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Introduction

John Perceval (1683–1748), fourth baronet, of Burton Hall, near Kanturk in County Cork, created first Baron Perceval (in 1715), first Viscount Perceval (1723) and first Earl of Egmont (1733) in the Irish peerage, sat in the British House of Commons for the government borough of Harwich in the parliament of 1727–34, and left to posterity a diary containing accounts of debates in the Commons which constitute the best source for parliamentary proceedings during the period of Sir Robert Walpole’s prime ministership.¹ This was published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission in three volumes between 1903 and 1909, as appendices to its sixteenth report.² Elsewhere in Perceval’s large personal archive in the British Library other examples survive of the diarist’s craft and some of these have been published: in 1962 Robert McPherson edited the ‘journal’ compiled by Perceval from notes, minutes and papers while he was a trustee of the Georgia Society in the 1730s;³ in 1969 Aubrey Newman printed fragments from 1749–51 and 1760, illustrating the politics of the ‘Leicester House’ faction, with which Perceval was involved;⁴ in 1982 the present author published excerpts relating to Irish parliamentary proceedings in 1711 and 1713 from a ‘journal of public affairs’ kept by Perceval between 1711 and 1718;⁵ and in 1989 Mark Wenger edited Perceval’s diary of his travels in 1701 as a young man through the eastern and northern counties of England.⁶ Occasional references in the Historical Manuscripts Commission volumes indicate that Perceval had compiled other accounts of events – specifically of parliamentary debates – and forwarded them in correspondence. The British Library’s collection of his papers contains five such items, which are printed below: detailed accounts of debates at Westminster dating from March and April 1731 which do not seem to have been used by historians of the period, and which complement the published ‘diaries’.

What we know of Perceval’s method of compiling these surviving ‘diaries’ suggests
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² Henceforth H.M.C., Egmont Diary.
strongly that they were not in fact written up on a daily or even weekly basis, but put together in longer segments from other sources. Perceval assiduously kept copies of the letters he sent to his many friends and acquaintances (a number of them in Ireland, for whom his correspondence was an important source of news from Westminster), so he would have been able to draw on a large stock of raw material. The editor of the diaries covering the 1727–34 parliament was impressed by Perceval’s conscientiousness in preserving notes of incidents and the details of speeches, and considered it likely that his accounts were set down shortly after the event, ‘when impressions were fresh in his mind’. But the evidence of earlier, Irish, diaries from 1711–13 seems to indicate a date of composition some time afterwards; not least the fact that much of the material was repeated in a different document, a kind of political ‘autobiography’, which may have served as a first attempt by Perceval to put his notes in order. A similar process of editing is suggested by the survival in the Perceval (Egmont) papers of two separate accounts of a debate in the British House of Commons in 1728, one giving a note of the points made by each speaker in turn, and the second, in the form of a draft letter to an unnamed correspondent, which grouped the speakers and the arguments on each side of the question (though associating particular comments with separate individuals in footnotes). Typically, the accounts of debates contained in the 1727–34 diaries follow a pattern in which speakers for and against a question are listed together, and their arguments treated collectively, something which must mark at least a second stage in composition. It may well have been Perceval’s habit to expand his notes into connected prose, as a preliminary stage of editing, and then to reassemble the text in the form in which it was finally set down in his diaries.

The first of the new reports printed in this article covers the debate on Tuesday 23 March 1731, on the report of the ‘grand committee’ of the House of Commons appointed to examine petitions from weavers in Bristol, London and other towns about the depressed state of English cloth manufacture. The upshot was the appointment of a committee of the whole House, to establish ‘what might be proper to be heads of a bill to relieve the woollen manufacture of England’, in particular how to deter, if not to prevent altogether, the smuggling of Irish woollen yarn to France (which enabled the French to undercut English exports) and of Irish woollen cloth to Portugal (which had excluded English clothiers from the Portuguese trade). When this committee met on Friday 2 April 1731, Perceval again recorded the debate. (He may also have spoken in it himself, having prepared a lengthy speech, but if so did not note his own contribution.) These two accounts were included in letters to his friend Marmaduke Coghill, a leading figure in the court, or ‘Dublin Castle’, party in the Irish House of Commons and a member of the Irish revenue commission. Perceval noted specifically in the diary in relation to the debate of 2 April that he ‘would not set down the particulars […] because I have mentioned them in my letter to Dr Coghill’. The next new report relates to a debate on the following Monday, again in a committee of the whole, but this time concerning the fortifications erected by the Spanish monarchy that appeared to threaten…
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Gibraltar. Perceval’s diary scarcely mentioned this debate at all, other than to say that the House sat till eight o’clock in the evening, and to give the bare bones of what had occurred: ‘Sir Thomas Sanderson made a motion […] which may be seen in the votes, but Mr Conduit moved the leaving the chair, which was carried at length without a division.’ The fourth new report, on 8 April, recorded proceedings in the committee considering possible heads for a woollen bill, which was now debating a motion to open English ports to receive Irish wool and woollen yarn. Again, this debate was dealt with in the diary in a single sentence, with Perceval noting, ‘I writ Mr Coghill an account of affairs’. The committee reported on 12 April, and a proposal to remove the import duty on Irish yarn occasioned considerable debate. This time Perceval’s diary gives a list of speakers on each side, and the gist of the arguments, but the newly discovered report is fuller and attributes speeches to individuals. The diary and the new report deal with the aftermath, the debate on the first reading of the bill on 14 April, in a similar way. The last of these new reports covers debates on 26, 27 and 28 April, again on the woollen bill, and here what we have is complementary to the diary and roughly equal in the depth of detail provided. Again, Perceval gives a clue to the nature of the separate report by observing in his diary entry for 28 April that ‘many other gentlemen spoke in the debate, which I have taken notice of in my paper to Dr Coghill’.

It is easy to see why Perceval should have been especially interested in the debates over the woollen trade, and should have communicated the results to Coghill. Irish Protestants nursed a particular grievance over the passage of the English Woollen Act of 1699, which had prohibited exports of wool or woollen cloth from Ireland other than to England. This statute was seen not merely as casual discrimination against Ireland carried out to benefit sectional English interests, but a death-blow to Ireland’s principal manufacture. Historians have questioned its actual impact, and the extent to which it may have been mitigated subsequently by the growth of the illicit trade to the continent, but there can be no doubting its symbolic importance. This was all the more prominent in 1731, because the Irish economy was then perceived to be in the grip of a severe economic depression triggered by successive harvest failures in the late 1720s. Public opinion in Ireland sought a solution. The Irish parliament proposed measures to drain bogs, encourage the growing of corn, and promote manufactures; pamphleteers proposed measures against absentee landlords; and a group of amateur agronomists founded the Dublin Society to spread the message of economic ‘improvement’. The economic crisis also had a powerful political dimension: in Ulster famine resulted in the large-scale emigration of Protestant Dissenters to north America, thus weakening the Protestant interest in the kingdom. Although he was himself an absentee landowner, Perceval was devoted to the interests of his native country, and had a strong personal stake in the health of the woollen industry, since his estate lay in County Cork, a centre for wool production.

While the ultimate ambition of Irish Protestants was to achieve some amelioration of the restrictive clauses in the Woollen Act and other elements of English mercantilist legislation (such as the various Navigation Acts regulating the opportunity for commerce with the
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transatlantic plantations), the immediate problem in 1731 was to avoid the imposition of further restraints on Irish trade. Vested interests in England were still concerned about Irish competition, but in different ways, as the debates reported by Perceval make clear. Wool-growing and cloth-manufacturing districts were aggrieved at the smuggling of Irish yarn and cloth. There was a strong belief among English clothiers that the Irish government, in particular the customs service, was unwilling rather than unable to stop the smugglers. What they demanded was a guarantee that the Irish would not weave cloth for export, or send yarn abroad, but instead send all their yarn cheaply to England. The Irish landed class, which tended to regard the smuggling scare as exaggerated, could see at least some economic advantage in greater access for Irish yarn to the English market. English spinners objected, however; what they wanted, understandably enough, was cheap Irish wool, which they themselves could work up. Yet, as Coghill pointed out, to draw all Irish wool across to England would ruin ‘the yarn trade’ in Ireland. The Irish were thus faced with more than one English vested interest, and the English regions particularly involved in wool-growing, weaving and spinning – the west country, Yorkshire, and East Anglia – were either over-represented in the House of Commons, or, in the case of the Norfolk weavers, had a particular claim on the prime minister personally, who hailed from that county.

Nevertheless, Perceval, and like-minded Irishmen at Westminster, still had valuable cards to play. In 1731 Walpole was not entirely sure of his position in the House of Commons. His ministry had been weakened by the resignation of Lord Townshend the previous year, and a conjunction had been effected between the Tories and opposition Whigs led by William Pulteney, which seriously threatened the Court majority in the lower House, especially over issues in which public opinion was aroused.\(^{23}\) On day-to-day business Walpole came to depend on the votes of ‘independent country gentlemen’, of whom Perceval was one: members who were ostentatiously uncommitted to either side, or, like Perceval, generally loyal but not to be persuaded against their conscience on points of principle.\(^{24}\) Moreover, if Perceval could organize an ‘Irish lobby’ in the Commons this might carry as many votes and thus as much weight as some English regional interests,\(^{25}\) the more so since besides the short-term cost to the ministry of losing the votes of Irishmen at Westminster, there were also implications for the management of the Irish parliament. Walpole was ambivalent about the desirability of a smooth parliamentary session in Dublin: on the one hand, the furore against Wood’s Halfpence in 1723–5 had proved an unnerving experience, but he had withstood the storm and reorganized his Irish ‘system’, as he thought, to prevent a recurrence, and in any case it would be the lord lieutenant who would feel the sting of any backlash over wool, and Walpole had developed a habit of using the lord lieutenantancy as a punishment detail for politicians who crossed him.\(^{26}\) The balance of these calculations meant that Walpole was willing to help the Irish lobby if it would secure him votes in the Commons, and would probably have preferred a settlement of Anglo–Irish commercial differences that was acceptable to both sides, but was not prepared to push the Irish case very far.

Perceval had begun the task of defending Irish woollen interests at Westminster in the


\(^{24}\) On this point see A. A. Hanham, ‘Whig Opposition to Sir Robert Walpole in the House of Commons, 1727–1734’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of Leicester, 1993). Much of what I know about the nature of English parliamentary politics in this period has been derived from discussions with Dr Hanham, for which I am very grateful.


spring of 1729, in response to a petitioning campaign by English cloth manufacturers over the decay of their trade, which they attributed to clandestine exports of cheap Irish yarn to their foreign competitors. A request for further British legislation to prevent this practice was frustrated, but the parliamentary discussion focused on the duties payable on wool and woollen yarn exported from Ireland to England, a complex issue which was to figure prominently in 1731. As Perceval observed, the easiest way to prevent smuggling from Ireland was to reduce the duties on wool and yarn coming to England, but this would not be welcome to English producers. A year later, in January 1730, English clothing interests resumed their campaign, and Perceval reported to Coghill that there was ‘a design to take some further course with respect to wool and yarn run from Ireland to France’. This time the ministry adopted Perceval’s solution of removing duties on Irish wool and yarn going to England. The British Privy Council (as it was empowered to do by Poyning’s Law) inserted a clause into an Irish bill to remove the export duties on wool and yarn, which the Irish parliament accepted with some opposition. At the same time Perceval was assured by Treasury secretary John Scrope that the British import duties would be repealed, though this could not be done until the next parliamentary session. He was sceptical of this, suspicious that the attempt had been postponed because the ministry was wary of opposition, but found cause for long-term optimism in the encouraging words of some sympathetic MPs, notably Walpole’s brother Horatio (‘Old Horace’), and Horatio’s ministerial underling William Sloper.

When the British parliament resumed on 21 January 1731, the Irish parliament was not in session. Irish eyes were fixed firmly on Westminster, hoping for legislative action that would enable the importation of Irish yarn into England duty-free, but at the same time fearing some more punitive action. On only the second day of the session the Commons received a petition from the weavers’ company of Bristol about the decayed state of the woollen industry, the first of nearly fifty, from all parts of England, which it referred to a ‘grand committee’. The Bristol petition called for the removal of import duties on Irish yarn, a suggestion which the committee at first appeared to endorse after evidence had been taken from various witnesses, including the Irish economic writer David Bindon. But opinion was divided both within and outside parliament, and after strong opposition had been expressed by the Members for Yorkshire and Leicestershire in particular, Walpole told Perceval that ‘he was in his private judgment for taking the duty off, but he could not disoblige the country, for […] everything was laid on him’. Eventually, Walpole’s brother Horace proposed to
Perceval that the ministry would support the removal of the duty if the British parliament were also to extend to Ireland the system of wool registries currently in force in the southern coastal counties of England. This explicit use of the British Declaratory Act of 1720 (which asserted Westminster’s right to legislate for Ireland) was not acceptable to the ‘lords and gentlemen of Ireland’, but was at first insisted on by Horace Walpole, presumably for the very practical reason that a majority of the Commons would not trust the Irish parliament to take action on their own account. Eventually, the ministry did consent to a complicated compromise by which the duty on Irish yarn would be removed, but the operation of the relevant act would be suspended for a year on the understanding that the Irish parliament would in the meantime act to establish a registry.

On Tuesday 23 March, when the ‘grand committee’ reported, Horace Walpole’s ‘explained his mind touching the methods he would have taken to prevent the Irish wools being run to France’, and offered a package of measures, including the removal of the duty on Irish yarn, the opening up of more ports to receive the yarn, and the extension of the English registry scheme to cover the entire country, with implementation postponed for a year until the Irish parliament could demonstrate good faith by taking action against smuggling. When the issue of reducing import duties had first been raised in the committee there had been only a few voices against, but since then opposition had increased, from those who feared for the livelihoods of wool growers and spinners should there be an inundation of cheap Irish yarn. One hostile MP proposed that the report ‘be referr’d to a Comittee of the whole house and a distant day be appointed for considering it’. However, Horatio Walpole was supported by the former Chief Secretary for Ireland, Thomas Clutterbuck, and several other MPs sympathetic to the Irish cause, and most importantly by his brother Sir Robert, who made a crucial intervention, emphasizing that ‘the Single thing under consideration was the retrieving the Manufacture of England, and therefore the Question between England and Ireland is at present out of the Case’. At his suggestion, further consideration was postponed only until the following Friday, when the Commons agreed to bring forward a bill to explain the 1699 Woollen Act, and to take action to encourage the importation of Irish yarn.

A committee was then appointed to consider heads of a bill for this purpose. Its first meeting was on 2 April, and the proceedings form the subject of the second of these new reports. Significantly, the chairman was Walter Carey, the current Irish chief secretary and a member of an informal committee convened by Egmont to act as a pressure group to advance Irish interests. The beginning was not auspicious, for when Clutterbuck raised the prospect of encouraging Irish imports he was greeted with expressions of resentment at making relief for Ireland the prime focus, and several counter-proposals to take a tougher line with smuggling from both countries which involved legislating for Ireland as well as Britain. Of the alternatives suggested, the committee opted for bringing Ireland within the compass of the English act that punished the inhabitants of a town or hundred from which goods were illegally exported, and for strengthening the powers of the Admiralty to seize suspected contraband. Eventually, Clutterbuck was able to make his motion for a removal of the import duty on Irish yarn, but with the implementation deferred to allow the Irish parliament time to take action of its own. The ensuing debate covered a range of issues, including the nature of the Anglo-Irish constitutional relationship, and the propriety or necessity of the Westminster parliament exerting its supremacy over Ireland. Although both Walpoles spoke
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for Clutterbuck’s motion, the debate was not conducted on straightforward party lines. Local and regional allegiances proved more important in individual cases, as for example with the Yorkshire Whig and loyal ministerialist Sir William Strickland, who opposed any reduction in the duty. Furthermore, opposition leaders like Pulteney, Samuel Sandys and the Tory Sir William Wyndham did not take a straightforwardly negative line, but – successfully as it turned out – sought an immediate removal of the duty without conditions, presumably as a way of fishing for Irish support and at the same time embarrassing Walpole.

The second meeting of the committee, on 8 April, was also reported by Perceval. It was dominated by a proposal from John Conduitt, the Master of the Mint, on behalf of the Court, for opening more English ports to receive Irish wool and woollen products than had been allowed in previous restrictive English legislation. In this debate regional interests were paramount. Members were treated to the extraordinary spectacle of long speeches against the motion by Court stalwarts like John Scrope and Giles Earle, both of whom hailed from the west country, and counter-arguments from Horatio Walpole, who represented Great Yarmouth. Eventually Sir Robert Walpole again felt obliged to intervene on his brother’s behalf, declaring that the decision to be made was not a matter of west versus east: ‘Bristol has nothing to apprehend from opening Yarmouth, for if Irish Yarn will still come cheaper to Bristol than to other ports, then Bristol will still keep possession of that Yarn.’ But despite his reassurances, and the emphatic support of those who wished to see more Irish yarn brought in, the power of the west country interest was enough to see Conduitt’s motion rejected.

The committee then completed its deliberations, and despite a last-minute delaying tactic from Members who feared for the future of the spinning industry, reported on 12 April. The debate at the report stage, again covered by Perceval, concentrated on the resolution to remove the duty on Irish yarn, against which a last-ditch assault was mounted by MPs fearful of the consequences for their constituents. Francis Whitworth, who sat for Minehead, told the House he had been instructed by his borough to oppose the clause. Such Members were characterized by Sir Robert Walpole as ‘wool-growers and spinners’, and included figures as diverse as a representative of the Pelham family (probably Henry, the future chief minister), staunch court Whigs, and the Welsh Tory (and sometime Jacobite) Watkin Williams. But despite their efforts, including a desperate intervention by Thomas Palmer (recently returned at a by-election for Bridgewater) in which he tried to raise the spectre of Irish independence by brandishing a pamphlet that supposedly reiterated the arguments for the legislative autonomy of the Dublin parliament previously advanced by William Molyneux, the clause was adopted. Strong speeches by both Walpole brothers, and close supporters like William Sloper and Giles Earle (now returned to the fold) carried the day, the Walpoles having abandoned their earlier idea of a deferred implementation. Horatio now stated with brutal candour that if the Irish parliament did not respond, it was within the power of Westminster to do with Ireland whatever it wished.

The bill was brought in on 14 April, relatively late in the session, and pushed through its stages in the Commons in two weeks. The final debate on 28 April, on whether or not it should pass, was, according to Perceval, the subject of a ‘paper’ he sent to Coghill, but no copy has been located. He did record two speeches, the most strident of which was by Sir William Strickland, who claimed to have heard that if the bill were to drop ‘Ireland will do nothing’:

Is it to be declared here that Ireland will continue to run if wee do nothing! He hopes, as they have submitted to our laws, the time will come when that kingdom shall be sorry to put things to the trial. If he had an estate there, he should be sorry to see that day.41

There had been rumours that the bill would fail in the Lords but in fact the upper House responded quickly, receiving the bill on 29 April, and committing it on 3 May with a clear majority of 47–32 on a division. Perceval was now sanguine about its chances, but the opposition, led by a Scottish peer, Lord Islay, was determined it should fail, and in committee on 6 May rejected the clause removing the duty on Irish yarn by 38 to 35. Rather than reject the bill outright, its further consideration was postponed a week as ‘a more decent way to dispose of it’.

The other debate reported by Perceval to Coghill took place on 5 April, in a committee of the whole House appointed to scrutinize papers that had been tabled in the Commons concerning the fortifications the Spanish had been building near Gibraltar, which the opposition declared were a danger to the British garrison there. Unlike the debates on Irish wool, this was much more straightforwardly a confrontation between Court and opposition, culminating in a memorable exchange between William Pulteney and Sir Robert Walpole, in which the witty informality of the prime minister’s speaking style was seen at its most effective: according to Perceval, he

Begun by saying that Mr Pulteney of all men should least Speak against Joaking, Since what he generally said was but a Joak. He wished Gentlemen would not digress so much from the Question, he had looked on his Watch and counted 21 Minutes, before Mr Pulteney had said any thing to the Question. He wished also they would not Speak so often to the Gallary, but for once he would do it tho it encroached on Parliamentary Priviledge.

The immediate thrust of the opposition’s attack was that the ministry had been careless of British interests by allowing these new fortifications to be built. The real target, however, was the recent shift in foreign policy by which Walpole had moved away from alliance with France and towards an understanding with the Austrians, resulting in March in the first Treaty of Vienna, signed with the Empire and the United Provinces. The treaty was already being hailed by the ministry and its supporters in the press as having brought peace to Europe, but critics claimed that it had thrown France and Spain together in a potentially dangerous alliance, and indeed the following months were to bring heightened fears of Anglo–Spanish conflict, before Spain accepted the terms of the Vienna treaty in July. So while ministerial spokesmen asserted in the Commons that they were ‘settling the peace of all Europe’, Pulteney and his friends argued the opposite, though without success. They had already made one vain attempt, in February, to expose the danger of rising Spanish animosity to Britain, with a motion for the House to be shown a copy of the communication sent by the Spanish ambassador at Paris, Castelar, to the French court, declaring that Spain was no longer bound by the obligations of the Treaty of Seville of 1729, but they had been defeated on that occasion, as they were to be again.

I am grateful to the British Library Board for permission to publish these debates, and to consult and refer to other documents in its care. In presenting the material, I have adhered

44 *Journals of the House of Lords* [hereinafter *L.J.*], vol. xxiii, pp. 694, 699–700; H.M.C., *Egmont Diary*, vol. i, p. 188.


to the original spelling, capitalization and punctuation, while lowering superior letters and incorporating Perceval’s own amendments silently. Editorial interpolations, which have been kept to a minimum, are given in italics, within square brackets. The names of speakers have been rendered in bold for the convenience of the reader.

Text

23 March 1731 (Add. MS. 47033, ff. 44–6)

[f. 44r] On Monday Mr Scroop⁴⁸ made his Report from the Woollen Manufacture,⁴⁹ which occasion’d some small Debate. Mr Walpole⁵⁰ open’d by Shewing the necessity of preventing the Running of Wooll and Yarn to France from both Kingdoms, And of Woollen Manufacture from Ireland to Lisbon, wherein the people of that Kingdom broke their faith with England, who gave them all imaginable encouragement in their Linnen Manufacture conditionally that they should quit all Foreign Export of Wooll Raw or manufactured.⁵¹ That ’tis absolutely necessary to come into Methods that will be effectuall to prevent any longer this abuse, that we have the Methods in our hands if we will use them, but if we leave any one thing undone our Labour will be in vain. That these methods were of three Sorts, Penalty, Encouragements [f. 44v] and Restrictions. That Penalties alone tho ever so severe will not do, neither Encouragement without Restriction. That the Restriction can only be a general Registry of the Wooll of England and Ireland; That a Registry in England must be our own doing, But that in Ireland may be more properly be [sic] the work of the Parliament there, because we know not so well the Condition and Situation of that Kingdom, what Officers are there employ’d, or the particular Methods of Ordering such Registry as the Parliament of that Kingdom. To this end he advised the not letting the Registry take place neither the taking off the duty on the Irish Yarn (which he next would speak to) till this time twelve months, that the Parliament of Ireland might go hand in hand with us in the measures Judged proper to prevent all manner of Running to foreign parts. That by this delay they will know the Parliament here has its Eye upon them and expects they should co-operate with us, otherwise we shall be obliged for preservation of the Manufacture to make some Laws that will be very Severe upon them. That as to Encouragement it will be a great Disadvantage to take off the Duty on Irish Yarn, and the English Spinner need not fear being hurt by it, Seeing if other necessary things be done, the foreign Manufactures must fall for want of Materials, and England Command the Trade of the World, which will Set all heads in England to work and raise the Spinners Wages. Another Encouragement might be the opening more ports. That as to Penaltys they may be enforced, and New Methods found to secure the Wooll from being Run, as by obliging Masters of Ships to give Bond; by obliging the Coasting Vessells who carry Wooll from one port of England to another to enter into greater Bonds; that all Ships shall unlade at some Port, All Wooll be packed in Canvass And the 40 Shillings allowance [to] the [f. 45r] Seamen taken off. If all these things be done we may expect to see
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⁴⁸ John Scrope (c. 1662–1752), of Wormsley, Stokenchurch, Bucks., MP Bristol, Secretary to the Treasury, Recorder of Bristol.
⁴⁹ The ‘grand committee’ appointed on 22 Jan. 1731 to take into consideration the petition from the weavers’ company of Bristol and other petitions, concerning the state of woollen manufactures in England (C.J., vol. xxxi, p. 593).
⁵⁰ Horatio Walpole (1678–1757) of Wolterton, Norfolk, MP Gt Yarmouth, Cofferer of the Household.
⁵¹ This was a gloss on the proceedings leading up to the passage at Westminster of the Linen Act of 1705 which most Irish MPs would have found highly contentious. The only pretext for it was, presumably, the terms of the address of the Irish House of Commons requesting assistance to the development of the linen industry in Ireland, which was laid before the English House of Lords on 4 Jan. 1704 and which may be regarded as the origin of the act passed a year later. The address requested legislative encouragement in the event that the Irish should ‘turn their industry to the improvement of the linen manufacture’ (L.J., vol. xvi, pp. 360–1).
our Manufacture again in a flourishing Condition.

Mr Scroop reply’d the Opening the Ports was what he could not agree to, because the Ports near France would occasion the running of the Wooll thither: That to take off the duty on Yarn would indeed be of the greatest Service to the Poor Manufacturers of Bristol and the West, who Starve for want of yarn to work up, but by opening more Ports they would be deprived of a good part of the Material which now comes to them, and be thrown into a Worse Condition than at present, That he thought a Registry in England or Ireland impracticable, for the Commissioners of Excise had acquainted the Committee they would not undertake to Execute a General Registry in England under 3000 New Officers and £150,000 a Year, And tho the Commissioners of the Customs had given their Opinion that a Registry of all the Maritime Coast of England might be done for £25,000 a Year, yet where should that money be raised? He had heard it proposed to pay it out of the Old Subsidy but this would hurt the Sinking Fund. As to a Registry in Ireland, it had been proposed to lay a duty on the Irish Wool, But the Sum required cannot be imagined less than £40,000, And he doubted if the people of that Kingdom would tax themselves so heavily for the benefit of England, when the whole Expence of management of all the Revenue there amounts but to 60,000.

Mr Knight moved the Report might be referr’d to a Comittee of the whole house and a distant day be appointed for considering it.

Mr Clutterbuck said he knew of no Compact between the people of Ireland and England for not running their Wool. That having been among them. He found them an Affectionate Nation to England, Sensible of their Obligations for the favour shewn them in their linnen Manufacture, and resolved to return it by doing what was in their power to Support the Woollen Manufacture of England, but then they desired better Encouragement for bringing their Yarn over, which now he hoped would be allowed them – That they took off the duty on Wool because it would facilitate its coming to England, and did not do it as obliged by any faith pledged, but as English men who wished the general good of both Kingdoms. He concluded with Commendation of them for their Loyalty and propensity to advance the Interest of this Kingdom.

Harry Pelham said he would not deny that if all the methods proposed against running Wool from Ireland to France took place, the Manufacture of England would revive, but he could not see how they could be made effectuall to prevent the Running, and if so, Ireland as having a New Markett would be the better indeed, but England the worse, in as much as that Kingdom would increase their flocks, and So fill England with such a quantity of Wool and Yarn as must sink the landed Interest of Wool growers, and Starve the Spinners. He was for making further Laws to restrain running the Wool of both Kingdoms, but could not submit to a general Registry in England and doubted if Ireland would come into it.

Sir William Yonge said we were too early in debating any part of this Report, or any particular methods proposed, but in general he must say it is necessary to do something, or the land will indeed Suffer. That generally when Parliaments meddle with Trade they do more hurt than good because particular Views and Interests misguide the house, but this is a matter of so general concern to the whole Kingdom and welfare of the Subject, that he will not Suppose particular Views in favour of a Corporation, or County or one Set of Persons concerned in the Manufacture can influence any member, so that the consideration of this
affair is proper for the Parliament, and perhaps the only one that is so. That it has been an Old mistake to separate the trading from the landed Interest, for without Trade flourishes land must fall to nothing. And then what will become of the Wool growers and Spinners. That England profits by the Irish Yarn, and tho not so much as by the Raw Wool, yet still it profits, besides we cannot carry on some branches of our Manufacture without the Irish Yarn, and where is the hurt of allowing it to come in, when the Yarn itself is not the Sixth part of the value of the Manufacture afterwards, all which accrues to England, that if he were to regard particular Interests or the desires of his own County he should be ever against the Raw Wools entering, but he spoke for the general good, and was for Encouragements Restrictions and Penalties, all which together would restore the English Manufacture to the height it ever was; He concluded with observing a Fact he would maintain to be true, That when our Manufacture flourished most, the greatest quantity of Irish Yarn and Wool was imported, and therefore he was for opening more Ports.

Daniel Pulteney observed, that since the Spinners were now Starving, he wonder'd any Gentleman should be against taking off the Duty on Irish yarn and letting it take place immediately, Since it had been allowed that a great benefit would arise thereby to England tho not a Total one. He believed indeed that easing the duty would not wholly restore the Manufacture of England, But the Reason is the dearness of Labour occasioned by the heavy Taxes laid on every thing necessary to life, And Manufactures. He doubted about opening more ports, but was for trusting Ireland for taking measures to prevent the Running the Wooll, which if they do not, then the House may lay the duty on again and take what other measures with that Kingdom it thinks proper. He was also against a Registry because it might prove ineffectual, for he observed at the Committee, that the Commissioners of the Customs, tho they talked of Executing it for £25,000 yet they doubted if the Wool prevented to be run thereby, would answer the Charge.

Sir Robert Walpole would only Speak in general being not prepared for particulars in this important point – He said the Single thing under consideration was the retrieving the Manufacture of England, and therefore the Question between England and Ireland is at present out of the Case.

The Grievance is that Ireland runs Wool to foreign parts, And Woollen Manufacture to Lisbon. This last of all things must be effectually prevented, and as to the other, we ought in Common Justice let the Irish Yarn come in if we will not let them Manufacture it for foreign Export. But all considerations ought to be taken together, therefore if Irish Yarn be proposed to come in and nothing else done, he will be against it. He thought it best to make what ever we do not to take place till this time twelve month that Ireland may do what is expected of them, by which we shall Judge of their Sincerity, and if they do nothing effectual we may lay the duty on again. He moved the Report might lye on the table, and accordingly it was order'd, that it might be taken into Consideration Friday next.

2 April 1731

We went yesterday into a Committee of the whole House Upon the Woollen Manufacture, and sat till eight at night

Mr Clutterbuck moved, that Since Penal Laws against Running of Wool out of Ireland to Foreign Parts had been found ineffectual, we ought to give that Kingdom better
Encouragement to bring their Wool and Yarn into England, and therefore desired we would consider what were the Impediments hitherto, and what were the encouragements fit to be allowed for Inviting Ireland to send us all the Woollen and Bay Yarn they can spare from their home Consumption.

Captain Vernon[^61] Hoped Ireland should not be first consider’d.
Mr Sandys[^62] Said there were greater Injuries to our Manufacture than running of Wool, as the Dearness of Labour, the Blackwell hall Factors Impositions[^63] &c.
Mr Knight Exposed to the Committee an Artifice used of late in England of Working up Wool into Course Coverlets and sending the same abroad under the Notion of Manufacture, when by cutting one thread, those Coverlets came all to pieces and so France, Flanders and Holland were supplied with Wool for their Manufactures. That this was an illusion of the Law, and therefore he moved that Provision be made to prevent the Fradulent export of Wool out of England under pretence of being Manufactured.
Mr Earl[^64] took notice of Several Frauds used in Running Wool out of both Kingdoms, particularly the Skrewing Wool into Butter Casks to the weight of Butter, and by Melting a little Butter over them, passing that Wool for Butter. He moved therefore that neither Kingdom should be allowed to pack Wool any other way than in Linnen Bags.
Mr Burton[^65] Made the same Motion, but that Woolen Bags might be allowed.
Captain Vernon, Was for considering this matter in a general way. He proved the Notion was wrong to Seperate the Landed Interest from that of the Manufacturer. That Foreigners can not undersell us at Foreign Markets if deprived of our Material. That the Several Laws in being are Sufficient to prevent running, [f. 53v] only they are not sufficiently known and observed, he therefore proposed that all those Laws should be collected into one, and abstracts afterwards made of them to be printed and pasted up at all the Church Doors, Court Halls &c, that if any thing is wanting it is to make Convictions more easy.
Sr Abraham Elton[^66] Moved that no Wool should be carried to any place but in Bags of 240 Weight.
Sr William Young Said that could not be, that in some Countries the horses could not carry that weight, besides Persons who have small Quantities of Wooll would not be able to dispose of their Wool.
Mr Bladen[^67] Moved that the Barronys of Ireland within 5 Miles of the Sea should be put under the same Regulation as the Hundreds of England are by 7 & 8 Gul. 3.[^68] That the Barony

[^61]: Edward Vernon (1684–1757), of Nacton, nr Ipswich, Suffolk, MP Penryn, capt. R.N. (later admiral). He had voted in committee for taking off the duty on Irish imports (Add. MS. 47033, f. 26).
[^62]: Samuel Sandys (1695–1770), of Ombersley, Worcs., MP Worcester. He had voted in committee for taking off the duty (Add. MS. 47033, f. 26) and was in general a supporter of Irish interests (ibid., f. 72).
[^63]: Blackwell Hall was the principal London cloth market. Provincial clothiers had a long-standing grievance against the activities of the factors, the middlemen who controlled the trade, through whom they were obliged to sell their goods to wholesale drapers and export merchants.
[^64]: Presumably the Irish revenue commissioner and experienced parliamentarian Giles Earle (c. 1678–1758), of Eastcourt House, Crudwell, nr Malmesbury, Wilts. (MP Malmesbury, a revenue commissioner in Ireland, and chairman of the committee of privileges and elections), rather than his son William Rawlinson Earle (c. 1703–74), of Eastcourt House (MP Malmesbury), who had been elected to Parliament for the first time in the 1727 general election. Perceval noted that Giles Earle had previously supported the Irish cause in committee (Add. MS. 47033, f. 26).
[^65]: William Burton (c. 1695–1781), of Ashwell and North Luffenham, Rutland, MP Rutland.
[^66]: Sir Abraham Elton, 2nd Bt (1679–1742) of Bristol and Clevedon Court, Somerset, MP Bristol. He had voted in committee for taking off the duty on imported Irish yarn (Add. MS. 47033, f. 26).
[^67]: Martin Bladen (c. 1680–1746), of Aldborough Hatch, Essex, MP Stockbridge, a Lord of Trade. Previously secretary to the Lords Justices Grafton and Galway in Ireland 1715–17.
[^68]: Clause 6 of the act for the more effectual preventing the export of wool (7 & 8 Gul. III, c. 28) provided for the fining of the inhabitants of any hundred adjoining Scotland or within five miles of the English coast, through which wool was transported (for onward shipping) during the hours of darkness.
should be Subject to the Penalty upon Wooll passing thro it between Sun Set and Sun Rise.

Mr Oglethorpe was for Captain Vernons Motion to reduce the Laws into one and enforce the Penalties, and extend them to Ireland.

Sir William Young Objected to Captain Vernons Motion as too complicated.

Lord Tyrconnel approved it.

Mr Bing Against Vernons Motion because not effectual, for New Laws must be made to rectify abuses not seen at the time those Laws were made. Mr Vernons Motion was rejected and Bladens agreed to.

Mr Burton Moved against carrying Wool Coast ways, or better Bonds to be given, and Ireland Subjected to it.

Mr Earl moved that further provision be made to prevent Clandestine Exportation of Wool from England, and Wool and Manufacture from Ireland to Foreign Parts, by giving Power to Seize Ships and Examine them at any distance from the Shore.

Captain Vernon Moved that Seamen may have no longer the Liberty to carry out on their own Account 40 Shillings worth of Manufacture, which was agreed to.

Mr Clutterbuck Moved to take off the Duty on Irish Yarn, and urged the People of Ireland desired it, that tis reasonable to let it come in Since we debar them from sending it abroad, [f. 54r] that will be the most effectual means to prevent running their Wool to France. That ’twill be no hardship on the Spinner here for he may turn Weaver, which is a more gainfull Employ. possibly it might not be an effectual remedy, but it will greatly contribute.

Mr Sandys Said He had no Regard to Ireland in this Point, but as an English Man must Second Mr Clutterbuck.

Mr Oglethorpe Opposed it, and said he was Sorry to see one part of the Manufacture given up to Ireland. This is the first Step, the next will be to give them the making of White Cloths. He rather wished, cost what it would, that England bought up all the Wool of Ireland at the English Price and burnt it. That it will be the loss of the Linnen Manufacture in Ireland, turn all the Land to Wool, and all the Spinners to Wosted and Woollen Yarn. It will transport our Weavers thither, and England will depend upon Ireland.

Mr Whitworth likewise against it. We shall lay the poor of England under a certain difficulty for an Imaginary prospect. He had passed some time in Ireland and had been kindly entertained there, but he must prefer England where their Interest interfered; If letting in the Yarn of Ireland would prevail with the Gentlemen of Ireland effectually to Stop running their Wooll and Manufacture he would be for it, but till some Sure Scheme appeared from Ireland what Method they would take in the ensuing Parliament to do that good Work he would oppose this Motion, as tending only to increase the growth of Wool in Ireland, and not only over loading England with Yarn, but furnishing France with more Wool than at present.

Lord Malpas Said, All Methods were to be taken together, but we ought first to be Secure that Ireland will do their part effectually before this dangerous Experiment is tried, and

---

70 Sir John Brownlow, 5th Bt, 1st Viscount Tyrconnel (1690–1754), of Belton Hall, nr Grantham, Lincs., MP Grantham.
72 See above, n. 64.
73 Undyed cloth.
74 Francis Whitworth (1684–1742), of Leybourne, Kent and Minehead, Somerset, MP Minehead, Secretary for Barbados. He had been one of only three MPs who had voted in the committee against taking off the duty on Irish imports (Add. MS. 47033, f. 26).
75 Hon. George Cholmondeley (1703–70), styled Viscount Malpas, MP New Windsor, Master of the Horse to the Prince of Wales. He was Sir Robert Walpole’s son-in-law.
therefore he is against the Motion unless the Act take place at a certain limited time, So as to be of no effect if the [f. 54v] Parliament there shew themselves Insincere.

**Mr Clutterbuck** Said he meant that there should be a limited time for taking off the duty, and that it should not take place till June comes twelve month, To See if the Parliament of Ireland would do their duty, for if they do not the duty will of Course be replaced.

**Mr Palmer** Objected to a Law to take place at a limited time for taking off the duty on a Condition; a thing never done. It was Subjecting England to Ireland. That to take off the duty on Irish Yarn was to give the third part of the Manufacture to Ireland. That more Wool is Run from England than from Ireland, being preferable to the Irish Wool. That England will have very little Wool come, but all in Yarn to the lowering the Labour of our own Spinners. This will set the Irish on turning more land to Sheep, and the Quantity of Wool brought over will over Stock our demand and Sink the price of our own.

**Sr Wm, Young** Denied that making a probationary Act to take place at a certain time was making England dependant on Ireland. That Ireland had begun by taking off the duty on Wool. It is not the plenty of wool now in England makes it cheap, but want of that extensive trade we formerly had. ’Twas better have the Irish Wool than their Yarn, but in vain to hope for it. If the duty on Yarn be taken off, the Irish will be encouraged to bring their Wool in the Shape of Yarn over, and encouragement must be given, for otherwise no law can be made to prevent their Running. France has taken off the duty on Yarn, and if let it not come in here, it will be carried thither. Our Single business is to deprive Foreign Manufacturers of our Materials, and if we do it, our Manufacture will rise as theirs declines. Again, there are Branches of our Manufacture wherein Irish Yarn is necessary to mix with our own: The French work up two pounds of their Wool with one of ours; If England gets that one pound of Irish, it will work up two of her own.

[f. 55r] **Mr Pelham** Complimented Mr Palmer on his Speech. The Question turns upon a Competition between the Landed Interest of England and the Landed Interest of Ireland, But Surely that will not be sufferd by a British House of Commons, when tis a known thing that England Governs Ireland and can give law to it, tho it should be done but upon great occasions. That to make this a probational Law, a Law upon Conditions with Ireland is highly disrespectfull to England and Subjecting its Wisdom and Conduct to an Inferiour Kingdom. It is not true that taking off the duty on Irish Yarn will prevent their yarn being run to France, for Irish Yarn will not serve foreign Manufacturers, it is only their Wool. But it will occasion the Irish to send no more Raw Wool to England, but bring all over in Yarn, which will be Manufactured into Cloth before the Yarn of England. The Consequence of taking off the duty will be opening more Ports, which he is against: He would see what Ireland intends to do, before he takes off the duty.

**Mr Sandys** Will Speak as an Englishman without any consideration for Ireland. The Interest of England is to have all the Irish Wool and Yarn and no time lost, therefore he would have the Act take place immediately. The Irish Parliament have already done their part and all they can do, in taking off their duty on Wool coming to England, which shews their good Intentions that we should have it rather than France. Our business is to encourage that disposition, and induce them by fair means to bring their Yarn over, in a word to make it their Interest. The French have growing Manufactures at Abbeville, Elbeuf, Tancarville, Thoulon &c which

---

76 Thomas Palmer (c. 1685–1735), of Fairfield, Stoke Courcy, nr Bridgwater, Somerset, MP Bridgwater.

75 There were five Pelhams in the Commons: Charles (c. 1679–1763), of Brocklesby, Lincs., MP Beverley; Hon. Henry (see above, n. 56); James (c. 1683–1761), of Crowhurst, Sussex, MP Newark, Secretary to the Prince of Wales; Thomas (c. 1678–c. 1760), of Lewes, Sussex, MP Lewes, a Lord of TRADE; and Thomas (c. 1705–37), of Stanmer, nr Lewes, Sussex, MP Lewes. Hon. Henry Pelham was the most prominent in politics, and is probably the ‘Mr Pelham’ intended here, although he is also identified by Perceval elsewhere as ‘Harry Pelham’.

78 Abbéville and Elbeuf in Normandy, Tancarville in Poitou, and Toulon in Provence.
can't Subsist without Irish or English Wool, if we engross all the Wool of Ireland we shall undo the French, and our Spinners then will have full employ, who as things [f. 55v] are now, do almost Starve. This Expedient ought at least to be tryed. Wishes the Act were repealed that prohibits the bringing over Irish Cattle, for that would make Labour cheap, an Ease in our Taxes would make it more so, but till these are done other things must be tryed. Tis complained that Wool is declined in England in its Value, for that Reason he is for admitting Irish Wool and Yarn both to carry on our Manufacture for Exportation. Tis no objection to say that after the duty is taken off France will still have Irish Wool, for what they get will come so dear to them, they wont be able to undersell us. But why should we think they will have the yarn when made dearer to them by our taking of the duty, more than they now will get the Raw Wool Since the Irish took off that duty? We see that France thereby despaired of having the Raw Wool of Ireland, and therefore by a late Edict gave permission for Irish Wool to come in, But France will get as little Yarn as Wool if we take off the Duty. He is for taking off the Duty immediately, or else the Irish will do nothing against Running, and the French will have all the next Seasons growth.

Mr Wortley Montague79 Spoke against the Duties being taken off as a dangerous Experiment.

Sir William Windham80 Said it was a Mistake for us to be govern'd by old Maxims, which might be good when Established, but ought to be changed when Circumstances alter. If this were a point where Ireland interfered with England there could be no dispute whether Irish Yarn should come in or no, but the question is no more than whether we shall not try this Experiment to retrieve the Manufacture of England: tis not a dispute with Ireland, but with France, Try this, and continue the Penaltys against Running, and we have a fair chance to better our Manufacture by encouraging Ireland to give a helping hand. If this be the Event, our poor will have infinitely more work than now, He cant say what the immediate consequence will be to the Spinner, but the thing should be tryed.

Sir William Strickland81 Was against the motion, because he thought it [f.56r] ineffectual, and would not prevent the Irish from Running their Wool from the West of Ireland. But Methods might be found to prevent the Irish from Running Wool from the East of that Kingdom to the West. Ireland ought to go before and Shew what they will do To take off the duty on Irish Yarn will reduce the price of the English Yarn to nothing. The mixing of that with ours spoils our own. We shall still undersell other Countries but for Frauds in our Manufacture at home. As to opening more Ports, he was entirely against it, for what if a War with France should happen, how shall we prevent the Irish Running their Wool on Board the Enemies Privateers. The Spinners of England will be in despair, and Mobs rise in every County: The people in Essex rose on the very Notion of Irish Yarns being imported, and were quell'd with difficulty.82 Suppose the French Manufacture could be destroyed by this, it would be many years first, and in the mean time our people will Starve.

Mr Walpole Said Gentlemen mistook the State of our grievance and the Remedy. Mr Palmer forgot the mischief of Running Irish Manufacture to Lisbon, which appeared at the Committee to be no less than £30000 in value fairly enter’d at Lisbon, besides twice as much not mention’d in the Books of the Custom house of that City.83 That these Irish Stuffs are
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79 Edward Wortley Montagu (1678–1761), of Wortley, Yorks., MP Huntingdon.
80 Sir William Wyndham, 3rd Bt (c. 1688–1740), of Orchard Wyndham, Somerset, MP Somerset.
81 Sir William Strickland, 4th Bt (c. 1686–1735), of Boynton, Yorks., MP Scarborough, Secretary at War.
82 In June 1730 weavers at Braintree in Essex had rioted on hearing a rumour that imported Irish yarn was being held in the town. They followed the trail to nearby Coggeshall, where the yarn was seized and burned, but a body of soldiers intervened and four of the rioters were killed (Weekly Journal, 20 June, 4 July 1730.)
83 The committee appointed to consider petitions from Bristol and other towns relating to the decay of the woollen manufacture, which had reported on 23 Mar., had heard evidence from one Thomas Vere, described as an exporter of woollen goods, that he had procured an account taken out of the records of the custom house at Lisbon, which showed that during 1728 no less than £33,000 sterling worth of Irish camblets had been imported into Portugal (C.J., vol. xxi, p. 692).
sold to the Portugese 20 P Ct cheaper than the English can afford the same, and yet are better, whence it will follow, that in a very little time that branch of our Manufacture will be lost to England unless we now prevent it, by taking into consideration every thing that will contribute to hinder the Running now practiced in Ireland. We talk much of controuling Ireland but he wishes Gentlemen would consider the difficulty of Executing Laws where the Executive Power is negligent to see them observed: therefore tho he would have all the present penalts upon Runners remain in force and [f. 56v] New Regulations Enacted, Yet he was for giving that Kingdom encouragement to Set heartily about preventing the Running their Wool Yarn, and Manufacture to France, by admitting their Yarn into England duty free.

It was a mistake in Mr Palmer that English Wool is in France preferable to that of Ireland, for the contrary to that appears by the French Kings repealing his Edict against admitting Irish Yarn, and this Repeal likewise Shews that Mr Pelham was mistaken in saying the Irish Yarn is of no Use to the French Manufacture. If Ireland should after such Encouragement given them to bring their yarn to England, still continue their Clandestine Trade of Running, England can easily make them Repent it by laying a Restraint on their Linnen Trade, under Colour of exporting which, he is well assured two thirds of what that Kingdom sends to the West Indies is Woolen Manufacture. But we ought first to Invite Ireland fairly to co-operate with Us, and should avoid urging any extraordinary power over them till they drive us to a Necessity of doing it. If we do nothing, the Parliament there will do nothing, And where is the harm of taking off this duty conditionally? Is it below us to use Rational Means to attain the great end of Recovering our Manufacture? He is sure that Ireland will for its own Interest take effectual Methods to assist us in it. Suppose that by taking off the duty, more yarn should come over than before, It will be depriving France of so much which now is run thither, and when by their loss of our Material, their Manufacture for foreign Export is destroyed, we shall have the Supply of those Regions they traded to, and want more Wool and Yarn than Ireland can send us.

Mr Tuffnel84 Said he had direction from Colchester to VOTE for taking off the duty and for opening more Ports, he gave an Account of how the rising of Essex was occasioned. It was not because of Irish Yarn brought in, that was only a pretence, [f. 57r] a Gentleman who dealt in it, had an Enemy, who to be revenged of him for a particular quarrel, raised a Mob to burn his house, and it was only in Excuse of that Riot that his dealing in Yarn was afterwards given out.

Mr Clayton85 Was against trying so dangerous an Experiment, as carrying with it the very destruction of England. Foreign Manufactures in any Shape coming to England is of hurt to our own, therefore the Irish Yarn should rather be prohibited than encouraged – It directly hurts England and no other Country. He was for suspending this Resolution, till the House knew what Motions were to follow it. It hurts not only the Wool grower but the Spinner.

Mr Oglethorpe In a lamenting tone deplored the fate of our Woollen Manufacture now proposed to be given up to Ireland. Said we went upon a great mistake in thinking we should deprive France of their Manufacture by admitting Irish Yarn, for France takes none of the English or Irish Wool. Abbeville makes only Cloth of Spanish Wool, and the other Manufacture in the South of France is carried on with their own Wool mixed with that of Turkey and Barbary. It would be the undoing of the Linnen Manufacture of Ireland, for the Irish would lay that aside to turn their lands and hands to Spinning Yarn to send to England.

Mr Drummond86 Granted that Abbeville makes only Spanish Cloths and therefore takes none of our Wool, but at Elbeuf, Tancarville, and Thoulon great quantities of English and Irish Wool is used for making Cloths which the French export to Turky. The Irish have taken off the duty on their Wool that comes to England by which more Wool may be expected, but
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84 Samuel Tufnell (1682–1758), of Langleys, Essex, MP Colchester.
85 Either William Clayton (1671–1752), of Sundon, Beds., MP Westminster, a Lord of the Treasury; or William Clayton (d. 1744), of Marden Park, Surrey, MP Bletchingley.
86 John Drummond (1676–1742), of Quarrell, Stirlingshire, MP Perth Burghs.
that remedies but half the Evil of running unless we admit the Yarn also. That knowing the Nature of Cloth exported to Turky, he could inform the house, that the English do not Spinn fitting Yarn for such Clothes but must use Irish Yarn. The Turky Company do what they can in favour of the English Manufacture, but the Spinner here is not Industrious: If in three days he earns what will keep him Six, he will not work the other three. the Weaver will be also paid so dear, that at Naerden in Holland a Yard of Velvet is worked as cheap as a yard of Norwich Stuff is here, yet living in Holland is as dear as here, but those People live more frugally. If Irish Yarn be brought in, it will oblige the English Spinners to be more frugal. therefore for taking off the duty.

Mr Barnard The Debate depends on one Question only, whether France by help of Irish Yarn, Supports its Manufacture for foreign Export to Spain and other Countries. He does not believe France has Wool good enough or Sufficient in quantity to carry on their Manufacture, if they had they would not take any of ours. As to Opening more Ports, he thought it necessary that of Galoway in Ireland Should, as well as others on the West coast of Ireland that the Wool of that part of the Kingdom may come by Sea, and not by land Carriage to some other Port now open, otherwise those People must run it. As to the danger of Running in time of War, tis true Wool may be run there, but so it will be from Dublin which is now an open Port. It is not the Wool fairly enter’d that is ever Run, but the Wool not enter’d.

Sir Gilbert Heathcot. If we can destroy the French Manufacture by this Experiment it will be glorious, but it must Starve the English Spinner for some years.

Mr Earl Wonder’d the Question could bear so long a debate. The Yarn of Ireland, make what Law we please, will be Run if we dont take it, they cannot eat their Wool, and wont Starve. An Army can’t hinder it. The People of Ireland are at present willing to prevent it, but desire encouragement.

Mr Waller Thought all we were doing is a Jest without more effectual Laws to prevent Running from England.

Sir Robert Walpole If this were a competition with Ireland there is not a man in the house would debate a moment, but we are considering what is capable to recover our Manufacture, and whether the Question will effect it. Tis evident our Manufacture is decreased by setting up of Foreign Manufactures, till when we supply’d those Countries they now undersell us in. It was never yet a doubt that France would be obliged to lay aside their Manufacture, if deprived of our Material. What is the Sense of all our Acts hitherto made against Running Wool, but that our Wool is necessary to France. Tis no dishonour to make our Act take place at a distant time, in confidence that Ireland will in their Parliamt, take effectual Care to prevent Running. They must understand that we do this in that confidence, and to leave it to them to consider of the proper methods as being the best Judges, but if we See they do nothing to the purpose we may Repeal our Act, or any part of it, and proceed as we think fit with that Kingdom.

Mr Glanville He has not heard an Argument that was of great weight with the Committee

87 Naarden.
88 John Barnard (c. 1685–1764), of Mincing Lane, London, and Clapham, Surrey, MP London. A strong supporter of Irish interests in the Commons (Add. MS. 47033, f. 34).
89 Galway.
91 See above, n. 64.
92 Either Edmund Waller (c. 1699–1771), of Hall Barn, Beaconsfield, Bucks., MP Gt Marlow; or Harry Waller (c. 1701–72), of Lincoln’s Inn, MP Chipping Wycombe.
93 William Glanville (c. 1686–1766), of St Clere, Sevenoaks, Kent, MP Hythe. He had voted in the committee for taking off the duty on Irish imports (Add. MS. 47033, f. 26) and had in general proved to be a reliable supporter of Irish interests in the Commons (ibid., f. 72).
for taking off the duty, yet made use of. It was the loss of the Stocking Manufacture at Leiden, where with Irish or English Wool they make Stockings £20 or 30 p Ct cheaper than we can Sell them, and now take none from us, whereas before, they took all: If this Wool which is Run to them could be Stop’d that Manufacture must fall – The Opposers to taking off the Duty, which are the Lincolnshire, Yorkshire and Leicestershire Gentlemen have urged partially: All that they have said amounts to this only, that our Manufacture is indeed lost, but we would be ruined last: He is sure if the Parliament of Ireland consider their own Interest, and will be Sincere, they will pass some effectual Law to prevent Running, and this house expects and requires it of ’em, If they do not he will go as far as any man to let them feel the Resentment of a British house of Commons. Some Gentlemen say the Landed Interest of England will suffer [f. 58v] by the Yarn of Ireland come in, But if the French Manufacture Subsists, the Landed Gentlemen are those who will suffer most.

Sir Abraham Elton Began a long winded Speech but the house calling on him to Speak only to the Question he declared he was for it, and sat down.

Mr Will. Pulteney. 94 Declared he had no partial regard to any Town or County, but would Speak honestly in a National way. In the mean time he could not but grieve to see so empty an house on a matter of so great Importance, but possibly the Members dispaired of any thing to be done for the Manufacture this Session. His Opinion was that all the Wool and Yarn of both Kingdoms should be brought to and remain in England, otherwise the foreign Manufactures will Support themselves, for Ireland must run their Material if not suffer’d to bring it here. He owned it might be attended with dangerous consequences. But he supposed Ireland will do what is expected of them, otherwise he will be for useing severe Methods against them. In consequence of taking off the duty, he is for opening more Ports, but against a Register: Ireland can’t admit of one, and he fears England can neither. (at this the House cry’d out no Register). We are like a Physician to a Patient that only uses Quack Medicines, mistake the Malady, and prescribes at a Venture; And being sick our Selves, We turn and toss in our beds expecting ease, when our distemper is not in the Power of Man to cure. It is not the French Manufacture that destroys ours, it is not the decay of our own Wool, So much as our Luxery, which has infected the lowest degree of Mankind, and makes them not contented with a Small gain from their Labour, it is also the Number and weight of our Taxes which hinder the Manufacturer from Working as cheap as our Neighbours. But tho’ these be the great Causes of our Complaint, yet he is for trying this very dangerous Experiment, because in our Situation we ought to try all things that have a probability to give us some ease.

The Question was then called for, and being put for taking off the duty, we carried it by 117 against 61. 95

5 April 1731 (Add. MS. 47033, ff. 59–64)

[f. 59r] Debate in the House of Commons touching the Spanish Works before Gibraltar.

This day came on for Enquiring into the State of Gibraltar and after the House had Resolved itself into a Committee of the whole house, where the papers relating to that Garrison were orderly read throu:

Sir Thos. Sanderson97 Begun the debate, by observing out of these Papers, the encroachment the Spaniards have for some time been making on the place, by advancing a line of Contravalation from Sea to Sea with Forts at each End, and places of Arms, Batterys &c. so near as to be able to annoy when they shall please the Parade of our Garrison from their Guns and Mortars and be Masters of the Harbour to the Injury of their Shipping there.

94 William Pulteney (1684–1764), MP Hedon.
95 Figures repeated in H.M.C., Egmont Diary, vol. i, p. 171.
96 In the committee of the whole house appointed to consider papers concerning the works being carried on by the Spanish before Gibraltar (C.J., vol xxi, p. 716).
97 Sir Thomas Saunderson (formerly Lumley) (c. 1691–1752), of Sandbeck, Yorks., MP Lincs., Clerk to the Council of the Duchy of Lancaster, and formerly envoy to Portugal.
All which he alledged was contrary to the Law of Nations and to that known Maxim, that a Fortress given up or yielded by Treaty, carrys with it as much teritorial Jurisdiction as puts it out of danger from being anoy’d by random Shot. That the distance of Random Shot is 1640 Yards, and of Point Blank Shot 400, that the Spaniards are encroaching much nearer than the former distance, and might when those Works are finished, begin New Ones nearer still. He took this to be contrary to agreement, when by the Treaty of Utrecht it was given up to us, and therefore moved, that the Spaniards had cast up New Works and encroached upon the Town contrary to Treaty. This was the Sense of his Motion tho not the very words.

Mr Norris In a Speech of half an hour Seconded Sr Thomas but he Spoke so low I could not hear him.

Mr Conduit Then got up, and shew’d this Motion to be entirely improper now that we are just upon Settling the affairs of Europe by a general Peace. That by the Treaty of Utrecht, the Spaniards were so cautious not to give up any Teritorial Jurisdiction with the Town, that there is an express Article to cut us off from it. Nevertheless, tho he could not Vote for a Question which as Sr Thomas Sanderson has worded it, might occasion a Breach with Spain, yet he should be loath on the other hand to Vote against a right of Teritorial Jurisdiction belonging to Gibraltar, and therefore moved that Mr Plumbtree might leave the Chair.

Sr Ed. Bacon Rise to Second Mr Conduit, urging the unreasonableness of Sr Thomas Sandersons Motion.

Sr Jo. Rushout Never any thing so Surprizing and unparliamentary as to dismiss a thing of this consequence so soon by a Motion to leave the Chair. We have been a Week expecting this debate, and a Gentleman no sooner makes a Motion but another desires to leave the Chair; what Usage is this! where is Room for Debate! One would think that the Gentleman came ready resolved and had been consulted with beforehand. The Question is, We have a right by the Treaty of Utrecht to demand of the Spaniards the removal of their Works farther back out of Gun Shot or no? It appears by the Map that from their Works they can hurt our Ships in the Bay, nay and anoy our Out works too. But he will Sit down, in hopes the Ministry or rather the Minister will declare to the House that the works we complain of shall have a Stop put to them.

Sr Ed. Bacon Got up to Justify himself from the Imputation of being consulted before he came in, and declared he was too inconsiderable a Man to be consulted with, which Set the house a laughing, he being known to be one of those we call Dead Men for a Ministry.

Sr Charles Wager Said the Question for leaving the Chair did not come too soon, for

---

98 ‘Random’ refers to the full range of a firing piece, given by elevating the muzzle; ‘point blank’ refers to distance of a shot fired horizontally.
99 In 1713.
100 John Norris (1702–67), MP Rye.
102 The Treaty of Vienna had been concluded between the Empire, Britain and the United Provinces on 16 Mar. There was to be a further treaty, concluded on 22 July, also at Vienna, between the Empire, Britain and Spain.
103 Clause 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht between Britain and Spain (2/13 May 1713) ceded to Britain the town and castle of Gibraltar but, to avoid the possibility of future irregularities in the customs, it was understood that ‘the […] property be yielded […] without any territorial jurisdiction, and without any open communication by land with the country round about’ (A General Collection of Treaties … (London, 1710–32), vol. iii, p. 477).
104 John Plumptre (1679–1751), of Plumptre House, Nottingham, MP Bishop’s Castle, Treasurer of the Ordnance.
105 And thus to end this sitting of the committee, since John Plumptre was its chairman.
106 Either Sir Edmund Bacon, 5th Bt (1693–1738), of Gillingham, Norfolk, MP Thetford; or Sir Edmund Bacon, 6th Bt (c. 1680–1755), of Garboldisham, Norfolk, MP Norfolk.
108 Sir Charles Wager (c. 1666–1743), of Kilmennath, West Looe, Cornwall, and Parson’s Green, Middlesex, MP Portsmouth, vice-admiral and Lord of the Admiralty.
the debate is upon nothing at all. He has Reason to know the place and had now in his hand a Plan of it with the Works complained of, but they are too great a distance to anoy the Town. Then as to hurting our Fleet from the Battery at the end of the Line, he remembers last Seige, that one Ship who lay nearest that Battery and was longer than the rest in weighing Anchor to remove out of reach, did receive two Shots and that was all. He knows nothing of Territorial Jurisdiction belonging to the Place, nor is it necessary, for all the Power of Europe can’t take it, nor can their Works hurt our Ships, which may ride in Spight of them in another part of the Bay tho not indeed so convenient as under their Fort. That while we are at peace there’s no apprehension of disturbance from them, but if at War, their Line is so extended that an Army must be employ’d to defend it or our very Garrison will force it. And yet with all the pains and cost the Spaniards have been at to raise this Line, we see by the letters read to us that it was once totally ruined by the Wind and Sea, and so it will frequently happen. It is possible the present Treaty may persuade the Spaniards to lay by their Works, if not, they can do Us little hurt.

Mr Dodington Thought the Motion for leaving the Chair extreamly proper, and Sr Thomas’s Motion as improper: for to enter into a Nice disquisition how far Spain has Acted contrary or pursuant to the Treaty of Utrecht may be very prejudicial at a time when we are Settling the Peace of all Europe, and who can be for a Motion that implies that Nation has done us an Injury, without following it by another to insist on Satisfaction? which if refused by Spain, as certainly they will refuse, Seeing they have all along denied that we have any Territorial Jurisdiction, must throw us into a War with that Kingdom: for the honour of Parliament being engaged to maintain our Assertion, and the honour of Spain to Support their own, a War will be unavoidable, which he is Sure is not the intention of any Gentleman that hears him. We have made terms for them with the Emperor and obtained all that Nation dos wish for, and it is very probable that in gratitude for our good Offices they will be prevailed on to drop their works.

We See by the Papers, that the King has done all in his Power to Stop those works, and went so far as to threaten to forsake that Nation if they continued them, but for us to make a Remonstrance to the King on their Subject, is to imply as if he had been negligent or wanted Inclination to do what was proper for him. It is true that our Minister Mr Keen did in Strong terms assert to that Court our right to a territorial Jurisdiction, but Ministers often ask more than is Just, from which they may recede as is found proper, but if our Parliament adopt their Steps, we can’t recede. His own Opinion is, that the Spaniards have not acted contrary to their Treaty, for they expressly stipulated when the Town was given up to Us, that we should have no territorial Jurisdiction, as knowing indeed that without that Stipulation we had a right to it, but therefore they provided against it, and that Ministry who made the Utrecht treaty consented to them in that point.

This was an oversight in us at that time, and a very great one, but how can we help our selves now. If we consider the time when the Spaniards begun these New Works, we shall find it was not before we began to treat Seperately with the Emperor, when they not being

---

109 In 1727–8 Wager had commanded a British naval fleet cruising off Gibraltar to act against the Spanish siege of the town.
110 Either George Dodington (c. 1681–1757), of Horsington, Somerset, MP Weymouth and Melcombe Regis; or George Dodington (c. 1691–1762), of Eastbury, Dorset, MP Bridgewater, a Lord of the Treasury
111 See above, n. 96.
113 During the first half of 1728 there had been signs of an improvement in Anglo-Austrian relations, and Lord Waldegrave was sent as ambassador to Vienna in April 1729. This first overture was not a success, but in January 1729 the British approached the imperial government again in the hope of concluding an alliance (Black, *Collapse of the Anglo-French Alliance*, pp. 63, 97–108).
let into the Secret of what was transacting, and fearing we were trifling with them about the Succession of Don Carlos,\textsuperscript{114} shew’d their Resentment by raising these New Works, but now it comes out that we have done all for them \[f. 61r\] they could desire, it is highly probable they will Stop ’em, and shew us all the favour imaginable if we proceed amicably.

Danl. Pulteney Denied Sr Charles Wagers Assertion that our Ships cannot be hurt by the New Works, and offer’d to shew he had contradicted himself, by Reading the Copy of his Letter to the Duke of Newcastle\textsuperscript{115} dat. September 1727 to this Effect: \textit{The Spaniards have a Battery of 12 Guns on the Sea Side which lay neglected, but now they repair it to Canonade our Ships and have obliged us to remove from the best part of the Road. [sic]} \textsuperscript{116}

Sr Cha. Wager Expresst his concern that he should be thought to contradict himself, which was next to saying he had told an untruth. His Letter contradicts nothing he had now told the house. It was this very Battery that made the two Shots he mention’d which had done the Ship no harm. He removed indeed from the North Side which was the best part of the Bay, But he could in two hours have knocked down the Fort if he would, and at any time it may be taken by landing men in Boats at the back of it.

Mr Pelham\textsuperscript{117} Said it was presumption in him to say any thing in the Debate after what had been urged: But since the Ministry had been called on to tell what they intend to do, he would (tho a Minister but of a day)\textsuperscript{118} give them an Account of the Convention Settled with the Emperor,\textsuperscript{119} in which he will advance nothing but what he has Authority to say to the house.

This Convention or rather Treaty for it is entirely Settled will he verily beleives produce a general Pacification: It is defensive between the Emperor, England and Holland, Signed by the two first, and will be by Holland as soon as by the Constitution of that Government their Minister can have his full Power, in the meantime the States have been consulted\textsuperscript{120} and their approbation has gone a long with us thro the whole Affair. The Emperor has consented to perfect the Sevile Treaty\textsuperscript{121} and the greatest \[f. 61v\] Security is given to Spain in their demands. The Ostend Company\textsuperscript{122} is not only abolished, but the Emperor has engaged that no person shall trade under his Colours to the East Indies from any part of the Spanish

\textsuperscript{114} The third son of King Philip V of Spain, but the first by his second wife, Elizabeth Farnese. His right of inheritance (through his mother) to the duchies of Parma and Tuscany had been recognized by the Empire in the Treaty of The Hague in 1720.

\textsuperscript{115} As Secretary of State.

\textsuperscript{116} Add. MS. 32687, ff. 312–14. The passage in question reads: ‘The Spaniards had a Battery of twelve Guns upon the Sea Side, called the Tesse Battery, that fired during the Siege upon the Ships in the Bay, which Battery has been for some time neglected, and the Guns drawn from it but now the General has thought fit to begin to repair that Battery in order to Mount Guns again upon it […] I writ a letter to the General upon it […] I did not expect, being afloat, to have any such dispute with the General of the Spanish Army, but this Battery being first erected to cannonade the Ships in the Bay, that lye of the North End of the Town, which is the best of the Road as it did, and obliged us to remove to a greater distance, and not knowing but it may be intended to do the same thing again […] I thought myself obliged to write to the General upon it […]’

\textsuperscript{117} See above, n. 77.

\textsuperscript{118} Henry Pelham had been Secretary at War 1724–30, and Paymaster-General since 1730. This was possibly an ironic reference to the previous exchange between Pulteney and Wager.

\textsuperscript{119} The recent Treaty of Vienna (see above, n. 102).

\textsuperscript{120} The States-General of the United Provinces.

\textsuperscript{121} The treaty of 1729, concluded at Seville, between Great Britain, France, Spain, and the United Provinces.

\textsuperscript{122} Founded at Ostend in the Austrian Netherlands in 1719 by the Emperor Charles VI, to trade with the East Indies. Abolished in 1731 according to the terms of the Treaty of Vienna in return for recognition of the Pragmatic Sanction by which Maria Theresa was to succeed as Empress. None the less, ships of the company continued tradng unofficially until 1744.
Dominions in Europe that were under Charles the 2d King of Spain\textsuperscript{123} and are now in his possession. Our Trade to Sicily is restored on the foot it was in that Kings Reign. We are under no Engagement whatever that can affect our other Allyes the contracting powers, nor is any thing agreed upon contrary to any Treatys now Subsisting. It is agreed that all disputes in the North between our respective Allyes shall be terminated amicably, and not by force, and as to the Guarantheehiph of the Emperors Hereditary Dominions it will appear to be the most beautiful feature of the whole Composition. Lastly we are under no obligation whatever to defray the Expences the Emperor has been at in raising Troops, nor have Subjected Spain to pay them, So that Spain will be so entirely satisfied with this Treaty with Respect to her Interest that she cannot cavil with us for little matters. We now have the honour to give Peace to Europe, and he hoped every private man will do Justice to our Ministry, who have brought so great things about. He verily believes the Spaniards will gratifie us in all things. The King having had the Power, Credit and good Fortune to Settle in so fine a manner an universal Peace, He thinks it would be respectfull to drop this motion. It would be wrong to give a Negative to it because of misinterpretation, and as wrong to give an affirmative to it, it would be neither prudent nor Just. He entreats the Motion may be dropt, Since nothing can hinder an happy \textsuperscript{[f. 62r]} Execution of the Treaty and its good effects but our own Imprudent behaviour.

Mr Oglethorpe said it was very grateful to hear this Account of the Treaty, and that France has not conducted us to it, but is left to itself for once. However he could not think Sr Thomas’s Motion imprudent or unjust. Not imprudent since this is the only time to insist with Spain for allowing Giberialta r a Territorial Jurisdiction, now that they are supposed to be in the best humour, their obligations to us fresh, and their Interest in our hands which are not yet absolutely Settled; besides he looks on it that the Crown of Italy is now given to them,\textsuperscript{124} and hereafter they will be too great to gratify us. As to the Motions being unjust, If we have a Right to Territorial Jurisdiction, tis not unjust to demand it, and our Ministry may chance to lose their Heads if by this Treaty they do not Secure it. He is however for taking their words for it this time, and on that condition and clearing the Bay comes into the Motion for leaving the Chair.

Mr La Roch.\textsuperscript{125} Quoted several passages in the letters read to us, and from them declared himself for the Motion to leave the Chair.

Sr Will. Windham\textsuperscript{126} Spoke in defence of the Utrecht Treaty, and said it was then Understood we had as much territiorial Jurisdiction allowed as lay within reach of our Guns, which neither we nor the Spaniards might build upon. The Spaniards must have understood the same, as appears by a Clause in that treaty that if we ever parted with Gi beralt it should be to them, which Clause had been wholly unnecessary, if they had reserved a Right \textsuperscript{[f. 62v]} to build Forts to annoy us within Cannon Shot. He thought it fit for us now to insist on territorial Jurisdiction, by Address of Parliament, because the Parliament will not depart from its Claim and tis the only way to obtain it. He wished Mr Pelham may always have as agreeable News to tell the house as he has done this time, but if the Peace be settled in the manner he has said, he wished it had been done some years ago. He believes it will come out no more than a bare Accession to the first Treaty of Vienna between the Emperor and Spain\textsuperscript{127} with which we were then so angry. How we are got out of the French hands he cannot tell, but if it shall appear that they have had the principal hand in this Affair, our Ministries foresight will appear very short and no honour due to ‘em.

\textsuperscript{123} Carlos II (1661–1700), King of Spain, Naples and Sicily 1665–1700.
\textsuperscript{124} See above, n. 106. The right of Don Carlos (the future Carlos III of Spain) to succeed to the duchies of Parma and Tuscany was guaranteed by Britain and France in the Treaty of Seville in 1729. In January 1731 the last Farnese duke of Parma died and Carlos came into his Italian inheritance.
\textsuperscript{125} John Laroche (c. 1700–52), of Pall Mall, and Englefield Green, Surrey, MP Bodmin.
\textsuperscript{126} Sir William Wyndham.
\textsuperscript{127} The secret treaty of 1725.
Horace Walpole\textsuperscript{128} has seen ministers change shapes, be for any king and any measures. Believes that by the Treaty of Utrecht, Gibraltar was designed to be given up by the very words of the Treaty, for the words are without territorial jurisdiction \textit{[sic]}. We ought not to understand it so, and therefore the Parliament should not meddle at all with it, because that would imply it. He quoted treaties wherein if territorial jurisdiction is insisted on, care is taken to express it. This happy conclusion is the effect of the Hanover Treaty\textsuperscript{129} alone. He shew'd the ill consequence of the first Vienna Treaty. Said he would give Mr William a little more satisfaction about the present convention, tho' not all. That the junction of Spain with the emperors hereditary dominions by marriage of Don Carlos with the emperors eldest daughter\textsuperscript{130} is out of danger. He hoped Mr William would not deny the ministry \textit{[f. 63r]} the honour of this peace, since Mr Danvers (looking at Mr Pulteney and laughing) had in his last Saturdays Craftsman done it.\textsuperscript{131} ‘Tis Mr Danvers sentiments declared before he went out of the world, that is before he got into a place. (the house took the jest and laughed extreamly.) He liked the opposition of such able and honest gentlemen as Mr Danvers, because it was a watch upon the ministry, and hopes they will go on to be as watchfull, for when foreign affairs are settled, there will be business enough for them in home affairs. (at this the house laughed again.) If the Spaniards are as positive on their side that the Treaty of Utrecht gave no jurisdiction to Gibraltar as our Parliament is that it did we should go into a war should should \textit{[sic]} this motion pass. Believes the Spaniards will oblige us in all things when they see we have fulfilled our promises, but he will not undertake for it, least falling out otherwise Mr Oglethorpe should take off his head. (at this the house laughed again.) He believes Spain would give every thing up rather than have Gibraltar, and we had Minorca granted as an equivalent for our parting with territorial jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{132} He wished the house would have a little more candour, and when facts wrongly urged are absolutely denied, not urge those facts over again.

\textbf{Will. Pulteney} disapproved merriment on so serious an occasion, and perceived Mr Walpole had changed the minister into the wag he once knew him. However he had rather hear him make joaks than make treaties.

He would maintain Mr Danvers was the better minister of the two, and reminded him of the caution \textit{[f. 63v]} Danvers gave him upon the allowing France last year to levy troops in Ireland.\textsuperscript{133} It appears to him now the treaty is open'd, that we have stronger reason than before to agree to Mr Thomas Sanderson’s motion. He saw nothing done for England by this peace, it is not yet a peace, and incidents unforeseen may still hinder it. The letting the Ostend company fall, was more a benefit to the Dutch than to us, and he hears that two Ostend ships are allowed to go to the east Indies under pretence to bring home their effects. Perhaps we have obliged ourselves to see the emperor reimbursed his charges, either by our selves or by Spain.

It was a pernicious doctrine to the liberty of parliaments that to advise the king by our addresses is to reproach his majesty. This is a time and occasion to address him. Fame says that no person supports the minister in Spain in his measures but the Queen,\textsuperscript{134} which measures may alter, and then our fine treaty is lost (here the house laughed)

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{128} Horatio Walpole.
\textsuperscript{129} Between Britain, France and Prussia, 1725.
\textsuperscript{130} For Don Carlos, see above, nn. 106, 124.
\textsuperscript{131} Nicholas Amherst (1697–1742) was the principal author of the \textit{Craftsman}, under the pen-name Caleb D’anvers. The issue for 3 Apr. 1731 did contain a letter in praise of the peace, but it was written to ‘Mr Danvers’ over the signature ‘Anglo-Germanicus’.
\textsuperscript{132} In the treaty of Utrecht.
\textsuperscript{133} The \textit{Craftsman} had commented at length on the arrival of French recruiting agents in Ireland in the issue of 7 Nov. 1730, returning to the subject again on 12 Dec. following.
\textsuperscript{134} Elizabeth Farnese, Philip V’s second wife. The chief minister was Don José Patiño.
\end{flushleft}
because Mr Pultney alluded to the Report that Sr Robert Walpole is only supported by our Queen.) He thought it would be a Reflection on the house to put off a Matter of this great consequence so Slightly, and the Spaniards will think we are not in earnest for a Territorial Jurisdiction, Since upon a Debate we came to no Resolution in favour of it, but if we Interest our Selves, our Ministers endeavours will be Strengthen’d He then entered into a large Invective against the Ministers measures, and shew’d the Use of Parliamentary Enquiries, that they have forced the Ministry to persist in remedying the abuses and depredations of the Spaniards on our Ships, demolishing the Harbour of Dunkirk &c. Mr Pelham Assured the House that by the Treaty the Spaniards nor We are Subjected to pay anything to the Emperor.

Sr Robt. Walpole Begun by saying that Mr Pulteney of all men should least Speak against Joaking, Since what he generally said was but a Joak. He wished Gentlemen would not digress so much from the Question, he had looked on his Watch and counted 21 Minutes, before Mr Pulteney had said any thing to the Question. He wished also they would not Speak so often to the Gallary, but for once he would do it tho it encroached on Parliamentary Priviledge.

The Objections made to the Ministry’s Conduct for 5 years past was calling things what they were not. This Treaty puts an end to every ones dispute in Europe, Subjects England to no new Obligations and confirms the Treaty of Sevile. The Ministry have been accused of blundering, a Coarse word used by Mr Danvers, but who were the Blunderers now need not be asked, Since Mr Danvers himself had approved the Peace. It has been asked, did we not hear these things before? Why is not the Treaty laid before the house? Why the Treaty is not yet ratified and Published, and therefore it would be unparliamentary to ask for it; And it can’t be published yet, because Holland is a Party to it and has not yet signed on Account of the Slow Forms of their Government. He could inform the House that the Hague Letter which made so much noise in the Winter and was incerted in the Craftsman to inflame the Nation with Resentment that England had Stipulated to pay the Emperor his charges, was a letter invented here, translated here, and then sent over to Holland to be put into their Gazet and published over Europe.

a Gentleman asked what has been done for England? He is Surprized at the Question, Is it nothing to England that we recover out of an uncertain State, that Universal Peace will Reign, that our Trade revives and that by a [f. 64v] little prudent delay we have avoided a War, to which we might have seen no end? Two Ostend Ships are allowed pro hac vice only to bring over their effects from the Indies after which the Emperor Stipulates to put down that Company, and totally exclude any Nation whatever from trading under his Colours to the Indies from any part of the Spanish Dominions in Europe that had belonged to Charles 2d of Spain. He is Surprized at some Gentlemens aim: When we were well with France then they would have us break with her, now we are well with Spain, they would have us break with her. Sr Thomas’s Motion if allowed may tend to it and therefore its improper, And as to Addressing the King, the usual method is for Parliaments to give their Advice when asked: The Papers shew that his Majesty and his Ministry have done already what was proper for asserting their Right to a Territorial Jurisdiction, and demanded it, they can do no more than

---

135 Presumably Walpole is referring, inter alia, to the proceedings in the House of Commons in February 1730 in the committee of the whole House on the state of the nation. Complaints about the restoration of the fortifications at Dunkirk, which the French had obliged themselves to demolish by the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht, had been followed by an address for all papers concerning Dunkirk to be placed before the House (Jeremy Black, Parliament and Foreign Policy in the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 57–8).

136 See above, n. 77.

137 The Craftsman of 2 Jan. 1730 /[31] had published what purported to be an extract of a private letter from The Hague, retailing a rumour that the English ministers were about to reverse their policy of alliance with France and seek an understanding with the Emperor. See also ibid., 30 Jan. 1730 /[31], for a further discussion.

138 For this occasion.
Accounts of Debates in the House of Commons, March–April 1731, 
Supplementary to the Diary of the First Earl of Egmont

persist in it if the House should Address ever so strong, and therefore an Address must reflect
on his Majesty, as if he had not done what he could, or would not do what he could.

Sr Joseph Jekyll\textsuperscript{139} Said he had for many years been against Questions of this nature. He
differ’d from those who think the Spaniards have a right to build so near the town. Whether
we keep or part with Giberaltar he says we shall take care of the Interest of England. We have
a Right to Territorial Jurisdiction, for all Laws Say that he who concedes any thing concedes
what is necessary to the enjoyment of it. We have therefore a Right to hinder the Spaniards
from building Forts within our Jurisdiction, and they violate the treaty if they deny it.

He hoped if the Ministry do not take care to stop these Works that this house will. But
thinks in his Conscience this is so critical a time that tis best Mr Plumbtree should leave
the Chair. He rejoys to See so good a Progress made towards a general Peace and would
not give the least Encouragmt to the Spaniards to retard it. The Committee then put the
Question for leaving the Chair, which was carried without dividing.

8 April 1731 (Add. MS. 47033, ff. 65v–69v)
[f. 65v] Debate upon Mr Conduits Motion for opening more English Ports to receive Irish
Wool and Yarn.

Mr Cary\textsuperscript{140} in the Chair\textsuperscript{141}

Mr Scroop Was against opening more Ports because the Ports proposed ly on the East
Coast of England, and Ships bringing Wool from Ireland, if suffer’d to go up the Channel
will have an opportunity to run the same to France. At present the Wool and Yarn comes
fairly to Bristol and the other Ports now open, and this is a real benefit to England, but the
benefit proposed by opening more Ports is a Shadow only, and therefore he is for keeping
the Substance. The Wool of England is increased one third, and therefore a greater quantity
of Irish Wool and Yarn ought not to be desired, for that will force the English to Run their
Wool to France, for want of Vent at home, nevertheless it was reasonable to take off the duty
on Irish Yarn, as had been Resolved the other day, for the Benefit of the Manufacturer. As to
Laws, those in being are sufficient to prevent Running of Wool if duly Executed, and there
needs no Encouragement for our Manufacture but to make it fashionable as once it was for
both Men and Women to wear nothing but English Cloths and Stuffs. If the Capias Act\textsuperscript{142} was
strictly Executed there would be no running. The Committee had no thoughts of opening
more Ports, till towards the breaking up, and had it not been for Yarmouth, in which an
honourable Member Interested himself,\textsuperscript{143} the thing had not been proposed.

It had been said at the Committee that no Wool fairly enter’d in Ireland for England was
ever Run, but this was not proved. The Commissioners only said they knew of none: Indeed
this is so hard to think there should as things stand at present, because Wool Ships may not come
up the Channel, but if they are allowed to come round the Lands End to Southampton,
may find pretences \textsuperscript{f. 66r} from Stress of Weather, to run to France, and if London,
Colchester, Yarmouth and Hull should be open’d, to run likewise to Holland. They may
take the following method: First enter Regularly in Ireland 100 Packs of Wool for England
and take coquet\textsuperscript{144} for so much, then clandestinely ship 400 Packs more and when at Sea will
run the last 400 Packs to France, and return to England with only the 100 Packs. He hoped
the House would not thus hazard the Staple Trade of England. At present this is a most

\textsuperscript{139} Sir Joseph Jekyll (c. 1662–1738), of Bell Bar, Herts., MP Reigate, Master of the Rolls.
\textsuperscript{140} Walter Carey (1685-1757), of West Sheen, Surrey, MP Dartmouth, Chief Secretary for Ireland.
\textsuperscript{141} The committee to consider heads for a bill for regulating the woollen trade.
\textsuperscript{142} The act of 1414 (2 Hen V, st. 1, c. 9), permitting the issue of a writ of capias in Chancery to deal with offences
of murder, robbery, rebellion and riot.
\textsuperscript{143} Horatio Walpole sat in the Commons for Great Yarmouth.
\textsuperscript{144} A coquet or cocket was a sealed receipt given by customs officers as a certificate that imported merchandise had
been duly entered and had paid the appropriate duty.
beneficial traffick to Bristol, which City deserves encouragement paying £160,000 a Year customs to the Crown, and being cramped in other parts of their Foreign Trade. This is also almost all the Trade the North west side of England enjoys.

**Horace Walpole.** Mr Scroop has endeavour’d to Captivate Gentlemens minds: If Laws in being against Running were sufficient I would rest there, but Experience has shewn they are not effectual, either in their own nature, or because impossible to get Executed; therefore some encouragement to bring the Wool and Yarn in must be given, and opening more Ports will be a great one. Indeed if a Registry had taken place for all the Sea Coasts of England and Ireland (as had been proposed at the Committee but now seemed not the Inclination of the House and is therefore not insisted on) I doubt not but it would as effectually cure running in Lincolnshire Dorsetshire and Norfolk, as it has already done in Essex and Kent, but they who are against Restraint Should be more for encouragement. One Reason against opening more Ports and especially those which are near the French Coast is that in time of war the French Privateers will make Prizes of such Ships by Consert with the owners; This Objection ceases, if Provision be made, that in case of War those Ports shall be shut up again.

The Single Question is, whether by opening more Ports Wool will be more likely to go to France than Now? I think not: because at present Wool goes Coast ways from Bristol up the Channel, and has more opportunity of being run, than Irish Wool shipped fairly for any Port up the Channel; nor should we apprehend such Wool will be run, because there has not been an instance yet of any Wool fairly enter’d in Ireland being run to France. As to the Objection of 100 and 400 Packs of Wool, an Easie Remedy may be given, by obliging the Master of the Vessell to give Bond not to take more Wool on Board than he takes a Cocket for. I wish Bristol very well, but there is no Reason She Should Supply other Towns with Yarn; On the contrary they ought to be all put on the same Advantageous foot. Bristol cannot be hurt by opening the Port of Yarmouth, for if as has been pretended, She can furnish the latter with Yarn cheaper than it can have it from Ireland, Bristol will furnish on.

**Sr Abraham Elton** Made a long Speech against opening the Eastern Ports, reasoning upon the Winds.

**Mr Giles Earl** Thought this Bill one of the best things could be done for England, but to open the Ports will knock all in the head.

To take off the Duty on Irish Yarn is the great benefit of the Bill, for tho the People of Ireland are affectionate and dutifull to us, yet make what Laws we will upon them, if they are Severe they will not obey them, nor is it to be expected they should, for they can’t eat their Wool, and if you will not encourage them to bring it to you, they must and will Run in spight of all your threats; He dared engage they would effectually stop the Running, upon taking of this Duty, and then the Spinner of England, tho uneasie for the present on Account of the quantity of Irish Yarn that will come, will be easie soon again, when by ruining the French Manufacture they see their Yarn rise again and full Employment given them. If we do not open the Ports, then all Ships carrying Wool from Ireland, and found in the Channell, will be known to design to Run, because they are out of their Course to any open Port to England, and so they will be Seized by the Kings Ships, whereas if they have leave to pass the Channell as they must do to go to the Ports proposed, the Kings Officers must let them pass, and they may run where they please. Besides the Eastern parts of England do not want the Irish Yarn as much as is said: It is Somersetshire, Glocestershire and Wiltshire that works up the great quantity that comes.

**Mr John Barnard.** The Bill is to prevent Running of Wool, And putting the Laws in Execution is not part of it, but Mr Walpole has mention’d in a former Debate many Expedients

---

145 Cf. Marmaduke Coghill to Perceval, 23 Mar. 1730/1, in which he states unequivocally that the Irish parliament could never be brought to accept ‘a registry of the wool of this kingdom’ and adds, ‘If I am rightly informed the Registry Act has not had the effect proposed in Sussex and Kent and that great quantities of wool are run from those countries into France notwithstanding that act’ (Hayton (ed.), Letters of Coghill, p. 109).
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to prevent Running. I am for no Wool Ships being sufferd to come out of Port untill such Ship is fully laden. I am for opening more Ports, You are no safer now than you will be then from Running. At present tho you suspect a Ship of a design to Run by seeing her out of her Course to Bristol Such Suspicion is no Justification to an Officer to Seize her. There is no Reason to consider Bristol so much, She has advantages London and the Eastern Ports has not, She can Victual for long Voyages in Ireland cheaper than Londoners and others who Victual in England. In time of War, or at any other time when running shall be thought most likely to fall out, the King may by a Clause in this Act be permitted to shut up those Ports, which Obviates all Objections.

Mr Scroop Many things have been proposed, but the Session is late, and we can’t do all now, but something we can and must.

[Page 67v] Danl Pulteney Opening more Ports is too dangerous an Experiment: It defeats the Experiment of taking off the duty, for our Aim therein is to prevent the French from having the Material, but if our Ships may go up the Channel, tis highly probable several of those Ships will go to France. To oblige Ships to remain in Port till they can fill themselves with Wool is unreasonable and a great hardship on the Merchant. The Master of a Wool Vessell may Bond twice, and take two loadings, then Sell one of his Loadings in France and tear one of his Bonds, and when arrived in England with the other part of his Loading, appear to have committed no fault. The very Proposal of giving the King a Power to shut up the Ports implies that there will be danger of running if we Open more.

Sr Robt Walpole Was for opening the Ports, The opposition given to it is only a partial contention of the West of England against the East. The Question is, whether if we open more Ports, tis likely more Wool will be run than before, but make the Irish Yarn equally cheap to all parts of England that want it, and the Manufacture will be in general the better, both as to the goods, and the Vent, which in proportion must impair the Manufacture of France. Bristol has nothing to apprehend from opening Yarmouth, for if Irish Yarn will still come cheaper to Bristol than to other parts, then Bristol will still keep possession of that Yarn. As to the Opportunity of Running, if other parts [sic] be open’d, Such opportunity cannot be greater, than is now that those Ports are Shut, for Wool now comes Coast ways from Bristol to Yarmouth, and what comes so is more liable to be run, than what is directly carried by the fair trader from an Irish to any English Port, Even now, should a Ship be suspected of designing for France, from [Page 68r] being observed to sail out of its Course, yet no Officer on Such Suspicion may Seize her, so that Argument Mr Earl made use of against opening the Eastern Ports is of no force.

Harry Pelham Was against taking off the Duty and therefore am for fewer Ports being open, for the fewer the Ports, the less Yarn will come in, and this is the lesser Evil. All who were for letting in Irish Yarn declared they should be of a contrary Opinion if running were not effectually Stopped, but I am of Opinion it cannot be hinder’d if you open the Eastern Ports, Irish Yarn must come cheaper than the Midland Yarn of England can be sold for, and none of ours will be bought till that of Ireland is worked up; the Buyers of our Yarn will not even agree for it but at an Under Price, on pretence of dealing for Irish Yarn, which will sink our landed Interest Ruin our Spinners and Wool growers And give that branch of the Manufacture entirely to the Irish, So that I dont know what Gentlemen mean by prefacing their Speeches with declaring they have no consideration for Ireland in this Debate, to me it Seems a Bill entirely calculated to Serve Ireland, and we a Parliament of Ireland.

Captain Vernon I am for taking off the duty or our Manufacture is lost. This is not a dispute between England and Ireland but France and England. By computation of the quantity of Wool Run from Ireland to France, it appears we lose a Million Yearly when that Wool is wrought up, which France gets. It seems to me that we are not a Parliamt of Ireland or England but Advocates to aggrandize the French. The French Work a Vast Quantity of Stuffs &c and run them to Spain, where they are put on Board the Galeoons, and carried to
the Indies, But hinder the French of the Material, and they will send no more [f. 68v] thither, the consequence then will be that we shall furnish what they do now, and then our landed Interest, our Wool growers and Spinners will be a Million the better. As to obliging Ships not to leave Port till they have taken their full loading, could that be done, yet it would not prevent running, for fill a Ship ever so full, it can yet take in twice as much more, tho it seems a Paradox; there are ways of Stowing between the Packs, which the East India Company knows well.

Coll. Bladen The People of Ireland will not send you their Wool unless you encourage them to it by making it their Interest.

The more doors you open to let it in, the greater encourament, you give them, and this of opening the Ports is a necessary consequence of taking off the duty. Most of our Wool Acts were past in time of War, and in Peace the Reason of many of them ceases.

Danl Pulteney Ireland should be encouraged to bring in their yarn, but at the same time laid under the strongest Restrictions not to Run. All Arguments for opening more Ports are partial for particular towns, and the general Interest of England not considerd therein.

The Commissioners of the Customs told us at the Committee that a Registry for the Coast of England only might be done at a Small Charge, Perhaps such a Registry in Ireland might effectually stop all running there, and then you might open more Ports, but as a Registry there is thought impracticable, to open the Ports is an Encouragement to them to run more than ever.

Mr Winnington If Ireland means fairly to run no more, but to bring all the Yarn they can spare to England, then Bristol and Leverpool would alone suffice to be open, but if they resolve still to run, then they will desire the East Ports should be open too. I doubt if Irish [f. 69r] Wool and Yarn too will not be Run to France tho the duty be taken off, for the French will still be able to pay more for it than the value of the Duty, in as much as they use but one third of Irish Wool, to two thirds of their own, which is to them a drug. I can’t but think this Question is designed to give way for Running Irish Wool.

Mr Tuffnel I am Surprized that those who were for taking off the duty a few days ago, should now speak so dubiously about the good consequences arising from it! Surely the Free’r the Material comes in the Cheaper our Manufacture will be. His Instructions from Colchester were both to take off the duty and open more Ports.

Mr Oglethorpe I gave my thoughts before on the fatal effects I apprehend from taking off the duty; It will not prejudice the French Manufacture, It ruins the Spinners and Combers of England, and may for what I know create a Rebellion. If you will Ruin England, do it effectually and open all the Ports at once.

Genl Ross This Question seems in some Gentlemens Opinion to be favourable to Ireland, if It were would be for it having great Obligations to that Kingdom, but I verily beleive it will prove of irreparable hurt to it, they will still Run, we shall severely Resent it; And for that Reason I am against it.

Then the Question was put for Opening more Ports

And rejected without a Division.

Capt. Vernon Moved for a further Execution of the Laws of Ireland and England against Running, which past without Opposition.

Mr Walpole Not thinking it Material to move that any Irish Ports should be open’d, tho I urged him to it, and shewed him the Objections against the English Ports did not hold against [f. 69v] those of Ireland, immediately rose and Moved the Committee should Report their proceedings; accordingly the Speaker resumed the Chair and Mr Cary Reported that
we had come to several Resolutions which he was directed to Report When the house would receive the same. Mr Walpole moved for Monday.

Mr William Strickland. These Heads for a Bill are of great Importance, thousands and thousands are to be ruined by it, Petitions will come up against them, and we ought to allow them time. The Bill ought also to be printed, therefore I move you will not receive the Report till after the Holy Days.

Mr Oglethorpe I wish more, I wish it were entirely put off. Petitions will certainly come, and I fear you will want your Army to keep the people in Obedience.

Capt. Vernon Gentlemen talk of Petitioning, have we not forty Petitions on the Table? The Nation has done it already, and even pointed out the very way for us to redress them.

Mr Palmer In the West only the Weavers have Petitioned: The Spinners have not: In the Nation there are and will shew themselves ten to one against this Bill.

Then the Question was put for Monday, and carried without a Division

12–14 April 1731 (Add. MS. 47033, ff. 73v–80v) [f. 73v] Debate for and against admitting of Irish Yarn Duty Free.

On Monday 12 April, Mr Cary Reported from the Committee of the whole house, to whom it was refer’d to consider of Heads of a Bill for the more effectual preventing the Exportation of Wool from Great Britain, and of Wool and Wool Manufactured from Ireland to Foreign Parts, and also to consider of the Duty upon Woollen and Bay Yarn imported from Ireland to England. The several Resolutions they had directed him to report to the House, which were all agreed to without a Negative, the last excepted for taking off the Duty on Irish Yarn, which occasion’d a fresh Debate

Harry Pelham I am against this Resolution, because I see no Security from any Provisions in the Intended Bill, that Ireland and England shall not run their Wool, tho the duty be taken off. If other Provisions which were lately mention’d and seem not to be approved, do not take place, this Resolution will destroy not only the Spinners and Combers of England, but even the Landed Interest. I hope the house will not yeild to it because it will be to no purpose, Petitions will come, they must be heard Gentlemen will want to go into the Country and the Session will be too short to pass an Act. Either let us disagree to this Resolution, or put off the farther Consideration to this day month. My meaning is to drop your Bill this Session, and resume it next year if it be thought proper.

Watkin Williams. I second this Motion for the Reasons given, and because this Resolution will in a particular manner affect the Country I come from. [f. 74v]

Mr Sandys I am for this Resolution, because all the others are ineffectual without it. This is the only Clause that makes it the Interest of Ireland not to run their Wool to France and their Manufactures to Lisbon. To delay the matter is to give it up. This Resolution was the foundation of the Bill. I don’t think the Country will Petition, or they would have done it before, and they cannot complain of any Surprize or want of time, for the House went into

---

149 The original petition complaining of the state of the woollen manufacture and the deleterious effects of the running of Irish wool and woollens had come from the weavers’ company of Bristol. It had been received by the Commons on 22 Jan. 1731 and referred to a ‘grand committee’. Between 28 Jan. and 12 Mar. the Commons referred a further 49 petitions to the same committee, whose report on 23 Mar. resulted in the appointment of a further committee of the whole House to consider heads of a bill to regulate the trade. (C.J., vol. xxi, pp. 599, 603, 612, 614, 617, 621, 623, 624–5, 626, 633, 635, 639, 641, 643, 645, 653, 658, 660, 663, 666, 728).

150 On hearing the chairman of the committee, the House resolved that the report would be read on the following Monday, 12 Apr. (ibid., p. 722).

151 Watkin Williams (c. 1693–1749), of Wynnstay, Denbighs., MP Denbighs.
this consideration the 2d day of our Sitting.\textsuperscript{152} We shall have little thanks from our Country if out of a desire to return thither we drop a Bill of so great consequence to the Kingdom. In a word let us pass it and we shall Manufacture for all the World, for France which rivals us will be deprived of the Material necessary for carrying on their Work.

Lord Tyrconnel I would be for the Bill if I were convinced it would destroy the Manufacture of France, but I have still my Doubts, and I am sure if the Irish continue still to run their Wool and Woollen Manufacture, the Wool growers of England will be hurt. I am not for Sacrificing the Wool growers and Spinners to the Weavers, whose Luxery is the greatest Reason of our Manufactures decline.

Mr Gibbon\textsuperscript{153} No Man thinks it reasonable to Sacrifice the Interest of England to that of Ireland, but this is not the Case: We desire to help forward our Manufacture by calling in the Assistance of Irish Yarn by fair and persuasive means. Suppose what ought not to be Supposed, that some Rogues will still Run Wool, yet a great deal in the form of Yarn will certainly come that used to be carryed to France unspun, which is some benefit. I expect Ireland will heartily concurr [f. 74v] with us, and pass an effectual Law to prohibit all kind of Running, which Law we shall Judge whether it be effectual, if it be not, our Resentment will fall upon them, but they will be too wise not to see their danger on one side and their advantage on the other. I am for trying this Experiment, otherwise Ireland will be nothing.

Mr Whitworth I deny that all the Petitions sent us desired the duty should be taken off, my Town did not, and I have Instruction to oppose it.\textsuperscript{154} Some Gentlemen are of Opinion that this Bill without a Registry will signify nothing, I concur with 'em, but I beleive the Irish will not Submit to a Registry, and therefore I am for deferring the Bill till we see what Ireland will do to satisfy us of their good Intentions.

Capt Vernon It was the Unanimous Resolution of the Select Committee to take off the duty, and it was likewise carried in the Committee of the whole house.\textsuperscript{155} I perceive the Wool Growers are against any methods to prevent Running, and have regard to nothing but who shall give them most for their Wool. To put off the Question for a month is to lose the Bill, and then the Irish will run on. This Clause takes place but at Midsummer come twelvemonth to see what Ireland will do, and if within that time She does not satisfy us, the duty will be replaced, and we shall be where we are now, So that I admire how Gentlemen can oppose this Clause so obstinately, which if the Irish are Sincere will ruin the French Manufacture, and if they are not Sincere will draw such vengeance on their kingdom that the Wool grower and Spinner of England shall have ample satisfaction. Tis a Melancholly thing to see so little concern shewn for the Recovery of the Manufacture.

Sr Thos Sunderson The Moment this Bill passes the English Yarn will be bought from an expectation that the Yarn of Ireland [f. 75r] will come in Sufficient quantities, and cheaper. All we are doing is of no avail, for Wool will still be run from England as well as from Ireland.\textsuperscript{156}

Sr Wm Young If Gentlemen insist that it is wrong to let the Irish Yarn to come in, then

\textsuperscript{152} The session had opened on 21 Jan. and the Bristol petition that had prompted this inquiry had been read and received the next day (C.J., vol. xxi, pp. 590, 593).

\textsuperscript{153} Phillips Gybson (1678–1762), of Hole Park, Rolvenden, Kent, MP Rye. Formerly (1714–26) a revenue commissioner in Ireland and in general a supporter of Irish interests in the Commons (Add. MS. 47033, f. 72).

\textsuperscript{154} Whitworth sat for Minehead, whose trade centred around imports of Irish wool: 15,992 stone would be entered at the port in 1733, and 40,522 the following year (John Collinson, The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset ... (Bath, 1791), vol. ii, pp. 28–9). A petition of the merchants, clothiers, woolcombers, weavers, and other inhabitants of Minehead had been referred to the ‘grand committee’ on the wool trade on 22 Feb. (C.J., vol. xxi, p. 639).

\textsuperscript{155} By ‘select committee’ Vernon means the ‘grand committee’ appointed on 22 Jan., which reported on 23 Mar. The report of the committee of the whole on heads of a bill to regulate the trade included a resolution that all duties on imported bay or woollen yarn from Ireland should be taken off (C.J., vol. xxi, p. 728).

\textsuperscript{156} Saunderson had voted earlier, in committee, against taking off the duty (Add. MS. 47033, f. 26).
repeal the Act that prohibits the Irish from Exporting their Manufacture, that will be a less Evil than to let the French have our Wooll. Are we now serving Ireland or England, Surely not Ireland, they would be very glad you did nothing; I know but one real objection to taking off the Duty, and that I confess is a Strong one, namely the Irish will thereupon grow more wooll, but that must be a work of some years and in the mean time we hope the French Manufacture will perish: We expect the Irish will look on what we do as a sufficient Encouragement not to furnish our Rivals any longer, and they will be able to prevent further running if they please; they know too if they think at all that they must, for England will never endure to see its Staple trade ruined by their Connivance. Their Interest therefore and Just apprehension of their power will certainly after this encouragement given prevail on them to give us all the Material they can Spare, and I should be contented tho every pound of their Wool came in Yarn. If we beat France out of their Manufacture for Exportation, The Wool of all Ireland and England will not be sufficient for the Merchants demand, and then we need not envy Irelands being the Spinning house of England. Gentlemen have argued on a very mistaken notion that the landed Interest is not one and the same with the Trading Interest, whereas the former entirely depends upon the latter. We have a demonstration that our lands will not sink by the bringing over Irish Yarn and Wool, for since less of them came hither, the value of our lands have been lower, and our Manufacture never flourished so well as when the greatest quantities were enter’d. It has been said the Cloth Manufacture thrives, I will Suppose it, but our Stuffs which are twice the quantity of Cloth are in a perishing Condition because the French make the Manufacture with Irish Wooll. Ireland Supplants us by their Clandestine trade to Lisbon, Had Irish Yarn been a prejudice to our Manufacture we should have seen Multitudes of Petitions from the Manufacturers themselves to desire the duty might remain, but contrariwise these very people Petition it may be removed, because it renders the Irish Yarn too dear; nor is it possible it should be otherwise, while the Clandestine Exporter can get more by running his Wool to France than the fair Trader can by bringing his Yarn to England, This makes the Irish indifferent whether they let us have their Yarn, they know the necessity we are under for it, they think it a favour when they bring it, what they bring is in too small a quantity, and they are forced to sell it dear because of the Clog upon it. Even where it comes the Cheapest, which is at the Ports now open, it is too dear, and what must it be at Norwich Yarmouth and other Eastern ports of the Kingdom, whether it travels by Land from Bristoll? The dearness of Irish Yarn is the Source of our Malady, and tho’ I wish for the Sake of our Spinners that we could have the Raw Wool of Ireland other than their Yarn, yet if Irish Yarn be cheaper than English our Manufacture will be cheaper in proportion, and we shall work up twice the quantity of Irish Yarn. It is observable that Since less Irish Wool and Yarn are come hither our own Wooll has not raised in Price, which Shews that tis not the quantity of that Kingdoms Material that hurts us, but the greater quantity Run from thence to France, whereby the French are enabled to work for Foreign Export, and undersell us at those Marketts which formerly we alone Supplied. Certainly the Manufacturers who know best where the Shoe pinches, would long since have Petitioned against the Irish Yarn if that had been their Grievance; But their Complaint is against the Wool of Ireland Run to France, And tis unreasonable to expect that people will give it over if you tell them you will not take it in the way they can afford it. Remove the Duty and I have no manner of Doubt but they will cease to Run, And we shall have all they can Spare from their home Consumption, if not I will join as heartily as any man in the greatest Severities against them.

Mr Gilfrid Lawson. I shall Speak but to one Point, and that is touching the Country’s petitioning against the Duties being taken off. Petitions could not regularly come while this Affair was only in the Committee, for it is from the House, not from a Committee that the Country can know the Parliaments Intention And the Votes only take Notice of what comes

---

157 ‘And our Manufacture’ repeated.

158 Gilfrid Lawson (c. 1657–1749), of Brayton, Cumberland, MP Cumberland.
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Reported from Committees to the House. Besides Committees can only propose, It is the House determines, and the people might very well beleive the House would never agree to take off a Duty the consequence whereof would be their Ruin. Now the Report is made if we immediately agree with it, we prevent all petitioning, which is so Serious a Matter, I think a great hardship on the People, besides the lateness of the Session will oblige you to hurry on the Bill without due Consideration. I am therefore for postponing this Resolution.

**Danl. Pulteney** There was time enough for Petitioning, for all England knew this matter was to come before the Parliament, long before we sat, and how could the Spinners alone be ignorant of it when so many Petitions came up from different parts of the Kingdom advising to take off the Duty. If we do Something, Ireland will do the Rest: they will answer our Expectations. If the Bill must Drop, I hope you [f. 76v] will order it to be printed, that Gentlemen may be prepared against another Session. I doubt indeed whether the shortness will allow time for a Bill, but I wish it may, and am for this Resolution.

**Mr Digby** I have a concern in Ireland, I have also in England, and therefore may be allowed to speak impartially. I beleive this Expedient may have an effect, Gentlemen who oppose it have offered none on the place of it. If we apprehend it will encourage a further growth of Wool in Ireland, let us give more encouragement to their linnen, and that will prevent it. Let us all wear Irish Linnen and discourage that of Germany.

**Mr Palmer** I shall not trouble you long, having given my Opinion the other day, and hears what other Gentlemen have urged with great weight against this Motion. I only take notice that we have not Facts whereon to ground our Resolution. The Irish Nation made a formal Agreement with us to quit their Wool if we gave them the Linnen. We kept our Faith, and they have broken theirs. Before we go further, let us know how the Laws against Running their Wooll have been Executed, I have Reason to suspect that even their Magistrates are faulty, And that an Universal Spirit reigns to disobey the Laws: I have in my hand a Pamphlet that highly deserves the Censure of this House. It declares the Intention of that people to revolt, or else that they will go to New England and Set up an Independency there. It revives the Doctrine of Mullineaux’s Book, and ought to meet with the same fate. Shall we do any thing in favour of a dependant Nation thus disposed? They deserve it not, and encouragement will only add to this Spirit. I hope you will drop this part of the Heads of your Bill.

[f. 77r] **Mr Walpole** I am sorry that Gentlemen should see no facts whereon to ground this Resolution, when there appeared sufficient to every Gentleman in the Committee. The Bargain with Ireland when we gave them the linnen was not that they should import no Wool nor Yarn into England, But that they should not run their Wool to France, and their Woollen Manufacture to other Countries, which now they do to so notorious a degree, that England pays for Lisbon Wines by returns in Irish Stuffs. Some Gentlemen have said that no Laws we or Ireland can make will be able [to prevent] this pernicious Clandestine practice, This is

---

159 Hon. Edward Digby (c. 1693–1746), of Wandsworth, Surrey, MP Warwicks.
160 The Digby family were absentee landowners with extensive estates at Geashill in King’s County: see Daniel Beaumont, ‘The Gentry of The King’s and Queen’s Counties: Protestant Landed Society, 1690–1760’ (Ph.D. thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2 vols, 1999), especially, vol. i, pp. 20, 90–92, 96; Sherborne Castle, Dorset, Digby papers, D/SHC. 3D/118/18 (a reference I owe to Dr Patrick Little).
161 See above, n. 51.
162 [?Sir Richard Cox], Some Observations on the Present State of Ireland, Particularly in Relation to the Woollen Manufacture … (Dublin, 1731); cf. Add. MS. 47033, f. 70.
163 William Molyneux, The Case of Ireland Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England, Stated … (Dublin, 1698), which was condemned by the English House of Commons in the year of its publication as being ‘of dangerous consequence to the crown and people of England by denying the authority of the king and parliament of England to bind the kingdom and people of Ireland […]’ (Molyneux, The Case of Ireland Stated, ed. J. G. Simms (Dublin, 1977), p. 10).
to affirm that we can’t help our Manufacture unless that Kingdom pleases. But are we grown so weak as this? Can we not Execute the Severest Laws against them, can we not destroy their linnen, and cramp their foreign Trade in twenty manners? and will not England be justified in so doing if they continue to break their faith with us, and give the Riches of England to France? But we hope better things, we desire to do that by fair means which we can do by force, But if we do nothing, they will still continue to Run till forcible means are used to prevent it which we wish to prevent. When they see we are in earnest to have their Yarn, they will do what is proper rather than stand the consequences of a Refusal. Ireland sends its Manufacture not only to Lisbon but to Calais and Giblartar. As to the shortness of the Session, Suppose the Bill should only pass this House, the Irish will see our earnestness for it, our Resolution will have the force of a Law, and they will do their parts in full assurance that early in the next Session an Act will pass. I acknowledge that after the Duty is taken off more Yarn will come in than Wool, and we shall thereby profit less, but this is better than that France should have their Wool.

Sr Wm Strickland I am very sorry to see a matter of such vast not to say pernicious consequence prest at this Rate, at the very Close of a Session, and no time given for petitioning, It is denying Justice to those we represent. This Motion is entirely to favour Ireland at the Expence of England and if it pass will create a misunderstanding between the two Nations. No Act you can frame against their running will be Successfull under a long tract of time And I am sorry to hear they will do it in spight of our controul, if that be the case we must put them under force, and no doubt we have strength to oblige them. Even now that Duty is on, they import to us Yarn to the Value of 70000, and when taken off nothing but theirs will be used and ours will ly upon our hands. This Bill contains several new Expedients to prevent Irish Wool from going to France, but make what Laws you will, they will not take place in the West and North West part of Ireland, without you use force, therefore I am against this particular Clause because Ruinous to ourselves, and against the other parts of the Bill because ineffectual. Let Ireland lead the way and shew us how they can put their Laws in Execution. I think we are Submiting our selves to a dependant Kingdom, and are begining the first. How little do we consult our honour or our Interest?

Mr Giles Earl I am a Wool grower and yet entirely for agreeing. So entirely, that I wish all the Wool of Ireland came hither in Yarn. To tell the people of Ireland that they shall have no share at all in the Manufacture of what their own Country produces is a Jest. The Protestants of Ireland are a Conscientious and affectionate people, they are outnumber’ed by papists, and ought to be Encouraged. Tis they only who are the fair [f. 78r] Traders, and they only bring us Yarn. They take none on Board till after clearing at the Custom house. Where is the danger of the Experiment? what Yarn they bring will be worked up, with twice as much of their own, and this is all saved from France. £50,000 worth of Wooll run to France is a Million lost to this Nation. I know the Irish are disposed to do all that lyes in their power for us, but if we are unreasonable they will come into nothing. Why does all the West of Ireland run their wool, But because you will not let them spin for you? If after this Encouragement they deceive us, we are but where we were, the Clause takes place but this time twelve month, and we shall repeal it next Session.

Mr Oglethorpe The Question is Whether the Irish of [sic, recte or] English Wooll shall go to Foreign Countries: For if you pass this Clause, there will be that plenty of Irish Yarn in England and it will be so much cheaper than the English Yarn that we shall Spin less and run our Wool abroad as the Irish do – Suppose the Experiment be a good one, yet even while tis making, the English Spinners must Starve, and fall a Ruinous Burthen on their Parishes. Will you give up the Spinning to Ireland? Then oblige Ireland to pay their proportion towards our Taxes, oblige them to discharge part of our heavy debts, let them discharge the Candle Duty imposed for the Recovery of that Kingdom. The Romans had better Maxims than to encourage their Colonies and Conquerd Provinces at the expence of

164 Presumably the duty imposed by the Candle Duty Act of 1709 (8 Anne, c. 5).
Rome. If Ireland will not discontinue their Running, without we give up England to them, let us make Severe Laws, Conquerors have a Right to do it, there is an Army there, disposed in Barracks conveniently placed, which are so many Forts, and no doubt you may have your Laws well Executed. But I had rather fair means were used with them, It is the Nobler and more becoming way of treating our Fellow Subjects. Let us further encourage their Linnens, away with Cambrick and German Linnens, and let the Court and the Nobility wear none but Irish Linnen – If your Vote to take off the duty, tho it pass not into a Law, is to be looked on as the faith of Parliament pledged to Ireland that you will hereafter do it, then the inconvenience will be the same, as if the Law had passed, and Irish Yarn will this very year come in, therefore I am against your Agreeing. This Vote will put a Stop to the Spinning English Yarn, and then however we blame Ireland for breach of Faith, our necessities will drive us to be guilty of the same, by condemning our rashness, and not passing our Vote into an Act.

Mr Sloper By that Gentlemans Arguments, he is against any Remedy at all, and our Manufacture must bleed to death. The only Remedy is to take off the Duty. Tis Strange to tell Ireland they shall begin first: did they not begin by taking off the Duty on their Wool? they can do nothing more if you Shut the door upon them. The coming in of Irish Yarn will not diminish here the Spinning one pound of Wool. All our inconveniences have arisen from prohibiting the Irish to Export their Manufacture. This Set up France and other Countries, the Manufacturer left that Kingdom and the Material followed him. To preserve the Material is now our Endeavour, But if you drop this Clause you had a good as tell Ireland you will do nothing for them. As to calling this an Irish Bill, consider the mighty thing you do for that Kingdom. I will Suppose at most that they send us 600,000 pound of Wool in Yarn, the duty of this taken off at a penny a pound amounts but to £2500, Is this a great thing for the advantage of Ireland? Yet I perceive some Gentlemen think it too much, tho by it we have a probability of recovering our Manufacture. How Gentlemen can doubt a moment about it Surprises me. As to want of Facts for grounding our Resolution upon, No Gentlemen will say it, that attended the Committee, and then to Argue from a Rascally pamphlet, a Libell wrote by some Scoundrel without a name to inflame the House, It is unparliamentary, beneath the dignity of the House to take notice of it, and wrong to Suppose it to be the Sense or writ by Order of the Protestants of Ireland, The lateness of the Session is no Argument for your coming to this Resolution, the Whole Sessions has been spent upon it, and tis the Importance of the matter not the unfitness that has so long detained us. Want of time will be an Argument every Sessions in the mouth of those who oppose things that require time.

Mr Clayton I am for putting off this Resolution, because it will not answer your purpose, or if it does will ruin our Spinners. Tis owned that make what Laws you will, Ireland will not put them in execution without the Assistance of the Army, unless they find it their Interest to comply, but we all know that he that offers most will be prefer’d, and France is still able to outbid England tho the Duty be taken off. Tis true the Clause takes place only this time twelvemonth, but the Alarm it will give England begins the moment the Bill passes into a Law. We Labour under heavy Taxes, partly for the sake of Ireland, and shall we now prejudice England to pleasure those who owe their preservation to us? Do they deserve any thing at our hands who put us at defiance, reproach us with our inability to controul them, and set up for an Independancy? Nay who tell us before hand that they value not our taking off the Duty, for they will Still Run on? I hope we shall dismiss this Question for a month, or totally Reject it.

Sr Robt Walpole The Wool growers and Spinners, for these are the Gentlemen, and these
only who oppose this Question, do not take what is most essential in the Argument, but Argue against their own Wool, for what would become of their Wool if not manufactured, and what becomes of our Manufacture if that of France is suffer’d continually to encrease and ours to diminish? Suppose the Price of our Wool should be for the present lower, will it not be lower still while France can have more of the Wool of Ireland? Does not everybody see, that France undersells us at Foreign Marketts only by means of our Material, And do not we all confess that without it they cannot Subsist. The Question therefore is Which is best for the Wool grower of England, that England or France should have the Material. You are sure of it if you will take it in Yarn, if not, you are as Sure the French will have it in Wool, with the additional profit of Spinning it up. We do not Suffer the Irish to Export their Manufacture, and they have more Material than they can consume at home: If while we shut the door upon them on one side, we do not open it on the other, we do unjustly and cruelly by them, and they must and will Run, tis in vain to expect otherwise. [f. 80r] There is another thing most necessary to be attended to, their Clandestine Running of Manufacture to Lisbon and other places: this is a practice of few years, but every year growing, and if you do not stop it in time it will be very difficult to do it hereafter. This is a matter of such consequence that the very being of your Manufacture depends on it. Gentlemen say it is dishonourable to begin and Court Ireland to concur with us: I think there is neither dishonour nor Courtship in what we do. They know well enough that our regard is in the first place for England, and if it were not to destroy the French Manufacture the Duty would remain; Were it a Contest only between Ireland and us, perhaps it might be advisable not to let their Yarn come in at all, but the contest is singly between us and France, and surely if in Order to hurt a foreign Manufacture that eats like a Gangreen into our own, we take in the Assistance of Ireland and make them a kind and fair proposition to consider both our Interests to concur heartily with us, to let us have their Yarn with visible and reasonable advantage to themselves, tho to the greater advantage of our Selves, this can never be called dishonourable, or a base Submission to our Fellow Subjects – Let us but make a perfect Scheme and we shall see the Wool of England rise, nor will the Material of both Kingdoms suffice for the Manufacture that will be demanded of Us. I agree this is a National Concern, but insist it is likewise a Justice due to Ireland. I hope notwithstanding what has been said, there is yet time to pass the Bill, if not, let it at least pass our house, and the people of Ireland will beleive us Sincere, they will depend on the Acts passing next Y ear, and do what we expect from them.

The Question was then called for, and Mr [f. 80v] Pelhams Motion for defering it a Month, was first, as in Order, put, Upon the Division, they who went out were 62, and We who remained within 127.169

Then the Main Question was put, and the Duty Voted to be repealed without a Division,170 whereupon Mr Walpole moved for a Bill to be brought in upon the Several Resolutions we came to, and a Select Committee appointed.171

This being over, Sr Robert Walpole moved the house to resolve itself immediately into a Committee of the whole House to consider further of the duty upon Woollen and Bay Yarn imported from Ireland into England, and after Reading an Acct, of the Amount of those duties from Christmas 1715 to Christmas 1729 and how they stand appropriated, we resolved to replace the same on the Aggregate fund, and had leave to Report our Resolution

---

169 C.J., vol. xxi, p. 728 confirms that the motion was defeated 127–62, with Lord Malpas and Edward Digby tellers for the majority, and Lord Tyrconnel and Thomas Palmer for the minority.

170 Confirmed ibid.

171 A committee to draft the bill according to the resolutions of the committee of the whole House: this comprised (in order of nomination) Horatio Walpole, Walter Carey, Sir Robert Walpole, George Dodington, Sir William Yonge, John Scrope, John Knight, William Burton, Samuel Sandys, Edward Digby, Giles Earle, William Glanville, Samuel Tufnell, Phillips Gybson, Thomas Clutterbuck, Hon. Anthony or James Lowther, Edward Vernon and Daniel Pulteney (ibid.).
the following day.\textsuperscript{172}

Tuesday 13 April

\textbf{Sr Charles Turner}\textsuperscript{173} Reported yesterday’s Resolution, Which was Agreed to.\textsuperscript{174}

Wednesday 14 April\textsuperscript{175}

This day \textbf{Mr Walpole} brought in the Bill for preventing the Running of Wool from England, and Wool and Woollen Manufacture from Ireland to Foreign parts, which was Read the first time, and after a Slight Opposition order’d a Second Reading on Thursday next.\textsuperscript{176}

\textbf{Sr William Strickland} and \textbf{Mr Pelham}\textsuperscript{177} urged it might not be till Monday Se’nnight, that the Wooll growers and Spinners might have time to Petition, owning at the same time that they meant thereby to proc[er]astinate the time that the Bill might be lost thro the shortness of the Session, But \textbf{Mr Walpole}, \textbf{Sr Wm Young}, \textbf{Daniel Pulteney}, \textbf{Mr Earl} and Capt. \textbf{Vernon} pleaded for the Bill, and carried it for the day first mention’d.\textsuperscript{178}

The Sugar Bill\textsuperscript{180} also was Read and had no Opposition but from \textbf{Sr Richard Lane} a Citizen of Wooster who deals in Spirits.\textsuperscript{181}

\textbf{26–28 April 1731 (Add. MS. 47033, ff. 84v–88v)}

\[f. 84v\] Monday 26 April 1731\textsuperscript{182}

The Woollen Bill past the Committee.\textsuperscript{183}

\textbf{Mr Earl} offer’d a Clause for opening the Ports of Limerick Galloway\textsuperscript{184} and Dundalk, which was opposed by Captain \textbf{Vernon}, \textbf{Sr Abraham Elton}, \textbf{Mr Danl Pulteney}, \textbf{Ld Tyrconnel}, \textbf{Mr Sandys} and \textbf{Sr William Strickland}. Coll: Bladen \textbf{Sir William Young}, \textbf{Mr Barnard} and \textbf{Mr Walpole} Spoke for the Clause and on the Division we carried it 106 against 64.

The Arguments against opening were that Galloway and Limerick lye on the West Coast of Ireland, and by necessity of having two Winds Ships cannot come to England above three months of the year, but may go with one Wind to France and so will be tempted to run. Besides

\textsuperscript{172} The resolution, as reported on 13 Apr., was that, ‘in lieu of the duties and revenues now charged on woollen and bay yarn imported from Ireland into England, and charged with several annuities, the like sum be charged on the several duties and revenues commonly called the Aggregate fund, and made applicable to the same uses and purposes’ (ibid., p. 730).

\textsuperscript{173} Sir Charles Turner, 1st Bt (1666–1738), of Warham, Norfolk, MP King’s Lynn, Teller of the Exchequer, and chairman, ways and means.

\textsuperscript{174} Confirmed in \textit{C.J.}, vol. xxi, p. 730. Turner was chairman of the committee of the whole appointed on 12 Apr.

\textsuperscript{175} Cf. \textit{H.M.C., Egmont Diary}, vol. i, p. 179.

\textsuperscript{176} Confirmed in \textit{C.J.}, vol. xxi, p. 732.

\textsuperscript{177} See above, n. 77.

\textsuperscript{178} Confirmed in \textit{C.J.}, vol. xxi, p. 732.

\textsuperscript{179} See above, n. 77.

\textsuperscript{180} The bill for importing from the Plantations directly into Ireland, goods not enumerated by any act of Parliament, received its second reading and was engrossed (\textit{C.J.} vol. xxi, p. 731).

\textsuperscript{181} The bill for the better securing and encouraging the trade of his majesty’s sugar colonies in America, was read the third time and passed (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{182} Sir Richard Lane (c. 1667–1756), was a prominent merchant in Worcester, the constituency he represented in Parliament, and had served as mayor of that corporation in 1709–10 (Sedgwick, \textit{The Commons 1715–54}, vol. ii, pp. 197–8).


\textsuperscript{184} The bill ‘for the more effectual preventing the exportation of wool from Great Britain, and of wool and wool manufactured, from Ireland […]’ completed its committee stage (in a committee of the whole House) on 26 Apr. (\textit{C.J.}, vol. xxi, p. 743).

\textsuperscript{185} Galway.
that above Galloway the inhabitants are chiefly Papists and entertain great Correspondence with France. Lastly, the Freight of Wool by Sea from Galloway and Limerick will be as dear as the Land carriage from thence to an Open Port.

The Arguments for opening were, that the fair Trader (of whose running there is no Instance) will thereby have opportunity to bring the Wool and Yarn of those parts to England, and then the Wool owners there will be obliged to run their Wool to France as now they do by necessity, having no vent for it except they send it by land carriage to some Port now open, which is a charge of 10 or 12 p Ct upon it. This charge is so heavy that they are tempted to Run their Wooll, which otherwise they would not, and since we desire their Wool tis wrong to shut the door against its coming. 'Tis impossible that Galloway and Limerick should run more Wool than at present, On the Contrary Clandestine Traders will have temptation to leave their practice when [f. 85r] Wool may fairly come hither; Lastly it is not to be conceived that the Freight by Sea should be equal to the carriage by Land.

The Clause for repealing the allowance of 40 shillings Manufacture to Seamen occasioned a Debate.

Mr Gibbon, Danl. Pulteney, Scroop and Sr William Young were for qualifying it and making that allowance less, but not for absolutely hindering the Seamen to carry any thing, they thought it unreasonable and might affect the Navigation, for we shall throw the Trade into the Inconvenience it lay under before that Allowance, when if a New Coat was found on Board, the Ship was Seized and lost its Voyage: But Mr Earl, Capt Vernon and Mr Lawson insisted on this Clause on Account of the great Frauds committed under Colour of that Allowance, and accordingly it was agreed to.

Mr Walpole Offer'd a Clause to distinguish Wosted Yarn from Woollen and Bays Yarn, the former coming in under Colour of the latter and so Saving a higher Duty. He never intended Wosted yarn should come in, and therefore he now Offer'd a Clause that Yarn twisted in two threads or more should be excepted out of the Act.

The Taking off the Duty of Woollen and Bay Yarn was again opposed by Sr William Strickland. He said Irish Yarn will be sold here for ten Shillings a Stone, which will reduce the Wool of England to four Shillings, Since the Spinner works here for Six Shillings a Stone. Ireland will not be able tho willing to prevent running their Wool: That Kingdom with this Encouragement will multiply their Sheep, and be able not only to glut the English Market but Supply France as before. Tho the Act takes place only at Midsummer come twelve month, yet ill effects will be immediately felt.

Lord Tyrconnel added that enough of Yarn comes in already for our Use while the duty is on; tis some argument [f. 85v] against the Bill that 7000£ Duty a year will be lost to the Crown, but a greater that if more Yarn be admitted, our Malt, Corn, Tillage and Rents must all fall, our Spinners be ruined and fall on the Parish.

Mr Pelham added the Laws in being are Sufficient to prevent Running out of that Kingdom, but the Irish will not Execute them. It would do well if by this Bill we could be Secure that all the Material of Ireland would come, but there is no proof of it, no probable Scheme offer'd, nor any solid hopes that Nation will concurr with us.

Lastly Mr Oglethorpe exprest the great disgust this Clause has given in his Country, where he was desired to present a Petition against it which would have been Signed by above 6000 hands, but he declined it because he thought it might occasion tumults. Our Manufacture bleeds, but this Bill will not help it; If Irish Cattle were allowed to come in, and living made cheaper, if the Sheep of Ireland were bought by England, if Luxery was diminished, these would reduce the price of Labour and recover our Manufacture.

Sr William Young agreed that if by taking off this Duty, our Manufacture for foreign Export encreases not, then it will do hurt, but he beleived this would deprive France from having any more the Irish Wooll, and that might encrease our foreign demand. but Gentlemen

---

185 See above, n. 77.
overlook one great necessity for the Bill the preventing Stuff Manufacture of Ireland from going Clandestinely to Lisbon. He was sorry that Irish Cattle were prohibited, for it set that People upon breeding Sheep.

Mr Earl said that he was himself a Wool grower, and if our Wool were to suffer by letting in more Irish Yarn he had as much reason as any to be against it: [f. 86r] But what must become of our Sheep and land too if the running trade goes on? There is no way to get the better of the French but to hinder them from the Material. This is but an Experiment wherein we run no risque: If the Irish should notwithstanding the Clause still run their Wool, the Bill can do no hurt to the Spinner; if they do not, we have gained our Point.

Mr Walpole proved the French do use English and Irish Wool, by the number of Laws made to prevent running. But the running of Manufacture from Ireland is a New Grievance which this Clause is necessary to prevent. If after this Encouragement the Irish run any more we must use Violence which he would have understood both in and out of the house. English Wool is cheap because the Irish Supply Lisbon instead of England, and France has the manufacture of Irish Wool. Other Gentlemen Argue on a Provincial foot, he on a National one. Yorkshire has lately got the Manufacture from the West, and finding themselves in a flourishing way is careless what becomes of the rest of the Kingdom.

Mr Drummond said, that Yorkshire had got the Manufactory of Stuffs from Devonshire, and thrives exceedingly, therefore he wonder’d not they were against the Clause. He can demonstrate that we have a necessity for Irish Yarn, for the English are lazy and will not Spinn fine enough. The French draw Irish Wooll to Roan\textsuperscript{186} for their Manufactures for home Consumption, and to Bordeaux for their foreign Exports.

Mr Worthy Montague concluded against the Clause, and said he was confident the Irish would neither pass a New Act to restrain their Wool from being run, nor Execute the Acts in being, therefore tis a folly to expect any good from this Clause, which if it pass will occasion more running than ever, by encouraging that people to breed more Sheep, [f. 86v] whereby to Supply both England and France too. It will likewise encourage the Clandestine Exportation of their Manufacture. If we are in earnest we should immediately do for Ireland what they will not do of themselves.

After this the Question was put for agreeing with the Committee, and we divided, but they who were against it were so few they yelded without telling, and the Report was ordered for toomorrow.\textsuperscript{187}

Tuesday 27 April\textsuperscript{188}

The Lords sent down to us the Unenumerating Bill, wherein they Changed the Word English into British. We Received the Report of the Wooll Bill and order’d it to be engrossed.\textsuperscript{189} Sr William Strickland and Mr Lawson spoke against it, and Sr Richard Lane for it. The two former called on the Irish Gentlemen of the House to propose the Scheme the Irish parliament will go upon to prevent Running, or else to offer some other that might satisfy the House, but we were wise enough not to Speak, for we must either have said too little or too much, besides it was a folly to expect that any Gentlemen would say what a future Session of Parliament in Ireland would or should do. Those Gentlemen divided the house upon the Question for engrossing and we carried it 66 against 44.\textsuperscript{190}

The Lords sent us down this day the Naturalization Bill with some amendments.\textsuperscript{191}

Wednesday 28 April.
We past the Unenumerating Bill and carried it back to the Lords, We also past the Wooll Bill which occasion’d a fresh Debate.¹⁹²

Daniel Pulteney Tis Reported confidently without Doors that the Lords will drop this Bill, I therefore am for dropping it here, [f. 87r] for I fear the Parliament of Ireland will make no Bill to prevent the running their Wooll and Manufacture if this house only shews its intention to take off the Duty on their Yarn, and yet it may be expected they should, So we shall give a handle to use them severely when we meet again next year, tho’ in Reason we can’t expect they should do any thing till they are sure of the alternative proposed for not Running their Wool. If they should pass a Bill, and more Yarn come to us while the Duty remains, it will be said there is no occasion to take off the Duty, and that if taken off too much will come, and if after passing their Bill no more do come, we shall say they still do run, and are not in earnest to Execute their New Law, If they keep their Wooll in expectation that the Lords will consent next year to take off the Duty, then we shall have two years Wool and Yarn come in together, and the Complaint will be that they glut our Markett. I wish the Bill may pass this Sessions, there is time for it, but I fear it will not, and therefore am for dropping it here,

Mr Pelham I hope the Lords will drop the Bill theirs are British Estates, and they will take care of them, therefore Mr Pulteneys alarm that they will not pass it is well founded and a Reason for rejecting the Bill even here. In our house we have a mixed Interest, Several Gentlemen of Estates in Ireland. I concur with that Gentlemans wish, that we drop the Bill our selves.

Dani Pulteney I would Explain myself; My Alarm is founded on the Reports without Doors, and on the false Alarm the Lords may take from the Suggestions of others that the Bill will hurt their Tenants; I am persuaded of the contrary, and therefore could wish the Bill had taken place immediately, that the People might immediately be convinced of the Benefit that will arise to them.

[f. 87v] Mr Walpole I believe the Parliament of Ireland be will be [sic] so wise as to pass an effectual Bill, tho this Bill should only pass this house: they may reasonable [sic] expect the Lords will consent next year, and must dread the consequences of their continuing to run. As to the Lords having all their property here, is it not the same with the Commons? And for whose Interest is it we pass the Bill is it not alone for that of England? We are not Sure the Lords will reject the Bill.

Sr John Williams¹⁹³ I was a Turkey Merchant, but quitted the Trade 5 years ago by Reason the French undersold us, and it was not worth my while to carry on my business: On Prospect of your passing this bill I resolved to return to my trade, and yesterday sent to buy up Cloth, which I have not done these 6 Years, I found that on the bare Report of the Bills passing English Yarn was risen from 5 and 6 pence to 5 and Nine pence in the Pack, which is a manifest proof that Wooll and Yarn will gain if this Step be taken. It shews that the letting in the Irish Yarn is not apprehended, but that it will raise our Manufacture by depressing that of France.

Mr Palmer The Yarn may have risen upon a false Imagination of good attending the Bill, but the effect may be different. Had the Irish kept faithfull to their Compact with us and executed the Laws in being against running their Wooll and Manufactures, there had been no occasion for this Bill, but experience shews they have not, nor ever will leave that practice. Suppose they should pass a Bill, they will not execute it better than they have done the former, but they will encrease the growth of Wooll having two markets for it.

Mr Oglethorpe The Rise of the Yarn here is only a Jobb work, a contrivance to induce the Parliament to pass this Bill. or if it be not a contrivance, it must proceed from the [f. 88r] fear people are in that the Bill will destroy the English Spinner[s] and that they shall want this Material for the future, for which Reason that which is now in hand must rise. The same

---

¹⁹³ Sir John Williams (c. 1670–1743), of Stoke by Nayland, Suffolk, MP Aldeburgh.
apprehension rise the price of Salt upon taking off that Duty. Tis an Odd Maxim that to
regain our Manufacture we must ruin our Spinners. The Benefit we expect from this Bill is
remote, the hurt immediate and I greatly apprehend you will have full Employment for your
Army.

Mr Burrel I am very sensible of the great advantages of this Bill: It is the dearness of
Spinning in England that makes our Manufacture too dear. I fear our depriving the Irish of
their Clandestine trade to Lisbon, will be of no Benefit to England but throw that branch into
the hands of France. The English Spinner is lazy and provided he can get three Shillings in
a week, to spend, will work no more. He gets this by four days labour, and drinks it out the
other two. If Irish Yarn, which is cheaper than English comes in, it will beat down the price
of the latter, and oblige the Spinners to work the other two days, which will be better for the
Community and advance your foreign Export.

Sr Wm Strickland I am Sorry to hear that if this Bill be lost the Irish Parliament will do
nothing. What is it to be declared that Ireland will run on if we do nothing? Are we to be on
terms with them? Shall they ruin us if we will not ruin ourselves? I hope as they have not
Submitted to our Laws hitherto, the time will come and that not far off, when they shall be
sorry they ever put things to the tryal, and shall feel the power of England. I should be very
sorry I had an Estate in Ireland.

Mr Sandys How can we Expect the Irish should make a New Law against running their
Wool and Manufacture, if we refuse to take it. Even what we do is not for their benefit
but our own and they know it, but here is a collateral good arises to them, which though not
so advantageous perhaps as their Running, yet considering the hazards they are exposed to if
they still should do it, and the resentment they are to expect, is a reasonable Inducement for
them to concurr with us if this Bill do pass. I hope yet the Lords will pass it

We then divided for passing the Bill and who agreed
were 127, The Noes who staid in were 84.

After this the Naturalization Bill was Read and the Clauses added by the Lords opposed by
Sr John Hind Cotton, Mr Bromley, Mr Oglethorpe, Mr Palmer and Mr Daniel
Pulteney. The two last were for deferring it to a Short day. The others to a Month. Their
Reasons were that it may affect Innocent Papists and even Protestant Purchassers. But the
Attorney and Solicitor General argued so learnedly upon it, that nothing appeared
more reasonable than that the Bill should pass, as it did by a Majority of 165 against 41.

---

195 Peter Burrell (1692–1756), of Langley Park, Beckenham, Kent and Mark Lane, Fenchurch St., London, MP
Haslemere, Director, South Sea Company.
196 Confirmed in C.J., vol. xxi, p. 746. The tellers in favour of the bill were Samuel Sandys and Lord Malpas; the
tellers against, ‘Mr Pelham’ and Edward Wortley Montagu.
197 The bill to explain a clause in the General Naturalization Act of 1709.
198 Sir John Hynde Cotton, 3rd Bt (c. 1688–1752), of Madingley Hall, Cambs., MP Cambridge.
199 Either Henry Bromley (1705–55), of Harsehead Hall, Cambs., MP Cambs.; William Bromley (c. 1663–
1732), of Baginton, Warwick., MP Warwick.; or his son William Bromley, Jr (c. 1701–37), of Baginton, MP
Warwick.
200 Philip Yorke (1690–1764), of Lincoln’s Inn and Carshalton, Croydon, Surrey, MP Seaford.
201 Charles Talbot (1685–1737), of Castell-y-Mwynach, Glamorgan, MP Durham.
202 C.J., vol. xxi, p. 747, gives the figures as 151–41, and names the tellers for the bill as Sir John Hynde Cotton,
3rd Bt, and William Bromley, jr, and those against as Charles Talbot and William Burton.