

‘I Who Speak Always Unpremeditatedly’: The Earl of Mulgrave’s Speeches Against Corruption and in Defence of His Honour, 1692 and 1695

Robin Eagles

In the first half of 1694 William III’s administration grappled with the problem of what to do with the newly promoted marquess of Normanby, the former earl of Mulgrave. In spite of his newly won distinction, Normanby remained unsatisfied.¹ He complained that his expectation of being admitted on a regular basis to what he termed the ‘cabinet council’ had not been honoured and asserted in one of his regular screeds to the earl of Portland that ‘no man was ever worse used in being put out of it, than I in being sent for to it’.² Even when he was involved in the decision-making process, Normanby was a difficult colleague.³ Few men had a greater conceit of their own worth than Normanby or were less liked. And yet, Normanby’s value to a series of regimes meant that he was a central figure in administrations from the reign of James II through to that of Anne.⁴ He then attempted to forge friendly relations with the elector of Hanover, but following George’s succession Normanby (by then duke of Buckingham) too closely associated with the Tories and with the former administration was finally left out.⁵

As well as a central figure at court, however, Normanby was also a prominent parliamentarian.⁶ In November 1694, for example, he was appointed temporary speaker of the House of Lords, but he was also a frequent participant in debates and it is to two of his performances before the Lords that this paper will aim to offer some fresh insights.⁷ The first concerns his intervention in the debate on the place bill in the winter of 1692, and the second his spirited defence of his own conduct when he was investigated in 1695 for accepting *douceurs* from the City of London in return for passing on confidential information over certain bills before parliament. A number of themes might be developed from these speeches, but this paper will confine itself to three of them. First is how they help illuminate Normanby’s perception of the role of Lords and Commons within the parliamentary trinity. Second, what they tell us about Normanby’s own style of rhetoric; and third, and here the paper will concentrate on the second piece, what they have to tell us about transmission of texts from being spoken in the chamber to being released to a wider public through the medium of print.

An early version of this piece was given at the ‘Speaking in Parliament: History, Politics, Rhetoric’ conference held at Queen Mary, University of London in April 2016.

¹ According to Ebenezer Timberland, Mulgrave’s promotion to the marquessate was accompanied by an annual pension of £3000, ‘to make his lordship some amends for the place of Lord-Chamberlain, which he enjoyed in the former reign.’ *The History and Proceedings of the House of Lords from the Restoration in 1660, to the present time...*, [hereafter *Timberland*], 7 vols (London, 1742), vol. i, p. 432.

² University of Nottingham Library (UNL), Portland MS., PwA 1152, Normanby to Portland, 29 Apr. 1694; PwA 1232, Sunderland to Portland, [1 May 1694].

³ *CSP Dom.* 1694-5, p. 251.

⁴ Mulgrave’s offices included lord chamberlain, lord privy seal and lord president.

⁵ BL, Stowe MS. 224, ff. 186-7.

⁶ For a full account of his parliamentary career prior to the Hanoverian succession see the entry in R. Paley (ed.), *The History of Parliament: the Lords 1660-1715*, 5 vols (Cambridge, 2016), vol. iv, pp. 425-6.

⁷ *CSP Dom.* 1694-5, p. 343.

I

By the early 1690s Mulgrave was an experienced member of the upper chamber. Having inherited the peerage at the age of ten in 1658, he was summoned to the House of Lords when still under age in 1667 alongside his bitter rival and near-contemporary, John Wilmot, 2nd earl of Rochester.⁸ While Rochester tested the water by attempting to take his seat, only to prompt a complaint by the Lords, Mulgrave opted to await his majority a few years later before finally claiming his place.⁹ Subsequently, Mulgrave spent much of his early career attempting to fashion for himself a reputation as a capable military man.¹⁰ He also attempted to rival Rochester both with his own literary output and by establishing himself as a patron of other writers, most notably of John Dryden.¹¹ His efforts earned him some of Rochester’s most vitriolic outpourings. Rochester dubbed Mulgrave variously ‘Lord All-Pride’ and ‘Bajazet’, though whether he meant by the latter the tyrannical Turkish emperor immortalized by Christopher Marlowe in his epic *Tamburlaine the Great* or the eponymous character of Racine’s 1672 play is not so clear.¹² What is without doubt is that Rochester thought Mulgrave a poseur whose literary efforts and quasi-chivalric ambitions left him a mere laughing stock:

Against his stars the coxcomb ever strives,
And to be something they forbid, contrives.
With a red nose, splay foot, and goggle eye,
A plowman’s mien, face all awry,
With stinking breath, and every loathsome mark,
The Punchinello sets up for a spark.¹³

Rochester may not have been convinced by Mulgrave’s capabilities, but in one thing at least Mulgrave surpassed his enemy. While Rochester fell prey to his excesses in the summer of 1680, Mulgrave lived on.¹⁴ He acquired several significant offices and was promoted first to a marquessate (Normanby) and latterly to a dukedom (Buckingham and Normanby).¹⁵ He married three times, his third wife being one of James II’s illegitimate children;¹⁶ and at one point he was also

⁸ Andrew Swatland, *The House of Lords in the Reign of Charles II* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 33-4.

⁹ Mulgrave recounted his version of the episode in his memoirs. ‘At the next meeting of Parliament, I receiv’d a writ to sit there; and being known by every body to be younger by three years than the prefixed age for the voting in the House of Peers, it was opposed by ALGERNON EARL OF NORTHUMBERLAND, who very gravely moved, that they would rather exclude Lords till some years above the age of one and twenty, instead of admitting one so much younger. In this he was certainly in the right; and I acquiesced in it the more willingly, because the heat of youth (which was his objection) made me a great deal more inclined to something else, than to sitting there.’ *The Works of John Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave, Marquis of Normanby, and Duke of Buckingham*, [hereafter *Works*], 2nd edn, 2 vols (London, 1729), vol. ii, p. 8.

¹⁰ Mulgrave’s own memoirs note that he served as a volunteer aboard the ship commanded by Prince Rupert and the duke of Albemarle, having been inspired by the example of the earl of Ossory. *Works*, vol. ii, pp. 4-5.

¹¹ Dryden was Mulgrave’s most notable beneficiary but one of Mulgrave’s later chaplains, Samuel Wesley, published ‘The Life of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. An Heroic Poem’ and a verse rendition of the New Testament. *Post Boy* (9-11 Dec. 1697, 26-29 July 1701).

¹² *The Complete Poems of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, ed. D. M. Vieth (New Haven, 1968), pp. xxxvii, xlii.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

¹⁴ He died finally in February 1721. According to the *Daily Post* (27 Feb. 1721), right up until his death he was ‘heartly and free from sickness, tho’ confin’d by a sore toe; so that it may be said of him, that he dy’d of old age’.

¹⁵ J. C. Sainty, *Peerage Creations: Chronological Lists of Creations in the Peerages of England and Great Britain 1649-1800 and of Ireland 1603-1898*, *Parliamentary History: Texts and Studies*, 1 (Oxford, 2008), pp. 20, 24.

¹⁶ Catherine Damley, daughter of James II and Catherine Sedley, countess of Dorchester.

reported to have been entangled with James's legitimate daughter, Anne – an incident that led to his temporary expulsion from court.¹⁷ His most obvious and most enduring legacy, however, besides his considerable literary output was his early development of what was ultimately to become Buckingham Palace. It is perhaps unsurprising, then, that as well as Bajazet and All Pride another familiar soubriquet for him was King John.¹⁸

Mulgrave's resilience is particularly well demonstrated by his survival post 1688. He had been James II's lord chamberlain, appointed in 1685 following the death of the previous incumbent.¹⁹ Some thought he may have converted to Catholicism to satisfy his king's religious biases, though by the time of the Revolution he was counted by Roger Morrice among the Protestants still in office.²⁰ Although he remained at Whitehall as news of William of Orange's invasion spread,²¹ he was so far uncommitted during the crisis weeks that followed as to have been reported to have presented James with an ultimatum: his continued support in return for a marquessate. James proved unwilling to assist, prompting Mulgrave to beat his way back to Prince William and to make his bed with the victorious party.²² Thereafter, Mulgrave found himself frustrated. Stripped of office under the new regime he turned his attention to parliament instead. There he was able to make a name for himself as a frequent and talented participant and in December 1692 he joined an amorphous group of former courtiers arguing in favour of the place bill – a measure aimed to limit the numbers of members of the Commons able to hold places in the government or armed forces alongside of their seats in Parliament.

Concerns about the encroachment of the executive into Parliament, or about the connection between political and moral corruption, were not new and they continued to be a feature of complaints, particularly made by those with Country leanings, throughout the 1690s and the eighteenth century.²³ Since the Restoration the earls of Arlington and Danby had made significant attempts to recruit members of the Commons to the court in return for places and pensions.²⁴ The greater frequency and predictability of parliamentary sessions post 1689 brought the question of placemen more immediately to the fore, and it is in this context that one should understand the calls for limitations on the numbers of members of the Commons able to maintain their seats and retain certain offices.

The 1692 bill, sponsored in the Commons by Sir Edward Hussey, enjoyed an easy passage through the lower House and was passed on 22 December. From there it was sent up to the Lords, where it received its first reading on 23 December.²⁵ There it also enjoyed significant support and, thanks in large measure to Mulgrave's intervention in the debates following its second reading, was committed on 31 December.²⁶ Mulgrave's speech set out to explain his decision to speak before weighing into the broader issues thrown up by the measure. He

¹⁷ E. Gregg, *Queen Anne*, revised edn (New Haven, 2001), p. 27; Frances Harris, *A Passion for Government: The Life of Sarah Duchess of Marlborough* (Oxford, 1991), p. 33; BL, Add. MS. 28053, ff. 291-2.

¹⁸ Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 27. By the end of his life he had acquired another: 'Old rub'. *HMC Portland*, vol. vii, pp. 291, 293.

¹⁹ *The Entering Book of Roger Morrice*, [hereafter Morrice, *Entering Book*], ed. M. Goldie et al., 6 vols (Woodbridge, 2007), vol. iii, p. 46.

²⁰ James Anderson Winn, *John Dryden and his World* (New Haven, 1987), p. 294; Morrice, *Entering Book*, vol. iv, p. 415.

²¹ Morrice, *Entering Book*, iv, 340.

²² *Memoirs of Thomas, Earl of Ailesbury: written by himself* (Roxburghe Club, 1890), pp. 215-16; Roger Morrice recounted an anecdote emphasizing that with William too, Mulgrave adopted an unwelcome familiarity for which he was rewarded with at least one cutting put-down. Morrice, *Entering Book*, vol. iv, p. 401.

²³ See for example *The Parliamentary Diary of Sir Richard Cocks 1698-1702*, ed. D. W. Hayton (Oxford, 1996), p. xxxix; Mark Knights, 'Parliament, Print and Corruption in Later Stuart Britain', in *The Print Culture of Parliament, 1600-1800*, ed. Jason Peacey, *Parliamentary History*, xxvi:1 (2007), pp. 52-3.

²⁴ Violet Barbour, *Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington, Secretary of State to Charles II* (Washington, 1914), pp. 77-8; Andrew Browning, *Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds 1632-1712*, 3 vols (Glasgow, 1951), vol. iii passim.

²⁵ *Lords Journal*, vol. xv, p. 164.

²⁶ *Lords Journal*, vol. xv, p. 169; Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III* (Manchester, 1977), pp. 109-10.

had been, he insisted, reluctant to get to his feet, conscious of his want of ability and of his tendency to speak off the top of his head when this was an issue requiring careful argument:

This debate is of so great consequence, that I resolved to be silent, and rather to be advised by the ability of others, than to shew my own want of it; besides, it is of so nice a nature, that I who speak always unpremeditatedly, apprehend extremely the saying any thing which may be thought the least reflecting: though even that ought not to restrain a man here from doing his duty to the publick, in a business where it seems to be so highly concerned.²⁷

Mulgrave’s opening espoused a very classical unwillingness to intervene. He preferred, he insisted, to be guided by others better informed and more able, while also asserting his supremely modest concern that such a delicate case was not to be handled by someone as coarse and liable to speak off the cuff as he was.²⁸ But – in spite of all these caveats – the very importance of the case commanded action, and it was this that ultimately persuaded Mulgrave to stand up and have his say. Although one might be able to detect certain classical tropes in the way Mulgrave set out his stall, one particular feature of his mode of address is worth commenting on. His language throughout was plain English – and as such he demonstrated himself as much a good pupil of his former protégé Dryden as of any rhetorician of Greece or Rome.²⁹

Having set out his reasons for intervening, Mulgrave went on to assess the nature of the parliamentary trinity – a constitution, Mulgrave insisted, that was the envy of the world. While the Lords might enjoy a particularly significant place in maintaining the balance of the kingdom by virtue of their independence – not being subject to election – Mulgrave also emphasized the importance of the Commons. This was on account of their nearer relations to the very people they had been returned to represent and thus their greater understanding of those within that sphere, who were far less known to the more elevated members of the Lords.

I have always heard, I have always read, that foreign nations, and all this part of the world, have admir’d and envy’d the constitution of this Government. For not to speak of the King’s power, here is a House of Lords to advise him on all important occasions, about peace or war; about all things that may concern the nation, the care of which is very much entrusted to your Lordships. But yet because your Lordships cannot be so conversant with the generality of the people, nor so constantly in the country as is necessary for that purpose, here is a House of Commons also chosen by the very people themselves, newly come from among them, or should be so, to represent boldly all their grievances, to express the true mind of the nation, and to dispose of their money.³⁰

How absurd, then, in Mulgrave’s eyes was the notion of permitting members of the Commons to hold posts in the military or in the executive in combination with their seats in the lower House. With regard to the former, Mulgrave objected ‘Truly, if a captain has only deserv’d to be advanced for exposing himself in Parliament, I think the nation would have no great loss in the King’s letting alone such a preferment.’ In the case of the latter, Mulgrave opined that the prospect put him in mind ‘of a farce, where an actor holds a dialogue with himself, speaking first in one tone, and then answering himself in another.’³¹

²⁷ *Works*, vol. ii, p. 95.

²⁸ One example of Mulgrave’s unrestrained interventions had come at the time of the Revolution when he had blurted out to the Lords in the provisional government the reports concerning James having been captured at Faversham, ignoring the marquess of Halifax’s efforts to adjourn the session. Robert Beddard, *A Kingdom without a King: The Journal of the Provisional Government in the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 49, 91.

²⁹ In spite of Dryden’s own declaration that English was ‘a barbarous Modern tongue’ according to one later commentator, Dryden was responsible for creating ‘a language fit for civilized Englishmen to use.’ James Anderson Winn, *John Dryden and his World*, pp. 489, 491; Louis I. Bredvold, *The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden: Studies in Some Aspects of 17th-century Thought* (Ann Arbor, 1934), p. 3.

³⁰ *Works*, vol. ii, p. 96.

³¹ *Works*, vol. ii, p. 98.

Mulgrave’s concern, he stressed, was to prevent a situation arising where a corporation had selected ‘a plain honest country neighbour, and find him within six months changed into a preferred, cunning courtier’.³² It was a concern that would continue to resonate among country and later patriot commentators well into the next century and was well reflected in the 1731 collection of poems from the opposition newspaper, *The Craftsman*. This included ‘The Progress of Patriotism: A Tale’, setting forth the career of the honest backwoods Member, Sir Ralph, seduced by Sir Bluestring (a thinly disguised Sir Robert Walpole), and concluding with the stark warning:

So the plain Country Girl, untainted,
Nor yet with wicked Man acquainted,
Starts at the first leud Application,
Though warm perhaps by Inclination,
And swears she would not, with the king,
For all the World do such a Thing.
But when with long, assiduous Art,
Damon hath once seduc’d her Heart,
She learns her lesson in a trice,
And justifies the pleasing Vice,
Calls it natural, harmless Passion,
Implanted from our first Creation,
Holds there’s no sin between clean sheets,
And lies with every Man she meets.³³

In arguing for the importance of retaining Members’ independence, though, Mulgrave was not merely pointing to a high-minded interest in ensuring that the people were suitably represented – or seeking to avoid constant problems over conflicts of interest. Overshadowing his address was the spectre of civil conflict. His own father had backed parliament in the Civil War, and although Mulgrave himself had hardly played an illustrious role in the Glorious Revolution, he was all too aware of how easily matters might slide once more into conflict. In seeking to ensure that there were no grounds for complaint in the role played by Members of the Commons, Mulgrave betrayed his patrician disdain for those below him:

This country of ours is very apt to be provok’d; we have had a late experience: and though no wise man but would bear a great deal rather than make a bustle; yet really the people are otherwise, and at any time change a present uneasiness for any other

³² *Works*, vol. ii, p. 100.

³³ ‘The Progress of Patriotism, A Tale’, in *A Collection of Poems on Several Occasions, Publish’d in the CRAFTSMAN* (London, 1731), p. 52.

condition, tho’ a worse. We have known it so too often, and sometimes repented it too late.³⁴

It was, in many ways, ultimately, a cynical argument that Mulgrave set forward, but this did not prevent the speech enjoying immediate acclaim as well as enjoying a significant afterlife. Credited with having been instrumental in ensuring that the place bill was committed on this occasion, the speech was printed not long after its delivery (1693) and another edition was in circulation in 1706 when it was published within the collection *A Complete History of England, with the Lives of All the Kings and Queens Thereof*. It was printed again in a series of collections of Mulgrave’s works released after his death and was reprinted once again in the *Honest Elector* of 1747 when the question of place and pensions was to the fore in Parliament once more.³⁵ For all this, Mulgrave’s efforts in the winter of 1692 proved to be in vain. On 3 January 1693 the bill was debated again in a committee of the whole House, but when the chamber was resumed pressure from the court ensured that it was thrown out. Nine lords entered dissents at the resolution and a further 20, of whom Mulgrave was one, submitted a written protest.³⁶

II

Two and a half years after standing up in favour of free proceedings in Parliament, Mulgrave (since promoted marquess of Normanby) found himself the subject of investigation for corruption. The affair came at a time of heightened interest in such issues and the same session saw the Commons eject their Speaker, Sir John Trevor,³⁷ and both Lords and Commons involved in intense investigation of other members, chief among them the former lord treasurer the duke of Leeds.³⁸ The case involving Normanby came to light after the Lords began investigating wrongdoing over the convex lights bill (an early street-lighting initiative) towards the end of March 1695.³⁹ Normanby’s involvement in the measure stemmed from his efforts to secure favourable terms from the City of London for a lease of land on which to develop his new town residence.⁴⁰ In return, he was suspected of having accepted bribes to facilitate the passage of the convex lights bill and to have intervened in other measures of interest to the city fathers such as the orphans bill and to have helped thwart the Southwark waterworks bill. Various people were ordered to attend the Lords to explain the case, among them Roman Russell, who was accused by the duke of Bolton of having received shares in the City Light Company to the value of £2000

³⁴ *Works*, vol. ii, p. 103.

³⁵ *The Honest Elector; or, unerring reasons for the prevention of chusing corrupt members to serve in Parliament: with instructions for the choice of Speaker. Written by those two ever memorable patriots Anthony Hammond and Walter Moyle, both Members of Parliament. ALSO a particular address to the Citizens of London, concerning the rights and laws of Parliament AND the Earl of Mulgrave’s reasons against chusing Crown Parliaments* (London, 1747).

³⁶ Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics*, p. 110; D. W. Hayton, *History of Parliament: The House of Commons: 1690-1715* (Cambridge, 2002), vol. i, p. 257. The court (opposing the measure) was able to rely on a handful more proxies than those in favour of the bill, leading to the bill being thrown out. *Timberland*, vol. i, p. 417; *Lords Journal*, vol. xv, pp. 171-2.

³⁷ *History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1690-1715*, eds. E. Cruickshanks, S.N. Handley and D.W. Hayton, 5 vols (Cambridge, 2002), vol. v, p. 685.

³⁸ Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics*, pp. 149, 151-2.

³⁹ *Lords Journal*, vol. xv, p. 527.

⁴⁰ This was to prove a particularly vexed process, which found Normanby attempting at first to buy Berkeley House only to lose out following a lengthy legal tussle to the duke of Devonshire. He settled ultimately on the former Arlington House. Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, from September 1678 to April 1714*, 6 vols (Farnborough, 1969), vol. iii, p. 532; vol. iv, pp. 151, 224, 249, 298, 326; George Clinch, *Mayfair and Belgravia: Being an Historical Account of the Parish of St George, Hanover Square* (London, 1892), pp. 10, 66-7.

in return for his assistance in persuading members of the Lords to agree to the bill. Russell was Normanby's servant and the marquess objected to Bolton naming him without having warned him previously, while also insisting that 'if he had acted any such thing he was a great Rogue and deserved to be made an example.'⁴¹ For all Normanby's pretence of ignorance of Russell's doings, some of his colleagues scented blood. One in particular, the earl of Monmouth,⁴² looked set to 'stick upon my Lord Normanby's skirts' to ensure the marquess's condemnation, and during the ensuing proceedings the two traded insults with Normanby accusing Monmouth of 'not treating him like a gentleman'. Monmouth responded that, 'if his lordship thought so, if he pleased out of the House he would give him the satisfaction of a gentleman'.⁴³ Despite this, following a series of hearings in the Lords that took place through early April, Normanby was exonerated.⁴⁴ According to Charles Hatton, Normanby owed his escape to 'the favour (as some say) of the b[ishops]', while the whole episode was summed up succinctly by Narcissus Luttrell, who noted merely 'This day the house of peers were upon the matter of bribery relating to the convex lights, and acquitted the marquess of Normanby therefrom.'⁴⁵

Unsurprisingly, the affair generated considerably more heat than Luttrell's brief assessment suggested and after he was cleared seven peers (one of them Monmouth) put their hands to a formal written protest complaining at Normanby's escape.⁴⁶ In the course of the debates Normanby was vocal in defending his honour (as well as appealing to his colleagues for assistance). He had written previously to John Tillotson, the future archbishop of Canterbury, in the wake of the Revolution insisting, 'Nothing in this world is, or ought to be so dear to any man of honour, as his reputation; and consequently the defence of it is the greatest obligation that one man can lay on another.'⁴⁷ Such sentiments were reflected in his address, which once again offered him free rein to exercise his powers of rhetoric. Perhaps more significantly though, this speech offers a particularly helpful insight into the transmission of addresses to the House in the pre-Hansard world.

There was a disparity between Lords and Commons over the publication of proceedings in the seventeenth century. Having started informally in the 1640s, in 1680 the Commons made a significant decision to print its votes and proceedings. Their resolution was not followed by the Lords, who remained extremely jealous of the privacy of what went on in their chamber.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, a number of peers were more than happy to risk the censure of the House by releasing information more or less surreptitiously. The kind of information leaked might relate to protests or divisions, but occasionally speeches also found their way into the public domain. One of the most notable for doing so during the reign of Queen Anne was Lord Haversham, whose annual set-piece addresses were released with predictable regularity.⁴⁹ Normanby's forays may not be so well known but are of similar interest. The trial of Henry Sacheverell in 1710 offered a particularly high-profile opportunity for some of the Lords' contributions to make it into print, with Buckingham's (as he had since become) one of those in circulation within days of his performance, though it was not subsequently one of those reproduced in his collected works.⁵⁰ As noted above, his speech in favour of the place bill of 1692 was in print within a year

⁴¹ BL, Add. MS. 29574, f. 393.

⁴² Charles Mordaunt, earl of Monmouth, future 3rd earl of Peterborough.

⁴³ BL, Add. MS. 46527, f. 77; *HMC Hastings*, vol. ii, p. 247.

⁴⁴ Lord Journal, vol. xv, pp. 528, 529, 532-35, 543, 546-58.

⁴⁵ BL, Add. MS. 29574, f. 399; Luttrell, *Brief Relation*, vol. iii, p. 463.

⁴⁶ The protesting peers were the earls of Manchester, Essex, Ailesbury, Torrington, Stamford, Monmouth and Viscount Cholmondeley. See James E. Thorold Rogers, *A Complete Collection of the Protests of the Lords with Historical Introductions*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1875), vol. i, pp. 119-28.

⁴⁷ *Works*, vol. ii, p. 89.

⁴⁸ Jason Peacey, 'The Print Culture of Parliament 1600-1800', in *The Print Culture of Parliament, 1600-1800*, ed. Jason Peacey, *Parliamentary History*, xxvi:1 (2007), p. 5.

⁴⁹ For example, *The Lord Haversham's Speech in the House of Peers, on Thursday, November 15, 1705* (London, 1705); *The Lord Haversham's Speech in the House of Peers, on Saturday, February 15th 1706/7* (London, 1707); *The Lord Haversham's Speech in the House of Peers, Wednesday the 12th of January 1709* (Edinburgh, 1709).

⁵⁰ Brian Cowan, *The State Trial of Doctor Henry Sacheverell*, *Parliamentary History: Texts and Studies*, 6 (Oxford, 2012), p. 21.

of its first being given and was released in another collection little more than a decade later. Following Normanby’s death in 1721, his widow instructed Alexander Pope to produce an edition of his writings – a broad selection covering verse and character assessments as well as a few direct examples of his parliamentary sayings. This edition was scooped by the notorious bookseller Edmund Curll, who produced a pirate version in advance of the authorized one.⁵¹ Curll’s edition, however, was principally made up of Normanby’s verses and failed to include either of the parliamentary speeches featured in Pope’s publication.⁵² Released two years after Curll’s, Pope’s ‘authorized’ edition ran into difficulties over his inclusion of two pieces that were reckoned too critical of the Revolution. The collection was thus suppressed before being reissued with the offending pieces removed. Curll subsequently printed these in a volume entitled *The Castrations*, and by the end of the decade further editions had emerged including the censored material, this time apparently overlooked by the administration.⁵³ Subsequent editions appeared in 1740 (3rd edition) and 1753 (4th edition). Editions of his other literary works were published without the political material in later volumes.

Mulgrave’s speeches of 1692 and 1695 featured in all of the authorized editions. As well as these a near identical version of the 1695 speech appears in Timberland’s records of the House of Lords.⁵⁴ It may have been one of these speeches to which Pope referred when he wrote to Jacob Tonson not long after Buckingham’s death seeking sight of a copy of a work called *The Life of King William the Third*, which he understood contained ‘a speech of the late Duke of Buck’s: which I never heard of.’⁵⁵ However, a manuscript in the Egmont papers in the British Library offers a further insight into the original 1695 address.⁵⁶ This version, copied from a manuscript belonging to the diplomat Sir Robert Southwell (Egmont’s uncle)⁵⁷ in 1730 and claiming to have been ‘taken exactly in shorthand by a person who was present’⁵⁸ differs subtly from the printed versions. At a very basic level there is a slight difference in extent: the print version of the 1729 revised edition of Buckingham’s Works is slightly longer than the manuscript. However, what is more striking is the clear editorial intervention apparent in the printed version, which seems to indicate a deliberate policy of tidying thought processes and

⁵¹ It is presumably this work which was referred to as being shortly to be published in an advertisement carried in the *Weekly Journal or Saturday’s Post* (26 Aug. 1721).

⁵² *The Works of the Most Noble John Sheffield late Duke of Buckingham, published, by his grace, in his life time* (London, 1721).

⁵³ Maynard Mack, *Alexander Pope: A Life* (New Haven, 1985), pp. 396-8.

⁵⁴ *Timberland*, vol. i, pp. 436-40.

⁵⁵ *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. G. Sherburn, 5 vols (Oxford, 1956), vol. ii, p. 63.

⁵⁶ Publishers were able to draw on a variety of sources in compiling proceedings in Parliament. The preface to the twelfth volume of Cobbett’s *Parliamentary History* notes reports on debates compiled by Dr Johnson for the *Gentleman’s Magazine* and the manuscript notes of Thomas Secker, archbishop of Canterbury, among the sources drawn upon. William Cobbett, *The Parliamentary History of England, from the Earliest Period to the Year 1803*, 36 vols (London, 1806-20), vol. xii, preface. Speeches from the throne were frequently ordered to be printed, as were sermons delivered to both Houses, often soon after their delivery. For example see BL, Add. MS. 2724, f. 110, where Viscount Fauconberg noted the ‘very brisk’ publication of Charles II’s speech to the 1680 Oxford Parliament. For more on the increase in the publication of parliamentary materials in the later seventeenth century see M. Knights, ‘Parliament, Print and Corruption in Later Stuart Britain’, pp. 49-61. See also Karl. W. Schweizer, ‘Parliament and the Press: A Case for Synergy’, in *Parliament and the Press, 1689-c.1939*, ed. K. W. Schweizer, *Parliamentary History*, xxv:1, pp. 3-5.

⁵⁷ Egmont’s diary entry for 8 Jan. 1730 notes spending the evening ‘at my cousin Southwell’s’ – probably referring to Edward Southwell, Sir Robert’s son. Egmont notes Southwell’s death in the entry for 4 Dec. 1730. *HMC Egmont Diary*, vol. i, pp. 1, 119.

⁵⁸ BL, Add. MS. 47131, f. 7.

emphasizing, still more than Normanby appears to have done himself, the extent to which he had been poorly treated in the affair and the minimal extent of opposition to him.⁵⁹

Whereas the print version opens with Normanby’s declaration that the Lords have shown him so much ‘justice, and indeed so much favour and patience, in your examination of this whole business’,⁶⁰ the manuscript version suggests minor differences. Here, he thanks the lords for showing ‘so much favour, and indeed so much patience and justice in the thorough examination of this whole business’. Continuing, the print version emphasizes that it is only some ‘few persons’ who have been guilty of ‘unusual methods’ and ‘odd aggravations’ in the investigation, whereas the original (as supplied by the manuscript) seemed content with just ‘some persons’. The subsequent passage then shows evidence of considerable editorial intervention. In the print version (forty-three words) Normanby continues:

I will not, I need not insist upon it; your Lordships have all taken notice of it sufficiently; and the truth is, such an over-eagerness in a very small number against the opinion of the rest, instead of hurting me, only exposes themselves.⁶¹

The manuscript meanwhile (thirty-two words) orders things rather more concisely:

I will not, I need not insist upon it. Your Lordships have all taken notice of it sufficiently; since such a proceeding, instead of hurting others, only exposes those who use it.⁶²

Yet more intervention is apparent as this train of thought continues. In the print version (sixty-seven words), Normanby declares:

Yet I am sorry for this odd manner of proceeding, notwithstanding all the advantage it has given me: because it has also given occasion for a malicious suspicion in this censorious town, as if I had done these Lords some sort of private injury; of which yet I am so innocent, that they will not add it to their other accusations against me, I am confident.⁶³

The manuscript expresses it differently (and with one additional word):

And yet, notwithstanding all the advantage that has given me, I am heartily sorry for such a carriage, because it hath created a suspicion without doors as if I had one time or other done those Lords some great personal injury, which I declare here is a mistake, & I hardly beleive those lords will like adding any thing of that nature to the Roll of their accusations.⁶⁴

The changes here may seem at first sight subtle, but are of some significance. Whereas Normanby seems to have been content to use the phrase ‘without doors’, his editor altered this to ‘in this censorious town’; and while Normanby perhaps slightly weakly insisted that

⁵⁹ It is perhaps not surprising to note editorial amendments. In a letter to Caryll Pope noted ‘I have the care of overlooking the Duke of Buckingham’s papers, and correcting the press.’ In addition, Pope and the duchess of Buckingham enjoyed a difficult relationship over the production of the *Works* and Pope’s interventions in other matters, notably relating to Buckingham’s epitaph, also suggest that he may well have been free with his alterations. *Pope Correspondence*, vol. ii, pp. 100, 117, 123, 127-8.

⁶⁰ *Works*, vol. ii, p. 105.

⁶¹ *Works*, vol. ii, p. 105.

⁶² BL, Add. MS. 47131, f. 7.

⁶³ *Works*, vol. ii, pp. 105-6.

⁶⁴ BL, Add. MS. 47131, f. 7.

censure was a ‘mistake’, the printed version strengthened this to a declaration ‘of which I am so innocent’ – ending the sentence with the word ‘confident’ rather than (as Normanby appears to have ended) with the word ‘accusations’. Line by line analysis of the manuscript transcription over the printed version of the address reveals similar tidying and at the close of the piece the editor removed Normanby’s faltering ‘I confess it was not altogether necessary, & therefore ask your pardon for it’ and replaced it with the tauter phrase ‘which indeed was unnecessary’.

III

What does study of these two speeches inform us about the way in which at least one member spoke in Parliament in the late seventeenth century? One feature that may appear surprising is the lack of obvious citation of classical epithets. The style is straightforward and the language good plain English. But, this itself is of course a trope. In his 1692 speech Mulgrave insisted on his reluctance to intervene and emphasized his poor ability. His later defence of Sacheverell in 1710 made a similar point in arguing against censoring the doctor. He ‘complained of the Insufficiencys of the man to speak unexceptionally well, then we should have none preach but our Archbishops [...]’.⁶⁵ He also, once again, relied on his uncomplicated style of speaking when making his points, declaring at one point ‘very plainly that he was more desirous to know which was the stronger party than which of them had the juster and better cause.’⁶⁶ Normanby presented himself (utterly disingenuously) as a simple man, eager in the one speech to see such simplicity in the House of Commons too, and in the other to emphasize that an honest man, telling an honest simple story, surely could not be the same man accused of the dishonourable activities laid to his account.⁶⁷

The second feature of interest is how these speeches reveal Normanby’s conception of the role of the Lords within the parliamentary trinity. Even while under fire, Normanby continued to insist on the positive nature of the Lords as a place where justice might be obtained:

It happen’d very lately, that an honest Country Gentleman heard, only by Accident, of an Act’s being like to pass, which had undone him. I fancy, if any Lord had stopp’d it, either out of Good-will to him, or Justice, the Gentleman would call that Lord his Friend for ever after, and drink his Health too, in spite of all his Enemies.⁶⁸

Perhaps most striking though, thanks to the manuscript transcript, is what the latter speech tells us about the way Normanby’s speech was prepared for the press. There is little reason to doubt that Normanby’s speech was remarkably similar to the printed version; comparison of the texts after all offers confirmation of the broad extent and structure of it. And yet, the manuscript offers some compelling evidence that in attempting to reconstruct the event this is the version that is to be preferred as closest to Normanby’s original address. This sense is underscored by the final two paragraphs transcribed by Egmont relating to the original transcription, and which were tacked on below the speech. One appears to have consisted of part of the original covering letter that had been sent to Normanby by the transcriber, emphasizing how he had endeavoured to improve his transcript:

Tho I have not the honour to be known to your Lordship, I would neither make an ill use of taking your speech, nor mistake in the least if I could avoid it: and therefore have interlined it with small corrections from others who were nearer or heard better.

⁶⁵ Cowan, *State Trial of Doctor Henry Sacheverell*, p. 204.

⁶⁶ Geoffrey Holmes, *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell* (London, 1973), p. 207.

⁶⁷ A plain but bold style was also one of the features of the 1705 scandal, *The Memorial of the Church of England*, with which Buckingham (as he then was) was rumoured to have been associated. J. A. Downie, *Robert Harley and the Press: Propaganda and Public Opinion in the Age of Swift and Defoe* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 84.

⁶⁸ *Timberland*, vol. i, p. 439.

The second underscored that the foregoing transcription was what had been sent to Normanby for his approval in the penny post, and that it had been ‘own’d to me by the Marquis of Normanby to be what he spoke’.⁶⁹

If this is so, it says much about the editorial process by which the more polished published version was arrived at. Terminology was clearly strengthened where Normanby’s original prose was thought too weak or too compromising, some passages were excised and others expanded. The earl of Rochester, one suspects, might have enjoyed observing the process and noting that his loathed rival All-Pride was reliant at last on a fine editorial hand to assist him in his quest to escape the censure of his peers. And as for the administration that Normanby vexed so much, the earl of Sunderland recognized that there could be no end to the efforts to satisfy the marquess’s demands. ‘He is’, Sunderland observed, ‘very pressing and will be so for ever. If he had all he could aske today, it would be the same tomorrow.’⁷⁰

Appendix

Marquess of Normanby’s speech 18 April 1695 – printed version⁷¹ and manuscript account in BL, Add. MS. 47131, ff. 7-9 compared.

Printed version	MS. version⁷²
<p>YOUR Lordships have shewn me so much justice, and indeed so much favour and patience, in your examination of this whole business at my humble request; that I should make an ill return, if I wasted your time unnecessarily. And therefore I will not trouble you with observations on those unusual methods, odd aggravations, and inexcusable delays, that some few persons have openly practised in this debate. I will not, I need not insist upon it; your Lordships have all taken notice of it sufficiently; and the truth is, such an over-eagerness in a very small number against the opinion of the rest, instead of hurting me, only exposes themselves. Yet I am sorry for this odd manner of proceeding, not withstanding all the advantage it has given me: because it has also given occasion for a malicious suspicion in this censorious town, as if I had done these Lords some sort of private injury; of which yet I am so innocent, that they will not add</p>	<p>Your Lordships, have shewn me so much favour, and indeed so much patience & justice in the thorow examination of this whole business, according to my humble request at the first starting of it: that I should make a very ill return if I wasted your time unnecessarily, and therefore I will not trouble you with observations upon those unusual methods, odd agravations, & unexcusable delays, delays that some persons have practiced openly in this business: I will not, I need not insist upon it. Your Lordships have all taken notice of it sufficiently; since such a proceeding, instead of hurting others, only exposes those who use it. And yet, notwithstanding all the advantage that has given me, I am heartily sorry for such a carriage, because it hath created a suspicion without doors as if I had one time or other done those Lords some great personal injury, which I declare here is a mistake, & I hardly beleive those Lords will like adding any</p>

⁶⁹ BL, Add. MS. 47131, f. 9.

⁷⁰ University of Nottingham Library (UNL), Portland MS., Pw A 1241/1, Sunderland to Portland, 19 Aug. 1694.

⁷¹ The version here is from the 1729 edition of Mulgrave’s *Works*. The version in Cobbett is subtly different again.

⁷² Marginal comment: ‘The Marquis of Normanby’s Speech in the House of Lords 18. April 1695 taken exactly in Short hand by a person who was present. Out of a MS. Of Mr Southwells lent me 1730.’

<p>it to their other accusations against me, I am confident.</p> <p>NEITHER will I take up your Lordships time with recriminations; I confess it is hard to hold, when 'tis so easy to do it; the subject is ample enough, and your Lordships will not think it so unbecoming a gentleman to return an accusation, as it was to be the first accuser: but, tho' never so much tempted, I have too much respect for this great assembly to entertain you so ill.</p> <p>THE only thing I shall trouble you with, is the defence of what a man cannot be too careful of, my honour; and accordingly shall tell your Lordships a true story very plainly.</p> <p>If I should fail in any thing, it wou'd be no wonder, since I have neither used counsel without doors, nor troubled you with any here; being of opinion any man is able to speak truth without any assistance.</p> <p>ABOUT four years ago I design'd to build a house, and therefore dispos'd of that I lived in to the <i>Spanish Ambassador</i>; ⁷³ inquir'd every where for ground; treated with Mr. Neal for his beyond Berkley-house, and with many others also; but at last fixed on that spot of ground you have now heard so much of.</p> <p>Upon my proposing it to those concern'd, I found two difficulties; first, the title was so perplex'd, there was no buying without an Act of Parliament to clear it; the second was, that the inheritance of this ground after seventy four years is in the City of <i>London</i>. I endeavour'd to overcome the first of these difficulties, by procuring an agreement among the proprietors in the present lease of seventy four years, in order to have an Act of Parliament; and for the other, I treated with the City, desiring only four acres in all, for a house, a court before it, and a small Garden behind it. I think the first time I propos'd it was here in the bishops lobby to Sir - - - - HUBLAND, ⁷⁴</p>	<p>thing of that nature to the Roll of their accusations. I will not take up your time neither with recrimination. I confess tis hard to hold in such a case, the subject is ample, nay 'tis very easie, and your Lordships will allow 'tis not so unbecoming a Gentleman to recriminate, as to be the first accuser: but tho never so much tempted, I have too much respect for this great Assembly, to entertain you so ill.</p> <p>The only thing I shall take care of, is the defence of my honour, which tho in no danger, your Lordships will allow me to be very tender of it, and to tell you a plain story of the whole matter from the very beginning.</p> <p>If I fail in expressing it, 'tis no wonder, since I have neither made use of council without-doors, nor ask'd your leave for any here, because I am of opinion that a plain man is able to tell a true story without any help.</p> <p>About 3 or 4 years ago, I resolv'd to build a House for my self, and therefore let my wifes where I then lived, to rid my hands of it. I enquired every where for ground, treated with Mr. Neale for his beyond Berkley House, & with others also, but at last fixed upon this spot of ground you have heard so much of. Upon my proposing it to some persons, I found two difficultys I did not expect. First, the Title was so perplext and incumbred, there was no buying without an Act of Parliament to clear it: The Second was that the Inheritance is in the City after 74 years.</p> <p>I endeavour'd to overcome these difficulties by proposing an agreement among the Proprietors, and at the same time to buy the Inheritance of the City, it being only for 4 acres enough for a house, Court before it, & a little garden behind it. I think the first time I proposed it to the City was here in the Bishops Lobby ⁷⁵ to Sr. [blank] Hubland, S^r. Rob^t. Clayton & 3 more of</p>
--	--

⁷³ This probably refers to Normanby's residence in Dover Street. Entries in the State Papers refer to Normanby suing the Spanish ambassador around this time, presumably related to disagreements over the arrangement. *CSP Dom.* 1694-5, pp. 506, 513.

⁷⁴ Either Sir James Houblon, alderman of London from 1692-1700 and MP for London 1698-1700, or more probably his brother Sir John Houblon, also a London alderman and lord mayor in 1695.

⁷⁵ Room adjoining the House of Lords.

<p>Sir R. CLAYTON,⁷⁶ three more of the city all together, who then assur'd me the inheritance could not be parted with. Upon this I desir'd a lease of one hundred and fifty years, which yet was refused; and after many months I obtained one of one hundred years only.</p> <p>WHILE this was treating above a twelvemonth, one of the city officers brought me articles to sign; of which one was, that the lease should be void, unless I procur'd such an Act of Parliament to pass for settling all matters about it; wherein some clauses of his penning might be inserted for the city's advantage. This condition appear'd so unreasonable to me, (who was only one of the many parties that were to consent to such a private Act, before ever the Parliament, I knew, would pass it) that in a little heat I told this small officer Mr LANE⁷⁷ (the worthy witness) that it must be his own proposal, and too extravagant a one to come from the City, who had never asked such a condition. Mr LANE grew excessive angry, as the other person then present has sworn; and very pertly told me he was not to be ruffled out of his care for the City by any subject whatsoever; and yet, to pacify the good man, who might by his place do ill offices by misrepresentation, I agreed (not that an Act should pass, tho' a private one) but only that I would, as a party, give my consent to it as soon as all the other proprietors did so too. But the true reason why I refused his proposal, was not for the least doubt I had of your Lordships passing the Bill (which now lies on the table ready drawn by Mr FOULK's, who sent it at my request) but only because in justice your Lordships require all parties agreement to any private Bill, which I fear'd so many of them would hardly be persuaded to; and then my Grant from the City was to have been void, if I had sign'd his fine proposal.</p>	<p>the City alltogether, who at first hearing of it, assured me there was no parting with the Inheritance, and then I desired a Lease of 150 years, which is now reduced to 100 years only. While this was treating, which was above a twelvemonth, one of the City Officers brought me Articles to sign, one of which was, that I should procure that Act of Parliament so often mention'd for settling the ground in a limitted time, or else that I should forfeit the Lease. This appear'd so very unreasonable to me who was only one of the Partys to consent to such an Act & agreement, that I in a little heat told this small Officer M^r. Lane, that I was confident it must be his own proposal, & too extravagant to come from the City, who had never before mention'd the Act. & the reason it seems why they now desired it, was the hopes of its giving encouragement to other Builders on their ground thereabouts as well as to my Self; and also that they might by a clause in it secure their pipes of water lying there. M^r. Lane grew excessive angry, as was sworn by him who came along with him, & he very pertly said told me, he was not to be ruffled out of his care of the City by any Subject whatsoever. So that to pacify him, I told him I would not agree to the engaging an Act should pass, but only to consent to it and do my endeavour for it. And indeed, the true reason of my disliking any such Covenant, was no any doubt I had of any Acts passing by the consent of all Partys concern'd, and for so good an End too as to raise the value of that place from the Ruines it now lys in, but I was afraid, & am truly so still, that so many Partys cannot all agree, & then the Act cannot, nor ought not to pass; which had made my lease void in case I had sign'd his first proposall. Of the story to make an end, my Lords, the Lease past at last, & ly's upon your table, as well as that private Act so much desired, & drawn roughly by Mr. Fowlks,</p>
--	--

⁷⁶ Sir Robert Clayton, lord mayor of London 1679-80, and MP for variously London and Bletchingley between 1679 and 1707.

⁷⁷ Comptroller of the City of London.

<p>TO make an end of a long story, the City granted the Lease at last, and it lies also on your table, full of covenants so much to the City's advantage, and so little to mine, (there being some articles of charge to me besides the rent) that I have sold to the Lord JEFFREYES⁷⁸ for one hundred guineas this great present of the City (of which some have made such a noise) because it is of no use to me without building my house; which design fails only for want of the mortgagee's being able to make a sure title; and they are enough agreed to get an Act to pass about it. Upon this I will make a few remarks, and so conclude. First,</p> <p>THE value of this is, you see, so very inconsiderable, that it alone answers all suspicion about it: For tho' a bribe of a meer bawble is inexcusable; yet when circumstances are examined in order to judge if it be a bribe, or not, I suppose a plain gold ring is not to be suspected as much as a diamond of one thousand pounds.</p> <p>THE next objection vanishes about my undertaking for this Act, when it is considered how many instances there are every day of members in both houses who article, not only as I have done, to endeavour at, but also to procure a private Act of Parliament; because indeed they can be understood to mean no more by it, than to consent themselves, to persuade others what they can, and sometimes to pay the fees of the clerks, which in this very Lease I am oblig'd to free the city from, whenever the Act passes.</p> <p>THE length of the lease is as odd a cavil as the rest; since one hundred years is certainly as proportionable a term for such a great house, as forty years for a little one, especially considering how slightly they build those little ones now-a-days.</p> <p>WHEREAS there was some mention of my obliging the city about GULSTON's Bill;⁷⁹ I confess my memory did not lay that</p>	<p>without the least thing in it of another nature than to settle the title. The Lease is also full of several Covenants for the Cities advantage, & so little to mine, there being some articles in it of charge to me besides the Rent, that I have sold it to the Lord Jeffreys for 100 guineas. By which I will take leave only to begin some few remarks on this matter, & then conclude.</p> <p>The Value of all this, is so inconsiderable, that itself destroys all suspicion about it: for tho a bribe of a very trifle is unexcusable, yet when circumstances are examin'd to see whether a thing is a bribe or no, I suppose a plain gold ring will not be suspected so easily as a diamond of 1000£. Next, there are a thousand instances of Members in both Houses who have articulated not only to endeavour as I have done, but to procure a private Act of Parliament, because indeed, by that can be only meant to get all Partys to consent and to pay the Fees, for which there is a Clause in the City Lease, that they shall not pay any for this intended Act.</p> <p>The length of the Lease hath been an objection, & yes 'tis as proportionable to such a great house, as 40 years is to a little one, according as they build those little ones now a-days.</p> <p>And whereas there was mention made of my having been friendly to the City about Gulstons bill: If it had been to have saved my life, I could not remember the particulars of it, it was so slight a matter: but it seems it was a private Bill which invaded the Cities Rights, against which I deliver'd their petition, and the matter was so plain, that the Bill was thrown out: and I am confident, the least any of your Lordships would say of another who contributed to save your right, is that he was friendly in such a matter.</p> <p>There happen'd not long ago that an honest Country Gentleman heard by accident only of a Bills being passing wch. had undone him. I fancy if any Lord had known it, and</p>
--	---

⁷⁸ John Jeffreys, 2nd Baron Jeffreys, son of the notorious hanging judge.

⁷⁹ On 30 December 1693 the Lords gave a first reading to a bill to enable William Gulston to install pipes to supply Southwark with water from the Thames. The bill was opposed by the City of London and on 22 January 1694 the Lords resolved not to engross it. *Lords Journal*, vol. xv, pp. 329-30, 348. Gulston was later elected MP for Bridport.

<p>value upon it, as it seems their gratitude did, who own'd the obligation. It appears to have been a private bill which invaded the City of <i>London's</i> rights, against which I deliver'd their petition, and made the matter so plain, that your Lordships threw out the Bill.</p> <p>IT happen'd very lately, that an honest country gentleman heard only by accident, of an Act's being likely to pass, which had undone him. I fancy if any Lord had stopp'd it, either out of good will to him, or justice; the gentleman would call that Lord his friend ever after, and drink his health too, in spite of all his enemies.</p> <p>CONSIDER also the open manner of this whole proceeding with a great City, for at least a year together without interruption. EACH clause stood upon with all strictness, and every article disputed by counsel before them.</p> <p>BEFORE a committee of twelve common-council men, and six aldermen deputed to manage such things.</p> <p>CARRIED at last there (I desire your Lordships will take notice of that remark, because of a great estate lost here lately by equal votes) not by an Equality; if so, I should not wonder at a review taken of it; for things carried in that kind, will be talk'd of, and perhaps once more considered.</p> <p>But this was done, my Lords, by a great majority; it was sworn here at your Bar that there were but three against it, and they too own'd to your Lordships themselves, it was only because they thought the ground worth ten pounds a year more; which being after seventy years to come, is to be valued at a year's purchase; so I have a notable bargain of ten pounds, according even to their oaths, who crossed me in it, because indeed influenced by that City-officer.</p> <p>OBSERVE also, if you please my Lords, the City sent their officers several times to view this ground, by which one of my opposers own'd here he was at last convinc'd, that it was a good bargain for</p>	<p>stop'd the Bill, that the Gentleman all his life after would have said, that Lord had been friendly to him, and drank his health, tho indeed it was but just.</p> <p>Consider My Lords, the open manner of this whole proceeding, in the face of the whole City, for above a whole year together.</p> <p>Each clause stood upon with all the strictness possible, and every article debated.</p> <p>Managed by a Committee of 12 Common Council men, and 6 Aldermen.</p> <p>Carry'd, my Lords I desire you will take notice of it, not by an equality of Votes, (if so I should not wonder indeed⁸⁰ at a review of it, for things carry'd in that kind will be subject to reflection, and will be again consider'd of,) but this was carry'd by a Majority, My Lords, a very great majority, so that it was known there were not 3 against it, and They too, as they own'd themselves, only because they thought it worth above 10£ more, which being 70 years hence, is not worth above a years purchase. So I have a notable bargain of 10£ by this business. Observe next, if you please my Lords, there were several carefull views made of that ground, one of which as was sworn by the Gentleman himself, convinc'd Him who had been ever against it till then, that it was advantagious for the City pipes & Buildings. And the last thing to be observed is, that this ground is in Trustees names for the City, One of whom is remaining an infant, so that they could make me no legal Title till he is of Age, and I have only an equitable one, which sure had never been depended on, if any thing amiss could be objected against the bargain; this Lease being to be confirm'd many years hence, when probably the City must be in other hands, and who consequently will not confirm any unjust bargain, and my Heirs can force them to it no way but in a Court of Equity. The disobliging Lane also, thro whose</p>
--	--

⁸⁰ Marginal comment: 'a severe reflection on another business'.

<p>the City, upon account of their pipes and building.</p> <p>AND now, my Lords, I have reserv'd to the last, what alone would vindicate this business. This very ground is in trustees names for the City, one of whom is an infant, so, they could make no legal title before he comes to age, and I have only an equitable one to depend on. Therefore when this is to be confirmed and made valid, the city must be under other governors, who will never sure confirm an ill thing done by these: and they cannot be compelled to it, but in the court of Chancery; which must then review all this whole proceeding.</p> <p>AS to the Convex-Lights, your Lordships have seen I am not the least concern'd; but it falls out unluckily for my accusers, that they pretend I am too much regarded by so great a City for assisting them on all occasions (which I shall ever be proud of) and yet all the while blame me for stopping their Orphans Bill by my only interest here: A direct contradiction.</p> <p>I have troubled your Lordships too long about so slight a matter; which indeed was unnecessary; for though it happen'd once that many misdemeanours amounted to a treason, I am confident a thousand slanders out of the mouth of what great man soever, will never here be able to give a suspicion of misdemeanour, unless of himself who slanders.</p> <p>MY LORDS,</p> <p>I am too often entertaining your Lordships on all other occasions; and perhaps should be too apt to do it in my own case, especially if any Lord should either object, or recite amiss; which in this debate has been found not impossible. I ask your leave therefore to withdraw; not doubting but in such a case, my innocence will be safe under your Lordships protection, and much better defended than if I were here my self to look after it.</p>	<p>hands it all must pass, was not a very cunning thing, if there had been any contrivance in the matter.</p> <p>As to the convex lights, I am, Your Lordships have seen, not in the least concern'd. But I must tell you, it hath fallen out unlucky for my accusers, that I am suspected of being respected by the City for helping their Orphan Bill, and at the same time blamed here for being the only Lord who put a stop to it by the petition I deliver'd.</p> <p>I have troubled you too long in so slight a business; I confess it was not altogether necessary, & therefore ask your pardon for it: for tho it happen'd once, that many misdemeanours amounted to an accumulative Treason, I am confident there will never come a time that many slanders out of the mouths of whomsoever, shall amount to the least misdemeanour.</p> <p>My Lords,</p> <p>I am entertaining your Lordships too often on all occasions, and now in my own case may be too apt to do it, especially if anything be wrong objected, or wrong recited; & therefore to avoid it, I take your leave to withdraw, not doubting but in that case my Innocence will be safer under your Lordships Protection, and a great deal better defended, than If I were present my self to look after it.</p>
---	--