

The GrEco Project

---

Grenville's Economics

Lord William Wyndham Grenville

Correspondence with Francis Horner  
[1809-1816]

Transcription: Francis Bourne and Kenneth Taylor  
Christophe Depoortère  
Leonard Horner

## Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>1</sup>

[f. 57r]

House of Commons  
13<sup>rd</sup> June 1809

My Lord

In the Committee upon the Scotch Judicature Bill, M<sup>r</sup> Dunbar has introduced an amendment, directing the Commissioners to make their Report upon the forms of extracting Decrees, as well as upon the compensations which it may be reasonable to grant to officers whose fees may be reduced, on or before the first day of *January* next.

I have sent to your Lordship from the Vote office a copy of the warrant by which the Commissioners are appointed.

I have the honor to be My Lord

Your Lordship's most obed<sup>t</sup> & faitfull ser<sup>t</sup>

Fra Horner

## Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>2</sup>

[f. 58r]

Lincoln's Inn 14. June 1809

My Lord

Being retained all the morning at Westminster, I did not receive your Lordship's letter in time to acknowledge it by the last post, or to thank your Lordship for your obliging attention in sending me the papers relating to extracting decreets in the court of session. I have inclosed those papers again under cover to your Lordsdhip, & have directed them to be left at Camelford House.

I took an opportunity yesterday, upon the 3<sup>d</sup> reading of the Bill for giving the Commissioners farther time, to animadvert upon the content of their Report; particularly, upon their undue delay with respect to the fees of extract, and upon the pretext, which they have assigned for that delay, of discussions into which they had no warrant to enter, and which lie wholly out of their province.

Upon farther consideration, I think it advisable to withdraw the notice I gave of a Bill in the same terms as that which your Lordship introduced in the other House, for the immediate relief of the suitors from this grievance. It is [f. 58v] now impracticable in this session, to

---

<sup>1</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 58977, f.57.

<sup>2</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff.58-9.

obtain even the benefit of another discussion, which is all that could have been gained if there had been time and the injunction <sup>3</sup> to<sup>4</sup> the Commissioners to report upon the subject of extracts by the first of January, which has been inserted in the Chancellor's Bill, will present an opportunity, at the outset of the next session, of bringing this matter to a final regulation. But what has weighed much more with me, is, that I enter very much into the doubts expressed by your Lordship, whether it be expedient to adopt the new form of Extract which is proposed by the Commissioners. The papers, which they would still include, will be as apt as ever to run into argumentation and prolix pleadings, <sup>5</sup> as<sup>6</sup> has been uniformly the case in spite of reputed regulation of the Court, which have for a while restricted them; and this tendency is not likely to be more vigilantly checked, when the officers of the Court have a stronger interest to encourage it. Besides, it may be fit to be considered, in making a new Enactment, now for the form of Extracts may not be abolished in some measure, as well as the fees limited for the rest. Though an exemplification of the record is necessary, in [f. 59r] order to bring up the cause of the Court of appeal, or in order to give the judgement incidence in another suit; it cannot be necessary, for the purpose of obtaining execution upon a judgement, that the whole of the previous record should be exemplified at any rate, there can be no pretence for leaving the suitors subject to the imposition of fees of extract, unless the party himself requires an extract; this, I believe, was originally an abuse on the part of the officers, but the Court has so long sanctioned the demand, that I apprehend the relief must be given by the legislature.

I hope these reasons, which have induced me to change my intention, will appear to your Lordship not unfounded.

I am, My Lord, most sincerely

Your Lordship's faithful ser<sup>t</sup>

Fra Horner

---

<sup>3</sup> "upon" is deleted.

<sup>4</sup> "to" is inserted.

<sup>5</sup> "?" is deleted.

<sup>6</sup> "as" is inserted.

## Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>7</sup>

Lincoln's Inn, 11th February, 1810.

My Lord

The unsatisfactory returns which are made to the orders which I moved for in the House of Commons upon the subject of Bullion and Currency, and the ready desire which was expressed on both sides of the House to see that subject fully examined, induce me to propose in a few days the appointment of a select committee. But before going so far in a matter of such public importance, I feel an anxious wish to have the sanction and benefit of your Lordship's advice as to the proper objects, as well as the best course of investigation; in order that it may be conducted to an useful result. Hitherto, I have abstained from forming any conclusion, even in my own mind, respecting the causes of the present state of money prices; nor am I sure that I have yet gained a clear and exact notion of that change, whether depreciation or not, of which the cause remains to be ascertained. In this suspense of opinion, I have been desirous, before I enter into the inquiry, to collect the various solutions which the difficulty may seem to admit of at present, while our information is incomplete, in order that the search for farther information may be so directed as to bring each of those explanations to the test. I fear that I ask too much of your Lordship, whose time is so filled up, in requesting that you would have the goodness to instruct me in the views, which your Lordship entertains upon this important question; but I am prompted to make that request, by my anxiety to get into the right track through so intricate a subject, and by my conviction that injury of no slight degree may be done to the public interest by taking a false step, and even by the publication of erroneous opinions.

I have the honour to be, my Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful, obedient servant,

Fra, Horner.

---

<sup>7</sup> Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 5-6; and in *The Horner Papers*, p. 631. In British Library, Add MS 58977, f. 60r bears the mention: "Letter from M<sup>r</sup> Horner of 11<sup>th</sup>. February 1810. removed Feb. 25. 1842".

## Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>8</sup>

Camelford House, 12 February 1810.

Dear Sir

I saw with the most lively satisfaction that you had announced an intention of taking up a subject of so much difficulty and importance as that of the present state of the currency of the kingdom, and of the trade in Bullion. It would give me great pleasure to have an opportunity of conversing with you on the subject at whatever time would best suit your own convenience. I am generally at home from twelve to two, but I could with equal convenience fix any other hour that might suit you better, and be less liable to interruption.

The difficulty of arriving at any precise opinion as to the causes of the existing evil arises in great degree from the concurrent operation of so many circumstances wholly unprecedented. Nothing but a well conducted inquiry ascertaining as distinctly as may be the real effect (as is now practically experienced) of each of these circumstances, separately or combined with the others, can give one full satisfaction as to the application of those theories, which one's general notions of the subject would lead one to form upon it. But on a general view, I am inclined to attribute the effect complained of, in a very great degree, to the stoppage of money payments at the Bank — a measure originally adopted to meet a sudden and very urgent pressure, but, I think, very ill calculated for any long continuance. While the necessity of money payments there continued, every increased demand for bullion, which either the ordinary fluctuations of trade, or the extraordinary circumstances of these times, occasioned, was immediately felt there, and was met (or ought to have been so) by adequate measures to diminish the circulation of paper, and by a corresponding issue and importation of bullion, by a body possessed at all times of a considerable store of that article, and having both capital and commercial means for rapid purchases and importations.

I am far from thinking that the question admits of so simple a solution as to be answered merely by a reference to this single principle — but I am inclined to believe that its operation will more or less be traced through all the complicated details in which the subject is involved; and I entertain sanguine hopes that, under your conduct, the

---

<sup>8</sup> Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 6-7; and in *The Horner Papers*, p. 631-2. In the British Library, Add MS 58977, ff. 61-62 is a copy of the letter.

inquiry will lead to an issue satisfactory both in the elucidation of this branch of political science, and in the practical measures to which it may lead.

Believe me ever, my dear Sir,  
Most truly and faithfully yours,  
Grenville

[f. 62r] PS. I have not seen the accts on this subject hitherto presented to the Ho of Commons. If it would not be too much trouble, you would much oblige me by sending me a copy of them.

### Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>9</sup>

[f.63r]

Lincoln's Inn  
May 19. 1810

My Lord

I inclose a copy of some resolutions which have been passed by the Bullion Committee, not to be reported to the House, but as Instructions for me in drawing the report of their opinions. I hope to be able to present it to the House by the end of next week.

I hope your Lordship will be of opinion, that the view we have taken of these important subjects is both sound in principle, and practical. And it will be a great kindness to me, if your Lordship will give me the benefit of your advice as to the best course I can take in the House this session, in pursuance of the Report. It will recommend the [f. 63v] time, for finally opening the Bank, to be fixed by act of Parliament; but my own inclination is, not to ask [?] to introduce a Bill in the present session, but if possible to get a resolution pledging the House to resume the subject early in the next. In executing this measure, it seems to be of great consequence, that public opinion should lead <sup>10</sup> the way; and that before a decisive stop is taken by parliament, the Directors of the Bank should already have yielded a little, as I expect they will, to the weight of authority. It would, in this point of view, be of great importance, that, before the close of the session, the sanction of those who have most authority in the House of Lords should be given to those principles,

---

<sup>9</sup> British Library, Add MS 58977, f. 63.

<sup>10</sup> "now" is deleted.

which the Bank have so unfortunately for the public interests lost sight of.

I have the honor to be My Lord  
Your Lordship's faithful Serv<sup>t</sup>  
Fra Horner.

Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>11</sup>

Camelford House, 22d January, 1811.

Dear Sir,

I have waited with much impatience for your return to town, being very desirous of conversing with you on a subject in the highest degree interesting to myself. It may perhaps save some time if I take this mode of mentioning the matter to you generally, requesting at the same time that you will allow me the opportunity of seeing you on the subject to-morrow, at any time that may suit you best. I shall be at home the whole morning.

There is some question, as I will then more particularly explain to you, of the formation of a new Administration. In this arrangement, if it should take place, I have been requested to resume my former situation at the head of the Treasury, and Mr. Tierney would, in that case, probably be Chancellor of the Exchequer.

It would afford to me, under the anxiety inseparable from such a prospect, a satisfaction not to be described, if I could hope to persuade you to assist me as one of the Secretaries of the Treasury. I do not mean to flatter you when I say, that I should myself feel, and I am confident such would be the universal impression, that I had in that way secured the assistance of the person in all England the most capable of rendering efficient service to the public in that situation, and of lightening the burthen which I am thus to undertake.

Believe me, dear Sir, with great truth and regard,  
Most sincerely yours,

Grenville.

---

<sup>11</sup> Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 54-5.

## Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>12</sup>

Lincoln's Inn, 28th June, 1811.

My Lord

I happened to be waiting at the bar of the House of Lords yesterday, when Lord Stanhope presented a Bill, for maintaining and enforcing the value of Bank of England paper; and I cannot resist the wish I feel to call your Lordship's attention to the great importance of what passed upon that occasion. The manner in which the extraordinary proposal of Lord Stanhope was received by Lord Liverpool and the Chancellor, and the opinions which the former intimated upon the subject of legal tender, convince me, that the ministers have had the question of making Bank notes a legal tender under their consideration, and that they are prepared to take the first opportunity of effecting that momentous change in the system of our commercial and financial economy. I have been confirmed in the same conviction, by an expression which the deputy-governor of the Bank used to me, just before the debate took place, in talking of Lord King's notice to his tenants, that he hoped Government would not be compelled to make their notes a legal tender. The directors affect to deprecate such an alteration of the law; but they look to it as their ultimate protection, against the necessity, to which the general adoption of Lord King's notice by landlords, and of such actions against country bankers as have been brought lately in the West of England, would compel the Bank of limiting its issues in order to remove the depreciation of its notes. It appeared to me yesterday, that the discussion brought on by Lord Stanhope gave the ministers an opportunity, not merely of feeling the pulse of the House upon this question, but of making an impression favourable to such an expedient, when they shall hereafter bring it forward; and I cannot but think it will be a great misfortune to the public, if the session of parliament closes with such an impression as will be left both in the House of Lords and upon the public mind, by such opinions, stated and not exposed, nor protested against, by those who have most weight and authority. The several successive steps, which have been observed in every country that allowed its currency to fall into a state of depreciation, are coming upon us faster than was to have been expected in this country; and as there will be no recovery after Bank

---

<sup>12</sup> Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 78-80; and in *The Horner Papers*, p. 693-4.



notes are made a legal tender, the discussions which precede such a measure are evidently of the last importance.

I take it for granted, that Lord King will attend on Monday: the turn which was given to the debate yesterday renders that indispensable. If your Lordship can make it convenient to yourself, to take a part in the discussion, I am persuaded that the expression of your sentiments will be of most essential benefit to the public interests in this great question, and, I would even flatter myself, might deter the ministers from following so fast that course of measures, into which their own infatuation and the ignorance of their commercial advisers seem driving them.

I have the honour to be  
Your Lordship's most faithful and obliged  
Fra. Horner.

### Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>13</sup>

Lincoln's Inn, 22d July, 1813.

My dear Lord

I flattered myself it would have been in my power to avail myself of your Lordship's kindness, in asking me to Dropmore, and that it would have been in my power to have proposed a visit to your Lordship before going the circuit; but I have been so much occupied, that I shall be under the necessity of setting out for the West of England, without having that gratification.

A singular political event, and one not very intelligible, was announced last night ; that Canning has formally, and with some solemnity, disbanded his party; telling the gentlemen who have been his supporters during the session, that they may for the future, consider themselves as unengaged ; and that he is no longer to be regarded as their head. Ward says they are all turned adrift upon the wide world, but as he has stayed a year in his place, he thinks himself entitled to a good character from his master. He had his discharge from the mouth of Canning himself, the day before yesterday; and the same notification was made to Mr. Robert Smith yesterday. The only other circumstance I have yet heard, connected with this strange incident, is, that Wellesley Pole has been complaining very much that Canning did not bring matters to

---

<sup>13</sup> Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 135-6; and in *The Horner Papers*, p. 765.

bear with the ministry, and that he is now considered both by the Marquis his brother, and by Canning, as perfectly free to do what he can in that way for himself Whether this is a deep measure, or the sudden effect of some ill humour; and whether Canning, in reducing his establishment thus abruptly, points towards Government or Opposition ; I have heard nothing yet that enables me to guess. But very erroneous ideas these men must have of party connexion, or indeed of political morality, who consider their parliamentary associations as held together and as dissoluble without any reference to opinions.

I dare say your Lordship will receive from others a more correct and particular account of this occurrence; but it is so odd a one, and so much deserves to be well understood and watched, that I have taken the chance, by my report of it, of contributing to give your Lordship a full account.

I beg you will present my compliments to Lady Grenville, and am ever,

My dear Lord,

Most sincerely and faithfully, Yours,

Fra. Horner.

### Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>14</sup>

Dropmore, 25th July, 1813.

My dear Sir,

It is a great disappointment to us not to have the pleasure of seeing you before you set off for the West. I hope you will make this place in your way, on your return, if you possibly can.

Living in a time of strange events, yet I have been seldom more surprised than by that which you mention in your letter. What I most lament in it is, the discredit which it throws on all party connection, the upholding which, on its true foundation of public principle, I take to be essential to the benefit of a parliamentary constitution.

Otherwise the mere fact of a party being thus dissolved, shows abundantly it could exist to no good purpose. How Pole is to come into office I do not well understand, as his pretensions are said to be so high. Canning, if he is to be had singly, would I suppose be a very desirable

---

<sup>14</sup> Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 138.

acquisition indeed to a government so unusually weak as this is in House of Commons' debate.

Ever, my dear Sir, most truly yours,  
Grenville.

P. S. I have been not a little surprised by the Speaker's speech, if we are to take the newspaper report of it as correct. Does your recollection furnish you with any instance of a Speaker remarking to the Throne on motions made, hut rejected, in the House of Commons. How is the King (or Prince Regent) to know that such matters passed there? and what authority has the Speaker to assign grounds of such decisions?

### Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>15</sup>

[f. 64r]

Lincoln's Inn  
Feb. 5<sup>th</sup> 1814.

My Dear Lord

I am very desirous to have the advantage of knowing your Lordship's opinion, with respect to the course which is most adviseable, upon our question in the House of Commons relating to the Speaker's conduct. I find a notion is entertained that it may be proper to begin with moving for a Committee of Precedents; to which I feel an objection [f. 64v] not only upon the ground, that we shall probably have but one question on the subject – and had better therefore put upon the Journals the opinion of the ministry in direct terms, but likewise upon this ground that it ought not to be treated as a matter depending upon the learning of precedents, but upon those first & vital principles of the constitution of the House with which it is the duty of every member to be familiar. All the good that we can hope to effect by our motion & debate, is the impression made at the time, and the example left to future speakers; with a [f. 65r] view to this impression, it is important that we should be quite right in the form and shape of the question upon which we take the discussion. Lord Morpeth has been good enough to consult my opinion about this, which inclines to a direct vote of censure at once; but I should feel myself much more secure in forming an opinion to communicate to him, if I had the benefit of knowing your Lordship's sentiments.

---

<sup>15</sup> British Library, Add MS 58977, ff. 64-5.

It is possible enough that the Speaker may attempt to justify his speech, by some instances of similar impropriety [f. 65v] committed by his predecessor, though hitherto I have not been able to discover one case of the sort; and as his defense, I presume, will be heard, before any question can be put, it may be right to be provided with a motion for a Committee, if he should produce any authorities not previously known to us.

I hope Lady Grenville is quite well, and beg to offer her my best regards.

I am ever

My dear Lord most faithfully Yours

Fra Horner

### Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>16</sup>

Dropmore, 7th February, 1814.

My dear Sir

My notion is that the Speaker's speech ought to be considered simply as a breach of privilege, on the constitutional ground which you mention, and according to the old doctrine, that the Speaker has neither eyes to see, ears to hear, nor tongue to speak, in the business of the House, but as the House commands.

The question of discretion I should myself disclaim, saying distinctly, that if I thought the Speaker had any such discretion to exercise, though even then I should think this a very indiscreet use of it, yet I should by no means wish the House to interpose with any censure of a mere error in judgment, however glaring. But if we are right in our view of the case, it is absolutely necessary to declare, for the purpose of the future maintenance of the privileges of the House of Commons, that they have not intrusted to their Speaker any discretion to communicate to the Throne, in presence of the Lords, any part of the proceedings of the House, other than such as have been brought to that state in which they are constitutionally and *necessarily*, and by order of the House itself, so communicated.

In this view of the case, the proper course, I think, would be, to begin by a resolution simply declaratory of the law of parliament and privilege of the House of Commons in this respect. Nor do I see that in

---

<sup>16</sup> Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 156-8.

any case, whether of the passing or rejection of this resolution, it could be necessary to follow it by any vote directly applying this rule to the recent conduct of the Speaker. In such a case, prevention is the proper object to be professed and to be pursued; and this will, I think, infallibly be obtained by such a motion, in whatever manner it may happen to be disposed of at this moment.

The wording of such a motion would require some care and attention, to be quite sure that the privilege is correctly and accurately stated; and on this subject it is probable that Charles Williams Wynne, who has, I doubt not, looked carefully through the precedents, can give better advice than any body else.

For the argument, however, it is obvious, that, in this way of treating the subject, precedents are of much less importance, because the Speaker's speeches not being properly matter of record, it was natural, and indeed unavoidable, that slight breaches of the rule should pass unnoticed; and it is not until the violation of it is gross and flagrant, that it attracts attention. This is the case with almost every other privilege of parliament: the daily and habitual breach of these in slight cases is never understood to prejudice, in the slightest manner, the rule of privilege itself, which it remains in the breast of the House to exercise and assert to its full extent, whenever the occasion requires it. In the present case, it may easily be shown that the violation is such as, if wholly unnoticed, must destroy the privilege itself.

I confess I doubt whether the matter has hitherto been taken up and spoken of quite in as high a tone as its importance requires ; if it be, as I really believe, the greatest *direct* violation of the *independence* of the House of Commons that has been attempted, I might say, for a century and a half. By *independence* I do not, of course, mean its right of free action, with which this matter has no concern, but its right of separate, distinct, and *uncommunicated* proceeding. It is far less in degree, but in principle exactly similar to the case I alluded to at the beginning of this note, the case of the five members.

Ever most truly yours,

Grenville.

Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>17</sup>

[f. 93r]

Dropmore Nov 27 1814

My dear Sir

Lady G. & I earn the hope that you will allow us the pleasure of seeing you here this Xmass.

We shall probably be here the whole of the vacation, & the longer time you can have the goodness to [?] to us the more we shall [f. 93v] feel ourselves obliged to you.

I think I should be in town for a few hours on Thursday. I wish to take the opportunity of Lord Donoughue's motion to give notice of making some motion after the [?] on the subject of the proceedings at Ghent, unless I should be anticipated by the conclusion of Peace which I more wish than expect.

I am most truly y<sup>rs</sup>

Grenville

Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>18</sup>

[f.66r]

Lincoln's Inn  
Nov 28<sup>th</sup> 1814.

My Dear Lord,

It would give me the greatest pleasure to have it in my power to pass some days at Dropmore this Christmass. But I wish very much to go down to Scotland, if I can find it practicable to set out from London early enough from so long a journey; of which I shall not be sure till the Privy Council have fixed their days of sitting at the Cockpit.

I rejoice very much to hear that your Lordship intends to be in the House on Tuesday. The city people had a very strong impression on Saturday, that these negotiations at Ghent are to terminate soon in peace; among others, [f66v] I found Baring of that opinion. Hitherto, the negotiation on our part appears to have been very strangely conducted.

I am ever My Lord

Most faithfully Yours

Fra Horner.

---

<sup>17</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 72844, f.93. An allograph writing on the top of f. 94r reads "To Francis Horner From Lord Grenville".

<sup>18</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 58977, f. 66.

## Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>19</sup>

Saturday morning [4 March 1815]

We received the report of the Scotch Jury bill yesterday and I think you will be of opinion that it has been much improved in the committee.

I moved in the committee an amendment making the direction of juries imperative in the cases of damages for personal wrongs. I withdrew it at the desire of the Lord Chancellor who undertook to consider the subject, and to move some such amendment on the report if he thought it possible to accomplish the object without material inconvenience.

He did not say much yesterday to satisfy me of the impossibility, but as he declined making the motion I did not think it worth while to press the subject further as I understand that this is the point on which the Scotch Judges and lawyers are in general most pertinacious.

I expressed a general approbation of the experiment, though not going so far as I thought it might.

From the strong impression which the Corn bill is making out of doors I feel very sanguine in obliging its supporters if not to relinquish it altogether at least to lose their support price. Every thing seems to depend on gaining time, and I wonder if that with that view the London people have not petitioned for liberty to be heard by Counsel, and to produce evidence on the many points in which the evidence is defective particularly.

1. The real growing price under the reduced charges of agriculture
2. The manner of taking the averages, and their effect on the price of the loaf in London and elsewhere.

And 3<sup>rdly</sup> On the actual proportion of the money price to the real price of the labour of those artificers and workmen who are not *constantly* supported (as our agricultural labourers are) by the Poor's rate, and of the comparison of that proportion with the rate existing from [?] of the war.

On this point I have some very curious information and expect more. It tends to show that the *present* price of the loaf compared with the *present* wages places them exactly in the same situation as in the

---

<sup>19</sup> Letter published in *The Horner Papers*, pp. 829-30.

average of the last peace – and consequently that *any* fall in wages, or rise in bread must be injurious to them.

I thought that at the meeting in the city yesterday it would certainly have been resolved to apply to be heard by counsel and evidence. I am sorry now I did not suggest it earlier. Perhaps it is still not too late. I mention it to you as you may know, as I do not, when such a suggestion might be made with best effect.

Wakefield who is one of the witness they rely on, has been to me to state his descriptive opinion *against* the bill – all his answers refer, he says, to the actual charges of cultivation – but he is satisfied they must fall, and that with them of course must fall the growing price.

It is curious that there is (comparatively speaking) scarce any information in the reports as to the growing price in Ireland, from whence the supply of England is meant to come.

I return to you Sir I. C.'s opinion on the Jury trial

Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>20</sup>

[f. 67r]

Temple  
Decr 4<sup>th</sup> 1815

My Dear Lord

Will you do me the honor to accept of a copy of Mr Dugald Stewart's Dissertation, on the history of moral philosophy in modern Europe. He has printed a few copies separately from the Encyclopædia to which it is intended to be prefixed, and has sent me two of them. I know you think very highly of his merits as a writer, and have followed with interest the progress of his different speculations. Your [f. 67v] favorable opinion of his powers in composition, and of the aim & scope of his philosophy, will not, I think, be lessened by the perusal of the present work.

I have sent it to Camelford House.

I beg you will offer my kindness respect to Lady Grenville, & believe me

My Dear Lord your very faithful serv<sup>t</sup>

Fra Horner.

---

<sup>20</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 58977, f. 67.



## Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>21</sup>

Camelford House, 6th Dec 1815.

My dear Sir,

Having been called to town for a few days, I found on my table a copy of Professor Stewart's Dissertation. I read it with the eagerness which the subject and his name would naturally create, and I have received from it a degree of delight and instruction, such as few books indeed have ever afforded to me.

It was not till last night that your letter followed me up from the country, and informed me to whom I was indebted for so valuable a present; and this must be my apology for not having sooner thanked you for it. With all my admiration of it, I do not acquiesce in all he says here and elsewhere of Oxford. It may be the effect of prejudice, but I confidently believe that he thinks of our institutions and studies there, less favourably than we deserve, and than he would himself think of us if he were better acquainted with the facts. He has also brought against us a charge, that of expelling Locke, which certainly is not historically true, and I believe I shall be tempted to trouble him, through you (if you will allow it) with a very short note to place that transaction in what I conceive to be its true light. Not that any of us is much concerned to vindicate what our predecessors did a century and a half ago, but because historical truth is valuable, even as to the minutest facts, and still more so when it concerns the conduct of public bodies.

When I got your letter, I was on the point of writing to you, to express how happy you would make us if you could contrive to pass any part, the longer the better, of your Christmas holidays at Dropmore.

Ever, my dear Sir, most truly yours,  
Grenville.

---

<sup>21</sup> Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 306-7.

Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>22</sup>

[f. 68r]

Temple  
Decr 7<sup>th</sup> 1815.

My Dear Lord,

I shall be particularly happy to accept your Lordship's kind invitation to pass part of my Christmas holidays at Dropmore. It is would be agreeable to you to receive me about the last days of this month, I rather think that would be the most convenient time for me; but I will contain to make any other arrangement that you Lordship would prefer.

I am quite sure that M<sup>r</sup> [f. 68v] Stewart will be very grateful for any communication from your Lordship serv<sup>t</sup> as you propose, and that he will yield readily and thankfully to the proofs of his having been<sup>23</sup> misled into an incorrect statement. I take for granted he must have drawn his impression, with respect to the proceeding against Locke, from the correspondence of L Sunderland with Bishop Fell, which was published by Fox.

I am much gratified [f. 69r] with your approbation of the Discourse in general.

I am ever My Dear Lord  
Most faithfully yours  
Fra Horner.

Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>24</sup>

Dropmore, 10th Dec. 1815.

My dear Sir,

The time you mention will be perfectly convenient for our having the pleasure of seeing you here. Since I have returned here, I have entered upon a second and more deliberate reading of Stewart's Dissertation. I am afraid you will not think very highly of my judgment in selecting for observation, amidst such a mass of the most valuable matter, a slight and incidental reference to an almost forgotten anecdote. But something must be allowed for local attachment, and I have no

---

<sup>22</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff. 68-9.

<sup>23</sup>“been” is inserted.

<sup>24</sup>Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 307.

doubt of satisfying you when I see you, that the act in question was in no respect (what Stewart represents it) the act of the University, but, solely and exclusively, the act of that profligate and ambitious court whom Locke had offended by his attachment to Lord Shaftesbury. It is in that light that Fox represents it, drawing from it its proper historical inference, that of the insecurity even of the most obscure stations, under the tyranny of such a government

Ever most truly yours,

Grenville.

Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>25</sup>

[70r]

Temple  
Decr 16<sup>th</sup> 1815

My Dear Lord

I will transmit your very interesting communication to Mr Stewart on Monday. I wish to retain it in my own hands so long, for the sake of forming my opinion upon the statement & assessments contained in it. No one that feels a proper concern to the literary glory of the country, can fail to be interested in every thing that affect even historically [f. 70v] the reputation of Oxford, which has had so large a share of that glory, and must always exert so powerful an influence over the general state of knowledge & opinion in this quarter of the world.

Since I had the promise of this communication from your Lordship, I have had an opportunity of answering it to Mr Stewart, and I had the gratification of repeating at the same time the terms in which you had [f. 71r] commented his new publication. I can easily perceive that he has derived no common satisfaction from what he terms your kind and liberal praise and he has desired to me to say to your Lordship, that he would gladly correct any erroneous statement he may have made with regard to Locke.

I am ever My Dear Lord

Your faithful Serv<sup>t</sup>

Fra Horner.

---

<sup>25</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff. 70-1.

## Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>26</sup>

[f. 72r]

Woburn Abbey, 31<sup>st</sup> Dec. 1815.

My dear Lord

I inclose the answer, which I have received from Mr Stewart, to the communication which you sent him through me, respecting Locke's affair at Oxford in 1684. With his usual candour and love of accuracy, he yields to your Lordship's explanation, and proofs, of the real nature of that transaction; which has been so erroneously represented by every writer, I believe, who has hitherto mentioned it. The inaccurate language which Dr. Fell and Lord Sunderland themselves<sup>27</sup> used, to describe what they had done, became by tradition the only memorial of what had passed. At a period nearly equally distant from that time and from the present, we find Pope, when he takes occasion to glance at the story, calling it the expulsion of <sup>28</sup> Locke; in a passage of the fourth book of the *Dunciad*.

Though I perfectly concur with your Lordship in thinking, that the Chapter of Christ Church had no means of resisting the arbitrary violence of <sup>29</sup> government, I am rather inclined to be of opinion, that legally they had a right to refuse obedience to the warrant. When the King is Visitor, he [f. 72v] must visit by his Lord Chancellor. I take this to have been clear known law, at the time we are speaking of. Upon ancient authorities, to be found in the Year-Books, it is so laid down by Fitzherbert, in treating of the writ of Prohibition; by Lord Coke; repeated by Rolle; and <sup>30</sup> after an interval, during which no new decision on that particular point had been made<sup>31</sup> by Comyn. I should apprehend, therefore, that, in 1684, the opinion of lawyers would have been, that a sign manual, countersigned by the Secretary of State, was not legally a visitatorial act.

This consideration, however, if well-founded, still does not affect the conclusion, that, in point of fact, the Chapter submitted to an act of power, which in this point of view <sup>32</sup> only appears the more

---

<sup>26</sup> MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff. 72-3. Letter published in *Memoirs and correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, Vol. 2, pp. 310-3.

<sup>27</sup> "themselves" is inserted.

<sup>28</sup> "the" is deleted.

<sup>29</sup> "sta" is deleted.

<sup>30</sup> "at a later period, though no [intercessing?] decision had occurred" is deleted.

<sup>31</sup> "after an interval, during which no new decision on that particular point had been made" is inserted.

<sup>32</sup> "would" is demeted.

arbitrary and violent. I cannot help thinking, that the Dean of Xt Ch.<sup>33</sup> must be regarded as a willing accomplice in the act; for he suggests the course that was adopted; and he ought to have known so much of the laws of the country, as concerned the rights and protection of his college. But for the point in question, it is not material to ascertain, how far Doctor Fell was more or less servile to the Court.

I think, too that your Lordship has shown unanswerably, that it is quite incorrect and unfair, to couple the transaction of 1684 with any [f. 73r] thing in the state of philosophical opinions at that time in the University. In all probability, few individuals <sup>34</sup> in<sup>35</sup> Oxford, and least of all <sup>36</sup> the<sup>37</sup> senior academies, could <sup>38</sup> be apprized<sup>39</sup> of those [tenets?] and speculations, which were not published to the world till two years after the Revolution. For if my recollection is right, the first edition of the Essay was in 1690, after Locke's return from Holland.

At a subsequent period indeed, and when the Government of the Church as well as State was in hands incapable of illegal violence, and not adverse to free inquiry, there *were* proceedings at Oxford, directed expressly against <sup>40</sup> the Essay on Human Understanding. And these appear to have originated within the body of the University, and to have grown out of the opinions that reigned there on metaphysical and theological subjects. I allude to a meeting of the heads of Houses, which is said to have been held in 1703, in order to discourage & censure the reading of the Essay; at which, after much debate, it was resolved, without coming to a public censure or decree, that each head should prevent it from being read in his college. All I know of this is from Locke's correspondence with Anthony Collins in the same year, 1703, and the notice given by Des Maizeaux, the editor of those letters. Locke ascribes this attempt to “damn his book” to an opinion, entertained by those learned persons, of its tendency to discourage the [f. 73v] School Logic, which he calls “the staple commodity of the place.” He appears to have obtained <sup>41</sup> but imperfect information of what had been actually proposed, or agreed upon, at the meeting; and perhaps no authentic

---

<sup>33</sup> “of Xt Ch.” Is inserted.

<sup>34</sup> “at” is deleted.

<sup>35</sup> “in” is inserted.

<sup>36</sup> “them” is deleted.

<sup>37</sup> “the” is inserted.

<sup>38</sup> “have any thing” is deleted.

<sup>39</sup> “be apprized” is inserted.

<sup>40</sup> “Locke” is deleted.

<sup>41</sup> “many” is deleted.

account of it, more circumstantial, is any where preserved. It is an incident of no inconsiderable importance, in the history of English philosophy; and, if truly stated in the accounts I have mentioned,<sup>42</sup> would seem justly to admit of that reflection, which has hitherto been inaccurately attached to the proceeding of 1684. So Locke himself understood it. It was this too which gave Pope the hint of the satirical passage to which I <sup>43</sup> have already referred, in which he describes Aristotle's friends at Oxford “still expelling Locke”, and imputes their prejudice against him to the intolerance of men addicted to that logic. Warburton, too, who was probably better acquainted than Pope with the literary traditions of our Universities, not only concurs with the poet in his representation of the fact, but <sup>44</sup> uses these<sup>45</sup> very remarkable expressions; “Such was the fate of this *new philosophy* at Oxford.”

I propose to have the pleasure of coming to Dropmore on Wednesday next. Believe me,

My dear Lord,

Most truly & faithfully yours,

Fra. Horner.

#### Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>46</sup>

[74r]

Temple

Jan'y 24, 1816

My dear Lord,

I hear from L<sup>d</sup> Holland, that what had occurred to some of the members of the H. of Commons, as a course which might be taken on the first day of the session, does not appear to your Lordship so well calculated as are through it, to answer the object which we have in view. It appears to me so necessary to us as to Law the advantage of your advice & ?, that I wish to state to you upon what grounds it was that I concurred with the rest in adopting the idea of an amendment [f. 74v] confined to the subject of the prorogation of parliament. I may mention that those among whom this matter was talked over, were Mr Tierney,

---

<sup>42</sup> “, if truly stated in the accounts I have mentioned,” is inserted.

<sup>43</sup> “[?]” is deleted.

<sup>44</sup> “[?]” is deleted.

<sup>45</sup> “uses these” is inserted.

<sup>46</sup> MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff.74-6.

Sir Sam<sup>l</sup> Romilly, Abercromby, Brougham, Mr Lyttleton, Mr Leach & a few more as many of the House as were known to be in town.

Though the same difference of opinion, which we had to regret last spring, still subsists, as to the principles that are involved in the late transactions of the war & negotiation, there is (according to my observation) the most general & sincere desire to avoid a premature & indeed all unnecessary declarations of that diversity of opinion in particular [f. 75r] we have however been given to understand, that, not improbably, some of those individuals, who do not enter into those general feelings, may make the experiment of an amendment to the address, embracing all the controverted points. Your Lordship knows too, what importance many members, of most weight in an opposition, always attach to the opportunity of appearing in divisions; as well as the impracticability of securing an attendance, without such a prospect being held out. In the absence of Mr Ponsonby, accordingly, many of us here felt at a loss what answer to make, to repeated inquiries which came from the country, whether there was to be any division the first day, and whether their attendance [f. 75v] was required.

Under all these circumstances, it appeared to us very fortunate that there was a subject of great [moment?], & demanding then earliest notice, on which there was but one sentiment in the whole body of our friends, the unexampled, & unconstitutional conduct of ministers, in wantonly postponing the meeting of parliament, when measures of so [?] a character had been extend into by the executive, which called for the most prompt application to parliament for its sanction, if they were necessary upon this topic, it seemed likely that we should all be found strongly united; it has interest enough attached to it, as well as [f. 76r] importance, to furnish a just reason for postponing the larger questions of policy to a farther day; and by taking it up in this manner upon the first meeting of the House, we not only give the precedence to a question which in some measure affects the privileges of parliament, but in the shape of an amendment we have an opportunity of asserting the constitutional principle in a declarating and solemn form.

It was under the influence of these reasons that we concurred in thinking, that it would be advisable to say to our friends that an attendance on the first day was advisable as an amendment would in all probability be proposed; with [f. 76v] an understanding, that the amendment should be restricted to the particular subject of the prorogation. It was not without difficulty, I think, that some persons of much consideration were induced, by the prospect this holds out of a

strong vote and of preserving a good understanding, to relinquish the opportunity which the first day would present of expressing themselves upon other questions.

I shall feel myself extremely obliged to your Lordship, if you will take the trouble to let me know your sentiments upon the whole of this matter, as it now stands.

Believe me My Dear Lord  
Your faithfull & affect[?]  
Fra Horner.

### Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>47</sup>

Dropmore 25 Jan. 1816

My dear Sir

Lord Holland's letter conveyed to me the first intimation of any intention of forcing a question upon the prorogation to a division in the House of Commons on the first day. I cannot satisfy myself of the propriety of such a course. It is I believe generally held that divisions on amendment to the Address are seldom advantageous to those who press them, though they are sometimes unavoidable. And in this instance Ponsonby's absence, and the known contrarities of opinion respecting the War and its consequences seemed to me to afford strong additional objections to that mode of proceeding.

Then as to the question itself, consider how it stands. The House knows nothing on the first day but the fact that they have been more than once prorogued since the signature of the treaty of Peace. Were this all, it would be improper, no doubt, and a fit subject of animadversion. But what gives to this fact a constitutional importance almost unexampled, is that the Treaty stipulates for the maintenance of a standing Army in Peace, and in Foreign pay, and that the Crown has openly assumed the Prerogative not of contracting only, but of executing this engagement without the sanction of Parliament.

It is not the prorogation that is illegal or unconstitutional, but the unauthorized execution of the Treaty. On the first day neither the stipulation of the treaty nor, still less, the fact of their execution can be before the House. You might certainly advert to the thing as notorious, and in this shape you might have a desultory debate *about it*; but a

---

<sup>47</sup> Letter published in *The Horner Papers*, pp. 871-2. A copy of this letter is in the British Library Add MS 58977, ff. 77-8.



decision *upon it* you could not have, not even if the House unanimously agreed with you in principle.

To whom then, in a case of such real and paramount importance, will this mode of incidental and mixed discussion be favourable? Surely to those who have the worst side of the cause to defend: Who wish to weaken its impression and divert attention from it. Their desire must be to blend it inseparably in the public mind, with the general and temporary politics of the day; with measures which have been singularly successful and are therefore almost universally popular.

In this endeavour I have no doubt that by such a form of discussion they must succeed. A debate on an amendment to the Address cannot by any possibility be confined to the simple and abstract point of law and constitution. It must extend to the policy or necessity of the stipulation itself, and from thence not improbably to the justice and expediency of the object for which the stipulation purports to provide. And in either case, I need not tell you what differences of opinion will be found, and what difficulties they may create as to any concurrence in a vote concluding such a debate.

Ever my dear Sir  
Most truly

Grenville

### Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>48</sup>

[f. 79r]

Temple April 16.1816

My Dear Lord

I am very anxious to see you, before we return to discussions in the House of Commons, on the general state of the finance, and on the measures to be taken with respect to the Bank. I would propose therefor to come to Dropmore on Monday next, if it is agreeable to you; my engagements in town will not allow me to name an earlier day. I am [f. 79v] the more desirous to talk over the Bank question with your Lordship, because I have been urged by several of our friends to move for a Committee to inquire into the expediency of continuing the restriction. The bearings of this question are now in a great measure new; and its importance to the country greater than ever. I am not myself convinced that much is left to be done by a Committee; but rather think

---

<sup>48</sup> MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff. 79-80.

that, either in the progress of the present bill, or upon specific [f. 80r] resolutions that might be moved, we should find ample opportunities for impressing upon parliament & the public what we think the just view of this subject; in which we have indeed only to apply principles, that have long been recognized, to existing circumstances of which every body is aware. But I shall of course be directed in this by others, if a Committee is thought a better mode of proceeding. I have not seen Mr Grenfell; I shall try [f. 80v] to find him to morrow, that I may collect from him the ideas which you have communicated to him.

I am ever My Dear Lord

Yours most faithfully

Fra Horner.

### Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>49</sup>

[f. 81r]

Wednesday [24 April 1816]

My Dear Lord

I have written out the clauses of the East India Company's Charter<sup>50</sup>, which direct the manner in which the commercial accounts are to be kept, for the information of Parliament. The returns you shewed me certainly evade the purpose which the legislature must have had in view, & severely comply with the letter of the act.

Yours most faithfully

Fra Horner.

[f. 82r]

53 Geo III. C. 155.

§. 64. "That, from & after the passing of this act, the s[ai]<sup>d</sup> Court of Directors shall & they are hereby required to direct & order that the books of account of the said Company, at their several Presidencies & settlements in India, at their Factory in China, at the island of S<sup>t</sup> Helena, and in all other places, as well abroad as in England, be so kept and arranged as that the same shall contain & exhibit the receipts, Disbursements, Debts and assets appertaining to or connected with the Territorial, Political and Commercial Branches of their affairs respectively; and that the same shall be made up in such manner, that the said books shall contain & exhibit the accounts of the Territorial & Political Departments separately & distinctly from such as appertain to

---

<sup>49</sup> MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff. 81-2.

<sup>50</sup> The East India Company Act 1813, also known as the Charter Act of 1813

or are connected with the commercial branch [f. 82v] of their affairs; and the s<sup>d</sup> Court of Directors are hereby required, forthwith, after the passing of this Act, to prepare a plan for the arrangement of the accounts of the s<sup>d</sup> Company in the manner aforesaid, and to submit the same to the said Board of Commissioners for the affairs of India, for their approbation; and it shall be lawful for the said Board of Commissioners from time to time - to make such alterations and amendments therein, and such additions thereto, as they shall think fit; which said plan, so approved, altered, amended or added to, by the s<sup>d</sup> Board of Commissioners, the s<sup>d</sup> Court of Directors shall direct and order to be carried into execution.

§. 65. And be it further enacted, That the several accounts required by the s<sup>d</sup> Act of Parl<sup>t</sup> of Great Britain, of the 33<sup>d</sup> year of H. P. M, to be annually laid before both Houses of Parliament, [f. 83r] shall be henceforth prepared and arranged in conformity to the principles of separation hereinbefore directed, of the Territorial and Political Branch of the affairs of the s<sup>d</sup> United Company.”

### Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>51</sup>

Dropmore, 25 Apr. 1816

I return you many thanks for the trouble you have been so good to take in sending me the paragraph from the East India Act. It seems to be beyond all question that the form now adopted in presenting the account to Parliament is a complete evasion of the Act, and I think it extremely important that it should be noticed, and that endeavours should be made to oblige the East India Co. to bring annually before Parliament and the Public the real state of their commercial transactions in the same form of profit and loss which any other merchant would adopt in stating his accounts.

If they make difficulties about this, I submit that the best course would be to move for the plan prepared by the Company in pursuance of the *express* directions of the Act and approved by the Board of Commissioners – and the to refer that plan to a Committee with instructions ‘to examine and report how far the [case?] is, and how it may be made effectual for the purpose, intended by the said Act, of bringing annually before Parliament a distinct and separate view of the territorial

---

<sup>51</sup> Letter published in *The Horner Papers*, p. 890.

and politival receipts and disbursements of the East India Co., and of the profit and loss on the respective branches of their commerce’.

Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>52</sup>

[f. 94r]

Dropmore ap 26 1816

My dear Sir

Very unexpectedly to me my niece has this morning shewn me a letter from Castle hill announcing that Ebrington & his Father are gone to Exeter, with hopes which they think well founded of the County. I should grieve to see them [f. 94v] embark in the expense & vexation of a contest-but I trust they are both too wise for this, & if the [?] is attainable by moderate exertion it is certainly a natural one for them both to wish, & the increased employment & duty would be of essential service to [?] Ebrington. Many tells me what you mentioned that some vote might probably be within your reach, & [f. 95r] it might be useful if you would have the goodness to write, tho’ I hope the [?] of a [?] is led to be looked to as probable.

Your most truly &c

G.

F. Horner Esq<sup>r</sup>

Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>53</sup>

[f. 84r]

Temple April 27.  
1816

My Dear Lord

I have written to such persons as I know near Exeter, who are likely to give their votes to Lord Ebrington. And I have particularly pressed upon them, the importance of <sup>54</sup> their attendance on the day of nomination; as the [shew?] then will probably decide the question. Mr William Smith promised me last night that he [f. 84v] would unite to the same effect to D<sup>r</sup> Carpenter, who is at the head of the Dissenters in

---

<sup>52</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 72844, ff. 94-95. An allograph writing on the top of f. 94r reads “From Lord Grenville to M<sup>r</sup> F Horner”.

<sup>53</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff. 84-5.

<sup>54</sup>“an” is deleted.

Exeter. I [?] wish I could be of any use to L<sup>d</sup> Ebrington on this occasion; nothing would give me a more real pleasure.

I mean to mention the subject of the Indian Commercial accounts on Monday.

The debate on Ireland last night fell very far [f. 85r] short of that you led in the House of Lords, in point of usefulness & impression. Every body seemed to shrink from a statement of the truth, either as to the extent of the existing evil, or the causes which have led to it. One good effect has resulted from the discussion in the House of Lords, that M<sup>r</sup> Peel last night announced the intention of the Irish Government, to revert to what he admitted to have been the ancient mode of nominating sheriffs in Ireland, and which corresponds with [f. 85v] our practice.

I am ever My Dear Lord  
Most faithfully Yours

Fra Horner.

### Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>55</sup>

[f. 86r]

Temple  
May 1<sup>st</sup> 1816

My Dear Lord

Will it not be a difficulty that may be objected to the plan of directing the Bank to pay their notes in cash, beginning with the smaller notes first, that as the law stands at present the Bank may always be compelled to give smaller notes in exchange for large ones? If I have a note for 100£, I may demand of the Bank 100 notes for 1£. In this state of things, if the Bank were compelled to give cash [f. 86v] for the small notes only, it would not be in her own power to keep down the amount of these small notes in circulation; but in effect, by being found to pay them, would be liable to pay all of every denomination. To make your proposed clause answer its purpose, it would seem necessary therefore to provide, that the Bank should not be compellable to give small notes in exchange for larger. Does your Lordship see any objection to such a regulation?

[f. 87r] I have heard there is some intention on the part of Government, in the Committee, to propose a clause giving the Bank an option to pay within the period of two years. If I had not been told that

---

<sup>55</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff. 86-7.

the Master of the Mint is anxious for such a provision, I should give no credit to the story; for an option to the Bank is wholly inconsistent with the principle, on which the suspension has always been placed hitherto, that of compulsion <sup>56</sup> for public reasons which the Bank all along affected to <sup>57</sup> regret.

[f. 87v] I expect to find no objection to the appointment of a Committee for examining the East India Accounts. For Mr Wallace has said to me, that, upon examining them since I mentioned the subject, he does not think that the [directions?] of the act have been complied with.

My Dear Lord

Yours most faithfully

Fra Horner

### Lord Grenville to Horner<sup>58</sup>

Dropmore 3 May 1816

I think there can be no doubt that when the Bank are left under their natural and legal liability to pay Cash, as far as respect their small notes, they should be relived from any obligation to discharge the larger notes in small ones. Without this provision one great advantage of the plan of gradual usurpation would be defeated. I mean the security it affords that no accidental run upon them in the first moment of Cash payment could at the very utmost go beyond the amount of small notes actually in circulation, an amount which they could with certainty command the means of meeting by the issue (*if necessary*) of larger notes to a great extent than before.

The clause of option would as you truly state it be so ridiculous an abandonment of the whole pectoral of compulsory restriction that I do not think it can really be intended. Yet some such measure seems absolutely necessary to give any thing like sense of substance to some of the arguments which I see used against you.

---

<sup>56</sup> “which” is deleted.

<sup>57</sup> “?” is deleted.

<sup>58</sup> Letter published in *The Horner Papers*, p. 898.

Horner to Lord Grenville<sup>59</sup>

[f. 88r]

Thursday

My dear Lord

In case I should not find you at home, I include one form of a resolution. The name I think of the subject, I am the more inclined to apprehend that a declaration of the privilege in general terms might [draw?] over debate into a minute discussion of precedents, in the course of which it might be easy for any one to make exceptions to the general description upon the authority of particular cases. I would rather assume the privilege in the Resolution, and [?] it in the debate.

[f. 88v] It is important, I think, to fix upon that particular part of the Speech, which we mean to stigmatise as a preach of our privileges; I have therefore introduced the bill of the Catholic Bill. It is always to be kept in mind, that that Bill, at the moment the Speaker was addressing the Throne, was still a depending Bill before the House, until the prorogation put an end to it. And though it may not be of much use in the debate, to enforce this technical and lawyer-like view of the case (as you will perhaps think it), yet it is very convenient in our entry of the objection to [f. 89r] the Speaker's conduct upon the Journals, to comment it with the history of the previous proceedings upon the Catholic Bill.

Yours faithfully

Fra Horner.

[f. 90r]

That this House did not authorize Mr Speaker to make any communication to the Throne, in the presence of the Lords, on the subject of the Bill "to provide for the renewal of the Civil & Military Disqualifications under which his Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects now labour; and the notice which Mr Speaker took of the subject of that Bill, in his speech to His Royal Highness upon the 22d day of July last, was a Departure from the established usage and derogatory to the essential privileges of this House.

Or

That it is contrary to Parliamentary usage & highly derogatory from the privileges of the House of Commons that <sup>60</sup> Speaker should

---

<sup>59</sup>MS in British Library Add MS 58977, ff.88-89.

<sup>60</sup> "the" is deleted.

make any communication to the Throne that is not grounded upon a proceeding<sup>61</sup> which<sup>62</sup> has obtained the concurrence of this House.

---

<sup>61</sup> “that” is deleted.

<sup>62</sup> “which » is inserted.