⁾ came to town about 5, Mr. Clegg³⁷⁾ and Byron³⁸⁾ about 12. I went to Fazakerly's to know if he would attend, he said he would come as soon as possible; I told Pigot, and he and I went to Strange, and after Pigot went to Fazakerly, feed them both for to-morrow that one might be ready if there should be occasion. Set down my name to prove the voting for the hiring of the workhouse and the reading of the subscriptions. I wrote to Mr. Lloyd at Cambridge

Abingdon's, February 4th, 12 o'clock.

Mr. Pigot just called to tell me that Mr. Illingworth had a letter from Manchester, that Mr. James Chetham and James Bayley was coming up; that Mr. Lightboun said he thought the Court was determined to have the bill pass;³⁹⁾ . . . Yesterday we were at the Committee upon the Manchester petitions. Mr. Byron gave his evidence according⁴⁰⁾

31) Sir Thomas Aston (?1704-1744), MP for Liverpool 1729-34. A Cheshire country gentleman and opposition whig.

32) Married since 1702, Lady Mary and her husband, 2nd Earl of Warrington (D. 2. note 25), 'quarrelled, and lived in the same house as absolute strangers to each other at bed and board'.

33) The pension/place bill was promoted by opposition MPs: Sandys, Stanley, Lord Tyrconnel, and Thomas Wyndham. *Commons Journals*, XXI, 603, 609.

34) George Cholmondeley, Viscount Malpas. See A. 6. note 9.

35) One of the White Hart Inns, in St. John's Street near Smithfield, in Long Acre near Covent Garden, or in the Borough.

36) Thomas Illingworth (D. 1. note 2), Robert Bowker (A. 6. note 5), and Adam Banks (?1694-1751), were all High Churchmen. Banks was chaplain of the Collegiate Church of Manchester, elected fellow there after Copley died in 1732.

37) Isaac Clegg, presbyterian merchant. See C. note 21

38) Christopher Byron, whig attorney. See A. 6. note 1.

39) i. e. Walpole's administration. Not 'Curate' as in *Poems*, II, ii, 616.

40) Not 'Byrom' as in *Palatine Note-book*, II, 92; *Poems*, II, ii, 616. Christopher Byron's evidence is quoted in *Commons Journals*, XXI, 644(A. 6.).

to his short memory. I took down in shorthand what I could.⁴¹⁾

D. 5. London, 24 March to 1 April 1731 (For the hiatus between 4 February and 24 March, see F. 5.—14., various correspondence during the period.)

Remains, I, ii, 475-80

Friday, March 26th.

(In the Court of Requests Coffeehouse between 3 and 4 o'clock, waiting to see if any of the Members that I know will appear, of whom I may learn of anything relating to our workhouse bill.) . . . From Lord Delawar's,¹⁾ from whence I went to the Duke of Devonshire²⁾ 11 o'clock, his Grace spoke to me and desired me to call at 10 to-morrow. Mr. Wallbank³⁾ called on me this morning in my chamber, and stayed and drank a dish of chocolate with me, and said he had good hopes that the bill would not pass, having heard several express themselves to that purpose.

Wednesday, March 24th.⁴⁾

To Lord Delawar's, and Pawlet's⁵⁾ the second time; he said he understood more of it than before, paid 5 guineas, was to go to Newmarket on Friday, and would send me word to Abingdon's when he came back again. Lord Delawar sent him this note by me: 'My lord — I told your lordship that a shorthand breakfast club would be a proper way to improve us in that science. I will wait upon you whenever you please to command', which Lord Pawlet read pretty well. Went to the Court of Requests, our Manchester people there, and we were in the gallery where I sat next to Mr. Chetham, and the bill was read a second time.⁶⁾ A Captain Somebody said to me, What you have given it up then? or to Mr. Chetham, but I think it was to me, and I said I could not tell what would

41) Making any written record of parliamentary proceedings belonged to the prerogative of the Speaker, and thus was prohibited to others, though some contrived to make notes, for instance, Sir Edward Knatchbull and Sir Roger Newdigate. See A. 3. note 3, and F. 8. (18 February).

1) John West (1693-1766), Baron De La Warr, Treasurer of the Household 1731-36.

2) William Cavendish (1698-1755), 3rd Duke of Devonshire, lord lieutenant of Derbyshire from 1729. 'The standard of whiggism': H. Walpole.

3) — Wallbank of Blackburn. See page 55 (27 March).

4) Byrom is writing retrospectively.

5) Charles Powlett/Palet (1685-1754), MP, Lord Pawlet 1717, 3rd Duke of Bolton 1722. Whig, but dismissed 1733. Devoted to Lavinia Fenton, actress, since he first saw her as Polly in *The Beggar's Opera* in 1728. His half brother, Lord Nassau Powlett (1698-1741), MP for Lymington 1727-34, followed him into opposition in 1733.

6) See A. 9.

be done to-day. After the reading, Sandys made a speech in regard to the state of the case, and said he would not oppose the committing of it, but hoped the gentlemen would take care of proper alterations, or he hoped it would not pass, being neither on the footing of Bristol, Canterbury, or Worcester.⁷⁾ Sir Edward Stanley moved for a committee of the whole House. Sir R. Bradshaigh said he would be against the bill as it stood, and Sir W. Willis and another Member that were for a bill, he told them to be against it, and they seemed as if they would.⁸⁾ Mr. Shuttleworth said he had observed Sir Robert Walpole to stop Lord Malpas and Sir William Yonge from speaking, from whence he had some hopes, but I could not see why; he asked us to dinner for Saturday 3 o'clock. [Editor's para]

Yesterday, Thursday.

I was here and met Sir Thomas Aston, who said, What, half the people of Manchester are for leaving the town! and after a little talk he said, Well, press them hard and they will drop it, but take no notice of that! that is to say, I suppose, that it came from him. I spoke to Mr. More to be present and not so hard upon us; he said he believed it would not pass.¹¹⁾ Met Dr. Bentley in the park and Mr. Abbot, and we had talk about Mr. Law, charity, religion.¹²⁾ We dined together in Devereux Court.¹³⁾ I was at the Royal Society, Lord Delawar told me there that the Duke of Devonshire would begin tomorrow . . . We went thence to Will's, where Mr. Pigot was, and he wrote to Mr. Dickenson and I finished mine to Mr. Lloyd; and he sent down the petition for the Lords . . .

Friday, 26th.

Called at the Court of Requests. Mr. Leycester bid me tell Mr. Pigot that Sir Edward Stanley wanted the particular sums that the subscribers *pro* and *con* everyone

7) For the Bristol Workhouse Act of 1696, see Preface, note 2; for the Canterbury Workhouse Act of 1728, see D. 2. note 9; for Worcester, 3 George II, cap. 23 (1730): An act for amending and making more effectual an act made in the 2 & 3 Anne, intituled, an act for the erecting a workhouse in the city of Worcester, and for setting the poor on work there.

8) Sir William Willys (?1685-1732), 6th bart., MP for Great Bedwyn, government whig.

9) Malpas and Yonge, both staunch Walpolian. See A. 6. note 9, and D. 4. note 19.

10) Sir Thomas Aston, opposition MP. See D. 4. note 31.

11) Robert More (1703-1780), MP for Bishop's Castle 1727-41, government whig.

12) Thomas Bentley. See D. 4. note 24.

13) William Law (1686-1761), mystic and author of *The Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (1728), was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Byrom, after reading *The Serious Call*, visited Law in London on 4 March 1729. *Remains*, I, ii, 337-38. cf. F. 10. (page 82).

14) In the Strand, near Temple Bar.

paid. I met Busby,¹⁵⁾ the young fellow that talks away at Richard's, he said he had heard that the Manchester bill was a roguish thing, or a bad thing, and the Charitable Corporation another.¹⁶⁾ Saw Mr. Digby,¹⁷⁾ Member, who spoke to me, and said it was a wrong thing....

Saturday, 27th.

...I was gone to the Duke [of Devonshire]'s, who being up, I was introduced into the study, and by-and-bye he came to me and took 10 guineas out of a drawer and gave them to me before we began [the shorthand]. I had almost writ the alphabet for him while he was coming; I just hinted at everything, because he seemed to take it very readily; he was very courteous, and appointed Tuesday morning between 10 and 11 for me to come again....I went to the Church Coffeehouse, where I had Tom Bentley's note:

<Dear friend — Lord Carteret,¹⁸⁾ upon mentioning you and telling him I had just left you at the coffeehouse, sent a servant for you, but you was just gone; he bids me tell you that any morning he shall be glad to see you. — Yours, T. Bentley.>

I writ an answer, that I was sorry I was gone, but would be glad to attend him to Lord Carteret's any morning, having a great desire for that worthy hero's favour for my native town, to prevent the bill, which would do mischief, and nobody any good, as appeared to me. Thence I went at 3 to Mr. Shuttleworth's, where Mr. Lister, Pigot, Walbank of Blackburn, who brought up the last petition, dined; We drank claret and burgundy after till late; we had much talk of many things, but with this drinking there is seldom much wisdom in one's talk; beef soup, loin of veal, 2 fowls boiled, 4 little dishes, pigeons and asparagus.

Sunday, 28th.

Sir Oswald Mosley came to town to-day.¹⁹⁾

Monday, 29th.

15) Unidentified.

16) The Charitable Corporation, chartered in 1710, obtained licences from the government to increase its capital in 1728 and 1730. Attacks were made on it in Parliament from 15 March 1731 for unfair trading practices, and extensive frauds were disclosed. *Commons Journals*, XXI, 670 *et seq.* Sir Robert Sutton (?1671-1746), MP for Nottinghamshire 1722-32, government whig, was involved, and charged by the opposition. cf. F. 4. (page 73) and F. 15. (page 88).

17) Edward Digby (?1693-1746), tory MP for Warwickshire. A friend of John Ward (D. 4. note 13).

18) John Carteret (1690-1763), 2nd Baron Carteret. The leader of the opposition whigs. Secretary of State 1721-24 and 1742-44, Earl Granville 1744.

19) In answer to F. 3. and other probably lost letters.

Went down to Westminster, met Sir Oswald and Mr. Pigot there.

Tuesday, 30th.

Rose 7, went at 9 to Lord Delawar's, he writ a little; said he was talking with the Prince when I came into the House of Lords about shorthand, and when I came he told them that was his master; said that it would do rarely if the Prince would learn. Thence I went to the Duke of Devonshire . . . I went from him to my Lord Carteret's . . . Thence to Westminster; then to the park with Mr. Leycester, Sir Oswald, and Pigot, saw T. Bentley there. Dined with Mr. Pigot and Sir Oswald at the Bear and Harrow, 2s. 6d., pease soup and cod. Thence to Richard's, Pigot said that Whitworth spoke of it as a bill that would pass, that he would be for them unless there was a great majority against them; Pigot said he was a sensible man, but I did not like the character Pigot gave of him, that he thought one way and would act another. He called in the coach from the park at Sir J. Bland's, who had the gout. I was at the coffeehouse auction in Covent Garden, met Mr. Davy, who seemed to talk for the bill . . . Went at 11 o'clock to the club, M. Folkes there and Will., and More, Wray, Dixon, Hoadly, Derham, J. White, Sloane, who said Lord Delawar was ravished with my shorthand.

Wednesday, 31st.

The above I have just copied here while I am waiting at Lord Carteret's, to see whom a bishop and a duke have been (the Bishop of Carlisle, says an Irishman here, and the Duke of Kent, I think), so to divert such tedious attendance I have copied Mr. Pigot's second case here, which he tells me that Sandys and the other Members are not for printing, or any case, which in my opinion is not so advisable as to make the case known all manner of ways; but we must submit to wiser men.

Thursday, April 1st.

At the same place again . . . I called here before 11 according to Lord Carteret's orders, who took yesterday our case, their answer, and our written reply, and said he would read them.

20) Frederick Louis (1707-1751), Prince of Wales 1729, son of George II and father of George III, died as a result of a cricket accident.

21) Francis Whitworth (1684-1742), son of Richard Whitworth of Staffordshire. MP for Minehead, government whig. See F. 8. note 43.

22) Martin Folkes, vice-president of the Royal Society (D. 3. note 13), had introduced Byrom to the Royal Society Club at the Sun in St. Paul's Churchyard in July 1723: *Remains*, I, i, 51-52.

23) Probably B. 2.

24) Probably B. 3.

(Abingdon's, Friday, 2 o'clock.²⁵⁾ Here the man came to me and I went upstairs into Lord Carteret's dressing room, and he asked me questions and talked with me while he was shaving, and I gave him an account of the whole matter from the beginning. He said when I came away, that he was in opinion with us, and should do what service he could if it came to the House of Lords, but he thought it would not. I met Oglethorpe²⁶⁾ in his chair, and asked him what he thought? He said he thought we should succeed, and that they began to be tired of it, that it was to be all over England if it succeeded, there being 2 or 3 more workhouses already upon the like footing. I went into the park Thence to Westminster, where Mr. Pigot said it was agreed between Sir Edward Stanley and Mr. Brereton²⁷⁾ that no counsel should come down on either side to-morrow. It seems Capt. Vernon had insisted that the wool business should come on before others, and so Wednesday next is the day now talked on. Sir O[swald] M[osley] has been with the Duke of Newcastle and Sir Robert Walpole. Mr. Dickenson in the Court of Requests, who came yesterday to town; They set me down near 3 o'clock at Mr. Ridge's, where I found them at dinner and Dr. Walker from Trinity, and after dinner we all went in Mr. Ridge's new coach to Ashburnam House, to Dr. Bentley's To Will's, where we drank punch, Mr. Lightboun, Dickenson, Pigot, Wallbank, Sir O. M. and I. Wrote to Mrs. Byrom; Sir O. went away before 12, we stayed after 1.

D. 6. London, 7 April to Manchester, 13 June 1731

Remains, I, ii, 485-519.

Thursday night, 12 o'clock [April 8th].

At the King's Arms all alone. I have been writing to Lady Bland a long letter to give her an account of the deferring of the workhouse bill for 6 weeks Mr. Pigot said last night he would write to Mr. Copley. Sir Oswald Mosley called about 10 as I was drinking tea below, and we went about 12 to Mr. White's to return him thanks, he was gone out, so we sat with his son a little, and then he went to his lodgings in Cook's

25) Writing retrospectively. See F. 15. (1 April).

26) James Edward Oglethorpe (1696-1785), son of a strong Jacobite, MP for Haslemere 1722-54, trustee for Georgia. People were 'uncertain whether he was a whig or a Jacobite': H. Walpole.

27) Thomas Brereton (-1756), MP for Liverpool 1724-56. 'Entirely the slave of Sir Robert Walpole': Lord Egmont. See F. 7. note 38.

28) Edward Vernon (1684-1757), independent MP for Penryn 1722-34, captain in the Royal Navy.

Court, and I to Westminster, where were Mr. Pigot, Dickenson; Lister said, Doctor, you answered Plumtre very well, that you walked it¹⁾. I wrote a shorthand letter to Lord Delawar, thinking I had seen him in the House of Lords, but I believe I was mistaken; the Bishop was not there.²⁾ I met Sir G. Saville and thanked him, and he thanked me for giving him the opportunity, which was very gratifying to him.³⁾ I called at Harding's sale [of books]...thence to John Stansfield's,^{*} told him of our success; thence to Richard's; to the Royal Society; walked thence with Dr. Vernon in the King's Bench walks....

Wednesday, 7th.

The workhouse bill deferred 6 weeks.⁴⁾

(Parliament Coffeehouse, Friday, 2 o'clock [April 9th]: I am here in a room by myself writing, so to go on with Wednesday, April 7th.) I called upon Taylor White and drank tea with him, and would have had him gone with me to Westminster, but he was to dine with Mr. Sloane. I went thence to his brother, and thence to the Court of Requests, where the Manchester men were got on all sides: Mr. Chethem, Clegg, Bayley, Kay, Worsley (younger), Baskerville,⁵⁾ George Legh, Pigot, Dickenson, Banks, Oldfield,⁶⁾ Wilson, Sir Oswald Mosley. I went up into the gallery, but Mr. Pigot making signs to me, went down into the body of the House; the Bishop was in the Court of Requests, and spoke to Sir Robert Walpole as he went by, and seemed to be very smiling afterwards. Fazakerly and Strange for the town, and Darnel and Rider against, were heard,⁷⁾ and some opposition made to the examining the town's witnesses, because it had been done in the former committee, but they were examined, *viz.*, Banks, Byrom, Bowker, Hart, Dickenson, Oldfield and B[yro]n. [Editor's para]

I gave the same evidence that I did before, but was better heard, as they all were.

1) See the exchange between Plumtre and Byrom on 7 April (D. 6. below and E. 1.).

2) Samuel Peploe, bishop of Chester. See C. note 1, and D. 2. note 34.

3) Sir George Savile/Saville (1678-1743), 7th bart., son of the Rev. John Savile, rector of Thornhill (Yorks.), was FRS, sheriff of Nottinghamshire, MP for Yorkshire 1728-34, independent whig, and father of Sir George, 8th bart., MP for Yorkshire, 'a whig who never wished for office and never belonged to a party'. See F. 2. note 10.

*) John Stansfield, once assistant manager in Edward Byrom (John's father)'s business in London. See John Byrom's letters to Stansfield in *Poems*, III, 146-78.

4) See A. 13.

5) John Baskervyle (1706-1784), whig curate of Withington?

6) Unidentified.

7) Nicholas Fazakerley (D. 2. note 20) and John Strange (D. 3. note 21), both barristers.

8) Sir John Darnall (D. 2. note 21) and Dudley Ryder (1691-1756), both government barristers. Ryder was educated at the dissenting academy at Hackney, Edinburgh University and Leyden University, MP after 1733, Attorney General 1737-54.

Mr. Plumptre asked me in reference to the town's meeting, how I came there? And I told him that I walked there; he asked by what right I claimed to be there? I told him by that right which every man has to be anywhere where he can do service to others; he asked me if others came upon no other right? I told him I did not enter into or desire to invade the rights of others, but I claimed by that for myself.⁹⁾ Sir Thomas Aston¹⁰⁾ rose up and said he thought it was not fair to ask me about others, I had told him how I came there myself, but for other's rights I did not take upon myself to answer. Plumptre said I deserved to be animadverted upon — but for what, I wonder. When I gave him the first answer Lord Malpas smiled, and being near the bar, I said to him, Why, what answer could I give to such a question? And I spoke to Lord Malpas afterwards, that I did not intend to affront any gentlemen; he said there was nothing in't; but Sir Thomas Aston took notice on't. I told him I hoped he would make some alteration in the bill, he told me it would be thrown out; Sir, I said, I'm afraid you joke. [Editor's para]

Legh Master, upon my asking him, said he would lay 10 to 1 we lost it; Oglethorpe said otherwise. They called upon Mr. Clegg to be examined on the other side, which caused a debate, and Lutwiche¹¹⁾ spoke on our side, and we withdrew, and he (Mr. Clegg) said he had nothing to say, that it was a mistake in their calling him instead of Mr. B[yro]n, who was examined next, and Mr. Chetham was called and came to the bar, but was not admitted. [Editor's para]

When the bill was read, Sandys proposed the clause of the trustees being only chosen by the majority of the payers, to which Malpas objected faintly, and upon a . . . [?] the loudness of Ayes and Noes, Mr. Williams, who was chairman, Sir H. Hoghton being ill, said the Noes had it, which being disputed, there was a division. The Ayes had it, 91 against 63, after which the Members that favoured the bill walked off; and when the Speaker resumed the chair, Sir Thomas Aston said he supposed the bill was not designed to pass, to which Lord Malpas said he would try to make a good one, and Lord Chetwynd¹³⁾ said it was a matter of moment and deserved consideration and proposed 6

9) See E. 1.

10) Sir Thomas Aston, opposition MP. See D. 4. note 31.

11) Thomas Lutwyche (1674-1734), barrister and tory MP for Amersham 1728-34, member of the October Club. His daughter Anne married Nicholas Fazakerley. See D. 2. note 20.

12) Hugh Williams, government MP. See A. 13. note 2.

13) Walter Chetwynd (?1677-1736) was created Viscount Chetwynd of Bearhaven [Irish] 1717, MP for Stafford 1702-34, opposition whig.

weeks, to which Lord Malpas opposed next Monday, to which Mr. Sandys said he had likewise attended [to] it, and would help to make it a good bill, but could not under 6 weeks; and so it was resolved that the House would that day 6 weeks go into a committee of the whole House upon it: And so this same affair was ended, and God send peace and mutual love amongst my countrymen. [Editor's para]

Went to Lebec's Head, where were Sir Oswald, Mr. Pigot, Dickenson, Fielden, Garnel;¹⁴⁾ they had salmon, of which I ate, and some pease soup. Mr. Pigot wrote another letter to desire them at Manchester to take care of any mobbing,¹⁵⁾ which Mr. Dickenson and I signed. Wilson was to go express in the morning to Manchester. We came to the Blue Boar about 3 o'clock, and I wrote a line to father Byrom to go by him, and next morning Sir Oswald called on me as above.

...I met Mr. Stanley walking in the Court of Requests, and followed him up into the lobby, and as he was coming from thence I met him and gave him his 5 guineas and 3s. 6d., which I had had lapped up for him for some time in my pocket. I said, Sir, I had not an opportunity before, or I would have taken it, to present you with this; he was wondrous shy, and said, Sir, your most humble servant, with the distant air, and took it, and much good may it do him. Robert Bowker this morning as I called upon him told me that he wanted a receipt from me for 20 guineas which he had had from Mr. Bury in my name, but I desired him to take up the note again, for I did not want or desire the money, that I would not expect to be paid for serving the town, that if I received anything, it should be for the use of the poor. Called upon Mr. Banks at the Ordnance Coffeehouse, and we went to the Bishop in Dartmouth Street, and sat with him a little, till the ceremonial time was consumed, in talking about the roads to Manchester. Sir Roger Bradshaigh asked me at Waghorn's if there had been any mobbing or insurrection at Manchester, saying that the Speaker had been told so. I told him the story of the new petition.

Saturday, 10th.

...To Mr. White's, where was old Mr. White and Jack in the room below; when I came in old White told me of my answer to Plumptre that I came on my feet, said he thought I was a pert. I told him that I had no design to affront any man and was

14) All gathered here including Byrom were High Churchmen of Manchester, except Sir Oswald Mosley, whose change of mind had been crucial, and Garnel who is obscure.

15) See F. 18.

sorry that was not sufficient come off before the House of Commons. I was telling some story — I forgot what — and old White said he would tell me a better story than that; it was, that Mr. Pl[ump]tre had been to see Sir Harry Hoghton, who had an ague, and was very angry with Sir Robert Walpole that he had not carried the bill, as he might if he would; that P. said, Why, after all, there was something in it that Sir Robert's conscience could not away with [*sic*]; upon which Sir Harry said, 'Conscience! What does he talk of conscience for? I am sure I voted for the Hessian troops'¹⁶⁾. This story the Whites both said I might tell again as true. And I did tell them at the Bear and Harrow at night, and Pigot said it was of my own framing, and I said, No; and he said it was an admirable story, and should not be lost.

... We took leave with Sir O[swald] and Mr. Dick[enson] who were to go down early to-morrow morning. Mr. Dickenson asked me why I would not take the 20 pounds;¹⁷⁾ I told him.

Monday, 12th.

Mr. Parker came to me at Will's about 2 o'clock, and we went to Mr. Fazakerly's, where were Tom Vaudrey,¹⁸⁾ a clergyman, and Mrs. F[azakerly]. We had a white meat, beef, potted char, pigeons, rabbits, and a large dessert, and French wine all afternoon till past 6. The conversation turned at last upon the subordination that was necessary to be amongst people, and I contended for an equality, and for the poor people, and told Fazakerly not to love money. I am too forward I doubt upon such occasions¹⁹⁾....

Good Friday, 16th.

This morning I was at the Duke of Devonshire's with Lord Delawar, and they both wrote after my reading 2 articles from the treaty of peace very well, especially the Duke, who was going to Newmarket again on the morrow, and Lord D[elawar] said he would be at home on Thursday next, he said he would never leave it off; that he had been talking with the Bishop of Chester, that the Tories had agreed to the workhouse, but finding the Whigs and Presbyterians too many for them, went back again²⁰⁾.... I called at Mrs. Leycester's, who were to go into the country on Monday, and they came home just as I was there, and I stayed and dined with them. We talked about our bill,

16) See E. 1.

17) 20 guineas from Robert Bowker on 7 April.

18) Thomas Vaudrey (1695-) of Gray's Inn.

19) cf. F. 17. note 73.

20) See Sir John Bland's argument in F. 1. and Sir Oswald Mosley's in G. 1.

they said Mrs. [Hugh] Williams had asked her husband how it had gone, and he said nothing, but being asked again, — Would ye have me swear? If not, hold your tongue. Had a letter from Lady Bland.

.

Thursday, [May] 13th.

... Mrs. Abingdon has given me my bill for lodging and coals, 5 pounds 9 shillings, *viz*:

19 weeks' lodgings	4	15	0
Coals	0	14	0
			£5	9 0

I thought 5s. a shilling too much, and she said she must 'bate something.

.

... To Manchester on the 10th of June about 8 o'clock, Mr. Houghton to Baguley.²¹⁾ The bells rang upon our coming, and folks said I had done it on purpose,²²⁾ but I knew not what day it was till I asked at Altringham when I was dating a note to Mrs. Byrom. We had a very pleasant walk and came well home; was at father Byrom's that night; at Kersal next day with Mrs. Byrom and Beppy, brought Ted home. To-day [12th] Mr. Lloyd, Bowker, Bradshaigh, brother, 2 Halls, and J. Brook here to see me.

Sunday, 13th.

J. Brook preached at New Church [St. Ann's] to-day, morning and evening. I was at the Old Church [Collegiate Church] morning, New afternoon, 'I have learned how to abound, &c.'²³⁾ Spoke to Lady Bland.

E. POEMS OF JOHN BYROM

E. 1. On the Whig Workhouse April 30th, 1731

Poems, I, ii, 220-21, & III, 187

21) John Houghton lived at Baguley, Cheshire. See D.1. note 11.

22) See Preface (page 3), F. 18., 19., and Byrom's remark 'that I am a fool, and a Jacobite' in a letter to Leycester (F. 16), and E. 4.

23) Philippians, iv, 12.

I.

'This Manchester affair, at last',
Says Plumptre,¹⁾ visiting Sir Harry,²⁾
'When we all hoped it should have passed,
Plague on't! has happened to miscarry!' —

II.

'Why then, Sir Robert,³⁾ I must say,
Has used us ill', replies the knight.⁴⁾
'What! When he might have gained the day,
Sneak off and leave us! Was that right?' —

III.

'Why, people said, it was a job',
Says Plumptre — as indeed it was!
'And so, on second thoughts Sir Bob
Could not in conscience let it pass'. —

IV.

'Conscience!' replies Sir Harry, still
Angered the more at such expressions;
'He makes a conscience of my bill!
I'm sure I voted for his Hessians'.⁵⁾
. . . .
When at the Commons' bar Byrom, the Doctor, stood
And told of matters what he could,
Plumptre stood up, and said with front severe:
'Pray, let me ask, how came you there?'⁶⁾
'How came I there?' thought he, 'how came I thither?'
'You must say something!' — 'Why, Sir, I walked thither'.
'Walked thither, Sir! Pray, speak to my intention:

1) John Plumptre, MP, government whig. See A. 6. note 8.

2) Sir Henry Hoghton, presbyterian, MP and government whig. See A. 1. note 1.

3) Sir Robert Walpole, prime minister. See D. 4. note 25 and E. 3.

4) i. e. Sir Henry Hoghton, who was actually taken ill. F. 15. (page 88).

5) In the division on the supply of Hessian troops on 3 February 1731 (249:164). *Commons Journals*, XXI, 611. See D. 6. (page 61: 10 April).

6) Not 'here' and 'hither' as in *Poems*, I, i, 221. Byrom walked to the town meeting. See D. 6. (page 59: 7 April).

What right claim'd you to be at that convention?⁷⁾
 'What right? Why, Sir, the right of every man
 To do his neighbour service where he can'.
 'Pray, did the persons there advance a claim
 Present to be in any but that same?⁸⁾'
 'I would not injure, Sir, nor yet define
 The rights of others; but this claim is mine'.
 Thus it appears, that questions put at random
 Were answered right. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

E. 2. A Manchester Memorandum

Poems, III, 26

Let bills contriv'd for public good
 Be soon and fairly understood!
 Tho' privacy be somewhat snugger
 That brings them in by hugger mugger:
 Yet, as it makes the people surly,
 We'll throw 'em out — by hurly burly.

E. 3. The Preferment: An Epigram

Poems, III, 27

Sir Robert,⁹⁾ his merit and int'rest to show,
 Laid down his Red Ribbon to put on the Blue;¹⁰⁾
 In two strings, already, the knight is preferr'd:
 Odd numbers are lucky — We wish him a third!

7) i. e. the town meeting at Manchester.

8) Quotation marks are mine.

9) Sir Robert Walpole. cf. E. 1. and F. 15.

10) The red ribbon represents the Order of the Bath conferred on Walpole on 27 May 1725, the blue ribbon the Order of the Garter conferred on 26 May 1726.

E. 4. Extempore

Poems, I, ii, 572-74

God bless the King, — I mean the Faith's Defender;
God bless — no harm in blessing — the Pretender!
But who Pretender is, or who is King,
God bless us all! That's quite another thing.¹¹⁾

[Another version:

God bless the King, God bless our Faith's Defender,
God bless — no harm in blessing — the Pretender;
Who that Pretender is, and who that King,
God bless us all! — is quite another thing.]

E. 5. The Grammar School Mills¹²⁾

Poems, III, 60-65

I.

Dear Sirs,

It is true that I am feoffee
For the mills of the School; but your asking of me
What scheme the petitioners have in their view,
Is applying to one as much puzzl'd as you.
They themselves, I am told, are not fully agreed
Except in one point, and that is, *to succeed*;
But how — in what matter, or manner, or mill —
That reck'ning must come when they bring in their bill.

II.

For the good of the town, they would have us convey
What we cannot, perhaps, so well manage as they —
The mills, and the lands appertaining thereto.

11) As for Byrom's Jacobitical statements, see D. 6. (10 June) and F. 16.

12) The inhabitants of Manchester were under the obligation of grinding their corn and grain at the water mills owned by Manchester Grammar School until 1759: 32 George II, cap. 61. See PRO, DL4/139(1730); 141(1735); 146(1757); 147(1758).

Now, this, at first sight, one cannot well do;
 For, in persons maintaining a charity trust,
 Such a sudden compliance would hardly be just;
 Tho' I wish, for my part, if the good of the town
 Would rise up in their room, that the mills were all down.

III.

But, there is the question — and what for the good
 Of both county and town, should be well understood.
 For, altho', in a custom continued so long,
 There may, without wonder, be somewhat that's wrong,
 Yet a Parliament bill should be weigh'd a bit longer,
 Lest the town should be saddl'd with somewhat that's wronger;
 Lest the grant of new pow'rs to a new set of folks
 Should subject the town to more ponderous yokes.

IV.

Its lands or its houses, its windows and lights
 Pay nothing, at present, to day mill rights;
 Nor has A, B, or C any levy [to] raise,
 Distrain and distress, in the gentleman's phrase —
Some gentleman's phrase; for indeed other *some*
 Were against this attempt, and the major part dumb;
 So that no disagreement, as yet, can I see
 Betwixt the good town and her loving feoffee.

V.

And the end of a suit, on which damage depended,
 Which, if some did not hinder, would quickly be ended?
 We were willing to lease, by our answer appears,
 All the mills that we hold, for the term of ten years
 (And we could not for more), if the town would accept
 Of the choice of lessees, and the custom be kept.
 Now, let some, one and all, put themselves in our place,
 And inform us what more could be said in such case?

VI.

We gave to the question concerning expense,
Some gentlemen thought, satisfactory sense
To prevent, in all cases of grinding or flour,
Both abuse of School rights and abuse of School power;
Intent on performing, as well as we could,
A particular trust for the general good.
And no gentleman need to be so [much] disgusted;
For with breaking the custom we are not entrusted.

VII.

That the suit may go on, and the Parliament too,
And about the same point, is a method quite new.
But how a feoffee can consent to the bill,
While he sues for the custom, surpasses my skill.
They would think him, I doubt, either foolish or mad,
Both to hold it for good and to drop it for bad;
And the School might be suing, tho' losses were great —
Short line of discernment may fathom that feat.

VIII.

They object insufficiency to a poor mill,
That for want of its grist is obliged to stand still
By the dealers and millers, who, after one day,
If it were not ground for them, might grind it away;
And, in case of some chance, if the A's and the B's
Can prevent other grinding, when they are trustees,
As proposal has told us — if no other aim
Be design'd in its make — cannot we do the same?

IX.

As concerning the building of which you have spoken,
That will soon be set up when the custom is broken.
For the grinding of wheat in vast quantities down,
I know nothing on't but from vulgar renown;
Nor have had curiosity in me for poring

Where the man that you hint at has been at his boring.
 But I wish that all change, in the matter of mills,
 May have less or not greater than charity ills.

X.

One would not suppose that, to make a bill pass,
 Any persons conceal any snake in the grass.
 In respect all the gentlemen, some and some other,
 Tho' lamenting, for both, disagreeable pother,
 And expense of the rich, that were better bestow'd
 Upon such as now feel a more sensible load;
 Nor can I conceive, how a Parliament rout
 Should produce greater good than fair methods without.

XI.

We feoffees have the trouble; the School has the gains —
 Of what use is reproach for our well-meaning pains?
 Notwithstanding defects, let the alphabet doubt
 Whether College, or Church, be entirely without,
 And propose it to them, that rotation of letter
 May take their belongings and manage them better;
 For I think, without vying with College or Chapter,
 The proposal, to us, not a syllable apter.

XII.

If the Parliament does, we must yield to our betters:
 There are some, to be sure, amongst men of all letters;
 And it's well if some worse, from the A's to the uzzards,
 Do not make the town wish for their countryfied buzzards.
 But, when I reflect how the workhouse and cut,
 Tho' they both were so good, being hasty of foot,
 Miscarried, by leaving agreement behind,
 I expect a third instance of similar kind.

13) The chapter of the Collegiate Church of Manchester.

14) A project for a navigable cut or canal in Worsley to the River Irwell. Cf. 10 George II, cap. 9(1736); 32 George II, cap. 2(1759).

F. VARIOUS CORRESPONDENCE

F. 1. John Bland¹⁾ to Thomas Kenyon²⁾ and Thomas Pigot³⁾ in Manchester

LaRO, DDKe [Kenyon Papers] 9/114 (5)

[n. d., c. 1730]

Gentlemen,

I received yours by a messenger from Manchester who brought me likewise a letter not sign'd, containing nothing more than a summons on Wednesday next, which I can by no means comply with, as being just setting out for London, where I should have been on the account of private business before this time. I have not time to give my thoughts fully on the proposalls for this *Charitable Design*, but I cannot help saying that it amazes me to see the name of any one honest Church man amongst the subscribers. Since by this scheme it is as certain that the whole power & management will inevitably fall into the hands of 16 of the 24⁴⁾, as that 16 are more in number than 8. And although 8 be so small a part of 24, yet can it not be expected that there will ever be so many as 8 at any future election; for if any of the 8 first trustees happen to dye [*sic*] within the three first years their places must necessarily be fill'd up with friends to the 16. But if any of the 16 dye there will still be enough remaining to substitute others of the same stamp into their places. So that if 3 out of the 8 should dye within the 3 years, the number of 8 would be reduc'd to 5. Beyond which number they could never more possibly rise, but would lose one from that small number so often as any one of them should happen to dye between one election & another, which would soon reduce the 5 to — 0. This is so plain a truth that it admits of no contradiction, & therefore I can give my answer to these modest gentlemen in three words: *Nil Mihi Vobiscum*⁵⁾. Nor will I ever agree to any scheme of this nature, where there is the least proba[bi]lity that the Dissenters and their Confederates should at any time prevail over those that are *True Church of England Men*.

The best service I can do my friends in Manchester will be in the place I am going

1) Sir John Bland, 5th bart., Jacobite. See C. note 8.

2) Thomas Kenyon of Salford. See D.1. note 30.

3) Thomas Pigot, barrister. See D.1. note 5.

4) Of the twenty-four trustees of the workhouse nominated in C., whigs and presbyterians when allied would make sixteen against eight tories.

5) I have nothing to do with you.

to, & there they may depend upon my utmost endeavours to *Defeat This Charitable Design*, which is not improperly so call'd if we allow that charity begins at home, & in this respect I must own the 16 to be as charitable men as ever I met with. My kinsman O—⁶⁾d must certainly be a profound wise man who has given 100 guineas to erect 24 new lords of Manchester, for I cannot suppose if their lordships can carry such a bill, that they will want any power which in charity they ought to bestow on themselves. Pray give my service to the Borough Reeve, Churchwardens &c. from whom also I had a letter & let them know that though I have not leisure to answer it, I have inclination to do them all the kindness that lyes in the power of

Your most faithfull humble servant

J. Bland

[PS] I observe there is no qualification requir'd after the first election, so that the 2d set may be Quakers, Independents, Muggletonians or Jews according to the conscience of the first 24. However I am convinc'd they would be such men as one would almost wish to have chang'd for the set abovenam'd.

F. 2. John Byrom in London to Mrs Byrom in Manchester

Remains, I, ii, 455-57

Page's coffeehouse, Tuesday night, January 26th, 1731

My dear love

I believe I sent you a barrel of oysters and sister Betty ⁷⁾another, she desiring one every week, but I do not well remember, for I am not at leisure for such small matters. You must know this affair of your Manchester bill swallows me up as though I was an oyster myself. Mr. Pigot and I have attended all persons and places, without intermission, since his arrival; even shorthand itself is forc'd to adjourn its concerns for the present, for we must not suffer our countrymen and kinsfolk to be imposed upon, nor tyrants to reign over the poorest of 'em. We have to-night ⁸⁾sent down petitions for to be signed by as many as possible, and to be sent by the return of post, that we may offer them before the committee sits on Wednesday, that is to-morrow se'nnight, and

6) Sir Oswald Mosley. See B. 1. note 2, C. and G. 1.

7) John Byrom's sister Elizabeth.

8) See A. 3. and D. 4. (25 & 26 January).

oppose the very first steps they take. We hope to raise the spirit of true and generous liberty against this awkward phantom resemblance, or rather counterfeit of it, and doubt not of success if our judges themselves are free to vote according to their consciences.

I cannot but laugh to think of your several Dissenters that have petitioned here, that our poor may be brought up as their case, one of 'em (for they have several sorts, of which I have seen three) says, in the true religion^{*)}. These generous Sectaries would free us from the arbitrary power of going to Church, disposing of our own charities, and such wicked things! They have been very sly in their attacks upon the town; but now they come to open rupture we hope for a fair battle, and then fear not success.

I dined with Hu[gh] Williams yesterday; the B[isho]⁹⁾p had been with him long since, and he had a case to which I made what reply the time permitted. I have spoke to some Members of my acquaintance, and Mr. P[igot] and I have been with some who will be hearty for us; all the unprejudiced seem to apprehend that it is a job, as they call it — that is to say, an unfair thing — to be done to please a party. We hope Sir Robert W[alpole] will not use his power against us, he having more material things upon his hands than to humour our petty partisans. We are set writing here, and Mr. G. Lloyd and Dr. Hooper smoking by us. I have writ to Mr. Copley to desire a letter to Sir George Saville¹⁰⁾, to whom I spoke yesterday, knowing him at the Royal Society, and to Darcy Lever. I should have waited on Lady Bland again, but thou knows I had not time. Sir John [Bland] will write to her about this affair.

I am of opinion that they cannot carry the clause of trustees nominating each his successor — nay, I think I am sure on't, as far as these worldly affairs have certainty in them, which is but little: what other form they will put it in, we shall see. I grieve, I own, that the money which is to be bestowed upon lawyers, &c. should not go to the poor's charity, quotha! Oh, the idle attempt of these conventicling contrivances¹¹⁾ for unreasonable power! Happy the quiet, harmless, peaceable poor Christians, who neither desire nor fear any power but that which is good, just, reasonable, beneficial, &c., viz. that of God our common father and governor, to which I commend thee and thine, and am, &c. . . .

*) See B. 1. (page 18 above): 'in the true notions of religion, loyalty and liberty'.

9) Samuel Peploe, bishop of Chester. See C. note 1.

10) Sir George Savile, independent whig. See D. 6. note 3. John Copley (D. 4. note 16) held the rectory of Thornhill under Savile's patronage.

11) Contemptuous address directed against Dissenters' clandestine project, as Byrom assumed.

F. 3. Thomas Pigot and John Byrom in London to Sir Oswald Mosley

LaRO, DDKe 9/114 (10)

[n. d., early 1731¹²⁾]

Sir Oswald,

I have only time to tell you that the gentlemen on the other side are pressing for a bill with very great earnestness & are endeavouring to make it a party dispute, so that I think your presence here would be of very great consequence. If I can be of any service to you in this place, please to command me without reserve....

T. Pigot

PS. I am in so much haste that I fear to lose the post, but I will write more particular[ly] in my next. I have wrote to Mr. Lloyd & Mr. Kenyon whom I suppose you will see.

Sir Oswald,

How do you do? I continue in my opinion that your name and interest is extremely material, to prevent the ill consequences of this intended bill, & beg that we may have your assistance in person I shall rejoice to see you on any occasion but especial[ly] on one so agre[e]able to your inclinations & mine, the love of liberty & friendship to the town of Manchester which I hope will excite you to come hither to the satisfaction of....

J. Byrom

F. 4. Sir Oswald Mosley in Manchester to John Byrom

Remains, I, ii, 461-62

Ancotes, February the 2nd, 1730/1

Sir:

I thankfully acknowledge the receipt of yours, which give me a pleasing prospect of success, and am glad to find you are able to bear the fatigues of soliciting upon an affair of so great consequence, for I have experienced the difficulty of negotiating matters of less moment in that town.

12) Byrom 'wrote...to Sir Oswald Mosley to come up [to London]': D. 4. (30 January).

I have here inclosed a letter to Mr. White, which I have left open that you may see what I have said and supply the defect by explaining the case more fully; perhaps you may prevail on him to engage Lord ¹³⁾How, Sir Robert ¹⁴⁾Sutton, Mr. Pelham, ¹⁵⁾General Sutton, Sir Robert ¹⁶⁾Clifton, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Plumtree, and Lord ¹⁷⁾Galway. I have writ to Sir George Sevil [Savile], Judge ¹⁸⁾Jessop, and Sir Henry ¹⁹⁾Hoghton some time since. I am to write to brother ²⁰⁾Thornhagh, and send it to-morrow morning by a special messenger, desiring him to engage Mr. Hanbury, Sir Thomas ²¹⁾Frankland, Mr. Bacon, ²²⁾Mr. Vincent, and such other Members as he is acquainted with.

I am in hopes the petition for a bill will be rejected, and defer my journey till I hear the success of that. If it should be ordered to be brought in, upon the first notice I shall have my horse saddled for the journey, and shall be willing to join all my forces to yours in attacking the enemy; till then I shall continue meeting our friends at Hawkswel's to drink your health and good success, and am your most humble servant

-
- 13) Emanuel Scrope Howe (?1699-1735), 2nd Viscount Howe [Irish], MP for Nottinghamshire 1722-32, opposition whig.
- 14) Sir Robert Sutton, government whig. See D. 5. note 16.
- 15) Henry Pelham (1695-1754), brother of Thomas Pelham-Holles, Duke of Newcastle (1693-1768). Then paymaster general 1730-43, and future prime minister, he acted as deputy to Walpole in Parliament.
- 16) Richard Sutton (1674-1737), MP for Newark 1712-37, major-general 1727, Walpolian.
- 17) Robert Clifton (1690-1762), MP for East Retford 1727-41, government whig. He succeeded his father as 5th bart. on 27 February 1731.
- 18) George Gregory (1670-1746), MP for Boroughbridge 1727-46, government whig, returned by the Duke of Newcastle.
- 19) John Plumtre, government whig. See A. 6. note 8.
- 20) John Monckton, Viscount Galway, government whig. See D. 2. note 24.
- 21) William Jessop (1665-1734), barrister and MP for Aldborough 1715-34, puisne justice of Chester 1729.
- 22) See D. 2. note 29.
- 23) John Hanbury (?1664-1734), opposition MP for Monmouthshire, constant companion of Duchess Sarah Marlborough, after her husband's death in 1722.
- 24) Sir Thomas Frankland (?1683-1747), 3rd bart., MP for Thirsk, government whig. He was among the committee members on 23 January (A. 1.).
- 25) Waller Bacon (?1669-1734), barrister and MP for Norwich 1715-34, Walpolian, committee member on 23 January (A. 1.).
- 26) Henry Vincent (?1685-1757), MP for Guildford 1728-34, government whig, committee member on 23 January (A. 1.).
- *) Sir Oswald actually came to London on 28 March. See D. 5. note 19.

F. 5. R. Leycester to John Byrom²⁷⁾

Remains, I, ii, 462-63
Chester, 6th February, 1730

Dear John:

I have writ by this post to desire my brother Hugh²⁸⁾ to oppose with might and main the arbitrary and unfair proceedings you mention relating to the Manchester bill. As I am an entire stranger to the matters in dispute amongst you, I had no other arguments to make use of with my kinsman, but only to exhort him to hear both sides and to give judgement without being partial to either, which I presume is all you desire of him; and this, I make no doubt, the worthy senator would have done without my application. However, I think it will be proper for you to wait upon his worship and state the matter in its proper colours, the best meaning men being liable to be imposed upon by misrepresentations.

A friend of mine, one Robin Walpole, might, I fancy, have done you some service in this case, but as you said nothing of him to me I thought it not worth while to write to him

I could never learn since I saw you last, whether you were at Manchester, Cambridge, or London I intend to send you up the Bishop of Chester next week to solicit the Manchester bill, being desirous to have a clever man on each side the question. — Dear John, I always am your loving friend

F. 6. John Byrom to Mrs. Byrom

Remains, I, ii, 463-65
Saturday night, Feb. 6th, 1731 [*sic*]

My dear:

. . . We are still upon the hurryment and lurryment. I carried our case to my printer in ordinary last night, and to-night we shall have some ready cut and dried. Mr. Pigot went to Lord Bingley²⁹⁾ this morning, being sent for, to tell him to make no accommodation, but to fight it out; that Lord is very hearty for our town, nay, he says he thinks

27) Ralph Leycester. See D. 2. note 37, and F. 16.

28) Possibly Hugh Williams. In 1727 Ralph Leycester married Katherine, daughter of Edward Norris (1663-1726), whose another daughter Susannah married Hugh Williams (see A. 13.).

29) Robert Benson, Baron Bingley. See D. 4. note 27.

it his duty, because of the great unreasonableness of the thing, which shocks him. I have two letters from Sir O[swald] Mosley to Crew Offley³⁰⁾ and Mr. White, father to my two disciples, and one from Mr. Copley to Sir George Savile. I shall wait on them with letters and cases accordingly. We are in very good heart, though the committee will, we suppose, bring in something or other to the House, having been so pre-engaged and prejudiced many of 'em. But perhaps when our case appears it may convert some as well as anger others. Justice Chetham and Capt. Gregge³¹⁾ are arrived; pray who told your ladyship that this worthy officer came against my worship? I should be sorry to have my old school-fellow and boarder against me on this occasion, because he would be on the wrong side of the question; and as for any opponent, I am afraid only of a bawling lawyer, not of a generous, fair, militant adversary.

We are all here at the Queen's Head by my lodging, and Mr. Pigot is making out a brief for counsel, our solicitor in Parliament being with us, who is a shorthand man, though of another order. Mr. Banks is lame of the gout, but hopes to mend. Mr. Pigot and I in the midst of our visits made one to Mrs. Leycester and Miss Mosley, who keep a coach and have very smart lodgings by St. James's Square....³²⁾

They have been searching and extracting their quintessences from our town books, which they had an order to inspect. We have also been making proper calculations from 'em, which we presume will be much in our favour. Fazakerly, who was before engaged, had promised to be at Tuesday's committee [on 9 February]. The talk of accommodating, which I just mentioned in my last, is nothing but general amusement, such as neither we nor friends in the country must regard. If they will reject the bill, well and good; if not, let 'em go on, and we shall follow them close. I wish indeed that they would repent of their scheme and trouble their countrymen no more about it; but repentance is a Tory principle it seems, for in one of their cases they say, 'The Tories repent', as if it was a sin to repent, especially of such a wicked scheme as this.

30) Crew Offley (?1683-1739) of Staffordshire, MP for Bewdley 1722-34, government whig.

31) Benjamin Gregge (-1740) of Chamber Hall, sheriff of Lancashire 1722. His daughter Martha married Thomas Percival (1719-1762) of Royton.

32) Queen's Head Inn, Gray's Inn Lane. See D. 4. note 7.

33) Jane Leycester (D. 1. note 23), sister of Sir Oswald Mosley, and Elizabeth (1714-1786), daughter of Sir Oswald.

F. 7. John Byrom to Mrs. Byrom

Remains, I, ii, 465-67Tuesday night, Feb. 9th, 1731 [*sic*]

My dear love:

I promised father Byrom³⁴⁾ last post to send him word what passed at the committee to-day. I have since been with a gentleman of the Temple . . . , so I have scarce time, but desire thee to tell him that we have been at it once more with two counsel of a side, and the point turned chiefly upon the evidence of the book wherein the votes for hiring a workhouse, &c. was written, which our adversaries would have not to be evidence. Rob[ert] Bowker, Mr. Banks, and Mr. Harte and Mr. [John] Byrom were examined,³⁵⁾ Rob. B[owker]'s evidence would not be taken because he had a salary. Mr. Harte was examined touching the value of petitioners, &c. in all views; Mr. Banks to the town meetings; and an order for our withdrawing to consider whether they should read the votes in the books about the hiring. We were called again, and further inquiry made about the books and meetings, and Mr. Byrom was examined. Sir H. Hoghton said he was a subscriber, but that mistake being corrected, he [Byrom] gave his evidence with some warmth, that he was at all the meetings which they laboured to confound with one another, that the house was hired by unanimous consent and first signed by the sub[scriber]s for [the] bill, not till a workhouse should be built as they suggested and had been said by their side, but rather to prevent it, and unanimously rejected (the sub[scriber]s' scheme) at the last meeting; the others being such an inconsiderable minority that they did not for that reason appear. Being asked about his paying rates, etc., and told he had no interest, then said he had no interest in the case but that of truth and liberty, but had a mind to live in peace and quietness at Manchester as they did at present without risking a variation; and, asked how this matter would disturb that, said it had done already and thought would do more if it went on, and the best way was to quash it at once. The committee seemed a little surprised at his eagerness, and not quite so ready to ask him questions as he was to answer. In short, he told 'em his mind for a word of their mouth, and took the opportunity to give a shorthand account of the matter, putting as much as he could into the compass of his examination, and so got the sooner dismissed, having used freedom and little flattery to the good

34) Joseph, father-in-law of John Byrom. See D.1. note 15. and the pedigree on page 33.

35) See A. 6. (24 February).

folks, who were some of 'em a little disposed to ask little piddling questions, but getting nothing from him but the main matter I believe they were glad to get shut of him. When he had done, all withdrew again while they debated the question concerning the books again, and were so long about it that in the meanwhile the House of Commons broke up, and thereby it seems the committee was at an end and could do no more without moving the House to sit again, so they broke up as they went in, without any determination. [Editor's para]

There was a prodigious full committee, the like not known this many years. Some of our friends thought they could have divided a majority against them; on the other side they looked very blank that nothing had been done for 'em. Sir Henry Hoghton was for moving to adjourn, but was told that he could not, nothing done in committees being valid after the House is broke up. We suppose Sir H. H. will watch his opportunity to move (for their sitting again) to-morrow, and will, if our speakers be but there, be opposed; but if he carries his matters through a committee, which the usual arts may perhaps do, yet it is grown a common opinion that he can't carry the bill. The great ³⁶⁾ Pultney, who hardly ever attends committees, was there on our side; Lord Malpas and Sir W³⁷⁾[illia]m Younge not there. We hope that the more the thing is known we shall gain more friends. I perceive the committee way — when questions are to be put, Master Brereton ³⁸⁾ goes and sweeps the out-lying Members in, who not having heard anything of the matter are ready cut and dried for the purpose. I think we follow 'em up hill and shall pull 'em back before they get to the top. There is nothing [which] vexes me but the expence this will put our countrymen to for the preservation of their poor and work from these pretended guardians; but their own interest will, I fancy, make these gentlemen sick of theirs, if we continue our present alacrity against them, which for my part I will do, being very desirous to avoid the ill consequences that may attend this odd scheme if we let it gain ground. I have [been] talking with Capt. Gregge at Dicks without a duel to my worship that you said he came against . . .

36) Daniel Pulteney, opposition whig. See D. 4. note 9.

37) William Yonge, Walpolian MP. See D. 4. note 19.

38) Thomas Brereton, Walpolian MP. See D. 5. note 27.

F. 8. John Byrom to Mrs. Byrom

Remains, I, ii, 467-69

Ab[ingdon's], Thurs. night, Feb. 18, 1731

Dear Mrs. Valentine:

Mr. Pigot is writing by me to Mr. Kenyon,³⁹⁾ &c. He will give account of the committee of yesterday, who very civilly rejected the evidence of the town books, though I can't think a man of 'em all had the least doubt in his own mind of the truth of that evidence; but by the usual stratagems of pouring in numbers of gentry whom they had imposed their own system upon, they carried that question, that what was evidence enough in courts of justice (as our counsel affirm) was none in a court of —. The enemy will triumph much I suppose upon this occasion, but I do verily think they will be disappointed at last. I never much questioned the success of their artifices in this same committee. I think their friends will get them a bill brought in that may pay their charges and establish the trust, but not in the manner they wish for. We have various reports of their ways of softening, rejecting, or modelling their succession scheme, but can't tell, nor I fancy they themselves well, which way it must be offered to the House. I am sure all the gentlemen I have talked with are for a fair election of some sort, as restrained perhaps to those that pay for £10 a year, and for my part I am not discouraged by this committee from thinking that an election must be end on't.

I was again examined yesterday before the committee, and much to the same effect as before, only more were asked me by their counsellors than before. I told 'em I was at the meeting and saw that book there (which was given me to look upon) signed by Mr. Chetham first, and second time by the projectors of the scheme in December, and being asked as to the notice, I did not pretend to know that, but Mr. Hart produced the notice signed by Mr. H. Banks and himself; in short it was as plain as a pikestaff I thought, but they voted the book no evidence, and as to the notice, our friends thought we should have carried a second question about that, but I much doubt it from the humour they were in, but they adjourned till to-morrow.

The last question that concluded my examination having a more particular regard to you Mrs. Val., I must acquaint you with it. When they had wearied themselves and me too in asking how long I had known the town [Manchester], lived there, scot and

39) i. e. F. 9.

lot and lays and tax questions (by which shift I suppose they only laboured to make [me] appear an unlanded mortal and therefore unbelievable) and Mr. Shuttleworth saying something about his wife's paying or managing something in his absence, Sir James Campbell, a Scotch Member, desired to ask me one 'quastion, whather my waif dad nut gev me on accoont of what she paid bae my oardurs, &c.', to which I replied, she was a very good wife and I never called her to account for anything; upon this you may imagine the committee might smile a little. I longed to be a little arch upon such like questions, but not being amongst so many friends as I wished for, I forebore. This same knight came to me after my examination was over from Sir H. Hoghton to tell me that I must not write, that it was disorderly and that he would complain to the committee if I did; so I put up my book, not thinking it a time to overcome the — by opposition.⁴²⁾ Not write in the cause of one's country, in a matter of open trial! But I'll have one trial more for it. We shall certainly overcome such low descending animals at last, the Gothic enemies of liberty and shorthand, which I hope will still flourish in Manchester....

28 for us, 37 for them, but 9 majority with all their fuss, and I dare say several that will be against them in the House.

I have received Sir O. M[osley]'s letter to Whitworth,⁴³⁾ shall write when delivered.

F. 9. Thomas Pigot to George Kenyon in Manchester

LaRO, DDKe 9/116 (83)

[n. d., most probably 18 February 1731]⁴⁴⁾

Dear Sir

The adjournment of the committee till tomorrow morning being so short that it scarce allows me time to write. But as some account will be expected of what hapned [sic] at the last <day that>⁴⁵⁾ committee sat, so I shall inform you that it hapned just as I expected. Tho' we had a very great appeareance in favour of us, yet when we divided upon the question whether the Towns Book should be admitted as evidence, they carryd

40) See A. 6. (page 12).

41) Sir James Campbell (?1665-1752), 2nd bart., MP for Argyllshire 1708-34, government whig.

42) See A. 3. note 3, and D. 4. note 41.

43) Francis Whitworth, government whig. See D. 5. note 21.

44) See F. 8.

45) Insertion by Pigot.

[sic] it by 9 against admitting what (as our councell say) would have been evidence in any court in Westm[inste]r Hall. Afterwards they refused to read the notice of the last towns meeting so that Mr. Banks who read & attested it must come up, & to take away all pretence of excuse, will send you the Speakers summons for him.

It was thought by our freinds[sic] that before the committee broke up we had a majority in our favour, but I doubt they will prevail to bring in a bill, for they have such agents as we cannot procure, who bring down people upon us upon every division. But yet depend upon it the bill moves very heavily even thro' the committee, & I can't help thinking that we get ground upon them, & that they cannot carry the bill upon the foot intended or upon any foot to the prejudice of the town. I have had an intimation of their new scheme, tho' an imperfect one, which I chuse to omitt sending you till I can do it with better authority.

Our freinds are very hearty, & confident of successe when the matter comes before the house [of Commons] — pray take care that the petition in the country is sign'd by every one that pays to the poor, send it to my Unkle Lindley, & every one you can think on that will sign it that the disparity in value may be evident to the house betwixt the petitioners for & against the bill. I will write to you next post when to send it.

I was at Westm[inste]r till 4 o'clock to-day, & found the gentlemen on the other side very bussi[sic] in delivering cases, & l[ett]res with them desireing[sic] the attendance of the Members tomorrow. And I beleive[sic] they have 20 people solciteing for 'em, and a great many falsitys are insinuated, but as they will be detected so I beleive they will turn to our advantage. — The Dissenters have made this a common cause — for I have been told by some Members that would have attended for us, but that they had been applyd to to attend on the other side by the Dissenters in their burroughs[sic]. I cannot yet be positive how far this matter is espous'd by the C[our]t. It did not appear to be so at the last meeting, unless my Ld Malpas appeareing against us should be thought to be a sign of it.⁴⁶⁾ I cannot think of every thing I should say to you to-night, so must conclude with service to our freinds at Hawkswells, to whom pray excuse my not writeing this post & tell Sir Oswald Mosely[sic] that I cannot prevail upon Mr. Leveson⁴⁷⁾ to take any other part in the affair he wrote about that what I mention'd in

46) See A. 6. (page 13), D. 4. (page 52), D. 6. (page 59), F. 7. (page 77), and F. 14. (page 86).

47) Either William Leveson Gower (?1696-1756), tory MP for Staffordshire 1720-56, or Baptist Leveson Gower (?1703-1782), tory MP for Newcastle-under-Lyme, 1727-61.

my last. I will sett apart Saturday to write to every body if we have not another adjournment

T. Pigot

[PS] Our adversaries will affect to triumph upon their advantage in the committee, but I think upon the whole they have little reason to boast. — Let the event be what it will; I have done & shall continue to do my best to oppose 'em.

F. 10. John Byrom to —

Remains, I, ii, 469-71

Abingdon's, Feb. 20th, Saturday night

Dear Sir:

. . . I presume Mr. Pigot is writing accounts and directions somewhere about what passed at the last committee, &c As for our common cause, I hope it will end to the disappointment of the adversary in the main matter of preventing their absurd powers and influences. They had but 3 majority in the question whether the book should be read. Considering the many solicitors they have and the pains they took to drive the votaries thither, they have not been so very triumphant as one might expect in the committee, and I fancy some that were for admitting a bill will not pass such a one as they could wish for. Their counsel gave up the terms of the subs[cription] paper in their reply, and seemed to beg hard for a bill of any sort. They adjourned till Wednesday next,⁴⁸⁾ when the report is to be stated and considered paragraphically, and our friends who are very kind in their attendance will, I hope, see as fair stating of the facts as they can consistent with the bringing in a bill, which we always apprehended they would obtain, though not so hastily perhaps as they imagined at first, having met with as vigorous an opposition as our time and their arts would permit. As soon as ever we can hear any certain account of their bill you shall have it. I waited on Mr. Whitworth with Sir Oswald's letter yesterday morning before I went to the House in hopes of talking with him, but he was not stirring; my humble service to Sir Oswald, when I have seen Mr. Whitworth I shall write to him. I suppose the guardianers[sic] will crow upon their turning up trump in the committee, but as we have I think better cards than

48) i. e. 24 February.

they, I flatter myself we shall get the game. They have indeed many Court cards and some tricks; but if they play false we may make 'em revoke, and besides, we shall reckon all four by honours.⁴⁹⁾

Well, good success and good night. Service to the assembly at Hawkeswell . . .

My dear love:

This [the letter above] was too late last night by mistake, so now I'll e'en it thee. I spoke to Dr. Sayer to-day,⁵⁰⁾ who I believe is to contrive their bill, and he said he would help to accommodate the matter to please all, and talk to me about it after the report . . . Mr. Law has published a book, and yet I have not seen it. Oh, hang this bill!⁵¹⁾ . . . Mr. Pigot and I have been at Westminster, and I dined with Mr. Lightboun to-day . . .

F. 11. Thomas Pigot in London to George Kenyon in Manchester

LaRO, DDKe 9/116 (82), partly destroyed
Febry 27 [torn, but certainly 1731]

Dear Sir

I had the favour of yours & by the same post received the petition. I have for some [time?] been under apprehensions, that as the terms of the subscription are overturned, so we ought to have a new petition. I have consulted Mr. Ward upon it⁵²⁾ — He is of a contrary opininon, & so are the several Members I have talkt[sic] with upon the subject. And still I am not satisfied in my own opinion, have not been able to find Sir Edward Stanley today, otherwise should have got him, to consult again with some others, now the petition is come up. For I am terribly afraid lest any advantage should be taken from a slip since at present in all appearance they have little chance besides.

My last to Mr. Dickanson⁵³⁾ would inform you that we have driven them from the termes of the Subscription and all I can add is that they are confoundedly puzzled[sic] in what shape to bring their bill. I beleive the evidence you have sent is very proper,

49) i. e. Government ministers/MPs.

50) Exton Sayer (?1691-September 1731), LLD, MP for Totnes 1727-31, government whig. 'One of the leading government spokesmen'. He died as a result of a riding accident.

51) William Law (D.5. note 13). The book mentioned is probably *The Case of Reasons, or Natural Religion fairly and fully stated* (1731).

52) John Ward, barrister. See D.4. note 13, and F.13.

53) John Dickenson, merchant. See D.1. note 12.

and I am in no fear of their carrying any point of consequence against us.

I most fear their delay, & [] at the latter end of the sessions [] gone. This would be attended with very [] expense & fatigue for which reason shall get [] call'd upon in the house, if they make much longer delay.

If the gentlemen I advise with should think it proper to have another petition sign'd, will send you one out of hand, but hope there is no occasion. But if I find 'em in the least doubt will not scruple the next post to give you the same trouble again. For as hitherto we have proceeded without any mistake so I should be very sorry if any hapned, now our affairs seem to be in so good a posture.

I am in all probability in for it two months longer, but shall bear it patiently how long soever it is, & am determin'd to see 'em out for to make use of Sir Edward Stanley's words in the debate. I am heartily against the bill . . .

T. Pigot

F. 12. John Byrom to Mrs. Byrom

Remains, I, ii, 472-73

Will's C[offee] H[ouse], Tues. night, Mar. 2, 1731

My dear Love:

I called here to see if any of our Manchester friends were here, but find none, so shall ask you how you all do at Manchester itself. I have been at Westminster, but can learn nothing about our bill, or their bill rather, but that it is not yet ready. I met my disciple the elder White in the park and dined with him; the old man was at the Parliament House all day, his lady told me she heard him say there would be no bill. But I fancy they will do something that one may not like. Lord Malpas, Sir William Yonge, Mr. Chetham, Capt. Gregge, &c. met on Sunday night at the Bedford Head and talked matters over, but I was told of nothing, they said but that that Byrom was an incendiary and set and spirited the Manchester people up, that he had no property and therefore no business to make himself so busy, and that if he had been there they would 'a pulled him to pieces; this I had from a friend, to whom I made the best apology I could for myself, and said if they would admit of it, I would do it before them who were so kind as to charge me with these grievous crimes. I am sure I never have heard the word agreeing or accommodation, but I have leapt at it like a dog at a crust, though I found

nothing was meant by it. Sir G. Saville told me to-day that he understood matters would be agreed; Mr. Whitworth that we should have the election to our liking. I had much discourse with Mr. Oglethorp, whom I met with at Button's Coffeeshouse at Mr. Whiston's lectures, and he said they must keep to a fair election, and so in short several other Members have told me; and yet I can't help my suspicions till the event opens its mouth and speaks what none can possibly contradict.

...If the war begins again we shall see and wait upon all our friends with a better grace, and that is another case; but now I speak to one that will believe me, I wish it was over to everybody's satisfaction and no occasion for any more incendiaries. Strangers have made an observation that half a dozen of the top men from Manchester should have been up and made their appearance only, which would have stopped the thing at once, but they don't consider that great bodies don't move without great occasions. I hope there will be none for anybody's coming; but if for their own diversion or health they have a mind, the weather is admirable; if there be occasion, a little hundred of summons' must march, so pray be at an hour's warning all of you. The Lords are about two to one (86 to 40) against the pension bill, and all the bishops to a man. I have got a sort of a sore throat to be doing with, but it is not very bad. I am going to our Tuesday night friends, whom I have missed being with of late, but have promised to-night to be there. I long to be at home again with thee and thine.

F. 13. Thomas Pigot to —⁵⁷⁾

LaRO, DDKe 9/133 (5)

March 11th, 1730

Dear Sir

Today the bill was brought into the house [of Commons] which you have inclos'd. To me it seems to carry the same if not a worse tendency than the termes of the sub[ription] paper. But you will better judge of it than I am able to do.

I have been in a great hurry all this day, in considering & adviseing[sic] about what is proper to be done. I doubt we shall be obliged to make use of the petition we have,

54) James Edward Oglethorpe, MP. See D. 5. note 26.

55) Button's Coffee House, Russell Street, Covent Garden.

56) *Lords Journals*, XXIII, 628-29. cf. page 52, note 33.

*) Possibly the tory Board of Loyal Brotherhood at the Cocoa Tree. See page 49, note 12.

57) Not known, but forwarded to Thomas Kenyon.

but let not that prevent you from sending one sign'd by the majority of the payers, if it is not already sent. For Mr. Sandys is of opinion it may be presented notwithstanding the former is presented, & therefore I shall expect it by the return of the post at the farthest.

M[ess]rs Fazakerly & Ward are of opinion that you should call a town's meeting to consider of the bill, & to take the sense of the town whether they will oppose it or no. Be sure you be active in getting as many to attend it as possible, & lett the person who is to prove the notice have a copy in his hand & sitt so near the person as to be able to give evidence of it. It is now late & cannot by this post send you the question that will be proper to putt at the town's meeting but will do it time enough, for I doubt doubt[sic] but we shall get a fortnights time, before we have a heareing, so that if you give notice on Sunday we may have the person that proves the notice & the town's votes time enough, go forthwith to Mr. Kenyon & shew him this & desire him to draw a proper notice & get it publish't in the afternoon.

Pray be as active as possible. The gentlemen on the other side begin to sneer again. — Our Members [of Parliament] are very much disoblig'd by reason that the bill is brought into the house contrary to promise. Sir Edward Stanley says he will do his endeavours to oppose it, & so does Mr. Shuttleworth & a great many others, but there is no answering for consequences in an affair of this kind. I am in good heart, & still of opinion that unlesse it is made a point of by the Ministry they cannot carry it. Mr. Banks is the proper man to wittnesse[sic] this town's meeting in regard he is no payer, & knows where the objection lay against the evidence of the former. But take 2 wittnesses that we may be sure of one in case of accident. You need not send the wittnesse that is to affect your petition now signeing till you hear what day we are to be heard on, for if they are up by that time it will be time enough & you shall have proper notice. — I should think if you find a copy of the notice to be given of the town's meeting, after it is publish't upon the Church door & on the Exchange,⁵⁸⁾ it would not be amisse.

I hope Mr. Dickanson won't think it hard to come. If I am advised he may be examin'd. — I think we want the appeareance of some of the partys-interessed[sic] as well as those that are sent up as agents or evidence.

It being late, I can add no more at present but you may depend that I shall leave

58) The Exchange in Market Place, Manchester, built by Sir Oswald Mosley in 1729.

no stone unturn'd, I must now have resort again to Mr Neilds banquer⁵⁹⁾[sic], but shall advise you when I go thither as I have done hitherto. We are all together drinking your healths....

T. Pigot

[PS] My service to Mr. Illingworth: Mr. Hart has wrote to him.

F. 14. John Byrom to Mrs. Byrom

Remains, I, ii, 473-75

Abindon's, Thurs. night, Mar. 18, 1731

My dear love:

We have had some little squabbling at our Royal Society Parliament to-night⁶⁰⁾, and I have been engaged amongst some of that fraternity till it is too late to write so much as I thought for; but I hear Mr. Pigot has writ to Mr. Lloyd and Sir Oswald, and Mr. Hart to Mr. Illingworth; and your brothers, who were at the House when the reading of the bill a second time was debated, will give you account thereof. Sir Edward Stanley made an exceeding good speech⁶¹⁾ against it; as did Mr. Sandys who opened the debate, and Mr. Oglethorp, Plummer⁶²⁾, &c. spoke against it stoutly, Lord Malpas, Sir William Yonge, Dr. Sayer, Sir Edmund Bacon, Hugh Williams, Sir H. Hoghton for it, or rather for the second reading, for still they seemed to give up the point of the election of trustees, but urged that it might be altered if amiss, and that the House might reject it still if they did not like it. It was carried for the second reading upon a division, 121 against 94, viz. 27 majority against us, and yet I think the bill will not pass; for there are many who might think it hard not to allow a bill a second reading, and yet not be for it upon its suggested terms if insisted on. Sir Rob. Walpole was there, and I presume some might pay him and Lord Malpas the compliment not to reject a bill brought in by that noble lord with so little ceremony. [Editor's para]

59) Miles Nield, merchant living in Hunt's Bank, Manchester. See C. note 11.

60) i. e. at the House of Commons last night. Tonight is a dialect for last night.

61) Either Richard Plumer (?1689-1750), MP for Lichfield, 1722-34, then independent whig, or Walter Plumer (?1682-1746), MP for Appleby 1730-41, 'one of the leading spokesmen of the opposition whigs'. One Mr. Plummer was among the committee members of 23 January 1731 (A. 1.).

62) Sir Edmund Bacon (?1680-1755), 6th bart., was tory MP for Norfolk 1728-41. Perhaps Byrom took him for Waller Bacon, government MP for Norwich (F. 4. note 25).

63) See A. 8.

I was told to-night by a Member that I have been with, of the Royal Society, and who was against us, or for the second reading, that the bill he could tell me would not pass. I saw another gentleman on our side that I met by accident and was a stranger to, that he hoped they could dam it as the phrase is, that is to say, stop it or delay it, or somehow hinder its passing. I don't suppose but others are of a different opinion; but for my part I must confess I cannot see any reason for our guardians to crow over us yet, and am persuaded that they are not at all pleased with the opposition made even to the reading of their bill. If the gentlemen of the town are as hearty as I take them to be, if those who can come will come, and the rest take pains, the mischief may be prevented. Wednesday se'⁶⁴⁾nnight is appointed for the second reading. Mr. Pigot I doubt not has sent what directions are necessary. I have not met with him to-night. I am glad of 350 hands to the petition;⁶⁵⁾ I may be mistaken, but I verily think that if these people will have a bill they must have it with a fair election. It will never do as it stands at present; therefore Mrs., as you love your native country, don't be discouraged, but hope on; I intend to write next post more fully, but have not time now. I must go to Lord Delawar to-morrow morning again, he is entered the lists of shorthand and tells me the Duke of Devonshire and another lord in his street intend to learn. Come, I hope we shall see Manchester and its arts flourish still!

F. 15. John Byrom to Mrs. Byrom

Remains, I ii, 480-82

Thursday night, April 1st, 1731

Dear Mrs.

How do? Mr. Pigot is writing here at Page's Coffeehouse, and Sir Oswald and Mr. Dickenson have wrote, so I need only ask ye how ye all do at home. The bill dispute will not come on to-morrow because of other affairs in course before it. Wednesday is talked on for it, so this day se'⁶⁶⁾nnight will be time enough to tell ye what passed about it. Sir Oswald has been with Newcastle's duke and Sir Bob Bluestring, knt, &c., of which I suppose he will himself take notice. I have been talking the matter over with

64) 24 March. See A. 9.

65) Either the petition [IV] to the Commons (A. 10.), or one intended to the Lords (F. 17).

66) See E. 3.

Lord Carteret this morning. I left the papers with him yesterday for his perusal, and to-day had a private audience, and he said he was in opinion with us and would do what he could in the House of Lords, if it came there, which he thought it would not. I met Mr. Oglethorp in a chair as I was walking by, and asked him what he thought, and he said he thought we should succeed, and that he fancied they began to grow tired of it. Thus say they, and thus I hope it will happen, though it is talked on as a determined point by the gentlemen on the other side, who will make no alterations, and who, I will lay gold to silver, will have no bill unless they do. But I may be mistaken, and I look not upon them as infallible. The public, I'm sure, seem to have a notion of it not at all in its favour, and it must be carried by a kind of main force against the very sense of those who are to vote for it, who therefore will perhaps absent, if not be for us. But these things are uncertainties till they are past. Here is the Charitable Corporation here have [*sic*] gained a question, 158 against 91, which some would make the measure of our future overthrow; but that is all imagination. I question not but there is a fairer prospect of the bill's not passing than of its passing, much will depend upon the attendance of friends, if they be but in town it will be well. Sir Henry Hoghton is ill at home of a fever as they say, I wish his recovery of strength and sentiment in due time. I had some converse with the Bishop t'other day in the Court of Requests about indifferent matters, he was very civil, and I said I would do myself the honour to wait on him, and so shall some day or other. The 3 gentlemen I mentioned, *viz.* Lord Delawar, Lord Nassau Powlet, and the Duke of Devonshire have begun shorthand. The Duke wrote at the first trial a paragraph out of a newspaper very readily, and if he has but leisure and apply a little to it, will be one of our top proficients....

F. 16. John Byrom to Ralph Leycester

Remains, I, ii, 482-84

London, April 3rd, 1731

Dear Peter:

The Manchester bill wags on, some say it will pass, some say it will not. I am in

67) See D. 5. note 16 (page 55).

68) Ralph Leycester is often addressed as 'Sir Peter': *Remains*, I, i, 53; *Poems*, III, 3-5, 14. See F. 5. and D. 2. note 37.

opinion against it, but think it more advisable at present not to trouble you with any dispute about it. I am sorry to see my countrymen in a contention of this nature; I think the blame belongs to those who are the real promoters of it, by offering at such powers as they would not care to have trusted to others, though that in time would be the consequence. I desire no new government corporations against the consent of the people, whom one may, if they please, suppose to understand their own interests as well as those wise gentlemen who are for humbling them, as the phrase now runs. I take that part which I imagine will do best for the present, and prevent the like arbitrary nonsense for the future.

They that tell you I am mad, you may tell them they are in the right on't; it is also enacted by the authority aforesaid that I am a fool, and a Jacobite;⁶⁹⁾ and when they have rung changes upon these 3 musical drones till they be weary, I hope their most noble Festivities will betake themselves to their repose and leave me to mine.

... I have the pleasure of seeing your sisters in the park now and then, and they are both in good health....

Your relation Sir Oswald Mosley is in town on purpose to prevent or vary the bill, for which he has suffered in his reputation, as well as I, from those gentlemen who give too much into the low policy of enriching a design with the spoils of their private characters who oppose it, an injury which no one can fence against, which it is hard to bear, but worse to return. As far as I can apprehend, Sir Oswald has acted with great openness, integrity, and consistency in the affair, and with that good nature and intention which, if it had prevailed as much in others, would have prevented any contest, any bill. I don't pretend to justify the ruin of men, women, children, church, and trade, from this bill. — You know this is the vulgar way of expressing men's opinion of a bad thing, that it will ruin the country. A corporation of this nature will as naturally corrupt as a stagnating pool, unless a fair election preserve it clean and sweet like running water. I pray, sir, what have these Whigs against Whig-ism to say for forcing a law for which the people say they have no occasion, the laws in being sufficient — but I had designed to say no more of this matter but when called upon by greater necessity. I flatter myself that notwithstanding what some of your friends, whom I never seek to disoblige, tell you, I may reckon myself as earnest.

69) See D. 6. (10 June 1731) and E. 4.

F. 17. John Byrom to Mr. Lloyd⁷⁰⁾

Remains, I, ii, 491-92

Richard's, Tuesday night, April 13th 1731

Dear Sir:

You're very welcome. I rejoice to hear of your health and the town's joy. Long may they both continue. If those gentlemen who were for the bill are pleased, certainly your satisfaction is very general. I would only beg one favour of my loving countrymen altogether, and that is, that for the future they would carry so fairly and kindly to each other that the beginnings of matters may be as acceptable to them all as the endings of them have happily proved to be in this case.

I am glad your petition to the Lords is so complete as 360. I'll take care that it shall be presented if the bill should pass the Commons at the 6 weeks' end.⁷¹⁾ You say you could make them more, but I fancy that about 5 more or 6 at most would do, provided that every person would take upon him or herself, their heirs and successors, to put the town in mind every day of the 365 or 6 in the year, that they mind their business, agree among themselves, see that no poor soul want relief, and beware of a corporation.

... If ever I am lady of the manor [of Manchester]⁷²⁾, I will have the Town Hall graced with this same instrument of escape, and my burgesses shall adorn it as they please; or, if I am a burgess myself I am resolved my halberd shall be as like a pikel as possible.

Well, after all, I wish you joy of your success in asserting the rights of Manchester against a dangerous invasion. Peace and good neighbourhood be with ye. High, be civil to the low; rich, take care of the poor;⁷³⁾ one live comfortably with another. Amen....

70) Gamaliel Lloyd, merchant. See D.1. note 10, and D.3. note 11.

71) See A.13, F.14. note 65. The bill did not pass the Commons.

72) Lady Ann Bland, whig lady of the manor of Manchester, and mother of Sir John Bland, Jacobite. See D.1. note 22 and D.6. (page 62).

73) cf. D.6. note 19 for Byrom's paternalistic stance.

F. 18. John Byrom to Mrs. Byrom

Remains, I, ii, 492-93

Thursday, April 15, 1731

My dear love:

I received yours yesterday, was very glad to hear you were all so sharp and so much good company together, and that our folks got so well home from London, and were so ushered in with ringing of bells, &c. They would hardly expect to arrive there in such triumphant circumstances. I am glad too to hear there were no disturbances, only 5d.⁷⁴⁾ in window glass at the meeting, which, considering the expense it had put the town to, was well off belike....

F. 19. John Byrom to Mrs. Byrom

Remains, I, ii, 508-14

Windsor, 4 o'clock Tuesday, June 1st, 1731

... We set out from Abingdon's this morning at 3 o'clock to go up the water part of our way [the Thames] to this place.... We are drinking some green tea lemonised a little at the coffeehouse,⁷⁵⁾ having been to view the outside of the Castle. We hope to be at Oxford to-morrow in very good time, and expect to be met by Messrs. Clayton⁷⁶⁾ and Thyer.⁷⁷⁾

... As we travel *incog*[*nito*], we shall be probably at home before your bellman is aware of it, so that he need not provide any new ropes upon that occasion, for I presume your old ones will hardly hold out such a long, full peal as will reach the ears of

Thine, J. B.

74) See D. 6. (page 60: 7 April) when a mob at Manchester was expected.

75) '... and went to the coffeehouse, and drank three dishes of tea apiece with a lemon': *Remains*, I, ii, 514.

76) John Clayton (1709-1773) was at Brasenose College, Oxford, 1725-32, where he joined the Oxford Methodists. High Churchman and Jacobite, he was elected chaplain of the Collegiate Church of Manchester in 1740 and fellow in 1760.

77) Robert Thyer (1709-1781), also educated at Brasenose College, became Chetham's Librarian in 1732, and edited Samuel Butler's MSS.

78) See F. 18. and D. 6. (10 June 1731).

G. LEGAL DOCUMENTS [G. 2. *et seq.* in Part Two]

G. 1. Sir Oswald Mosley's Case relating to a Workhouse Building in Manchester, and Actions brought against him for Workmen's Wages, Materials, etc., with Mr. Fazakerly's¹⁾ Opinion, 31 January 1732

MaCL, MSF 362. 51. M1 (3-6)

<[Marginal note] Several actions were brought ag[ain]st Sir Osw[ald]
(one of the Subscribers to the Workhouse) by the Workmen for Wages,
Mater[ia]ls, &c. which were tried at Lanc[aste]r Assizes.>

Case — In October 1729, a Subscription of 2000£ was made by some of the Inhabitants of the town of Manchester for erecting a public Workhouse in the said town, and Trustees were nominated for carrying on the said building &c. (whereof Sir Os: Mosley was one) in pursuance of the deed of Subscription²⁾ q[uo]d *vide* annexed. This Subscription being set on foot by some of the Subscribers with private views to their own advantage and obtained by surprise before the consequences of the terms subscribed to were well understood, did soon afterwards meet with almost a general dislike, and 8 of the 24 persons named as Trustees refused to act nor ever met the rest unless to declare their disapprobation of the design; but the other Trustees supposing themselves to have a power according to their subscription-deed to apply to Parliament for an Act to establish their designs: And a majority of those Trustees, *vizt.* 16 out of 24 (of which Sir Osw: Mosley was one) thinking they might with better colour apply to Parliam[en]t for an Act in case they had a building erected for a Workhouse before such application to Parliam[en]t, met by themselves 9 June 1730 and made an order for the erecting of a building and for the collecting of 7s. 6d. in the pound of each subscriber for carrying on the building intended: in consequence of this order Mr. Butterworth the cashier made a deputation to Mr. Smith which recites the former order (which deputation we are in possession of)³⁾ to collect several sums of money but to what amount was collected we know not, and it being at the last mentioned meeting agreed to erect the building upon part of the Poor lands (for which some of the 16 were Trustees and one of them the actual tenant thereof)⁴⁾ and to employ Mr. Nicholas Mosley as a steward or agent to look⁵⁾

1) Nicholas Fazakerley, barrister and later tory MP for Preston. See D.2. note 20.

2) The latter half of B. 1.

3) Thomas Butterworth, leading presbyterian of Manchester. See B.1. note 4.

4) Unidentified.

5) Nicholas Mosley (-1734), woollen draper of Manchester, a relative of Sir Oswald.

over the workmen. And Sir Osw: Mosley not being then apprized of the mischievous consequences of the terms in the Subscription deed, and being a gentleman well skill'd in architecture, was ready and assisting with Ja[me]⁶⁾s Cheetham Esq. and others in the carrying on the said building, and in order thereunto the said Sir Osw: Mosley did acquaint the said Nich[olas] Mosley that he was by the said 16 Trustees appointed their agent or steward for the purposes aforesaid, who accepted the said trust without any other orders, as he says, or we can prove. [Editor's para]

The building was begun and the workmen received their directions chiefly from Sir Osw: Mosley as to the dimensions &c. but in some instance from Mr. Cheetham. The plan being first approved on by Sir Osw: Mosley, Mr. Cheetham, and some others of the trustees to whom the same was referred: The building was carried on, and Nic[holas] Mosley as steward or agent to the said Trustees received of Mr. Butterworth their cashier several sums of money from time to time, in the whole 176£ and applied the same to the discharge of the workmen and for materials used in and about the building: but the more publick the terms of the said subscription became, the more they were disliked; and charges of the building exceeding greatly the sums received by the said Nich[olas] Mosley; And Mr. Butterworth and the rest of the said 16 trustees refused to advance any more, expecting to carry a Bill in Parliam[en]t for the purposes aforesaid, and thereby to compel the payment of all the Subscription-money. But Sir Osw: Mosley being afterwards convinced that it would be very prejudicial to the town if an Act of Parliam[en]t was obtained upon the foot then intended: And the other Trustees refusing to proceed amicably with the rest of the town in obtaining an Act of Parliam[en]t that might be of general benefit: He did thereupon join with the 8 Trustees and the other Subscribers who opposed the Bill, and by that means the promoters of the Bill were defeated in Parliam[en]t, and several sums of money are still standing out and owing to the workmen, and for materials used and employed in the said building. [Editor's para]

With designs to have calmed the heats in the town that happened on this occasion a town's meeting was called, and the Churchwardens and Overseers impowered to hire or purchase a Workhouse pursuant to the Stat[ute] 9 G[eorge]⁷⁾ 1st. And the Churchwardens and Overseers did thereupon offer to the gentlemen who had ordered the build-

6) James Chetham, influential whig magistrate. See B.1. note 6.

7) Knatchbull's Workhouse Act of 1723. See Preface note 3.

ing to purchase the same for the use of the town, and pay as a consideration for the same, the expenses they had been at in the building of it including the money due to the workmen, and for materials &c. But these gentlemen being exasperated at Sir Osw: Mosley for leaving them and opposing their designs in Parliam[en]t, in hopes to distress him, and by that means (as we imagine) to force him into a Court of Equity for relief against all the Subscribers, have spirited up 8 of the workmen and others to whom money is due on account of the said building to bring actions at law against Sir Osw: Mosley, two of which will be ready for trial at the next Assizes (*vizt*) one at the Suit of Rob[er]t Howarth,⁸⁾ head carpenter for 80£ due to him for work and labour, and the other at the Suit of Matt[he]w Pickford⁹⁾ for Wood sold. [Editor's para]

We imagine they will produce some evidence of orders given by Sir Osw: Mosley to Rob[ert] Howarth to undertake the work, and buy timber, tho' he cannot recollect that he ever gave any, but on the contrary believes otherwise. But in case of any proof of that kind as to the action brought by Howarth, we shall be able to shew, that in the first place Howarth was with Sir Osw: and the other Trustees when the Plan of the building was agreed upon, and that Howarth had actually before that time been along with Mr. Cheetham (a principal manager on the other side) or by his orders at Mat[he]w Pickford's Timber Yard to look out for timber proper for the intended building. And that after the building was begun the said Howarth together with Nich[olas] Mosley bought some timber of one Rosthorne Bowers, and that upon Bowers asking who must be paymaster he told him, all the whole body of the Trustees, Bowers askt[*sic*] whether he might book it to Sir Osw: Mosley, Howarth said, No, then Bowers askt who was Howarth's paymaster for the work he did about the building, to which Howarth answered, that he did not look upon any particular person to be his paymaster, but the whole body was willing and agreed that he should do the work. Besides this we've a note under Howarth's hand, whereby he owns in express terms that he was not employed by Sir Osw: Mosley only, but upon the credit of all the Trustees. Several persons were sent to by the said 16 Trustees in a body to draw a Plan for the said building, and the whole was transacted in a publick manner.

Howarth, the carpenter, hath declared both before and since the action brought to the effect, that he looked upon himself as employed by the whole body of Trustees, and

8) Robert Howarth, carpenter, died before 1735: PRO, DL 4/140 (depositions in 1735).

9) Matthew Pickford, timber merchant.

that he had no particular orders from Sir Osw: Mosley. And it is also in proof that Mr. Cheetham and Mr. Abra¹⁰⁾[ha]m Howarth (another of the trustees) gave directions about the said building, as well as Sir Osw: Mosley, and that the building was publickly known and understood to be undertaken upon the foot of the said Subscription, and that several other workmen were employed by Sir Osw: and Mr. Cheetham, or Abr[aha]m Howarth jointly that Nich[olas] Mosley was agent or steward, for the body paid the workmen's wages from time to time, from all which circumstances[.]

Q — Whether Robert Howarth can maintain his action against Sir Os: Mosley singly.

A — If the facts can be proved as above stated, I am of opinion that Rob[ert] Howarth cannot maintain this action singly against Sir Osw: Mosley.

N. F.

As to the action brought by Pickford.

Sir Osw: Mosley never saw Pickford in his life, nor ever made any agreem[en]t with him for Wood, but the same was taken up by Rob[ert] Howarth and Nich[olas] Mosley for the use of the Workhouse. And a bill of parcels thereof was actually delivered to the said Nich[olas] Mosley and Ja[me]s Cheetham Esqrs.[, and they] are made debtors to Pickford for the said Wood by one of Pickford's sons, by whom the Wood was sold. The bill of parcels is in our hands, and was delivered to Nich[olas] Mosley, wrote by Mr. Pickford's servant who usually writes his bills.

Q — If Nich[olas] Mosley will be allowed an Evidence to prove the bill of parcels delivered to him as aforesaid, and of what weight will the bill of parcels be, if proved to be wrote by Pickford's servant, & by the master's order?

A — I think Mr. Nich[olas] Mosley will be allowed to be an Evidence, if you can prove the bill of parcels to be writ by Pickford's directions it will be Evidence.

N. F.

Nich[olas] Mosley does not pretend that he had any orders from Sir Osw[al]d to buy the said wood of Pickford, but that Sir Osw[al]d gave him orders to buy Lime, Flags, and drink for workmen, and that he thereupon presumed he had authority to provide materials for the building. We presume they will endeavour to prove that Sir Osw: Mosley gave some general orders or directions to Howarth about providing timber, and it might possibly happen upon Howarth's representing to him what timber was necessary that he might bid him get it, Sir Osw[al]d being frequently with the workmen and

10) Abraham Haworth, a whig trustee of the workhouse. See B.1. note 8.

overlooking them whilst the said building was on foot, and giving directions about it, but does not remember that he gave any such orders or directions about the said wood, and it is plain from the said bill of parcels that it was not sold upon his Credit.

[Q —] In case any proof of that kind should be attempted, can Nich[olas] Mosley or Howarth be admitted as Evidence in regard it will be swearing in discharge of themselves: And in case it should be proved that Sir Oswald ordered Howarth to provide wood proper for the building, will such general agency make Sir Oswald liable to either action, or considering the circumstances can it be intended that Rob[er]t Howarth did buy the wood upon Sir Oswald's credit, when he has frequently declared he was employed by all the Trustees, and the bill of parcels was otherwise made?

A — I think Nicholas Mosley (being no more than a servant) and Howarth may be proper Witnesses, but if Howarth should prove directions from Sir Oswald Mosley, and Howarth bought goods on the credit of Sir Oswald, it will be of some weight with a Jury to make him liable to Pickford: but it being uncertain what will be Howarth's evidence, I think it's not possible to give any opinion relating to it, but the credit by the bill of parcels being given to N. Mosley and Mr. Cheetham will be a strong evidence in favour of Sir Oswald: but without knowing Howarth's evidence my opinion can't be of any weight.

N. F.

Q — If a verdict should be given against Sir Osw: Mosley has he any, and what remedy and against whom, in a Court of Equity, and whether the Trustees only or all the Subscribers will be liable to make good the monies laid out as aforesaid in erecting the said building.

A — I think Sir Oswald may have relief in Equity against all the Subscribers to make them proportionably liable to reimburse him.

N. F.

Q — There are special writs brought by the said Howarth and Pickford in which they declare upon a common *indebitat[us]* ¹¹⁾ *assumpsit quantum meruit* and upon an account stated. Whether is it proper for Sir Oswald to plead the general issue, or any other, and what plea, to the actions?

A — He must plead the general issue.

N. Fazakerly

31 Jan[uar]y 1731 —

11) A form of action to demand recovery of damages upon a simple contract (implied promise).